
AN EVALUATION OF BEVANS' MODELS OF CONTEXTUAL THEOLOGY AND ITS CONTRIBUTIONS TO DOING THEOLOGY IN THE 21ST CENTURY CHURCH

O. S. Olagunju

Introduction

Every human being has their perception of what goes on around them; they have some theological clues to various experiences they are going through within the context they found themselves. This is what Stone and Duke referred to as 'embedded theology.' This theology rests at the subconscious level.¹ Stone and Duke explain that this theological instinct is intrinsic and is communicated by praying, preaching, hymn singing, personal conduct, liturgy, social action or inaction, and virtually everything else people say and do in the name of their Christian faith.² Stone and Duke. Ben Willie-Golo observes that 'this embedded theology' is what people pick up about God in relation to their experiences when they go to church and or when they interact with religious activity.³

This theology can be quite extensive or rather simple depending on the experiences and upbringing of the individual operating within it. But to some degree all people of faith possess an 'embedded theology' out of which they make theological claims or assessments, even if it only goes as far as acknowledging that Jesus has connection with the season of Christmas.⁴ Pushing beyond and addressing these "natural," often "unquestioned" and deeply rooted theological givens requires what Stone and Duke call "deliberative theology."⁵ Stone and Duke observe that

deliberative theology questions what had been taken for granted. It inspects a range of alternative understandings in search of that which is most satisfactory and seeks to formulate the meaning of faith as clearly and coherently as possible.”⁶

This kind of theology is deep and the process takes concerted effort and skilled insight as one seeks to probe and question the strong attachments of embedded theology. Golo notes that deliberative theology seeks to sharpen and expand the embedded theology.⁷

The two enter a kind of debate which seems to concern about the common reluctance of the rank-and-file Christian to explore a ‘deliberative theology’ and so call them into a “conscientiousness” that induces a deeper feeling of faith, a conscientiousness to do that which his faith teaches in order to be right with God.⁸ This conscientiousness becomes an intense concern, no matter how sincere one is or what efforts one is making, the point is that one is weak and does not know what to do at this point, the way one lives becomes a concerned witness to God.⁹

When these theologies are practiced within a particular context, then contextual theology begins. In every context the embedded theology is what most people do. They attach religion to every experience. They interpret their circumstances based on their understanding of God and his nature. They bring God in to their context, thus making their theology contextual. This is happening in sport, politics, culture and education. The context with which the Christian message is preached is essential.

Richard F. Wilson observes that

All theology is contextual beginning from the world of the Old Testament to the New and through the second century to the twentieth Christian theology, Christian theology has been articulated through particular tradition. Out of well defined contexts theological confessions were shaped in ways that gave rise to traditions.¹⁰

Wilson observed that even the bible was written in a particular context to a particular people with different cultural values and meaning. That is

why it is important for those who carry Christian message to understand the meaning of the message and the cultural context where the message will be preached.

Definition of Terms

Syncretism

This is a term that is used **interrelatedly** with contextualization by missiologist. Some scholars interpreted what is considered to be authentic contextualization as syncretism. According to Van Rheenen syncretism *is the conscious or unconscious reshaping of Christian plausibility structures, beliefs, and practices through cultural accommodation so that they reflect those of the dominant culture*. Or, stated in other terms, syncretism is the blending of Christian beliefs and practices with those of the dominant culture so that Christianity loses its distinctiveness and speaks with a voice reflective of its culture.¹¹ Hasselgraves notes that “syncretism is birthed out of a desire to make the gospel relevant to a social context. The Christian community attempts to make its message and life attractive and appealing to those outside the fellowship.”¹² Rheneen rightly submits that

Over the years these accommodations become routinized, integrated into the narrative of the Christian community and inseparable from its life. When major worldview changes occur within the culture, the church struggles to separate the eternal from the temporals. The church, swept along by the ebb and flow of cultural currents over a long period of time, loses her moorings. Thus syncretism occurs when Christianity opts into the major cultural assumptions of a society (Van Rheenen 1997, 173).

To avoid the danger of syncretism, David Hasselgraves asserts that Biblically-based theology must form our identities and challenge our syncretisms. We must realize that we are always, to some degree,

syncretistic, and acknowledge our syncretisms before God and fellow Christians.

As good as contextualization is, the theologian must be careful that the core essence of the gospel is not affected. When the gospel is made to compromise its essence and accommodates everything in the culture then syncretism sets in. When the church is afraid to offend but tolerate everything that comes into her folds she is in danger of losing its power and become just like any other institution.

Contextualization

Different scholars from different school of thought have defined contextualization from various perspectives depending on their theological conviction. Moreau (2005) notes that the meaning of contextualization differs depending on the emphasis placed upon scripture and the cultural setting.¹³

Chris Ridgeway defines it as adapting theology to be relevant to a particular context.¹⁴ Enoch Wan a Chinese theologian says contextualization is derived from the dynamic relationship between gospel and culture, between 'cultural relevancy' and 'theological coherence'.¹⁵ Therefore, contextualization is "the efforts of formulating, presenting and practicing the Christian faith in such a way that it is relevant to the cultural context of the target group in terms of conceptualization, expression and application; yet maintaining theological coherence, biblical integrity and theoretical consistency"¹⁶ Tite Tiénou describes contextualization within the process of theology. He writes, "Contextualization is the inner dynamic of the theologizing process. It is not a matter of borrowing already existing forms or an established theology in order to fit them into various contexts. Rather contextualization is capturing the meaning of the gospel in such a way that a given society communicates with God. Therein theology is born."¹⁷ David Hesselgrave and Ed Rommen define it as "the attempt to communicate the message of the person, works, Word, and will of

God in a way that is faithful to God's revelation, especially as put forth in the teaching of Holy Scripture, and that is meaningful to respondents in their respective cultural and existential contexts"¹⁸ J. S. Ukpong and C.U. Manus substitute contextualization with inculturation which they describe as making the gospel or the Bible relevant to a social context and location.¹⁹

Stephen Bevans describes contextualization as an attempt to understand Christian faith in terms of a particular context. Hence he gives model for contextual theology.²⁰ From all these definitions one common goal of contextual theology is to adapt God's eternal message to a particular cultural context without changing the core essence.²¹ The methods or strategies adopted for the adaptation may be different. This writer believes that, what contextual theologians are aiming at, is to see that the needs of the people are met within their emerging culture. How this is done would depend on the strategy adopted by individual contextual theologian.

Bevans' Models of Contextual Theology

Bevans proposes six models of contextual theology. These models are identified based on the methods, tasks, contents and orientations adopted by various contextual theologians. The writer will evaluate them and discuss their contribution to doing theology in the contemporary church.

Translation Model

Some scholars refer to this model as adaptation or accommodation model because of the way that liturgy needs to be related to a particular culture. Translation model is not word for word correspondence of say, doctrinal language of one culture into doctrinal language of another. Rather it is concerned with translating the meaning of doctrines into another cultural context.²² Bevans notes that this translation might make those doctrines look and sound quite different from their original formulation. However the vision of this model is to put something into

the system. Something from outside that will fit inside, something given that must be received.²³

Thus this model presents the gospel in to the context with the expectation that context will receive it. So, the model is salvation centered. It is supracultural and has divine element of biblical revelation as it core.²⁴ This model sees both the scripture and culture as good. It utilizes the four sources of theology in its interpretation of the Bible to a context. These sources are scripture, tradition, reason and experience.²⁵ Bevans notes that what makes this particular model specifically a translation model; however, is its insistence on the message of the gospel as an unchanging message.²⁶ This is one of the strength of translation theology; it takes Christian message seriously as recorded in the scriptures and handed down in tradition. One of the weaknesses of this model is that it has a naïve notion of culture and gospel and makes his revelation propositional.²⁷ Wilson sums up the model by saying that translation model moves from an acceptable core of meaning found in scripture and tradition towards a culture perceived to be in need of the gospel in a particular form.²⁸ So conclusively, Bevans does not adequately consider the trade-off between accuracy and comprehensibility that is inherent to the translation process. He does not acknowledge the difficulties entailed by the functional, rather than formal, approach to translation, which he advocates. How far can one carry functional translation before it begins to merge with the anthropological model, in which the identity of the target culture takes precedence over the message?

The Anthropological Model

The group of the contemporary contextual theologians that this writer has identified and which he will fully discuss their methods and orientations is the anthropological contextual theologian. This group of contextual theologians has creation-centered orientation to theology. They are convinced that the context with which human beings adhere

and the experiences they garner within the context are generally good. They have the perspective that grace builds on nature, but only because nature is capable of being built on, of being perfected in a supernatural relationship with God.²⁹ They also have the orientation towards the world and creation being sacramental. They note that the world is a place where God's self-disclosure is revealed and not in particular holy places, in strange, unworldly circumstances, or in words that are spoken in a stilted voice, revelation comes in daily life, in ordinary words, through ordinary people.

It is within such a creation-oriented theology that we can best speak of anonymous Christianity or of the Christ who is to be discovered in a culture. Creation centered theology approaches life with an analogical, not dialectical, spirit or imagination and sees continuity between human existence and divine reality. It is not that the world is perfect and sinless. Creation-centered orientation acknowledges the reality and ugliness of sin. But sin is sin precisely because it is an aberration in such a beautiful world, an attempt to get out of life what God has not put into it. And the only way that sin can adequately be exterminated is by confrontation with the power of good. They also emphasize on how to preserve the culture of the people who have received the faith.

This approach is about human person, his or her fulfillment within the Christian community.³⁰ Ben-Willie Golo notes that theologians who used this approach are those who had suffered colonial oppression, discrimination and abuse.³¹ These theologians acknowledge the fact that the bible is the word of God and is capable of challenging any context. It can challenge one's view about sexuality, view about the environment, and view about oppression. The question is of what relevance is the bible to individual context. How can the Bible be used to free people from the principality that oppresses them.³² The proponent of this model believes that God manifest particularly in the culture of the people therefore there is the need to re-orientate the understanding of the people along this line.

The anthropological model recognizes that the foundational role of proclaiming the gospel is learning so much about a culture that she or he can become as fully a participant as possible in the culture. This model utilizes the wisdom gleaned from interreligious dialogue as a material from which a truly culturally insensitive theology can be articulated.³³ The anthropological model studies the language of the people and they are at home with inter-religious dialogue simply because they believe that God is in every religion and there is something they can learn from it. So this model promotes inculturation, indigenization and contextualization of the Bible in all cultures.³⁴ One of the weaknesses of this group is the exposure of the gospel message to syncretism, cultural romanticism and extreme liberalism.³⁵ Carson notes that the prioritization of the culture by the anthropological contextual theologians is a weakness. He observes that

‘When the cultural setting is prioritized, however, God’s meaning is sought experientially within the culture using the Bible as a guide. This model more fully “assigns control to the context; the operative term is praxis, which serves as a controlling grid to determine the meaning of Scripture’³⁶

Wilson notes that related to the foundational work of learning the culture is the explicit theological task of discerning the presence of God within the culture.³⁷ Examples of the anthropological contextual theologians are Tinyinko Maluleke, Robin Hood, Max Warren, Bolaji Idowu and John Mbiti. They all note that the scripture only provide a guide or road map. The road map that points to God’s grace already embedded in the culture of the people. The strength of this model comes from the fact that it regards human reality with utmost seriousness. It attests to the goodness of all creation and to the loyal ability of the world into which God sent His only son. This model has the advantage of starting where the people are, with people’s real questions and interests, rather than by imposing questions asked out of other contexts, it allows men and women to see Christianity in a fresh light After all, Christianity is not foreign to Africa.

The Praxis Model

This model lies between the translation and anthropological model. The model leans towards a theology of liberation of the people from the oppressed based on God's revelation.³⁸ The praxis model understands revelation as the presence of God in history, in the events of everyday life, in social and economic structures, in situation of the oppression, in the experience of the poor and the marginalized. Bevans notes that God is revealed in history, however is not just there. God's presence is one of beckoning and invitation, calling men and women of faith to locate God and cooperate with him in his work of healing, reconciling and liberating.³⁹ The model does not believe that God will come to intervene in the affair of the people. They believe that man's destiny is in his hand and he must of necessity stand up for its right. Human beings should analyze his environment and find echoes from the scripture to support his action.⁴⁰ They believe that man should not stand at akimbo waiting for miracle, man should participate in what God is doing here, react to situation that will undermine the welfare of the people. This model does not believe that prayer is the solution to everything; yes, they believe man should pray but at the same time take action against any institution of oppression. Praxis theologian believe that most of the suffering face by people today are artificial, they are mostly manmade and not from God. So they re-orientate their theology towards alleviating the suffering of the people. Golo citing Bevan notes that the basis of their action lies in the followings:

1. Prophetic tradition: issue about God is not about word but action
2. Their Christian basis is in New Testament especially the book of James 1: 22 and in the history of the historical Jesus.
3. The close connection between ethical behavior and logical thinking. What we claim to know is that which we claim to be and all truth must be subject to the people who make it.⁴¹

The praxis slogan is that God has invited every man and woman to work beside him equally. In other words men and women are called to

theologize.⁴² This is the main presupposition of the praxis model. Wilson submits that praxis model sees culture as a dynamic reality that is going to change with or without theological influence and therefore becoming involved with culture is theological mandate.⁴³ For example, Carson, D. A. observed that the praxis model defines 'contextualization as the translation of biblical meanings into contemporary cultural contexts.' Therefore, they interpret images, metaphors, rituals, and words that are current in the culture in light of biblical understanding of it to make the message both understandable and impactful.⁴⁴ He further explains that the praxis model "assigns control to Scripture but cherishes the 'contextualization' rubric because it reminds us that the Bible must be thought about, translated into and preached in categories relevant to the particular cultural context."⁴⁵ When the cultural setting is prioritized, however, God's meaning is sought experientially within the culture using the Bible as a guide.

The goal of praxis model is to find what God is already doing in the culture rather than to communicate God's eternal message within the cultural context.⁴⁶ However, one of the negative weaknesses of this model is the close connection it has with Marxism. Examples of praxis theologians are Gustavo Gutirres; Louis Segundo, Jon Sobrino, Leonard Boff, Jurgen Moltman, Douglas Hall, Desmond Tutu, Steve Biko, Dickson Kyesi

Synthetic Model

This model also falls between the anthropological and translation model. By its name, it is not artificial but a synthesis of the entire model described by Bevens. This model tries to preserve the importance of the gospel message and the heritage of traditional doctrinal formulation while at the same time acknowledging the vital role that context has played and can play in theology, even to the setting of the theological agenda.⁴⁷ The thesis of this model will include the importance of reflective and intelligence action for the development of a theology that does not ignore

the complexities of social and cultural change. The model also reaches out to the resources of other context and other theological expression for both the method and the content of its own articulation of faith.⁴⁸ The theologians working under this model are interested in dialogue between and among the features of the gospel and culture. As much as possible this model affirms the uniqueness of the gospel rooted in scripture and traditions and the uniqueness of the culture as a composite of centuries of growth. Wilson notes that holding the uniqueness of the gospel and culture in tension, this model strives for the theological maturity that can emerge out of honest conversation about the ways the gospel and culture mutually pursue freedom and wholeness. Examples of theologians in this model are Kosuke Koyama, Aylward Shorter and David Tracy.

The strength of this model is its openness to the best or most applicable ideas from all sources. If the various strains are synthesized properly, the resulting theology will come together as a consensus of the community, and will therefore be relevant to that community. On the other hand, the theology of the community will not be the exclusive property and product of one community, but will be open to conversations with the theologies of other communities, which can result in further refinement of both. The synthetic model assumes that communities have enough in common to be able to communicate with one another.

A drawback of this model is the difficulty of achieving a true synthesis, rather than a mere juxtaposition of ideas. Early stages of the process are almost certain to look more like a strange jumble of diverse elements than a comprehensive theology. It might therefore have difficulty attracting participants from the culture, who cannot recognize adequate expression of either their culture or Christianity in the jumble. Another danger is that theology from one source or point of view might become dominant *not* on the strength of the theology, but on the basis its proponents' greater power, numbers, or opportunities for articulation.

This danger might be especially operative in the case of advocates of Western theologies.

Transcendental Model

This is the model of the existentialist. According to Bevans their starting point for doing contextual theology is not by focusing on the essence of the gospel message or the content of tradition as such, nor even by trying to thematize or analyze a particular context or expression of language in that context. Rather, the starting point is transcendental. This model is concerned with one's religious experience and one's own experience of oneself.⁴⁹ The second presupposition is in regard to the notion of divine revelation. By revelation the transcendentalists do not mean the revelation through the scripture or tradition or any other means but the revelation that is embedded in human experience as human is open to the words of scripture as read or proclaim open to events in daily life and open to the values embodied in a cultural tradition. The third presupposition lies on the fact that something that seems so private and personal is really something that can articulate the experience of others who shares one's basic context. Transcendental model seems to be the most spiritually oriented of the five models articulated by Bevans because of its sharp concentration upon the individual as a believing subject. The model seems spiritual but its spirituality has no bearing with the scripture or church tradition. Examples of the theologians in this model are Immanuel Kant, Heidegger, Soren Kirkegaard, Sallie MacFague, etc.

While all of the preceding models seem to envision an arena where pre-conceived theological ideas vie with each other for adoption and expression, the transcendental model allows for the emergence of ideas that cannot be inferred from past religious and cultural expressions. In this respect, it resembles an Eastern approach to theology, which sees the true theologian not as one who studies and debates, but one who has cultivated a relationship with the Holy Spirit through long years of

discipline and prayer. A weakness of this model is the hard-to-define concept of *authenticity*. It serves as a criterion for who may do theology in a given context and how to judge that theology. But the vagueness of the criterion makes it difficult to apply in practice. And if no such criterion is at work, there is no way to judge among potentially competing theologies of various individuals in a given context, each claiming to represent an authentic expression of theology in the context. The resulting theologies can degenerate into mere idiosyncrasy, while other members of the culture are left in confusion.

The Countercultural

The countercultural orientation tends toward suspecting the culture as utterly corrupt and resistant to the gospel. They believe that the gospel is not to be read in the light of the culture but culture in the light of the gospel and that by countercultural; they mean that “⁵⁰the biblical worldview provides a vision that runs deeply at odds with what has developed in the West.” The first task of theology according to the counter-cultural model is to expose those pagan, anti-gospel assumptions as false and ideological. This is done by a re-reading of the gospel over against these cultural assumptions.⁵¹

This model is a modified form of the translational model⁵². It is scripture centered and salvation oriented. Its orientation tends towards the Bible and at the same time be relevant to the context. This model recognizes the deep ambiguity and even anti gospel nature of the context. Its slogan is all culture should submit to the authority of the scripture and where culture crosses the scripture; the scripture should take precedence over the culture. The counter culturists do not seem to be comfortable with culture of the people, yet they seek relevance.

However, this model has four areas of caution. First, the anti-cultural stance of this model needs to be revisited. Second, the danger of sectarianism is always present in this model. Third, countercultural model is in regard to its relatively mono-cultural makeup. Finally, the model is

in danger of making Christians exclusivist over and against other religions.⁵³ The following theologians are examples of the counter-cultural advocates, Leslie Newbigin, Stanley Hauerwas and William Willimon, and Roman Catholics Avery Dulles, Mary Jo Leddy, and John Coleman.

The Contribution Of Doing Contextual Theology In The 21st Century Church?

In Africa for Christian theology to become popular it has to be shielded away from western coloration. The Africans see christianity as white man's religions because of the way their culture and world views have been embedded in it. Therefore for the theology to gain acceptance the advice of Bevans has to be followed. A theology that honors the experience of context will be one that is not tied to Western ways, themes and methods of theology." This may be very good for the West, but for the churches of Africa, Asia, Latin America, Oceania, and the churches of particular ethnic groups within the churches of the West (Indians, Carribeans, Aboriginal, Maori, African American, Latino/a etc.) theology should only be done from local experience and local context. The non-Western churches can also contribute to the global church by showing the whole church what it is: not a Western religion, but one that has been and is again a non-Western religion. In churches which are in a minority status within secular or non-Christian minorities, their context might very well impel them to do theology—on the one hand—that emphasizes the uniqueness and difference of their Christian faith, and—on the other hand—that helps Christians “give an account of the hope that is within them” in the face of indifference, opposition or even persecution. Bevans notes “what is needed today is a new apologetics. Such a “new” apologetics may not be unlike that of the early apologists in the church, and the experiences of Justin or Origen may well be important sources for these new efforts. Multicultural churches need to explore this unique, challenging experience. There needs to be a dialogue between and among cultures, ethnic identities and social locations.

In many churches, not only must a theology be done that engages the young, but young people need to be trained and cultivated as theologians. Theology should not be confined to highly trained academics but young ones should also be trained to engage in it. Bevans notes that “contextualization is too important to be left only to the trained theologians. Theology is the birthright of the entire church, and this includes the world’s youth.”

These are some of the contributions that a contextual theology can offer in this century

1. In line with Bevans discovery it offers the church a new *agenda* for its theologizing;
2. It offers the church a new methodology or approach to presenting the gospel
3. It offers it the church a new *voices*;
4. It offers the church a new *dialogue*.
5. It brings new perspectives to doing theology within the framework of the church and society
6. It offers new orientations.
7. It offers new vision or new insight into Gospel presentation.

A New Agenda

Contextual theology offers the church of the 21st century a new agenda. The contemporary church did not the same agenda with the early church. The contemporary church have to contend with some issues which is strange to the church of the early church for example the contemporary church has to deal with the issue of economic meltdown, poverty, ethno religious violence, migration and cultural diversity. This contention then necessitated the need for contextual theology in order to address the issues at stake. In Nigeria today a theology that does not address the issue of poverty, love, corruption, worldliness and religious tolerance cannot be worthy of the name.

A New Method

Contextual theology offers the church of the 21st century a new method. When contextualizing the gospel a new method or approach that is distinct from the traditional ones comes to light. For example the skilled use of proverb, drama, dance or music can be used in Gospel presentation.

New Voices

There have been strong, clear, beautiful voices in the past: scholars like Tinyinko Maluleke, Desmond Tutu, Loius Segundo, P.C Wagner, C. S. Lewis, Jack Hayford, Bolaji Idowu, John Mbiti, Mercy Amber Oduyoye, Pobee, Kwabena, Titie Tenou, Asamoah Gyadu etc have lent their voices in the past and some are still active in the present. I believe the Nigerian church needs to listen to its indigenous theologians, its young theologians from the seminaries and universities. Who are the voices in your country that you need to listen to. The voices of contextual theologians are one more gift that contextual theology has to offer the church of the 21st century.

A New Dialogue

As the contextual theology meets other religions in the context, dialogue should be the best option. Bevans, Newbigin and Wagner propose a wider dialogue among contextual theologians. Bevans notes that besides *our own* particular contexts, there is another context for doing theology in the contemporary church, and that is the global context.

Conclusion

Contextual theology is very important, as it enables contextualization of the gospel in different cultures. Bevans suggests six models of contextual theology. They are: (1) the translation model; (2) the anthropological model; (3) the praxis model; (4) the synthetic model; (5) the

transcendental model. 6) Countercultural model; these models are helpful in understanding the relationship between the gospel message and culture. Bevens identifies some important principles for understanding the role of particular theologies. For instance, he states that all theologies have some limitations, and that any good theology must be open to criticism from other points of view. In addition, he points out that there is but one gospel among many cultures, each of which might develop its own theological reflection. Thus, no theology can have a monopoly over all theologies. I think the summary of it is that it offers the church a new look at this affluent society today. Bevens notes that It is the honoring or testing or critiquing of experience that makes contextual theology *contextual theology*. What this means is that, for contextual theology, *anything* can be a source of theology.

References

- Barton, James and Morgan, *Biblical Interpretation* 174.
- Bevens, Stephen B. 1992. *Models of Contextual Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.
- _____. *Doing Theology in North America: A Counter-Cultural Model?* Unpublished
- _____. "Living Between Gospel and Context." In van Gelder, ed. 1999. Pp. 141-154.
- _____. 2002. *Models of Contextual Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books Retrieved from ["http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Countercultural_model"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Countercultural_model) accessed on July 20, 2011.
- _____. 2009 what has contextual theology to offer to the church of the 21st CENTURY? Mission in Context Lecture Church Mission Society, Oxford October 15, 2009.
- Carson, Don A. 1987. "Church and Mission: Reflections on Contextualization and the Third Horizon." In *The Church in the Bible and the World: An International Study*, ed. D. A. Carson,

- 213-257. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1987.
- “Contextual Theology as a Theological Imperative” Sureshacts.
multiply.com/journal/item/3-Dec2007.
- Donovan, Vincent J. 2003. *Christianity Rediscovered: 25th Anniversary Edition*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Golo Ben-Willie. Lecture Notes on Contemporary Theologians July 14, 2011.
- Hesselgrave, David J. 1995. “Contextualization That Is Authentic and Relevant.” *International Journal of Frontier Missions*. July, Volume 12:3, pp. 115-20. Accessed on July 19 2011 <http://strategicnetwork.org/index.php?loc=kb&view=v&page=v&id=8530&mode=v&pagenum=1&lang=>
- _____. 2004. “Traditional Religion, New Religions, and the Communication of the Christian Faith.” In *Encountering New Religious Movements: A Holistic Evangelical Approach*, eds. Hexham, Irving, Stephen Rost, and John W. Morehead II, 137-56. Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Hesselgrave, David J. and Edward Rommen. 1989. *Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Kato, Byang H. 1975. “The Gospel, Cultural Context, and Religious Syncretism.” In *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, ed. J.D. Douglas, 1216-28. Minneapolis: World Wide Publications.
- Kraft, Charles. 1989. “Contextualizing Communication.” In *The Word Among Us: Contextualizing Theology for Mission Today*, ed. Dean S. Gilliland, 121-138. Dallas: Word Publishing.
- Manus C. U. 2003. “Decolonizing Biblical Interpretation in Africa.” *National Association of Biblical Studies* vol 3, 2003,
- Moreau, A. Scott. 2005. “Contextualization: From an Adapted Message to an Adapted Life.” In *The Changing Face of World Missions*, by Michael Pocock, Gailyn Van Rheen, and Douglas McConnell, 321-348. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Orme, John. 2004. IFMA News, Vol. 55, Summer 2004, No. 2.

Tiénou, Tite. 1982. "Contextualization of Theology for Theological Education." *Evangelical Theological Education Today: 2 Agenda for Renewal*, ed. Paul Bowers, 42-52. Nairobi, Kenya: Evangel Publishing House.

Ukpong, J.S

Van Rheenen, Gailyn. 1997. "Modern and Postmodern Syncretism in Theology and Missions." In *The Holy Spirit and Mission Dynamics*, ed. C. Douglas McConnell, 164-207. Pasadena: Wm. Carey.

_____. 2006. *Contextualization and Syncretism: Navigating Cultural Currents*.

Passadena, CA: William Carey Library.

Wan, Enoch. 1999. "Critiquing the Method of Traditional Western Theology and Calling for Sino-Theology." *Chinese Around the World*: 13-16. Accessed on-line on September 22, 2004, at <http://www.missiology.org/missionchina/wan1-1.htm>. Stone and Wilson, Richard F. "Contextual Theology and Global Baptists" in *Contemporary Gospel Accents: Doing Theology in Africa, Asia, and Latin America* Ed by Daniel Carro and Richard F. Wilson. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1997), 3-4

Endnotes

1. Stone and Duke *How to Think Theologically* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989) 13-14.
2. Stone and Duke, 14.
3. BenWillie-Golo Lecture Notes on Contemporary Theologians July 13, 2011.
4. Stone and Duke
5. Stone and Duke
6. Stone and Duke
7. Golo
8. Golo
9. Golo

10. Richard F. Wilson "Contextual Theology and Global Baptists" in *Contemporary Gospel Accents: Doing Theology in Africa, Asia, and Latin America* Ed by Daniel Carro and Richard F. Wilson. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1997) , 3-4
11. Van Rhenen 1997, 173).
12. Hasselgraves
13. Moreau, A. Scott. 2005. "Contextualization: From an Adapted Message to an AdaptedLife." In *The Changing Face of World Missions*, by Michael Pocock, Gailyn Van Rhenen, and Douglas McConnell. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 321-348.
14. Chris Ridgeway
15. Enoch Wan
16. Enoch Wan 1999, 13.
17. Tite Tiénou. "Contextualization of Theology for Theological Education." *Evangelical Theological Education Today: 2 Agenda for Renewal*, ed. Paul Bowers, 42-52. Nairobi, Kenya: Evangel Publishing House. 1982
18. David Hesselgrave and ED. Rommen *Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989.
19. Manus notes that intercultural hermeneutics is another synonym to inculturation which he defines as a descriptive paradigm that seeks to make the New Testament narratives and message address grassroots Christians in their actual contexts and social location in Africa. He notes that inculturation is a dynamic on-going process by which people consciously and critically appropriate the Bible and its message from within the perspectives and with the resources of their cultures (Manus (2003); Ukpong 35). It is a process of appropriation, which in the case of Africa is concerned to make specifically African contribution to Biblical interpretation and actualize the creative power of the Bible in African society. Its focus is on Africa's anthropological empowerment and cultural identity (35). It is a methodology that employs the resources of Africa social or religio-cultural contexts, that is, the African view of reality and African life experiences, to examine the text of a given passage of the Bible and to derive meaning suitable to her/his context (Manus 663). This approach shares with the historical-critical method the dictum that the Bible is a culture's literary property that needs to be understood in its concrete historical and social cultural contexts (Morgan and Barton, *Biblical Interpretation* 174).
20. Stephen Bevans Model of Contextual Theology.
21. That is changing its message to suit the emerging culture where the gospel or the message is sent to be preached.
22. Bevans 38
23. Bevans 39
24. Ben Willie Golo Lecture Notes on Contemporary Theologian, July 2011.
25. Ben Willie Golo

26. Bevens 37
27. Bevens, 44
28. Wilson 6
29. "Issues in Contextual Theology" in *Methodological Issues and Concern* 21-22
30. Bevens
31. Ben-Willie Golo
32. Ben-Willie Golo notes that principalities are those thing that oppresses people.
33. Bevens 59
34. Golo, Lecture Notes
35. Golo, Lecture Notes
36. Carson, 219-20
37. Wilson, 7.
38. Bevens 75
39. Bevens 75
40. Golo
41. Golo
42. Bevens
43. Wilson 8
44. Carson, Don A. "Church and Mission: Reflections on Contextualization and theThird Horizon." In *The Church in the Bible and the World: An International Study*, ed. D.A. Carson, 213-257. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1987.
45. Carson
46. Carson 219-20
47. Bevens 89
48. Bevens
49. Bevens 104
50. Bevens, 2002. *Models of Contextual Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Countercultural_model accessed on July 20, 2011.
51. Bevens 14ff
52. Golo, Lecture Notes, 2011.
53. Stephen Bevens. 2002. *Models of Contextual Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books. Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Countercultural_model accessed on July 20, 2011.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.