
A table of contents for the *Africa Journal of Evangelical Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ajet-02.php

RETHINKING CONTEXTUALIZATION AND THE GOSPEL IN AFRICA

Timothy D. Stabell

Abstract

The following article argues that evangelical approaches to contextualization have often focused too exclusively on subjective culture, while tending to ignore questions of social justice. It then surveys the various models of contextualization suggested by Stephen Bevans (1992, 1995), looking at some of the strengths and weaknesses of each of these general approaches, and then proposes an alternative evangelical "synthetic" model.

One of the key concepts in missiological circles in recent years has been that of contextualization. Darrel Whiteman (1997) argues that the ideas and strategies represented by this term are no passing "fad." Contextualization offers exciting possibilities and real challenges for church leaders around the globe who labor to represent Jesus Christ as faithfully and effectively as possible in a multitude of very different socio-cultural situations. Whiteman suggests that contextualization can perform three important functions in the mission of the church. First, it can help those who are receiving the gospel to see it as their own, as addressed specifically and powerfully to them in their own concrete circumstances. Tite Tienou (1993, 246) speaks in this regard of the gospel becoming rooted in the different social and cultural contexts to which it comes. Second, proper contextualizing of the gospel enables its message to confront what is wrong and sinful in the socio-cultural context, which is being addressed. Whiteman refers to this as an "offensive" function, while Stephen Bevans (1995, 117-124) speaks of a model of contextualization that he describes as "countercultural." Third, Whiteman suggests, efforts made to contextualize the message can potentially help the whole people of God—the church universal—come to a deeper corporate understanding of the nature and power of the gospel. Andrew Walls (1996, xvii) similarly argues that as the gospel has crossed different cultural and linguistic barriers down through the centuries, the church's overall understanding of Christ

Dr. Timothy D. Stabell received his PhD from Trinity International University, Illinois, USA. Formerly he served as Director of TEE in Democratic Republic of Congo, where he was later, on short term mission, involved in church leadership seminars. He has been an Adjunct professor at Taylor University College and Seminary. He is currently serving at Briercrest College & Seminary, Caronport, SK, Canada.

has grown. As believers have proclaimed the gospel in new contexts, they have faced new challenges, new sets of problems, new forms of bondage and new questions. But as they have brought the gospel into such situations, they have found that the Christ of the gospel, his work on the cross and his resurrection from the dead have proved more than sufficient for the new challenges. What started as a proclamation of salvation in a new cultural context has thus often become a discovery of previously unrecognized spiritual riches.[1]

So contextualization offers exciting possibilities. This is as true for Africa as anywhere. To a very real extent, missionaries, pastors and lay people have been contextualizing the gospel ever since it was first preached on African soil. In my own personal experience, working as an expatriate missionary in northeastern Congo from 1983-1996, this fact has perhaps been demonstrated most powerfully through what goes on during Christian funeral services. Anywhere in the world, the death of a loved one—whether child, young person, or adult—is always a tremendously difficult time for the bereaved family. In Congo, however, this sorrow is often compounded by pressures from non-believing relatives and friends who insist that they should try to determine *who* was responsible—in the mystical world of "witchcraft"—for that death. The conviction that death generally "has a (human, occult) cause" is a prominent part of the belief system in Congo, as it is in much of contemporary Africa (Stabell 2005) (cf. Kombo 2003; Kunhiyop 2002; Mbuva 1992; Mukundi 1988).

In this context, aid and comfort from other members of the body of Christ can be critically important, and it is here as much as anywhere that the glory of the gospel shines through. As soon as a bereaved family's Christian friends learn of their loss, they begin to gather around. In virtually every such case friends and neighbors will stay with the family through the night in a public wake. Church choirs sing songs of comfort, pastors and lay leaders preach the biblical message of hope, and friends bring encouragement both by their presence and by material assistance where that is needed. Preachers underscore the biblical truth of God's sovereign and loving control over all that happens in a Christian's life (implied subtext: "This is *not* the work of witches"). They emphasize as well the assurance that believers have of one day seeing their loved ones again in God's kingdom. Christian friends remain with the family throughout the following day until the body has been buried. Then, in the weeks that follow, they continue to visit, bringing more words of comfort and hope from the Scriptures. I have seen God work miracles of consolation in families that were devastated by the sudden death

[1] See also William Dyrness's argument that the time has come for theologians of the first world to learn from those of the Third World (Dyrness 1990).

of a child, a father, a mother, a wife, a husband, a brother or a sister, as members of the body of Christ have faithfully given of themselves in this manner.

But while the example just given shows some of the real advantages of contextualized ministry in the gospel, it also, to my mind, opens a window on a very real weakness in evangelical formulations on the goal and practice of contextualization. While the contextualized message of the gospel just described addresses the matter of belief in witchcraft, for example, it says nothing about the tragic reality that death comes so much more frequently in Africa than in more "developed" countries. Why is it that although I have never personally had to attend a funeral for a child in North America, doing so while living in Congo was, tragically, not at all an unusual occurrence?

What I want to argue in what follows is that evangelical approaches to contextualization have tended to focus too narrowly on issues of "culture" while tending to ignore questions of social injustice and political power. Most evangelical definitions of contextualization (see for example Gilliland 1989; Hesselgrave 1999; Hesselgrave and Rommen 1989; Kraft 1999; Whiteman 1997) describe it as the process of relating the gospel to the world's various *cultures*. This is important and critically significant. But there is more to the social contexts in which people live than "culture."

In general terms, definitions of "culture" focus on the *subjective* side of human experience—on what "goes on in people's heads;" on the different "sets of ideas" (Taber 1991, 3, 8) that shape how they live in the world, what they claim to know, how they respond to life's challenges, and what they believe to be good, true, valuable or noble. Culture is the full repertoire of what is learned from and shared with others in a given society. There is, however, more to life than this subjective side. There are also the historically determined *objective* social, economic and political realities in which people live. In some parts of the world, for example, a man in uniform is seen as a friend to be approached for help when one is in need. In other places, the same kind of uniform elicits emotions of fear. These different responses are not just due to different *subjective cultural* orientations toward men in uniforms. In the first context, the uniformed policeman is indeed very likely to offer the help needed. If he abuses his powers, he is quite likely to be held accountable. In many other contexts, however, the uniformed man's salary may be so woefully insufficient that he feels obliged to extort bribes so that he can provide for his family, and he is therefore feared rather than respected. To give another example, for some people coffee is a consumer product that one buys in the store to drink with cream and sugar. For the people we lived among in northeastern Congo, however, coffee is a cash crop sold to exporters at extremely low prices in the frequently unsuccessful struggle to provide for the most basic of needs. At the same time, for exporters living in that

same community, coffee is a product that makes it possible for them to live in large houses supplied with all the modern conveniences, and to drive Range Rovers to and from the office.

Does the gospel, and the call for repentance, have anything to say about these objective social, political and economic realities? Have we done enough when we have related the gospel successfully to "culture?" A number of voices would join me in arguing that contextualization needs to address on more than cultural issues. As a matter of fact, when this term was first used in theological circles, the intention was that it encompass more than matters of adapting the gospel to subjective culture. In meetings of the Theological Education Fund (TEF) in the early 1970s, the need was expressed for a word that would go beyond what missiologists were calling "indigenization" or "inculturation" (Theological Education Fund Staff 1972; cf. Sanchez 1998; Coe 1976). These terms already spoke to the issues raised by proclaiming the gospel in different cultural settings. The word contextualization was coined precisely in an effort to move beyond what was expressed by these earlier words. The TEF argued that the gospel must address not only culture, but also issues arising out of rapid social change, social injustice, the global but uneven spread of technology, and so forth. From the TEF perspective, the illustration of Christian funeral services given above would be an example of indigenization or inculturation, but not really of contextualization in the fullest sense as they defined it.

Charles Taber, in his book, *The World Is Too Much With Us* (1991), argues that evangelical missions have worked with an incomplete and distorted understanding of socio-cultural context. We have, he maintains, been too heavily influenced by "idealist" understandings of society. Briefly, idealist views argue that the primary source of the character of socio-cultural reality is to be found in the *ideas* that people have about the world in which they live. If you want to understand why people do what they do, if you want to understand the nature of society and social processes, then you must examine what people *believe*. Explore their value systems and worldviews. In other words, study *culture*.[2]

From this idealist perspective, social problems are "in people's heads." In other words, if we want to solve the deep issues with which people struggle, we simply need to help them think rightly about those issues. The gospel then is *primarily* a *message* that we need to *communicate* as effectively as possible (see for example, comments by Hesselgrave (1999, 156, 161) and critique by Shedd (1985, 199)). Certainly, the gospel is nothing if it is not a message, and it is our

[2] Taber also criticizes missionary anthropology for its reliance on "functionalist" models of society. That is a separate issue with its own set of implications and problems.

responsibility to communicate the content of that message with all the clarity and power we can muster, and in terms that can be understood at the deepest levels of a people's thought world and belief system. But Taber argues that the Bible calls for more than this. It speaks as well to the objective social, economic and political realities in which people live, work and die. It speaks to questions of injustice, exploitation, domination, and oppression. It calls on the powerful to repent of their treatment of the disadvantaged (e.g., James 5:1-6). Taber recalls that during the Willowbank consultation on Gospel and Culture (cf. Stott and Coote 1979), some of the participants wanted to initiate discussion about the relationship between the gospel and these objective structural questions. They were told, "But that is not culture" (Taber 1991, 107).

Achille Mbembe is an African voice speaking powerfully to these issues, especially in his critique of the methodology of African Theology in recent years (1988). Beginning from the observation that Christianity has come to Africa as a foreign import, and has often been offered by people representing greater economic and political power (agents of colonialism), he focuses on the African response to the gospel. From his perspective, that response has often been one of subtle resistance (what he calls "*indocilité*"). Sometimes, where people in Africa have "converted" to Christianity, they have done so for utilitarian, instrumental reasons—for the perceived benefits that the church has to offer. They have seen the church as one resource among many, to be accessed as needed for the advantages it makes available. Availing themselves of these resources has not meant, however, that they have necessarily given up resorting to the resources of their "traditions" (including "traditional" "medicine men" or "witch doctors," or various forms of magic), all in the effort to survive, to earn a living, in a world of economic, political, and social oppression.

In this context, the methods of African theology, he argues, have often been inadequate. Theologians have too often sought to relate the gospel to traditional African *cultures*. This has involved focusing attention on a remote past (often as described by Western ethnographers) rather than on the contemporary realities with which Africans struggle on a daily basis. He contends that theologians have generally failed to do adequate historical analysis of the present forms of economic and political power. With this politically inoffensive approach to contextualization, he warns, Africa's resistance to a foreign religious presence—its *indocilité*—will not be tamed. People will continue to access the resources of "tradition" (things like magic, "witch doctors," or "witchcraft," as well as "ethnic" or "tribal" support networks), in part because the church is not addressing the basic causes of economic and political insecurity as it could. He calls on church leaders to have done with a Pilate-like washing of the hands, to clearly denounce the ideologies and practices of oppression, to offer the possibility of other forms

of solidarity and political community and to demonstrate that the God of Christianity is ready and willing to associate himself (through his servants) with Africa's suffering and humiliation (1988, 104-105, 180, 191).[3]

In the remainder of this article, I would like to suggest a way forward for evangelical contextualization that would help us avoid the "cultural reductionism" that has too often characterized evangelical missiology. The approach offered here is an adaptation of the different approaches described by Stephen Bevans (1992, 1995).[4] Bevans describes six different "models" of contextualization: translation, anthropological, praxis, synthetic, transcendental and countercultural. My suggestion is that a modified synthetic approach, combining the strengths (and avoiding the weaknesses) of the translation, anthropological, countercultural and praxis models (this article will not deal with the transcendental model) could offer us a more complete set of tools for tackling the challenge of contextualizing the gospel. In what follows, then, we will look first at strengths and weaknesses of each of these four approaches, and then think through how the strengths of each help to address weaknesses of the others.

As already suggested, evangelical contextualizers have most often defined the task as one of *translating the message* of the gospel with as much clarity as possible in the terms and cognitive categories of the culture being addressed. The strength of translation models, Bevans argues, is in their insistence on the givenness of the gospel message. The gospel, in this approach, is understood to be in its essence a universal message, applicable to all peoples, transcending particular cultures (see e.g., Stackhouse 1988). It is a message that has been successfully translated again and again, and can in principle be conveyed in the terms or categories of any of the world's cultures (Sanneh 1989; Bediako 1995). There is no culture in which the gospel cannot be understood.

---

[3] John Parratt's analysis of theological currents in Africa is relevant here (1995). He describes two main perspectives that have dominated the African theological scene, one north and the other south of the Limpopo. Theologians in central African countries, he argues, have been primarily concerned with the relationship of the gospel to issues arising from traditional culture. This is understandable, he argues, in the light of the colonial experience, and its tendency to belittle African cultures as backward, primitive and inferior. South African theologians, on the other hand, have focused on matters of social justice, reflecting more the concerns of South American liberation theologians. Again, this can be understood in the light of their experience of the injustices of apartheid society. Neither "school" has totally ignored the concerns of the other, but nevertheless each has had its distinct emphasis, and could profitably learn from its neighbor.

[4] Robert Schreiter (1985) offers a somewhat different classification of models, but there is a great deal of overlap between the two. Bevans' is the simpler, and is therefore easier to adapt for our purposes.

There have been some weaknesses, however, in applying the translation models into practice. Donald Carson has criticized the tendency of some evangelicals to differentiate what is "cultural" in Scripture from a universal, trans-cultural "core"—the "essence" of the gospel message. From this perspective, what contextualizers need to do is to identify those parts of the Bible that do not reflect the particular culture of the Old and New Testament peoples, and "*translate*" that "trans-cultural *core*." Sometimes this idea is communicated with the image of a kernel and its shell or husk. What is essential is the kernel, yet the shell or husk can be discarded. Furthermore, the shell is important in order to understand the "core." But, says Carson (1985b), this is an impossible task. There is no supra-cultural core or kernel. Every word of Scripture in some sense reflects the "culture" of the day in which it was written. It is, moreover, dangerous to seek to minimize the importance of some parts of Scripture as mere cultural (and by implication discardable) "shell."[5] What we need to communicate is the whole Biblical message. As evangelicals, we hold all of Scripture to be "God-breathed"—the words of God's mouth (1 Tim 3:16). This is not to say that we should not seek to understand the ancient Biblical cultures, or wrestle with the question of how the teaching given in those ancient contexts applies to life in the very different socio-cultural situations of our own day. The point here is simply that this particular way of formulating the problem ("kernel" and "shell") can too easily lead us astray, implying that some parts of Scripture are unnecessary baggage that we can discard once we have distilled the true core message. In lieu of the "kernel" and "shell" image, Carson proposes that we think of three different socio-cultural "horizons" that need to be bridged—the horizon of Scripture, that of the cross-cultural worker, and that of those to whom that worker ministers. He insists that such bridge building is not at all an impossible task where cross-cultural workers adopt an attitude of loving empathy and real desire to communicate and live the truth of the gospel (1985b, 18).

Another weakness of translation models is their tendency to fall into the kind of cultural reductionism described above, seeing culture as the most important aspect of social existence. From this perspective, as mentioned above, the task of sharing the gospel is seen primarily as one of communicating a message. Truer to the outlook of the biblical authors, it seems to me, would be to assert that our mission is *equally* to communicate a message *and* to seek to live out the reality to which this message points by the power of the Holy Spirit. Paul wrote to the Thessalonian Christians, "We were ready to share with you not only the gospel of God but also our own selves, because you had become very dear to us" (1 Thess

[5] Bevans suggests that the more accurate image is of an onion. Peeling away the layers of an onion will never succeed in revealing a kernel more valuable or true than the other layers (1992, 36).

2:8 RSV). Without a transformed life—one characterized by a growing desire for biblically defined righteousness and justice—the gospel can become a matter of words without power (1 Corinthians 4:20). The task of translating the message must never become separated in our minds from that of living its truth (cf. Gal 2:14) and "seeking first the kingdom of God and his righteousness/justice" (Matt 6:33; cf. Matt 5:6; Bosch 1991, 70-72).

As argued above, cultural reductionism may tend to blind us to the more objective realities of economic or political oppression and injustice—realities about which the Scriptures are not silent. If we narrow our vision to issues of cultural outlook, we will see our task as primarily one of seeking to change the way people think about the world around them. While this is a tremendously important aspect of our mission, the Bible also gives evidence of a responsibility to "seek justice, correct oppression; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isa 1:17). The prophets addressed not only the false worldview and cultural assumptions involved in the worship of idol gods; they also confronted those in positions of power about the specific ways in which they were abusing that power (e.g., Isa 3:14-15; Amos 5:7-12; cf. Birch 1991, 259-269).

"Anthropological models" of contextualization, as described by Bevans, have serious weaknesses from an evangelical perspective. These approaches emphasize that contextualizers need to take local cultures seriously. Many practitioners of this kind of approach, however, would argue that "taking culture seriously" means seeing culture as a medium through which God reveals himself to people. Culture, from this perspective, can for some be virtually on a par (sic)with Scripture. Hesselgrave is right here to remind us that all of the world's cultures are heavily impacted by sin, and therefore are not reliable sources of revelation.

There are other dangers in anthropological models with their focus on culture. "Taking culture seriously" can lead to relativism if we are not firmly grounded in the Biblical truth about God and his will (cf. Hiebert 1987, 108). Robert Schreiter and Bevans both warn us against romanticizing culture (Bevans 1992, 53; Schreiter 1985, 14). We must be ready and willing to see the lies and satanic deception that is often taught through human cultures.

Nevertheless, while being careful to avoid "taking culture seriously" in *this* sense, it has become increasingly clear that we ignore culture only at the risk of discovering that our efforts at communicating the message have been less than fully effective. The study of culture is imperative if we are to address people comprehensibly and on the matters of gravest concern to them—if we are to "scratch where it itches."

"Countercultural models" provide a good foil with which to address the weaknesses just mentioned of anthropological approaches. Bevans argues that like translation models, efforts to contextualize Scripture in a countercultural mode often give evidence of greater respect for the authority of Scripture than do some of the other models he describes. Moreover, the message of Scripture is seen as standing over against the values of sinful human cultures. The countercultural approach, consistently applied, is thus much less likely to fall into cultural romanticism and relativism. Bevans writes: "What this model realizes more than any other model is how some contexts are simply antithetical to the gospel and need to be challenged by the gospel's liberating and healing power" (1995, 118).

Praxis models (Schreiter (1985) refers to these as "liberation" approaches) have their set of strengths and weaknesses as well. Nuñez (1985) argues that there is much that evangelicals can and should learn from theologians speaking from this perspective. Liberation theologians have been insistent that the Scriptures address not only matters of culture, but also of social exclusion, economic injustice and political oppression. One of the main strengths of these models is thus their avoidance of cultural reductionism. Praxis models remind us to analyze social reality critically, with an eye open for the kinds of injustice that the biblical prophets railed against. They teach us to look at the world from the perspective of the poor, the disenfranchised, the oppressed, and to side with them against the oppressors, calling for the kinds of radical social and political change that will allow people to live their lives in security and peace.

Praxis models also emphasize a particular approach to epistemology. They argue that a purely theoretical knowledge is not true understanding. We only truly *know* the truth as we *live* the truth. It is not enough to know *about* the Biblical God of love and justice without living a life that reflects his love and justice, and his love for justice. In calling king Jehoiakim to repentance, Jeremiah reminds him that his father, king Josiah, did what was right and just, defending the cause of the poor and the needy. Then he adds, "*Is this not what it means to know me?*" (Jeremiah 22:16; cf. 1 John 3:16,17). One cannot claim to know God, in other words, without actively sharing his concern for social justice.

Praxis models of course have their weaknesses as well. They have, for example, been criticized for an insufficiently critical reliance on Marxist social theory and ideology, and for a tendency to absolutize the context of the oppressed (Stackhouse 1988). From this perspective, to be poor is to be automatically part of God's people, without reference to repentance and faith in Christ.

Is it possible to learn from the strengths of the above models, allowing their strengths to correct the weaknesses that have been described, and thus develop an evangelical synthetic model? The strength of translation approaches, again, is their insistence on the content of the gospel message. Maintaining this emphasis should keep us from minimizing the centrality of Scripture, or of placing culture on a par with the Bible as a source of revelation, as anthropological models do. Hesselgrave and Rommen (1989) are correct in their contention that one's view of Scripture will set certain limits on the kind of contextualization undertaken. If Scripture is seen as containing a significant proportion of mythological material, or if it is simply the wise sayings of enlightened men, contextualization can proceed without great concern for maintaining a focus on its propositional truth content. If the Bible is what they refer to as "divine writing," dictated by God with no human element whatsoever (as in Islam's view of the Qu'ran), contextualization is impossible. All we can do is transmit those Words verbatim. But because the Bible is both fully the Word of God and words written by men living at particular historical moments in particular socio-cultural settings, contextualization means respecting both the divine and the human aspects of Scripture.

Anthropological models, complemented and balanced by countercultural models, urge us to examine the culture of the people to whom we seek to bring the message of Christ's salvation. What is important to them? What are their struggles? What are the central issues of their lives? What satanic lies have infected their worldview? What in their belief system is consistent with biblical truth? Are there particular cultural motifs or images that offer opportunities for illustrating the biblical message in powerful ways (cf. Richardson 1974)? As Christ is proclaimed in ways that speak to these kinds of questions, both the missionary and his audience learn more of the living truth of God's Word.

Finally, praxis models can help us avoid the kind of cultural reductionism referred to in this article. They can remind us to look at society critically; pay attention to abuses of power; listen to the God-breathed words of Israel's prophets as they rage against injustices that "grind the face of the poor" (Isaiah 3:15); speak against and pray urgently regarding these things, and work toward forms of human community that embody God's love for justice biblically defined. Praxis models can call our attention to the very Biblical theme that knowing and doing are inseparable; that knowledge is not somehow artificially prior to doing; and that we only truly grow in understanding as we grow in obedience (including obedience to the call of God to pursue justice). They can help us balance proclamation of the kingdom of God with a humble realization that we also need to pray that God would demonstrate the reality of his rule in our lives. As has been argued

here, evangelicals have often argued for the primacy of proclamation (Shedd 1985). I, for one, do not want to diminish the importance of preaching the gospel of forgiveness and reconciliation with God. But at the same time, I believe that René Padilla was right that we should refuse to "drive a wedge" between proclamation of the kingdom and demonstration of its reality in our lives in matters of social justice as well as of personal righteousness. We too easily fall into semi-obedience if we see the one as primary and the other as secondary (Padilla 1985, 42). The two go hand in hand, neither is more important than the other. Obedience, as Padilla argues, is never secondary.

In conclusion, I want to return briefly to the illustration with which we began—Christian funeral services in Congo. My sense is that it is relatively easy to address the questions raised by the death of a loved one in terms of local subjective *cultural* understandings. I would emphasize the word "relatively" in that last sentence. There are still tremendous challenges that need to be faced at this level, as church leaders seek to help believers respond biblically, for example, to local beliefs about witchcraft. But the other kind of question—that of understanding why the tragedy of death is experienced so much more frequently in some contexts than in others—seems to me much more difficult to address. It is not for that reason any less urgent that evangelical leaders carefully analyze and speak biblically, in the manner of the prophets, to the economic and political realities that are so often responsible for this state of affairs.

REFERENCES

Bediako, Kwame. 1995. *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis.

Bevans, Stephen B. 1992. *Models of contextual theology*. Faith and Cultures. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis.

Bevans, Stephen B. 1995. *Models of contextual theology: Revised and expanded edition*. Faith and Cultures. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis.

Birch, Bruce C. 1991. *Let justice roll down: The Old Testament, ethics, and Christian life*. Louisville, Kent.: Westminster/John Knox.

Bosch, David J. 1991. *Transforming mission: Paradigm shifts in the theology of mission*. American Society of Missiology Series, no. 16. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis.

Carson, D. A., ed. 1985a. *Biblical interpretation and the church: The problem of contextualization*. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson.

Carson, D. A. 1985b. A sketch of the factors determining current hermeneutical debate in cross-cultural contexts. In *Biblical interpretation and the church: The problem of contextualization*, ed. D. A. Carson, 11-29. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson.

Coe, Shoki. 1976. Contextualizing theology. In *Third World theologies*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson and Thomas F. Stransky, 19-24. New York: Paulist.

Dyrness, William A. 1990. *Learning about theology from the Third World*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Gilliland, Dean S. 1989a. Contextual theology as incarnational mission. In *The word among us: contextualizing theology for mission today*, ed. Dean S. Gilliland, 9-31. Dallas, Texas: Word Publishing.

Gilliland, Dean S., ed. 1989b. *The word among us: Contextualizing theology for mission today*. Dallas, Texas: Word Publishing.

Hesselgrave, David J. 1999. Christian contextualization and biblical theology. In *The relationship between epistemology, hermeneutics, biblical theology and contextualization*, ed. Douglas Welker Kennard, 153-180. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen.

Hesselgrave, David J. and Edward Rommen. 1989. *Contextualization: meanings, methods and models*. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Hiebert, Paul G. 1987. Critical contextualization. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 11, no. 3: 104-12.

Hiebert, Paul G. 1996. The social sciences and missions: Applying the message. In *Missiology and the social sciences: Contributions, cautions and conclusions*, ed. Edward Rommen and Gary Corwin, 184-213. Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library.

Kennard, Douglas Welker, ed. 1999. *The relationship between epistemology, hermeneutics, biblical theology and contextualization*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen.

Kraft, Charles H. 1979. The Church in culture: A dynamic equivalence model. In *Gospel and culture: The papers of the consultation on the gospel and culture*, ed. John Stott and Robert T. Coote, 285-312. Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library.

Kraft, Charles H. 1999. Culture, worldview and contextualization. In *Perspectives on the world Christian movement: A reader*, ed. Ralph D. Winter and Steven C. Hawthorne, 384-391. Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Nuñez, Emilio A. 1985. The church in the liberation theology of Gustavo Gutiérrez: Description and Hermeneutical Analysis. In *Biblical interpretation and the church: The problem of contextualization*, ed. D. A. Carson, 166-194. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson.

Padilla, René. 1985. *Mission between the times: Essays on the kingdom*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Richardson, Don. 1974. *Peace child*. Glendale, Calif.: Regal.

Rommen, Edward and Gary Corwin. 1996. *Missiology and the social sciences: Contributions, cautions, and conclusions*. Evangelical Missiological Society Series, no. 4. Pasadena: William Carey Library.

Sanchez, Daniel R. 1998. Contextualization and the missionary endeavor. In *Missiology: An introduction to the foundations, history and strategies of world missions*, ed. John Mark Terry, Ebbie Smith, and Justice Anderson, 318-333. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Sanneh, Lamin. 1989. *Translating the message: The missionary impact on culture*. American Society of Missiology Series, No. 13. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis.

Kombo, Ronald Kisilu. 2003. Witchcraft: A living vice in Africa. *Africa Journal of Evangelical Theology* 22, no. 1: 73-86.

Kunhiyop, Samuel Waje. 2002. Witchcraft: A philosophical and theological analysis. *Africa Journal of Evangelical Theology* 21, no. 2: 127-45.

Mbuva, James Muli. 1992. Witchcraft among the Akamba and Africa Inland Church, Kenya. M.A., Fuller Theological Seminary, School of World Mission.

Mukundi, Mulumba Musumba. 1988. Witchcraft among the Kasaian people of Zaire: Challenge and response. Ph.D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, School Of World Mission.

Stabell, Timothy D. 2005. The modernity of witchcraft and theological contcxtualization in contemporary Africa. Ph.D. diss., Trinity International University.

Stott, John and Robert T. Coote, eds. 1979. *Gospel and culture: The papers of the consultation on the gospel and culture*. Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library.

Taber, Charles R. 1991. *The world is too much with us: "Culture" in modern protestant missions*. The Modern Missions Era, 1792-1992: An Appraisal. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press.

Terry, John Mark, Ebbie Smith, and Justice Anderson, eds. 1998. *Missiology: An introduction to the foundations, history and strategies of world missions*. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman Publishers.

Theological Education Fund Staff. 1972. *Ministry in context: The Third Mandate Programme of the Theological Education Fund (1970-1977)*. Bromley, England: Theological Education Fund.

Tiénou, Tite. 1993. Forming indigenous theologies. In *Toward the 21st century in Christian mission: biblical, theological and historical foundations*, ed. James M. Phillips and Robert T. Coote, 245-252. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Walls, Andrew F. 1996. *The missionary movement in Christian history: Studies in the transmission of the faith*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis.

Whiteman, Darrell L. 1997. Contextualization: The theory, the gap, the challenge. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 21, no. 1: 2-7.

Winter, Ralph D. and Steven C. Hawthorne, eds. 1999. *Perspectives on the world Christian movement: A reader*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.