

16 The Gospel: Its Content and Communication—an Anthropological Perspective¹

Jacob A. Loewen

The Gospel of Jesus Christ is God's good news for all mankind. On the personal level, its aim is to set people free from the power of sin and give them new life under the authority and power of Christ. On the societal level, the Gospel aims to establish a new society of citizens of the Kingdom of God in which justice and brotherhood shall flourish. Thus the Gospel is designed to bring glory to our Creator, enrichment to our fellows, and fulfillment to our own lives.



Jacob A. Loewen, 1922-2006 (Ph.D., Linguistics, University of Washington), was born in Orenburg, Soviet Union. In 1929 he migrated with his family to Canada. With wife Anne, Loewen was a pioneer MB missionary in Colombia from 1947-1953 and 1955-1957. From 1959-1984 Loewen worked as a non-resident “culture broker” with the MB Church in Panama. From 1963-1984 Loewen was a translations consultant with the American and United Bible Societies. In that capacity he lived and worked in South America, the Middle East, and Africa. Among his prolific writings, he is most remembered for his anthology *Culture and Human Values* (William Carey Library, 1975).

Unfortunately, this simple but far-reaching message sometimes gets distorted. Some years ago I came across an unusual example of this when a South American Indian gave me the following testimony: “It is wonderful to be a Christian,” he said. “Now we have ever so many more ‘hard’ words than before. You can heal your friends, or you can kill your enemies, whenever you want to. All you have to do is kneel behind them in a prayer meeting and while everyone else is praying out loud you just whisper the appropriate ‘hard’ words, breathe on the person, and it happens just like that. For example, if you should say words like *tutechan*, *wikik*, *kisimasi* (“temptation,” “wicked,” “Christmas”) or any of the other bad ‘hard’ words, the person will die like a fly. If, however, you use words like *kang*, *epong*, *klaiki* (“God,” “heaven,” “Christ”) or any of the other good ‘hard’ words, the person will be well before you know it.”

How in the world did this indigenous and syncretistic adaptation of Christianity come about? First, the preaching of the missionaries was done in English, with local Indians interpreting from English into their own language. Second, the tribe had a repertoire of “hard” words—magic words—that their creator-culture hero taught them so they could heal the sick. The local interpreters, faced with many Christian technical words which they did not know how to handle in translation, simply made “hard” words out of them. Those words that seemed to be associated with evil became bad “hard” words, and those associated with good became good “hard” words.

Distortion of the Gospel, especially in cross-cultural situations, is more common than many imagine. Every human activity has its difficulties, and the communication of the Gospel is no exception. Furthermore, in the history of western missions, the source of the problem sometimes lies in the messengers themselves.

To what extent can anthropological insights help us overcome such problems?

Presuppositions

Since success in communication depends to a large extent on understanding and, hopefully, sharing one another’s presuppositions, I had better begin by stating my own presuppositions:

God’s good news is for all mankind. For me the simplest statement of the nature and the content of the Gospel we are to share with all the peoples of the world was given by Jesus on that historic Sabbath in the synagogue of Nazareth when he unrolled the scroll of the Prophet Isaiah and read:

“The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
because he has chosen me to bring good news to the poor.
He has sent me to proclaim liberty to the captives

and recovery of sight to the blind;
 to set free the oppressed and announce that the time has come
 when the Lord will save his people.”
 (Luke 4:18-19, TEV)

The life-changing power of the gospel comes from God. It can never be generated by human effort, no matter how dedicated, how consecrated, or how anthropologically sensitive the messengers may be. On the other hand, no one can stop it no matter how hard he or she tries.

As in Jesus' day, so today there is more faith among the "gentiles" than there is in "Israel." I have to confess that my experience with so-called animistic peoples in South America and Africa, and with western missionaries who are bringing the gospel to them, has convinced me that the capacity to believe among animists is far greater than among missionaries who have been conditioned by secularism and materialism, and who today find it almost impossible to believe in a spirit world. I am still chagrined to remember the occasion when a fellow missionary and I were pushed out of a circle of Indian believers who were praying for the healing of a sick person. I will never forget their words: "We're sorry, God's power cannot heal when there are unbelievers in the circle."

Sad to say, western missionaries not only suffer from infection by this virus of unbelief, but they are also carriers of it. In the interests of fighting "superstition," they train national pastors to become similar disbelievers! (See my article in *Missiology*, Oct. 1976, "Mission Churches, Independent Churches, and Felt Needs in Africa.")

Anthropology does not have any ultimate answers for the communication of the gospel. I am firmly convinced that the science of anthropology can provide us with tools to understand culture and cultural problems. It can give us insights into our own behavior and the behavior of people in different cultures. But it can never write *the* foolproof formulae for communicating the gospel. Just as our Lord refuses to be confined to temples built by the hands of men, so his ongoing work will not be confined by any human intellectual structures, be they theological or anthropological.

On the other hand, when we stand in the Great Judgment, ignorance of the insights of anthropology will not serve as a valid excuse for not having done correctly what God committed us to do.

Communicators of the gospel must have personal experience of its power. This experience must include both the transforming power of the Gospel in one's own life and in one's own culture. Only persons who can testify how the gospel met their deepest needs, and how "the new spirit" from God provided them with the resources to overcome the personal devils that held them chained, can be believable witnesses on the gospel's behalf.

The Scope of the Gospel

My use of “gospel” embraces not only the New Testament but the whole Bible, which I accept as the word of God, valid universally and eternally. This broad use of “gospel” may strike some readers as simplistic ignorance. I have been asked, for instance, “Do you mean ‘Gospel’ (with a capital), that is, salvation through Jesus Christ? Or do you mean the ‘gospel’ (no capital), that is, the practical outworking of God’s word in a specific culture?” Others have been puzzled by the fact that I treat personal salvation and the solution to cultural problems as equally central to the gospel.

Though I am aware of all of these distinctions and more, from my anthropological perspective there is little practical value in maintaining them. In many Third World societies, the solution to a painful local cultural problem can be as much a part of salvation as the individual’s forgiveness of sin. For instance, for those African countries which in recent years have undergone their own “exodus” liberation experience, the biblical example of how God formed the nation of Israel out of twelve separate and often competing tribes may, in actual fact, be a far more relevant and meaningful message than one that singles out individuals for “personal salvation.” Here, we need to be aware of the sharp contrast between, for example, western individualism and African groups that still practice consensus. For the latter, a highly individualistic approach to salvation may be seen as socially disruptive, rather than contributing in a God-given way to the building of a nation that will provide justice and equality for all.

These are several reasons for highlighting the broadest dimensions of the gospel:

1. The biblical message is, after all, a multifaceted one. Not only did God’s people get it over a long period of time, but it was given to men living within differing cultural settings and operating on very different presuppositions and world views.

In addition to radical differences in world view between the Old and New Testaments, within the Old Testament itself we find that the presuppositions of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were very different from the presuppositions of David and Solomon, or of Ezekiel and the prophets in exile. We also need to recognize that the Bible does not hesitate to emphasize both sides of an issue; for example, in Romans, faith alone without works is stressed for salvation, while in James, faith without works is considered dead and useless. The implication of the multifaceted nature of the Gospel is that not all facets will be equally in focus for one person or one people at one point in time.

Interestingly enough, Africans say that the New Testament has more or less a western worldview, while the Old Testament is founded on a worldview similar to their own. In this light it may be significant to point out that at the present time (1980, *ed. note*) about 75 percent of all Bible translation work in Africa includes the Old Testament. The identification of the Africans with the Old Testament is so strong that up to World War II (after which so many of the African countries became independent and the authority of foreign missions eclipsed) the arrival of the Old Testament again and again split the existing church. Rebelling against what they viewed as the western wrapper in which the missionaries had given them God's message, many African believers started separatist movements boldly proclaiming: "The African gospel—the Old Testament—has finally arrived; the missionaries have kept our gospel hidden and have preached only theirs."

2. Different facets of biblical truth come into prominence for us at different times in our spiritual pilgrimage. The most important thing for me in my boyhood days in the Mennonite Brethren community in which I grew up was "to escape from hell and to be saved." Later, in my university days, I was excited by the insight that God's truth was like a giant piano keyboard, capable of many new chords. Even my unbelieving professors, I realized, were allowed by God's grace to discover some of his truth, while there were church people who insisted on playing in one key only, as though they possessed the whole truth.

Then, as anthropological awareness grew upon me, I became deeply aware of how my western material-oriented culture, with its total cleavage between the material and the spiritual, was actually stifling my capacity to believe in the spirit world. More recently it has been the Incarnation—the truth that God himself, in order to communicate his good news to men, found it necessary to limit himself to human nature and to a specific culture. This is the big truth in my life and thinking today.

3. Different cultures, facing the gospel for the first time, will find different facets of it more meaningful than others. A missionary statesman recently asked Bakht Singh, the beloved evangelist of India, what dimensions of the gospel he found most useful in witnessing to his own people.

"Do you preach to them about the love of God?"

"No," he said, "the Indian mind is so polluted that if you talk to them about love they think mainly of sex."

“Well,” the missionary said, “Do you talk to them about the wrath and judgment of God?”

“No, they are used to that,” he replied. “All the gods are mad anyway. It makes no difference to them if there is one more who is angry.”

“About what do you talk to them? Do you preach on the crucified Christ?” the missionary guessed.

“No, they would think of him as a poor martyr who helplessly died.”

“Then what is your emphasis? Eternal life?”

“Not so,” he said, “if you talk about eternal life the Indian thinks of transmigration. He wants to get away from it.” “What then is your message?”

Listen to his answer: “I have never yet failed to get a hearing if I talk to them about the forgiveness of sins and peace and rest. That’s the product that sells well. Soon they ask me how they can get it, and then I can lead them to the Saviour who alone can meet their deepest longings” (George W. Peters, “Is Missions Homesteading or Moving?” *Mennonite Brethren Herald*, April 15, 1977).

4. Differing cultural backgrounds and their concomitant presuppositions will cause people to hear a differing content from the same message. This was forcefully driven home to us when my wife and I tried to serve as resource persons to a group of missionaries and nationals who were trying to develop a Sunday school curriculum “that would really speak to the African people.” To our disappointment we discovered that Scripture passages and the truths they were to teach had already been chosen by the parent church in North America. When my wife and I objected, suggesting that we should let the Africans decide which truths should be taught and also let them select which stories taught those truths, the missionaries were incensed. After all, they were seminary-trained people; they knew the Bible and what it teaches!

In order to help them become more aware of how different cultural perspectives cause different people to hear very differently, we reviewed a number of Bible stories, and asked both the missionaries and the nationals to write down what they thought the central message was. The first example was the story of Joseph. The missionaries wrote that here was a man who was loyal to God even to the point of resisting the most fierce of sexual temptations. The Africans wrote that here was a man who, in spite of his brothers’ mistreatment, was totally loyal to his family.

5. The believing community in each culture must assume the ultimate responsibility for contextualizing the gospel in its own setting. That is, it must be allowed to develop its own patterns of translating the gospel truth into daily life and worship, applying it to the felt needs, problems, and contradictions of the culture.

However, for a people to be motivated to do this, they need a deep consciousness that God is speaking specifically and directly to them. In my experience, the extensive involvement of the believing community in the translation of the Bible makes just such an impact. It is the awareness of the importance of a contemporary encounter with the inspiration of Scripture that has led the United Bible Societies to shift from missionary translators to mother-tongue speakers as translators. When the believing community undertakes the challenge of Bible translation, it is moved to pray: "God, how would you have said this if you had spoken in our own language in the first place?" Then, when the group experiences consensus in regard to an answer, the people's attitude towards God's Word changes radically. One retired minister in Zambia testified: "For 25 years I have told the people that the Bible is the Word of God, but deep down in my heart there was a nagging suspicion that it was the white man's God speaking to the white man. But that has completely changed now. God has spoken to us and under his spirit's guidance we have made decisions which no white man could make."

These several factors point to the need for seeing the gospel in its broadest as well as its deepest dimensions, rather than insisting on a "one chord" definition.

The Messengers of the Gospel

Though many people feel called to be messengers of the gospel, there are some prerequisites that should characterize them all:

1. They should recognize that they are the products of their particular culture. Western culture is not unique in creating problems for obedient followers of the gospel. Each culture has its own inventory of problems, and the messengers must become fully aware of them.
2. Messengers must learn to appreciate and to understand the cultural background of the gospel in Scripture. Without an adequate understanding of the cultural settings of biblical times, no one can fully understand the biblical message or make a "dynamic equivalence" translation of the gospel into a new cultural milieu. Working as a translations consultant in East Central Africa, my appreciation for

the Old Testament has grown immensely. In Africa I am working with a people whose culture in many ways is more like the Hebrew culture than my own, and these people find great delight in seeing how God operated within that cultural setting. Unless one is aware of the specific cultural framework in which a given biblical message is imbedded, one can readily fall into the trap of defending nonsense, like when my church some decades ago excommunicated women for cutting their hair on the basis of the Pauline prescriptions to the Corinthians.

3. When messengers of the Gospel have occasion to witness across cultural boundaries, they need to be aware not only of the culture from which they come, but they must have an equally deep appreciation for and an understanding of the receptor's culture. To begin with, this presupposes a thorough mastery of the local language. As a translations consultant I frequently find myself trying to help national churches extricate themselves from the meaningless jargon imposed upon them by missionaries who had insufficient understanding of and respect for their culture. Thus in one African language the missionaries rejected the local words for "spirit" as satanic, and on the basis of the Greek and Hebrew used the local word for "breath" to mean "spirit." But notice what happens, then, with the key theological concept "Holy Spirit": Since the word for "holy" in this language is a homophone for "red," the people tend to hear "red breath." (!) Likewise, "evil spirits" comes out "bad breath," and "unclean spirits" is "dirty breath." During a translator training program in this language, the nationals concluded that "the whole thing doesn't mean anything!" A hundred years of mission work without an adequate vocabulary for some very essential truths of the gospel!
4. Messengers must approach their cross-cultural witness with expectancy. Having recognized the incompleteness of their own understanding of the Gospel, they must be open and ready for the spirit of God to do a "new thing." When Peter experienced the vision of the sheet being let down from heaven and was ordered to eat unclean animals, he, of course, was puzzled by the meaning of this strange experience. But it had so shaken him that he was able to break out of his Jewish restraint and racial prejudice against the gentiles and go to Cornelius' house and witness God perform a new thing—the gentiles also becoming recipients of God's spirit.

In addition to the above principles, which apply universally, there are special words of caution for messengers of the gospel, depending on their cultural background:

The western missionary as a messenger of the gospel. As I have written in "Evangelism and Culture" (*The New Face of Evangelism*), there are a number of negative aspects stemming from western cultural wrappings which affect the way

people from the West present the gospel. I think I am correct in saying that even today many western missionaries still consider the cultural wrapper of their home Christianity an integral part of the gospel. I find relatively few making a conscious effort to free the gospel from its western wrapper and even fewer who are aware of how their culture inhibits their own faith and obedience.

Local, missionary-trained pastors. All too often, if the missionaries are unable to separate the gospel from its western cultural wrappings, the national pastors who are trained by them become twice the sons of Gehenna.

Recently a newly-ordained national pastor came to me and asked: "Do you think it is true that spirits of the dead appear to the living?" He went on: "I had been in my congregation for just a few weeks when a man died. There had been considerable trouble, because this man had lent another member of the congregation some money and the debtor was refusing to pay it. On the day after his burial the dead man's soul appeared to his sister and said: 'You must go to the man who owes me the money and tell him to pay it at once. I am unhappy to leave this unsettled. If it is not settled I will not live in the graveyard alone.'"

When the family came to this pastor to ask for his blessing on their new approach to the defaulting debtor, he did not know what to say. As to whether the dead could appear to the living as the family had claimed, a retired lay preacher assured him, "That's exactly what happens." Unsatisfied, the pastor next sought out a fellow seminary-trained minister who reminded him: "We seminary-trained preachers don't believe in such things." The pastor finally told the people that he could not help them.

Then, as if suddenly remembering while talking to me, he added: "When I was living with my parents in the village, such a thing would not have troubled me. I would have believed it. But now I am a seminary graduate." In an effort to help him, I asked if there were any examples in the Bible of the dead appearing to the living. Relief flooded his face as he thought of the biblical examples.

Third World Christians as missionaries. It is a healthy sign that many Third World countries are launching missionary initiatives in countries other than their own. But sad to say, in many cases such Third World missionaries are no more sensitive to the cultures to which they are going than western missionaries were in the past.

Prophets of Independent churches. Probably the most successful witnesses (in terms of the number of members gained) on the African scene today are the prophets of Independent churches. Barrett recently observed that six out of ten conversions in Africa today are to Independent church groups. To this I would like to add from

my own observation that even the members of mainline churches (Presbyterian, Methodist, etc.) again and again fall back upon these groups for healing, “dewitching,” and so forth.

The prophets usually operate on the basis of a personal encounter with God who has given them a mandate to preach and teach a given way of worship. They identify very deeply with Old Testament prophets. Culturally they usually are single-mindedly African. This, often coupled with very limited Bible knowledge, leaves them very vulnerable to syncretism. Recently, however, I have observed in Zaire [Democratic Republic of Congo], Rhodesia [Zimbabwe] and Botswana an openness on the part of large numbers of such prophets to receive outside help to upgrade their knowledge of the Bible.

Culturally aware local leaders. It is gratifying to see a new kind of leader emerge on the African church scene. These usually are people who are proud of their African heritage but who have had extensive exposure to western cultures and also have gained some understanding of biblical cultures. It is men and women of this calibre who will be able to discern the western wrappings in which the gospel came to them, while at the same time they will be aware of where the dangers of syncretism lie. They are the great hope of the church to develop a truly contextualized Christian faith that will meet the needs of the people and further the growth of God’s Kingdom.

The Communication of the Gospel

God is always ready to meet us at the point of our greatest felt need. This, in itself, goes far in assuring that we will truly “hear” his message. I have been deeply impressed, while rereading the life of Jesus, to see how he put Isaiah’s definition of the gospel into practice according to the principle of felt need. Thus, when the four men brought the paralytic to Jesus to be healed, Jesus did not say, “My son, you are healed,” but “My son, your sins are forgiven.” Then, for the benefit of the Pharisees who took Jesus’ statement as blasphemy, he said: “To show you that I, indeed, can forgive sin, I am going to tell this man to get up and walk.” The healing almost seemed like an afterthought. Jesus began with the man’s yearning for forgiveness—his deepest need. On the other hand, when the man who had been incapacitated for thirty-eight years was healed, Jesus did not even identify himself to him. That came later, and it was not until then that Jesus said, “Go and sin no more.”

If we accept Jesus’ definition of the Gospel—“good news for all, whatever their problems”—then it behooves us to find out what the pressing needs of a given people are, and to check whether the message we are giving them is indeed meeting their felt need, because, if not, we may be the modern Pharisees who “bind grievous burdens upon people but don’t themselves lift a finger to help them carry them” (Luke 11:46).

This is not the time nor place for full-scale analysis of the problems of the communications process. However, it does seem essential to mention two crucial areas, one especially pertaining to the messengers of the gospel and the other to the hearers of the gospel:

Willful or unconscious misuse or skewing of the Gospel. Missionaries who accompanied the Catholic conquistadores and the Protestant colonizers did so with the highest motivation and found ample scriptural justification for their “Christian/lord-to-pagan/servant” approach. Today we look back and say their approach was entirely wrong—it made a travesty of the gospel. But the question that we need to ask is: Has that old attitude really died? Or has it merely taken on a new shape?

Racist white people have for generations been using the curse on Canaan quite out of context and completely erroneously to justify the subjugation of black men by white men. This interpretation may be dying out in Southern United States, but it is flourishing in Southern Africa. And what is most tragic about people having such biases is that they often are fervently religious. It is my deep and earnest prayer that the amount of skewing would decrease as we grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Syncretism. By syncretism I mean the mixing of the Christian faith and local traditional (non-Christian) beliefs and practices with the result that the Gospel is perverted, distorted, or largely voided in the process. An example is found in the Kako people of Cameroon, who restructured the communion service on the model of their own *sataka* peace-making ritual, resulting in a short-circuiting of repentance and reconciliation in cases of excommunication.

Effective communication is a cooperative effort between the source and the receptor. No matter how good the source is in structuring a message, if the receptor is not receiving properly the communication will be limited. And likewise, no matter how hard the receptor tries to receive the message, if the source severely warps the message for one reason or another, the reception will be hindered or skewed. For this reason a basic attitude of *reciprocity* between the source and the receptor is fundamental. To my mind this involves at least the following areas:

1. ***An honest acceptance of the validity of each other’s cultures.*** While some things may be new, strange, or even difficult, source and receptor will never suspect each other’s motives as persons nor as members of a culture.
2. ***A spirit of exchange.*** Missionaries have often been so preoccupied with the greatness of the message they had to communicate that they were unprepared to learn from their communicants. I can honestly say that during some thirty years in which I have tried to share the good news with people in many languages, tribes, and societies, I have usually been taught more than I was able to teach.

3. ***Personal and cultural self-exposure.*** As they understand each other's personal and cultural reactions more fully, source and receptor will be able to serve as mirrors to each other to help each other become aware of those things that are incongruent with the tenor of the gospel in their lifestyle or in their culture.
4. ***Indigenous "sources of steam."*** When the gospel impinges on a culture, obviously some things in that culture are going to have to change. But culture change is difficult to effect unless there is an adequate amount of push from within. All too often in the past, missionaries have tried to provide the push from the outside, but as soon as they turned their backs, or whenever they had to leave the field, things reverted to the old way. For this reason any genuine change that is to be effected must be linked to an indigenous "source of steam" that will help keep up the momentum after the missionary has disappeared from the scene.
5. ***Cooperative effort in contextualizing the gospel.*** At first blush, this may seem to contradict what was said earlier: "Each culture must assume the ultimate responsibility for contextualizing the gospel in its own setting." But to my mind it does not. Adequate contextualization is a difficult task and the sympathetic outsider can often have a very unique role to play as mirror, source of alternative, catalyst, friend of the court, and so forth.

The outsider-as-mirror is as crucial to the established churches of the West as it is for the younger churches in the Third World. Contextualization is never a once-and-for-all event—it is an ongoing process. In fact, what was meaningful and right in grandfather's day may be utterly wrong today. I think it is highly significant that church people working overseas become deeply aware of serious problems extant in North American Christianity. For this reason we of the West will do well to consider seriously such mirror reflections as that of the South American Indians who are convinced that money, and not God, is the "axle" of our way of life. (See my chapter in *The New Face of Evangelicalism*.)

6. Last, but not least, ***there must be an adequate interchange between the older and younger churches.*** As a church gets established in a "receiving" society, early on there should be exchanges between it and the "sending" church. This exchange must always be a two-way street. Too often, older churches have found the criticism of younger churches quaint, interesting, or sometimes even annoying; seldom have they done anything about them. When older churches take seriously the challenges given to them by younger churches, their own communication with younger churches will be maximized.

Over and above these requirements, which are equally valid for both the source and the receptor, there are certain specific requirements for each.

In view of the sources' call to be witnesses of the gospel, I feel that they must accept the greater responsibility for effective communication:

1. They must take the lead in cultural awareness, that is, in knowing their own, the Bible's, and the receptors' culture.
2. They must assume responsibility for establishing the proper initial channels of communication, following the communication principles outlined by E. A. Nida (see *Message and Mission*, Harper, 1960).
3. They must begin at the felt need of the receptors. Western missionaries—even the most evangelical—come from a highly secularized church situation in which God and the church have largely abdicated their concern for crop growth, human fertility, illness and health, mental health, social welfare, and so on. In the Third World, however (as in the Bible), these areas are still major religious concerns, and the gospel will be the good news for the Third World only if it includes such basic concerns in its focus. As I have indicated, when mission-founded churches offer no help in these areas, the people fall back on some other religion to cope with their problems.
4. They must demonstrate a humble acceptance of the fact that the receptor will establish an independent relationship with God. Western missionaries have too long held a spiritual-father complex toward people to whom they have been privileged to bring the gospel. (To be sure, this paternal role has often been aided and abetted by the receptor's readiness to accept the "child" role, thereby escaping personal responsibility.)

On the side of the receptors, I would like to underscore the need of an ongoing willingness to put themselves, their culture, and their unspoken world view and values under the scrutiny of the spirit of God. There must be an implicit obedience to the truth as God's spirit gives them new insight regarding the implications of the gospel. In the spirit of the early church, they will submit themselves to the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:28).

Notes

¹This chapter is reprinted, with permission, from *Down to Earth: Studies in Christianity and Culture* (Grand Rapids: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980).

Study Questions

1. Discuss the author's statement: ". . . I treat personal salvation and the solution to cultural problems as equally central to the gospel."

2. Late in life the author comes to understand God's work as ". . . the Incarnation—the truth that God himself, in order to communicate his good news to men, found it necessary to limit himself to human nature and to a specific culture." Discuss what this might mean to your ministry if you started with this view.
3. The author claims, "Messengers must approach their cross-cultural witness with expectancy. Having recognized the incompleteness of their own understanding of the gospel, they must be open and ready for the spirit of God to do a "new thing." Discuss some areas you can imagine your understanding is incomplete, and how willing you are to see God do a new thing.
4. Do you fit in the author's statement: ". . . even today many western missionaries still consider the cultural wrapper of their home Christianity an integral part of the gospel. . . few mak(e) a conscious effort to free the gospel from its western wrapper and even fewer are aware of how their culture inhibits their own faith and obedience." Discuss further.
5. Why do you think "Third World missionaries are no more sensitive to the cultures to which they are going than western missionaries were in the past?"