

1

MISSION

AN INTRODUCTION

Objectives

Your study of this chapter should help you to:

- Define mission
 - Get an overview of key components of missiology
 - Reflect on the nuances of *mission* and *missions*
 - Explore definitions of the term *missionary*
 - Acquire a feel for foundational concepts in missiology
 - Conceptualize the changing global context
-

Key Words to Understand

missionary
missiology
mission
missiologist
Missio Dei

closure
missionary call
globalization
glocalization
paradigm shifts

Fiction writers and movie producers have not often been kind when portraying Christian missionaries. Most missionary characters they dream up are bigoted, arrogant, and anthropologically challenged. Many of those fictional missionaries have been self-serving with very base motivations. For instance, one of W. Somerset Maugham's more famous short stories was "Rain." At the center of that story was a **missionary** who disintegrated morally while trying to convert a Pacific island prostitute.

James Michener's 1959 *Hawaii* weaves a tale that includes not-so-angelic 18th-century missionaries messing up the lives of charmingly simple islanders. Forty years later, a novel called *The Poisonwood Bible* was a Pulitzer prize runner-up and an Oprah Book Club selection. For that book author Barbara Kingsolver conceived a less-than-ideal missionary family living in the Congo. Nathan Price, the husband and father, is physically and emotionally abusive to his family. The strident and intransigent Rev. Price poorly represents the Lord he purports to serve.

Peter Matthiessen's 1965 book *At Play in the Fields of the Lord* is another example of a work that is very unflattering to missionaries. Matthiessen's missionary characters were destructive to themselves as well as to the Amazonian tribe they went to evangelize. A similarly negative picture of missionaries was painted in 1966 by the movie *Seven Women*. That film plays on the conflicting inner desires of some American female missionaries in China. The stereotypes spawned by such fictional missionary figures have opened up Christian missionaries to withering criticism and even caused missiologist J. Herbert Kane to ask, "What happened to the halo?" as a chapter title of his *Winds of Change in the Christian Mission*.

Fortunately, there is another side to this issue. Three films—*Inn of the Sixth Happiness*, *The Mission*, and *End of the Spear*¹—based on true missions stories have been positive. Way on the opposite end of the spectrum from most fiction writers are those people for whom real-life missionaries are saintly folk living close to heaven. Such people who put missionaries up on pedestals find inspiration in missionary hero books such as *The Missionary Hero of Kuruman*, a biography of **Robert Moffat** and *The Missionary Hero of the New Hebrides*, the life story of John G. Paton. Such biographies have used glowing superlatives to describe those who have borne the label *missionary*. The Roman Catholics have gone even further than Protestants in their adulation of missionaries. Having conferred official sainthood on several missionaries, Roman Catholics have everyone referring to *Saint Paul*, *Saint Boniface*, *Saint Anskar*, *Saint Francis Xavier*, and *Saint Isaac Jogues*. Even Patrick, missionary to Ireland, was sainted by the Roman Catholics although his branch of Celtic Christianity was not under the authority of the Bishop of Rome.

The Study of Mission

How should believers respond to the caricatures—good and bad—of Christian missionaries and the fruits of their work? Between the extremes of withering criticism and uncritical adulation, where does the truth lie?

Missiology

One way to sift through both the muck and the fluff about missionaries is to use discernment grounded in good **missiology**. Though the word *missiology* is not in the average English speaker's vocabulary, many will know that the suffix *-ology* means “language about” or “the study of.” Indeed, missiology is the study of, or conscious reflection upon, the practice of Christian **mission**. The first part of *missiology* comes from the Latin word *mission*, which means “sending out” or “assigned task” (thus, *mission*). *Missio* is a participle of the verb *mittere*, the Latin equivalent of *apostello*, a Greek verb meaning “to send” from which *apostle* comes. Based on this etymology, missiology can be said to be the study of sending. Because that definition may not communicate much to anyone other than a **missiologist**, it may help to think of missiology as “mission-ology.”

I Wasn't God's First Choice

I wasn't God's first choice for what I've done for China. There was somebody else. I don't know who it was—God's first choice. It must have been a man—a wonderful man. A well-educated man. I don't know what happened. Perhaps he died. Perhaps he wasn't willing . . . and God looked down . . . and saw Gladys Aylward.²

—Gladys Aylward

Missiology looks at more than missionary biographies. While **expatriate** missionaries are important players in world evangelization, they are only temporary agents seeking to accomplish some specific things. At the heart of missiology is reflection on the outreach, growth, and development of the Christian Church as it is planted and bears fruit in new cultural contexts. As a field of study, missiology draws on several other academic disciplines. As one might guess, missiology uses material from theology, biblical studies, and church history. It also gleans insights from communications theory, **cultural anthropology**, geography, linguistics, psychology, and sociology. These diverse threads of missiology's fabric are reflected in missions courses taught at colleges and universities around the world:

- Christian Theology and Religions in African Contexts
- Communicating Christ in Animistic Contexts

- Cross-cultural Adjustment
- Cross-cultural Communication of the Gospel
- Cultural Anthropology
- Ethnomusicology in Christian Missions
- Folk Islam
- Intercultural Communication
- Linguistics
- Religions of the World

Like other academic disciplines, missiology has its own specialized vocabulary. Examples of missiology's words and phrases include **4-14 window**, **10/40 Window**, **contextualization**, **dynamic equivalence**, **excluded middle**, **homogenous unit**, **inclusivism**, **indigenous church**, **modality**, people movements, re-amateurization, **sodality**, **Theological Education by Extension**, and **unreached people groups**.

“Doing” Mission

The Church did not coin the word *missiology* because it finally recognized that it had a missionary task or even because it wanted to start doing serious reflection on the missions enterprise. Just as Christian missionary work did not begin with **William Carey** (who is often called the father of the modern missionary movement), so missiology did not begin when Ludwig J. Van Rijckevorsel first used the word in 1915.³

All good missiology should be able to be translated into action. If there is no action, you're missing something.⁴

—Johannes Verkuyl, professor of missiology
Free University of Amsterdam

In the 5th century, Patrick was doing missiology in Ireland when he used local metaphors, such as the shamrock for illustrating the Trinity. Ulfilas, “apostle to the Goths,” made a missiological decision not to translate the books of Samuel and Kings when he decided their material would not be helpful in his ministry among combative and warlike peoples. Ramon Llull⁵ reflected on missiological principles in the 13th century as he wrote books and pamphlets to prepare missionaries for Muslim North Africa. Not long before that, Francis of Assisi decided he would approach Egypt's Muslim leaders by searching for common ground rather than simply regarding Islam as enemy territory. In the late 16th century, Matteo Ricci was struggling with whether Chinese veneration of ancestors transgressed Christian principles. As Jesuit Francis Xavier

evangelized in Asia, he sought to reduce Christianity to its core essentials, that is, what a person of any culture had to know and to do to be a Christian. These missionaries were all doing mission and reflecting on it long before missiology became the subject of university and seminary courses.

Missions or Mission?

Anyone looking at recent missiological literature would conclude that *mission* is an important word. Seventy-five years ago the more dominant word would have been *missions*. The change from *missions* to *mission* began in the 1960s, although the roots of the shift go back to 1934 when German missiologist Karl Kartenstein started referring to *Missio Dei*. This Latin phrase, which means “mission of God,” became a major theme for the 1952 World Missionary Conference in Willingen, Germany, and has since become a common way to describe global mission work. Its use, which some say originated with Augustine’s frequent use of *missio*, caused many to begin using *mission* almost exclusively.

Mission and Mission Board

Missionaries sometimes use the word *mission* as a shortened form of *the mission board*, a sending agency supervising and facilitating the work of missionaries and national churches. Even though saying “the mission” was common in Haiti when Paul Orjala was a missionary there, he opposed its usage because he felt it fostered feelings of **dependency**.⁶

For many people, *mission* and *missions* mean almost the same thing and are often used interchangeably. Each of those two words, however, has some unique nuances. Those advocating for the use of *mission* felt that *missions* emphasized too much the human side while the singular word *mission* would be a needed reminder that missionary work is trying to accomplish God’s mission. Some thought that *missions* overemphasized a **Western** perspective of world evangelism and that its focus on the expatriate individuals doing mission resulted in a weakened **ecclesiology**, the theological understanding of the Church that John Howard Yoder, missionary to Nigeria, saw as inseparable from missiology.⁷ A pragmatic and linguistically sound way of approaching the use of the two words is to see *mission* as the comprehensive label for the Church’s response to God’s calling while *missions* are the particular ways and organizational structures through which the Church’s global outreach is carried out.⁸

Even the change from *missions* to *mission* has not been enough for everyone. In attempts to shed negative baggage that *missions*, *missionary*, and even *mission* might carry, some academicians downplay the usage of all three words. Many

schools put *intercultural studies* on diplomas instead of *missions* or *missiology*. The neutral-sounding *intercultural studies* was chosen because it would be vague and seemingly innocuous in places where Christianity is suspect and restricted.

Do we claim to believe in God? He's a missionary God. You tell me you're committed to Christ. He's a missionary Christ. Are you filled with the Holy Spirit? He's a missionary Spirit. Do you belong to the church? It's a missionary society. And do you hope to go to heaven when you die? It's a heaven into which the fruits of world mission have been and will be gathered.⁹

—John R. Stott

Whose Mission Is It?

The sending and purposeful going that is mission did not begin in 1907 when Harmon Schmelzenbach sailed for Africa with financial backing and prayer support of students and faculty at Peniel College. Christian mission did not begin in 1793 when William Carey went to India. Mission did not even begin with the apostle Paul.

Though it is common to think Christian missionary outreach began in obedience to the **Great Commission**, mission did not originate with Jesus' words, "Therefore go" (Matthew 28:19). To be sure, Christ's Great Commission is a powerful call to the Church to win and disciple those of all people groups. That was not where mission began, however. Rather than originating in the final chapter of Matthew, mission is rooted in the words of Genesis 1. That should not be surprising. Scholars call Genesis the seedbed from which the rest of Scripture sprouts. If that be so, then Genesis should be where the missionary enterprise germinates and indeed it is. The declaration that God is Creator of all is the seed for proclaiming God's wish to be worshiped by all human beings. Mission does not start with human beings getting burdened about spreading the Good News, as laudable as that is. Mission starts with God, and thus believers should joyfully echo missionary Paul Orjala's book title: *God's Mission Is My Mission*. Since mission begins with the declaration that God is Creator, it can be said that Christians are not evangelizing the world because of what the Bible says; they are evangelizing the world because of who God is.

The church exists by mission as a fire exists by burning.¹⁰

—Emil Brunner

To continue with the seedbed metaphor, mission is more than a few plants—even robust ones—scattered among other good things in Scripture. Mission is the soil of Scripture in which everything else is rooted. The inescapable conclusion is that if Christians are going to call themselves “people of the Book,” they must be gripped by that Book’s passion for global mission.

Is Mission Everything the Church Does?

The importance that Scripture gives to mission must influence how Christians think about the church. Missionary outreach is not simply one more good thing that churches can do. Because mission is so integral to what it means for the Church to be the Church, those who do not fervently espouse global mission are failing to embrace a core essential of the faith. Brooke Brown, mission volunteer in Slovenia, emphasized how indispensable involvement in global mission is for all believers when she said, “People think you have to be called to missions. You’re already called from the moment you become a Christian.”¹¹

Getting believers of the 20th and 21st centuries to see how foundational mission is to the nature and purpose of the Church has been a rocky road. In some cases, people have used *mission* or *missions* to label anything and everything even remotely related to outreach. Sadly, such a broadening of meaning may have been facilitated by moving to using *mission* instead of *missions*. A negative consequence of the broadening of meaning beyond cross-cultural outreach efforts is that putting everything under the same umbrella tempts Christians and churches to forget their global responsibilities. It is human nature to get most excited about things and people that are close by. One consequence is that without a specific focus on faraway places and people groups, those faraway places and least-evangelized groups get less and less attention. At some point, even for those who acknowledge the sinful predicament of all human beings, it becomes easy to say “that is not my problem” about unreached peoples.

One danger with calling everything *mission* (and putting the label *missionary* on every Christian) is that, as Stephen Neill has said, “When everything is mission, nothing is mission.”¹² Neill’s point was that when *mission* gets broadened beyond its original usage, pleas to get involved in mission to unreached peoples can be ignored or shrugged off as someone else’s responsibility.

Too often the idea of outreach itself has been broadened even further to include every single thing that churches do. Charles Van Engen, former missionary to Mexico, said that such broadening is precisely what happened in mainline denominations during the last half of the 20th century. Van Engen noted that when churches began defining mission in all-inclusive ways, it brought “church and mission so close as to nearly eclipse each other.” Van En-

gen further commented, “The intention of the players in this drama was laudable. But . . . we face some disastrous consequences of their perspectives.”¹³

On the local church level, one disastrous consequence of saying “everything we do is mission” is that congregations have raised money to replace carpet as a mission or local evangelism expense. Indeed, if everything is mission, then buying toilet bowl cleaner can be called a mission expense. Sadly, as Van Engen has noted, there seems to be a cause-and-effect link between (1) the declaration that everything the church does is mission and (2) a loss of passion for global missionary outreach. “In such a situation,” Van Engen concluded, “both church and mission can get lost.”¹⁴ The dimming and even loss of global mission vision and passion can result, as it has, in more money being spent each year in America on chewing gum than is given to world evangelism.¹⁵

Kingdom of God and Closure

Pastor John Piper has reminded the Church that the world mission enterprise is not an end in itself; mission is a means to an end. That end is the worship of God by all peoples.¹⁶ Because mission is the means and not the end, missiologists have used the word **closure** when talking about fulfilling the Great Commission of Matthew 28:19-20. Closure looks to establishing communities of Christian faith within every culture. Closure looks for where the gospel is not being preached and asks how proclamation and discipling can begin there. However, with more than 1 billion people never having heard about Jesus of Nazareth, closure could seem way out of reach. Nevertheless, convinced that Matthew 24:14 is a declaration that the Great Commission will be fulfilled, many missionaries today echo the words of Howie Shute, missionary in Africa: “We didn’t come to work at the Great Commission. We’re here to finish it.”¹⁷

To truly understand the Church’s global mission, one must conceive of it in a kingdom of God paradigm. Doing mission with a kingdom of God paradigm invites God’s people to play a significant role in history. In a Kingdom way of looking at things, mission is not just about saving individual souls from hell, as important as that is. Mission is about proclaiming a **holistic** gospel of the kingdom of God in the tradition of Jesus (Mark 1:15) and Paul (Acts 28:31), both of whom preached healing that was spiritual, physical, emotional, and even political. Using kingdom of God terms to talk about world mission puts a focus on the righteousness, justice, and peace that God wants for all the peoples of earth. Thinking in kingdom of God terms provides a framework for integrating evangelism and societal transformation. It reminds believers that the Lordship of Jesus has societal as well as personal implications. Thinking in kingdom of God terms will enable people to grasp the missionary implications of a key phrase of the Lord’s Prayer: “Your kingdom come, your will be done” (Matthew 6:10).

Who Is a Missionary?

I believe that in each generation God has “called” enough men and women to evangelize all the yet unreached peoples of the earth . . . everywhere I go, I constantly meet with men and women who say to me, “When I was young, I wanted to be a missionary, but I got married instead” or “My parents dissuaded me” or some such thing. No, it is not God who does not call. It is persons who will not respond!”¹⁸ —Isobel Kuhn, missionary to the Lisu of Thailand and China

While awe-inspiring wonders of nature often evoke feelings of worship, God uses something more personal than natural revelation when He seeks to call humanity into fellowship with himself. As Dean Nelson wrote in a tribute to missiologist Paul Orjala, “When God wants to send a message, He wraps it up in a person and sends that person.”¹⁹ God’s willingness to entrust the Good News to human messengers is why within a short period after Jesus’ resurrection, the Holy Spirit prompted the Church to send evangelists across geographic and cultural boundaries. Over the years, people thus sent out have been called missionaries. People bearing this missionary title have had two clear identifying marks: First, they have been specifically selected or chosen, and second, they have taken the gospel to other cultural groups. Former missionary to the Muslim world Ray Tallman tied these two thoughts together when he defined a missionary as: “A ministering agent sent by God and His church to communicate the gospel message across any and all cultural boundaries for the purpose of leading people to Christ and establishing them into viable fellowships that are also capable of reproducing themselves.”²⁰

While Paul Little and others have called for every believer to be seen as a missionary,²¹ Tallman’s definition keeps it narrowed to people with a distinct vocation and who are sent by the Church to take the gospel to other cultural groups. Not everyone is a missionary in this way any more than every believer is a pastor in the way *pastor* is used in Ephesians 4:11. While all believers are to be witnesses and while they may utilize missiological insights in their ministries, not all are missionaries if the message is correctly understood from Ephesians 4 that believers have different callings and gifts.

Mission is also not about auto-sending, that is, people deciding on their own to go. *Mittere* and *apostello* both imply that there is someone doing the “sending.” Indeed, that is what happens. Missionaries are sent by a mission board as well as by the Holy Spirit and by the Church. Acts 14:1–4 gives an example of that happening when it says the church in Antioch laid hands on Paul and Barnabas and sent them to the cities of what is now Turkey.

The *Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions* defines *missionary* in a way that fits the experience of Paul and Barnabas and echoes what Tallman wrote. That dictionary says that a missionary is one who is called of God and sent by the Church “to serve God in a **culture**, a geographic location, and very likely, in a language different from the missionary’s own.”²² This does not mean that the only way to be a missionary is to go halfway around the world. In its most biblical expression, a “mission field” is simply where the “sent ones” go. The cultural and ethnic diversity that exists within many nations means that a **missionary call** may be the sending of someone to another culture or language group within that person’s home country. India, Nigeria, and Papua New Guinea are typical of countries that are complex mosaics of cultural and ethnic groupings. India, for example, is made up of about 4,600 distinct people groups speaking more than 400 different languages. Though not a very large nation, Papua New Guinea is one of the world’s most culturally complex ones with more than 1,000 people groups speaking 816 different languages.

Sometimes those who cross national boundaries to minister to immigrants from their native countries are said to be doing missionary work. They are not. By definition, missionaries are outsiders among those with whom they work. Thus, a Haitian going to Paris to pastor a congregation of Haitian immigrants would not be doing missionary work. Likewise, a Mexican going to the U.S. to pastor Mexican immigrants would not be considered a missionary. In a biblically rooted ecclesiology, pastors or elders plant or shepherd individual congregations within their own cultural group while missionaries or apostles are those who develop church planting and discipleship movements in other cultures.

On occasion people have speculated that youth pastors should be considered missionaries because they work with the youth culture. While there are special gifts and graces needed for youth ministry and some new words or ways of saying things need to be learned, cultural anthropologists would say that youth ministers are working with a subgroup of a larger culture, not a totally different culture. Thus, youth ministers do not really fit within the definition of *missionary*.

To try to delineate the cultural and language barriers and distances that call for people with particular missionary gifts using missionary thinking and strategies, missiologists came up with an E-Scale (for Evangelism Scale). In this E-Scale, E0 is the evangelism aimed at spiritually dead churchgoers. Traditional spiritual renewal events in local churches are one way that E0 evangelism is done. E1 evangelism is what believers are doing when they reach out within the culture or cultures of the people of their own congregation. E1 evangelism is aimed at people not currently involved in a church but who are of the same general language and cultural group as the congregation doing the evangelism. E1 evange-

lism is not cross-cultural missionary evangelism because the only boundaries the gospel encounters are the theological ones separating Christians from non-Christians. In Acts 1:8, Jerusalem and Judea are symbols of E1 evangelism.

E2 evangelism happens when some cultural boundaries are crossed, as would have been the case between Jews and Samaritans. Thus, the Acts 1:8 symbol of E2 evangelism is Samaria. In E2 evangelism, the language is often the same, but evangelism has a missionary tint because of the cultural differences involved. Evangelism that crosses the greatest cultural distances is called E3 evangelism. In E3 evangelism, a language barrier almost always has to be crossed. This ends-of-the-earth missionary evangelism is considerably more complex than E0, E1, or even E2 evangelism.

Globalization: The New Context of Mission

(see plate 1.1)

Things are different now from 1871 when journalist Henry Stanley ventured into the heart of Africa looking for David Livingstone. The 21st-century Church exists in a world where **globalization** has produced never-before-seen interconnectedness. In his book *The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*, Thomas Friedman described the monumental convergence of technological changes that has produced an unprecedented economic and cultural intertwining of individuals and societies. Globalization and its effects on societies of the world is discussed and debated by business executives, politicians, and even terrorists. It is something that will also affect Christian mission.

Today's context of economic and cultural togetherness has resulted from several things:

1. Instantaneous Global Communication

Not long ago, international mail correspondence took weeks or even months. It used to be very costly to get complex documents, photos, and video to faraway destinations in two days or less. Now, that material can arrive electronically in seconds. In milliseconds, cell phone technology links up any two users anywhere on the globe. E-mail and instant messages zip to and from computers around the world. There are positives and negatives to this. Whizzing along optic fiber cables are messages from those preaching the gospel and from those promoting violent guerilla warfare. Global connectivity means that a blog written in frustration by someone in the small Oklahoma town of Hartshorne can be read immediately in the little Tuscan village of Monteverdolini, Italy. Consequently, mission organizations as well as businesses have had to become sensitized to global audiences in regard to what they put into print and on Web sites.

2. Movements of People and Goods (see plate 1.2)

Freer access across what used to be tightly controlled national boundaries has made some areas of the globe seem what business strategist Kenichi Ohmae calls “the borderless world.”²³ People are aware of and have access to greater amounts of information, goods, services, and images than ever before. Such access has been fostered by things like the European Union and the North American Free Trade Agreement. The resulting borderless world is both a dream and a nightmare with freedom of movement often applying to people as well as commercial products. Each day, hundreds of thousands of people cross national boundaries on footbridges and in airplanes, ferries, buses, and private vehicles. Many of those travelers are on one-way trips to start a new life in another country. Among other things, such emigration influences evangelism and church planting patterns. Thus, the fastest-growing churches in some places are made up of immigrants. Some of the most vibrant evangelical congregations in Paris, for example, are filled with African and Caribbean immigrants rather than with native Parisians.

3. The Revolution in Technology

“Innovate or disappear” is a key dictum of today’s commercial world. A few years ago mechanical systems morphed into electronic ones that are now being ever more miniaturized. There was a time when a single computer filled an entire room. Today, the average automobile uses 50 microprocessors, each with more computing power than the room-sized computers of 50 years ago. Friedman says recent technological advances have “flattened” the world, allowing, for instance, the Grameen Bank (whose founder won the 2006 Nobel Peace Prize) to furnish solar-powered cell phones and computers to rural poor in Bangladesh who are doing computer programming for major global corporations. Globalization thus means that competition for jobs is moving from being local to being global.

4. Interdependence of the Nations of the World

Up until the 16th century very few people ever traveled more than 10 miles from their home. As a result, societies were very localized. Today, societies thousands of miles from each other are interlocked in communication, commerce, and even popular culture. Sociologist and economist Saskia Sassen said that today’s world has become “a worldwide grid of strategic places . . . constituting a new economic geography of centrality, one that cuts across national boundaries and across the old North-South divide.”²⁴ This has given rise to the phrase *global village* and sparked fears that unique cultural features will be obliterated by uniformity and homogenization. Others such as anthropologist Brian Howell com-

bine the words *local* and *global* into **glocalization**, noting that rather than tossing everything into a blender, globalization has actually promoted “the development of difference, but within a mutually intelligible system.”²⁵ No one knows how such flattening will ultimately affect efforts in the **indigenization** of the church. However, the thought that glocalization is promoting differences may allay the fears of some that a McChurch world is coming, in which churches will look and feel much the same anywhere on the globe.

Result: Paradigm Shifts

The enormous changes wrought by globalization are happening at a time when the face of Christianity is undergoing dramatic changes. For his book *The Next Christendom*, Philip Jenkins looked at dizzying demographic changes in Christianity and concluded that the world is seeing the arrival of a true “global Christianity.”²⁶

Both Sassen and Jenkins describe **paradigm shifts** that future generations may regard as hinge points in world history. Such paradigm changes could significantly alter the contexts in which the gospel will be proclaimed. The thought of that can be unsettling, but David Bosch, a South African who ministered among the Xhosa in Transkei, sounded hopeful when he spoke to this issue in *Transforming Mission*:

The events we have been experiencing at least since World War II and the consequent crisis in Christian mission are not to be understood as merely incidental and reversible. Rather, what has unfolded is the result of a fundamental paradigm shift, not only in mission or theology, but in the experience and thinking of the whole world. In earlier ages the church has responded imaginatively to paradigm changes: we are challenged to do the same for our time and context.²⁷

Through the centuries, when confronted with new contexts, the Church’s missionary outreach has been agile enough to adapt and even increase its level of effectiveness. May it be so again. As it moves forward, the Church will need to be sure of its foundations. It will need to use its resources wisely, and it will, as much as ever, need to be empowered and directed by the Holy Spirit.

Questions for Reflection

1. How is *mission* defined by this book?
2. Does every Christian need to consider whether he or she has a missionary call?
3. Some people consider *mission* to be a reference to God’s mission and *missions* to refer to human activity. Is this distinction helpful? Why or why not?

4. In what way is missionary work different from the work of a pastor or of an evangelist?
5. Who is the author of mission? What is God's relationship to humans and how does mission fit into that relationship?
6. What are the overall positives and negatives of globalization and glocalization?
7. How might globalization and glocalization negatively or positively affect Christian mission?