

# No Other Gospel

George Martin

**George Martin** is Associate Professor of Missions at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, where he has taught since 1996. A veteran missionary, Martin combines biblical scholarship and practical ministry in his lectures and writings.

*Tell me the old, old story  
Of unseen things above,  
Of Jesus and His glory,  
Of Jesus and His love*

So go the opening lines of the great old hymn so familiar to many. Then, filling out the story and its meaning, lyricist Katherine Hankey continues:

*Tell me the story slowly,  
That I may take it in –  
That wonderful redemption,  
God's remedy for sin.  
Tell me the story often,  
For I forget so soon;  
The early dew of morning  
Has passed away at noon.*

The gospel message is about redemption, the remedy for sin. These truths are easily forgotten, thus the need constantly to be reminded—*Tell me the story often, For I forget so soon*. The question arises, though, as to whether the core of that old, old story that is loved so passionately—that Jesus came to die as God's remedy for sin—is a story with universal application.

## Reaching People for Jesus

The following scenarios indicate that not all professing Christians agree on the answer to the question just posed. Envision a discussion about possible strategies for reaching animists<sup>1</sup> with the gospel.<sup>2</sup> The discussion ranges far afield, touching on the best use of financial and human resources, the linguistic and cultural barriers involved in evangelizing the animists, and many other pertinent matters.

At one point in the discussion the following statements are made. "We should not present Jesus Christ to the animists as

the savior of sinners. After all, their concept of sin is not the same as ours. Nor do they, in the same sense as we, understand themselves to need a savior. The great concern of the animists is to be delivered from the malevolent spirits, which they believe inhabit the world around them. Thus, we need to present Jesus to them not as the savior of sinners, but as the 'Great Spirit' who can protect them and enrich their lives."

Imagine a different dialogue, at another place and time, among a number of people who are keenly interested in missions. Thinking about the difficulty of communicating the gospel across cultures, the statement is made, "Western missionaries press on with the concept of 'justification' even among people for whom that is not a concern. Often, they (the people to whom we go as missionaries) are more concerned about the quality of life and other issues. We need to remember that Jesus did not only speak about justification, but also about abundant life. We must focus on the teaching about abundant life in the places where it is the major concern."

The question then arises, "Are the above missiological/evangelistic approaches sufficient?" In other words, is it enough simply to "get people to Jesus," no matter which Jesus that might be, i.e., the Jesus who can keep me safe from physical harm, the Jesus who can make me feel fulfilled in life, etc.? Stated differently: Is it sufficient for the missionary to present Jesus as the one who can meet the individual's felt need at the time (whatever that felt need might be)? Or, is the gospel message definite in nature, that is, does it address a particular

need of which the hearer must be made aware? Must the hearer acknowledge certain, particular truths? Must he respond in a specific manner?

### Reaching People in Every Culture

If missionaries of the cross are not careful they can ignore or forget the particularistic content of the gospel. The gospel message then is transformed and translated to meet whatever is the perceived need of the moment. This changing of the gospel might take the form of cultural redefinition. For example, one often encounters the concept of “regional theologies,” that is, the suggestion that there exists an “African theology” for Africans, an “Asian theology” for Asians, a “western theology” that addresses the needs of white Europeans and North Americans, and so forth. Thus, David Bosch writes that

. . . Western theology is today suspect in many parts of the world. It is often regarded as irrelevant, speculative, and the product of ivory tower institutions. In many parts of the world it is being replaced by Third-World theologies: liberation theology, black theology, contextual theology, *minjung* theology, African theology, Asian theology, and the like.<sup>3</sup>

The idea here is that peoples of the world have developed and possess theologies that are different from the theology of the western churches.

Of course, any particular theology encompasses a great many concepts and applications: theology proper (the study of God), anthropology, ethics, etc. Consideration of all that is touched by the Christian religion must recognize that legitimate culture specific questions arise: What worship style should be followed by the congregation? What constitutes

discreet clothing? What are acceptable family structures? How exactly should the organized churches relate to the government of the country in which they exist? Clearly, the answers to these questions and many others will vary from culture to culture.

In other words, the Christian religion does not demand that every believer in every culture conform to the same mold. The earliest church council came to this conclusion. Acts 15 recounts that certain Jewish men were teaching the Gentiles that in order to be truly Christian they must become Jewish in all matters. In the letter sent to the Gentiles in Antioch, however, the apostles and elders instructed them:

For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these essentials: that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols and from blood and from things strangled and from fornication; if you keep yourselves free from such things, you will do well.<sup>4</sup>

Cultural issues, however, are not this paper’s most pressing concern. The concern here is different, one that is much more fundamental to the Christian task. To restate the matter, I believe it is legitimate to speak of doing theology in various contexts, e.g., in an Asian context, in a Latin American context, etc. Also, it is obvious that theology done in the context of one culture results in different emphases and different questions being asked than when theology is done in another culture. Still, the core content of the gospel never changes.<sup>5</sup> As the opening illustrations and the experiences of many missionaries indicate, some proceed in the missionary task with a sense that the core values of the gospel are negotiable from one culture to another. In culture A one must preach an “A

gospel” that focuses on abundant life. In culture B one should preach a “B gospel” that emphasizes deliverance from malevolent spirits. In culture C one offers a “C gospel” that stresses liberation from political oppression, and so on.

Certainly, the concept of “culture” is important to the work of the missionary. As a matter of fact, the faculty of the Billy Graham School of Missions, Evangelism, and Church Growth considers a right understanding and approach to different cultures so vital to missionary work that its faculty offers, among others, courses entitled “Cross-Cultural Communication” and “The Gospel Across Cultures.” Teachers in these courses implicitly affirm several important matters. First, they acknowledge the need for missionaries to be culturally sensitive. Second, they understand the necessity of stating the gospel in a manner that can be understood and accepted by individuals in cultures different from that of the missionary.

Third, they acknowledge the importance of meeting perceived needs. After all, perceived needs often are real needs. A malnourished child’s empty belly will cause him to perceive that he is hungry. That hunger is not merely a figment of his imagination. He really is hungry, and might even be starving. Jesus had much to say about such needs. He has commanded believers to feed the hungry. The thirsty must be given water. The fearful and anxious must hear of the one whose name is “Wonderful Counselor” (Isa 9:5-6). In other words, people everywhere face similar problems, and the answers to these problems are found in Jesus Christ. An obedient church must minister Christ’s love. Thus in every culture people must be directed to him by a loving church.

## **Directing People to a Particular Jesus**

Having acknowledged the cross cultural nature of the missionary task, it is important to repeat the question this paper addresses: Is there any aspect of the missionary message that is truly universal?<sup>6</sup> Asked differently: Does the missionary bear a core message that transcends cultural barriers and that never changes in the process of being carried from one people to another?

In examining the task of preaching the gospel in a pluralistic culture, Don Carson argues that the rudiments of the historic gospel must be declared repeatedly. He concludes, “There is intellectual content in this heralded gospel, content that must be grasped, proclaimed and taught, grasped afresh, proclaimed afresh, in an ongoing cycle.”<sup>7</sup> A danger exists, however, that in the name of cultural sensitivity and contextualization, the missionary will be tempted to change this rudimentary truth or will do so unwittingly.<sup>8</sup>

Some argue that in certain circumstances Jesus should be presented, not as one who justifies, but as one who brings abundant life. They see this as a positive illustration of making the Christian gospel relevant to the hearer. Such a presentation, however, is not so much a case of making the gospel relevant as it is a matter of changing its very message and meaning.

It is one thing to maintain and present the core content of the message in different language and forms, and with illustrations that make the message understandable to the hearer. It is something altogether different to change the core content in order to make it palatable and acceptable to the hearer. Byang H. Kato asserts that the missionary task is “to make Christianity culturally relevant without

destroying its ever-abiding message.”<sup>9</sup>

Many evangelicals quickly discern the danger of substituting liberation theology, which promotes liberation from political and economic oppression, for the biblical message, which offers liberation from sin and its consequences. The presentation of Jesus as the giver of abundant life or as the supreme Spirit, separated from the message that he saves from sin, is less problematic for many. The distinction, however, is only a matter of degree; in reality, still the message has been changed. To guard against the danger of a changed gospel it is absolutely essential to reaffirm that the gospel message is about redemption and the remedy for sin.<sup>10</sup> As David Hesselgrave points out, “. . . the great themes to be specially emphasized are sin, righteousness, and judgment; and . . . this Good News of God’s provision for sinners is to flow out of, and lead into, the whole counsel of God.”<sup>11</sup> Hesselgrave argues correctly that there *is* a core content of the gospel that never changes. The apostle Paul was adamant about the need to guard the content of the gospel when he appealed to the Galatians:

But even though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we have preached to you, let him be accursed. As we have said before, so I say again now, if any man is preaching to you a gospel contrary to that which you received, let him be accursed.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, to return to a concept introduced above, one may speak rightly of regional, or cultural, theologies in the loosest of senses. By this I mean that every culture has its own specific problems and concerns, and that certain emphases of the preacher will vary from one culture to

another. In the secular, humanistic societies of the west the missionary likely will emphasize, among other matters, the dangers of materialism and rationalism. In the animistic cultures found on the Indonesian island of Kalimantan the missionary rightly will emphasize the power of Jesus Christ over the entirety of creation.

Though in each culture the missionary must address culture specific concerns, he or she must never accept the validity of “regional gospels.” There is one gospel, and it is universal and applicable to all cultures. The gospel is universally applicable because the one great need of all human beings is the same: they all need to be reconciled with the creator.

One might suppose that the universal nature of the gospel would never be questioned by professing Christians. Conclusions reached by Per Frostin, however, demonstrate that such a supposition is mistaken. In a report to the “Seventh Nordic Systematic Theology Congress in Copenhagen,” Frostin argues that

The assertion of *the contextuality of theology* implies a rejection of all claims of universal validity raised by any theology. Hence, this assertion is a critical principle of great significance, implying that *all* theologies, also those with universal claims, actually are stamped by their contexts.<sup>13</sup>

No doubt, Frostin is correct in his conclusion that all theologies are stamped by their contexts. But it is not true that the universal claims of the gospel are culture specific. To the contrary, the great themes of the gospel—God’s holiness, man’s sinfulness, and redemption from sin in Jesus Christ—are constant and universal in terms of geography and time and culture. If the core content of the gospel changes,

ostensibly better to answer the needs of a particular culture, then the result is a terribly corrupted gospel or no gospel at all.

For example, John Mbiti and Byang Kato write that

ecclesiology is not well developed in Africa because many African theologians are persuaded that a more important need of African Christianity is selfhood and identity after long foreign domination.<sup>14</sup>

Thus, in the name of recovering their native identity, some “include both dead ancestors and the as-yet-unborn in the ‘Great Family’ of the church in a way that does violence to both biblical ecclesiology and the Christian tradition.”<sup>15</sup> Obviously, such teaching makes dangerous inroads against the biblical gospel. To include in the “Great Family of the church” dead ancestors<sup>16</sup> and future descendants is to pervert the clear biblical teaching that one enters the family of God only through a faith response to the risen Christ. If Mbiti’s and Kato’s evaluation of this particular trend in African theology is accurate, we must conclude that concern with national identity and traditions has evolved into a perversion of the gospel message.

Yet another example of a change in the gospel message is the rise of various prophetic movements in South Africa. Mark Shaw writes about Isaiah Shembe, one of the most famous and controversial of the Zionist prophets of South Africa. According to Shaw, in the Zionist theology

Shembe is more than a prophet; he is the Christ. He referred to himself as the ‘Promised One’ and in the official theology of the church he rose from the dead in 1935 and wrote hymns for the church confirming his messianic status.<sup>17</sup>

To his followers and others who have analyzed the movement, Shembe’s rise is the quintessential example of a truly indigenous African theology and gospel. However, if Bengt Sundkler is correct in his evaluation that in the Zionist movement “there is no room for the Son in the creed and life of the believers. . . . His place [having been] usurped by another,”<sup>18</sup> we have moved beyond the mere regionalization of theology and the gospel to something much more sinister.<sup>19</sup>

At the risk of being repetitive, I affirm once more the need for the missionary to understand the culture in which he or she ministers, as well as the need to do everything possible in order to make the gospel message understandable and attractive to those to whom he or she goes. New believers are not bound to the cultural activities favored by those who brought them the gospel. For instance, Shaw also describes the work of Mojola Agbebi in Lagos, Nigeria. Disagreeing with the Baptist missionary who was leading the work in that place, “Agbebi africanized his name and rejected European dress.”<sup>20</sup> Then, from Adrian Hastings’ notes, Shaw states that Agbebi rejected

hymn-books, harmoniums, dedications, pew constructions, surpliced choir, the white man’s names, the white man’s dress, so many non-essentials, so many props and crutches affecting the religious manhood of the Christian Africans.<sup>21</sup>

There is nothing wrong with Agbebi’s actions. After all, all these other things (hymn-books, harmoniums, etc.) are cultural trappings and preferences that in no way affect the integrity of the gospel. The missionary must always be ready to jettison such baggage when it serves as an

obstacle to the gospel. On the other hand, missionaries must be careful not to jettison or compromise the gospel itself. Sinners in every culture must be brought not just to any Jesus, but to the Jesus who saves from sin.

### Conclusions and Applications

Several conclusions and applications follow from the truth of the Christian gospel and its universal application. First, as illustrated in a recent prayer request from a Southern Baptist couple serving in a cross-cultural setting,<sup>22</sup> the goal of the missionary is to make the gospel understandable. The missionary couple wrote: "Please pray for us as we begin to work among the people of \_\_\_\_\_. Pray especially that the Lord will enable us to present the gospel in a way that is understandable to these people so that they might become followers of Christ." In the simple request for prayer from these missionaries lies the primary goal for the cross-cultural witness of the gospel. These missionaries have dedicated themselves to making the gospel understandable for people of a different cultural background. While doing so, they labor with the hope that the message will be accepted.

A related concern is the need for a comprehensive presentation of the gospel that relates its message to all of life. The missionary must resist mere decisionalist approaches that present a series of questions that elicit a nodding "Yes." Matthew 28:19-20 commands Christians to make disciples, to baptize, and to teach. In other words, the missionary must be competent in birthing new converts and bringing them to full maturity in Christ.<sup>23</sup>

More specifically, the missionary must emphasize the forgiveness of sin and the justification of the sinner through the per-

son and work of Jesus Christ. Where Jesus is not named, and where his redemptive work of reconciliation is not known, there is no salvation. I attended a worship service in Indonesia where a woman was asked to give a testimony about her salvation. She told how she had been ill for a number of years and had visited the local shaman,<sup>24</sup> who was unable to help her. She then turned to Islam, but that was of no help. She had tried this and she had tried that. She had been in and out of various hospitals. One day, a friend encouraged her to "try Jesus." She did, and according to her testimony, he healed her. There before us she expressed thanksgiving for this healing.

Reflection on this testimony reveals the absence of one vital element. The woman was asked to give a testimony about how Jesus had saved her. One might assume that she would tell how Christ had saved her from sin and its consequences. One could also have anticipated that she would talk about her resultant fellowship with God and her service to him. But at no time did the woman mention these matters and her experience of them.

We must adhere to the fundamental truth that Jesus Christ came into this world to save his people from their sins.<sup>25</sup> If we do not keep to this most basic of Christian teachings in our preaching, mission work and personal experience, then we have fundamentally altered the religion of the New Testament.

We must distinguish between points of contact and the core message. The missionary entering new cultures will discover many new and strange things. Some of these things will not be comprehended. On the other hand, some concepts, actions, attitudes and beliefs will be familiar. These points of contact between cultures can be

employed as “door openers”, or, to use Don Richardson’s terminology, “eye openers.”<sup>26</sup> The goal is to establish “a beachhead for the truth in the understanding.”<sup>27</sup>

The apostle Paul was always looking for “door openers” and effective approaches for preaching the gospel. Thus, he testified: “I have become all things to all men, that I may by all means save some.”<sup>28</sup> Paul adhered to this principle when preaching to the citizens of Athens. He found a point of contact—their acknowledgment of the existence of God who rules providentially over his creation—and used that shared belief to preach Christ’s resurrection.

Two things must be noted about Paul’s approach. First, he found a point of contact. Second, he then moved beyond it to the pivotal issue. In other words, he used the “eye opener” to establish common ground and then proclaimed the essential core of the gospel.

The same methodology can be discovered in the ministry of Jesus. He began with people where they were. In the temple during Passover, Jesus used the temple motif to refer to his own death and resurrection (Jn 2:13-22). To the Samaritan woman, Christ said, “Give me something to drink.” Then, building upon the common experience he shared with the woman, he spoke of sin and directed her to himself, the Messiah. He capitalized on the hunger of the multitude to preach about the bread of life (Jn 6). Many other such illustrations from the ministry of Jesus could be given.

So it must be with every missionary. The missionary to a people suffering oppression under a tyrannical regime must identify with the people and seek to encourage them and help them. But this

missionary must then tell them how Jesus saves from the most dangerous tyranny of all, that of sin. The missionary to an animistic culture is always looking for door openers, but must move beyond the initial point of contact to declare and explain the essentials of the gospel.

And what are the essentials? Again, the gospel message is about redemption, the remedy for sin. To use J. I. Packer’s outline, the gospel is a message about God and his holiness, man and his sinfulness, the person and work of Jesus Christ, and a summons to repentance and faith.<sup>29</sup> If these truths are not declared, then no matter what else might have been preached, it was not the gospel. “Eye openers” are good. They are useful and even necessary as one ventures to preach the gospel in other cultures. But “eye openers” are not the gospel.

Additionally, missionaries must realize they can learn much from people in other cultures. Important aspects of the biblical revelation, which one may have missed, are often brought to light when viewed through a different cultural lens. So, even those who affirm the concept of *sola scriptura* and insist on theology and theologizing based on revelation can acknowledge that personal experiences sometimes assist in understanding revelation.

As Americans, my family and I had grown accustomed to enjoying Christmas in “the American way,” that is, spending the day alone as a family, for the most part away from other members of our society and even from our church family. For us, Christmas day was a time of family fellowship, relaxing in our home and enjoying the day.

Our lives began drastically to change, however, when we went as missionaries to Indonesia. We arrived in Indonesia in

November, and toward the end of December we were invited by a local congregation to spend Christmas day with them. Still tired, unsure of ourselves and intimidated, we declined this gracious invitation. In Jakarta the following year, however, we accepted the invitation from a congregation in that city. Spending Christmas day with the Jakarta congregation meant that we awakened at 5:00 in the morning so that we could be at the church by 6:00 to enjoy breakfast with our church family. Throughout the day we worshipped and enjoyed wonderful fellowship together with Christ. We returned home in the dark after having spent a long Christmas day with Indonesian brothers and sisters. We were tired, but from that experience we came to understand better the biblical teaching regarding the nature of the church.

We did not substitute a newly experienced cultural concept for a biblical concept. Rather, the new cultural experience shed much light on an old biblical concept and helped us to understand better our place in the family of God. Perhaps this is what A. R. Tippett means when he affirms "that it was his experience as a missionary to the Fiji people rather than his study of western theology or his experience in western churches that taught him most of what he understands to be a sound doctrine of the church."<sup>30</sup> Charles Kraft explains, "A western cultural perspective, focused as it is on individuality, seems peculiarly blind to . . . the human need for well-integrated groupness."<sup>31</sup> In a similar vein, Kraft himself relates that he gained a heightened understanding of and respect for the Old Testament (even the genealogies) as a result of his experience in Africa.<sup>32</sup>

Finally, Christians must face the fact that

they are living in an increasingly diversified and pluralistic world, and must wrestle with the implications of this reality. Charles Van Engen claims, "Christians and non-Christians, pluralists, inclusivists, and exclusivists are beginning to share one thing in common. We are all being radically impacted by the largest redistribution of people the globe has ever seen."<sup>33</sup>

It is increasingly likely, even in the United States, that one's next-door neighbor will be a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Moslem, or an adherent of any number of other religions and cults. The issue of making the gospel understandable to those of other cultures and religions no longer is the concern only of the missionary in a distant land. Virtually all believers, then, will likely have opportunities to perform the ministry of reconciliation to those who are culturally and religiously different than they.

As the church embraces these opportunities, it would do well to consider the words of John Hick, who admits,

For if Jesus was literally God incarnate, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity living a human life, so that the Christian religion was founded by God-on-earth in person, it is then very hard to escape from the traditional view that all mankind must be converted to the Christian faith.<sup>34</sup>

This is this very conclusion that I cannot escape!

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> "Animism" refers to the beliefs and practices of a people who attempt to appease or control, by various rituals, sacrifices, and/or taboos, the supernatural spirits which can influence the individual either positively or negatively.

<sup>2</sup> A recent discussion of this subject can be



- found in Gailyn Van Rheenen, *Communicating Christ in Animistic Contexts* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991). For an earlier discussion, see Alan R. Tippett, "The Evangelization of Animists," in *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, ed. J. D. Douglas (Minneapolis: World Wide Publications, 1975) 844-855.
- <sup>3</sup> David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1996) 4.
- <sup>4</sup> Ac 15:28,29, NASB. Even these restrictions were loosened by Paul. See 1 Co 8:4-13.
- <sup>5</sup> John Mbiti, rather than employing the terms "theology" in a general sense and "the gospel" in a narrower sense, makes a distinction between "Christianity" and "the gospel." The former, he wrote, "results from the encounter of the Gospel with any given local society" and thus is always influenced by the local culture. The latter, however, is "God-given, eternal and does not change." "Christianity and Traditional Religions in Africa," *International Review of Mission* 59 (October 1970) 438.
- <sup>6</sup> Charles Kraft employs the phrase "supracultural truth" to identify this concept. *Christianity in Culture: A Study in Dynamic Biblical Theologizing in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1979) 124, 125, etc.
- <sup>7</sup> Donald A. Carson, *The Gagging of God: Christianity Confronts Pluralism* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996) 506.
- <sup>8</sup> Nor is this a danger restricted to the international mission field. The danger can be illustrated many times over in the churches of the United States.
- <sup>9</sup> Byang H. Kato, "The Gospel, Cultural Context and Religious Syncretism," in *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*, 1217.
- <sup>10</sup> See the opening paragraphs.
- <sup>11</sup> David J. Hesselgrave, *Planting Churches Cross-Culturally: A Guide for Home and Foreign Missions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980) 205.
- <sup>12</sup> Gal 1:8, 9, NASB. In his first letter to the church at Corinth Paul articulates the unchanging facts of this gospel, and emphasizes that it is by *this* gospel that they are saved.
- <sup>13</sup> Per Frostin, "The Hermeneutics of the Poor—The Epistemological 'Break' in Third World Theologies," *Studia Theologica* 39 (1985) 135.
- <sup>14</sup> John S. Mbiti and Byang H. Kato, "Africa," *Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models*, ed. David J. Hesselgrave and Edward Rommen (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989) 97.
- <sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>16</sup> Apparently these dead ancestors include those who did not make any sort of faith response to Jesus.
- <sup>17</sup> Mark Shaw, *The Kingdom of God in Africa* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996) 247.
- <sup>18</sup> Bengt Sundkler, *Bantu Prophets in South Africa*, 2nd ed. (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1961) 283.
- <sup>19</sup> For a recent evaluation of some of the African indigenous churches by one of their own leaders, see Solomon Zvanaka, "African Independent Churches in Context," *Missiology* 25 (January 1997) 69-75.
- <sup>20</sup> Shaw, 243.
- <sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>22</sup> The names of the missionaries and the country in which they serve are not reported because of the sensitive nature of their work.
- <sup>23</sup> Paul Hiebert explains, "Ultimately, the relationship of gospel and culture is not a problem to be solved, but the process of discipling all peoples—individuals and communities—in all things (Matthew 26:19)." "Gospel and Culture: The WCC Project" *Missiology* 25 (April 1997) 206.
- <sup>24</sup> A person set apart as especially attuned to the spirit world, believed to possess supernatural powers, and called upon to deal with it on behalf of others.
- <sup>25</sup> Mt 1:21.
- <sup>26</sup> An illustration of this type of "eye opener" is the Peace Child ideal in the Sawi cultures. See Don Richardson, *The Peace Child* (Glendale, CA: Regal Books, 1974).
- <sup>27</sup> Don Richardson, "Finding the Eye Opener," in *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1992).
- <sup>28</sup> 1 Co. 9:22, NASB.
- <sup>29</sup> J. I. Packer, *Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1961).
- <sup>30</sup> A. R. Tippett, A private conversation reported by Charles Kraft in *Christianity in Culture*, 298.
- <sup>31</sup> Kraft, 298.
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>33</sup> Charles Van Engen, *Mission on the Way: Issues in Mission Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996) 179.
- <sup>34</sup> John Hick, *God Has Many Names* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982) 19. Hick does not hold to the traditional view.