

The Great Commission

Biblical Perspectives

Lynne J. Wall

What must it have been like to be one of the 1200 delegates present in Edinburgh at the World Missionary Conference in 1910? The excitement and optimism of that era may be hard to recapture in our war-weary and cynical times.

But there was a feeling then that the Christian church in the West stood poised on the brink of a *kairos* moment. That moment was characterised by a vision: “the evangelisation of the world in this generation.” This catch-phrase had its origins in the title of a book written by the American, John R. Mott and first published in 1900. Mott was the larger-than-life, charismatic leader of the Student Volunteer Movement who took a leading role at the Edinburgh conference.

For myself, something of the fervour and enthusiasm for missionary activity that was present in Edinburgh, characterised my Sunday School experience in a Sussex village in the 1950s. After the Second World War there was a similar atmosphere of hope and a rekindling of missionary interest. As children, we were encouraged to pray for the “sick little Indian children” who occupied the cot named “Hope” in a mission hospital somewhere in rural India, which presumably our pennies helped to support.

Just as we were encouraged to invite Jesus into our hearts, so these children needed the light of Jesus, and Western medicine and education to bring them salvation and life in all its fullness. My Sunday School teacher’s hope, when she heard that my family was emigrating to New Zealand, was that I would “convert the Maa-oris”!

I may smile now at some of this naïveté both in 1910 and in the 1950s but there was an almost shining integrity and commitment to Christ underpinning this missionary zeal, which influenced my life immeasurably.

I begin by asking what were the biblical insights underlying this missionary zeal and enthusiasm? Then I explore whether the way the Bible was read in 1910 was as naïve as it now appears by examining the work of three major 19th century biblical scholars. I assess the impact of biblical studies on both the theology and practice of mission. Finally I turn to the current situation in the field of biblical studies and address issues of biblical interpretation and scriptural authority in relation to understandings of mission in the 21st century.

Biblical insights underlying missionary zeal

Edinburgh 1910 was a very carefully planned and prepared conference. Nine commissions carried out research among missionaries in the field by way of questionnaires and the gathering of statistics about the effectiveness of the methods and strategies used by overseas missions. It was deliberately pragmatic in its deliberations. By removing any discussion of doctrine or dogma, it hoped to avoid discord and keep focused on addressing problems faced by missionaries in the field and finding the most effective and fruitful ways of bringing Christ to the world.

So stringent was this practical focus that it is hard to find any theoretical, let alone, theological basis for mission amongst the hundreds of pages, which make up the reports of the nine commissions to the conference. Much is presumed and assumed. There is very little biblical underpinning for the practice of mission, yet it is clear that the Bible played a pivotal role in inspiring and motivating the missionary endeavour.

However, despite the lack of evidence of direct scriptural foundations, it is possible to deduce a number of biblical motifs characterising the work of Edinburgh 1910.

It is clear that the work of mission, and particularly overseas mission, was seen as a matter of obedience to the final command of Christ in Matthew 28:18-20: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age." The Dutch theologian, Abraham Kuyper, of this period claimed: "All mission is formally, obedience to God's command; materially, the message is not an invitation, but an order, a burden."¹

This scriptural injunction was read with an immediacy and urgency that may seem paradoxical in the light of the nearly two millennia separating the text from the reader. The time was right as John Mott would point out, given the exploratory, scientific and industrial discoveries which had taken place in the 19th century. "The hand of God in opening door after door among the nations of mankind, in unlocking the secrets of nature and in bringing to light invention after invention, is beckoning the Church of our day to larger achievements."² In his closing address to the Conference, Mott compared the position of the delegates to that of Christ in the Garden of Gethsemane: "A sense of urgency should strike into the core of each one of us – even the most obscure delegate. Christ seemed to live under the spell of this urgency by day and by night, and one here has in mind not so much that our lives may be cut off quickly but that our opportunity will slip away."³

Biblical references to the coming of the Kingdom of God were also taken up with fervent zeal, and not just by millenarian enthusiasts. Kirsteen Kim claims that "[I]n 1910 the language of the kingdom was current because of the background of colonial empires headed by monarchs."⁴ The spread of kingdoms and empires through migration certainly encouraged a similar "sublime enterprise of extending and building up the Kingdom of Jesus Christ in all the world," to quote John Mott again."⁵

The use of military language and imagery made the task of mission seem just that – an operational task which God required of faithful Christians. We can note echoes of Pauline military imagery such as, "We are more than conquerors through him who loved us" (Rom 8:37). Mott quotes Calvin Mateer, an American Presbyterian missionary to China, in the following extract from his book *The Evangelization of the World in this Generation*: "The Church of God is in the ascendant. She has well within her control the power, the wealth, and the learning of the world. She is like a strong and well-appointed army in the presence of the foe ... The victory may not be easy, but it is sure."⁶

It is easy of course to criticise the fervour and extreme language employed by those seeking to promote the missionary cause in 1910, to point to paternalism and superiority accompanying the missionary endeavour, and to place ourselves in a rather more enlightened position. As far as biblical interpretation is concerned, such use of biblical

texts as “The Great Commission” can be critiqued as mere proof-texting with little regard for the context of such verses.

I want to stand back a little from such knee-jerk reactions and ask if they are justified. Of course there were fundamentalists and some who had had little opportunity for education who may have taken a literalist view of the Bible. But the overall impression is that the majority of missionaries were not uneducated and that those attending the 1910 Edinburgh Conference were far from simplistic in their views of the Bible. As Andrew Walls cautions us, “There is little sign in their report of triumphal rejoicing in the Western empires,” and that “[t]he principal direct reference to the empires are mostly about the obstructiveness of Western governments towards missions.”⁷ With regard to biblical interpretation, there is this illuminating conclusion to James Barton’s report on Commission 6 on ‘The Home Base’, “We can never understand our own Holy Scriptures until they are interpreted to us through the language of every nation under heaven.”⁸

What is often forgotten by readers of the Bible today is that much of the foundational work for our own critical readings was carried out by scholarly giants in the 19th century who receive very little attention or acknowledgement. We stand on their shoulders just as the delegates to the 1910 Edinburgh Conference did. The great biblical legacy of the 19th century was the focused development of the historical-critical method of reading the Bible and its fruits.

The rise of Victorian “lives” of Jesus generally reflected the pre-critical approach to much Christian belief in the 19th century. With the exception of Albert Schweitzer’s *Search for the Historical Jesus* (1906), most “lives” of Jesus reflected the ideal character of the 19th century English gentleman. These works were pious and reactionary, especially in light of the German radicalism emanating from scholars such as F.C. Baur and the Tübingen School. But the new methods in both science and religion could not be denied forever. The publication of Darwin’s *Origin of the Species* in 1859 offered another challenge to the Victorian theological establishment.

Despite these theological tensions, English biblical scholars in the 19th century seemed receptive to the opportunities of new methods of reading the Bible. Of particular note are three Cambridge scholars who changed the face of biblical studies through their understanding and application of the historical-critical method.

What then do we mean by the historical-critical method? The development of history as a discipline was closely linked with what happens in a court of law. Evidence is presented and then it is tested by different methods including, logic, coherence of an argument and the credibility of witnesses offering the evidence. The same process was taking place in relation to historical documents. How trustworthy were the accounts of events in the past?

With regard to texts from the ancient world, there were further questions to be asked. For instance, did the authors hold the same values about plagiarism as we do today or was it acceptable to claim that a work was to be attributed to someone who in fact did not write it? What motivated the authors to write these documents – were they interested in presenting more than a factual account? How objective is their evidence? These were not new questions but the impact of some of the answers touched sensitive areas of faith and belief when they were applied to the Bible.

It was in the 19th century that the call came for the Bible to be read as any other book. The highly controversial book, *Essays and Reviews*, was published in 1860 and caused a

storm of protest from both Evangelical and High Church wings of the Church of England. More than 400 books and articles were written in response to this furor.⁹ In *Essays and Reviews*, Benjamin Jowett, master of Balliol College, Oxford, famously urged readers to “interpret the scripture like any other book.”¹⁰ But Jowett and his colleagues were rather provocative and opportunistic in their publication. Its extreme tone and negativity did not lead on to further historical-critical work by its authors. Jowett, for instance, was more interested in the Bible as literature. He felt that once the text was liberated from centuries of interpretative overlay, it would speak freely to the reader.

The historical-critical approach to the Bible

Others took up the challenge of the detailed and thorough work demanded by the historical-critical method as applied to the text of the Bible. They showed that this method, far from threatening or destroying Christian faith, was able to enhance and enlarge our understanding of scripture. Of particular note are three Cambridge scholars who changed the face of biblical studies through their understanding and application of the historical-critical method in the English-speaking world. They are Hort, Lightfoot and Westcott.

All born in the mid to late 1820s, they remained colleagues and friends, often working together as in the production of the Westcott and Hort Greek text of the New Testament. The field of text criticism is undoubtedly where Fenton John Anthony Hort made his greatest contribution. Of a delicate constitution and with a strong streak of perfectionism, he published very little in his relatively short life, (he died aged 64). But the introduction to their celebrated text, though based on the work of his partnership with Westcott, is actually Hort’s writing. There they advocate the methods of text criticism which are still the basis for textual critics today.

Westcott and Hort were open to scientific and historical methods when faced with a plethora of manuscripts and the aim of recovering the “original words of the New Testament, so far as they can now be determined from surviving documents.”¹¹ Of significance is the fact that they advocated no one particular method but rather preferred a holistic approach, which took note of a variety of methods and their results. Internal evidence such as the author’s style, grammar and the wider context of the work, together with the external evidence of copying mistakes and “improvements” led to a most probable reading. This was then set against a pattern of errors and variants derived from a family tree of a particular text and its many copied variations.

So what was so exceptional about the thorough and painstaking work of this scholar? It is important to remember how shocking and threatening to personal and institutional faith, the raising of scientific and historical questions was at this time. Hort, perhaps the more liberal of the three Cambridge scholars in theological outlook, was able to steady the ship of the British church as it tossed on the seas of historical-critical method and radical German theology. At the centre of his theology, as reflected in the Hulsean Lectures of 1871, was the incarnation – that the truth of God was revealed in the historical person of Jesus, and to this truth each person was called to make a response in terms of belief/faith and everyday life.¹²

Hort’s considerable and wide intellect was characterised by an openness of mind. As a serious botanist, his response to Darwin’s work is reflected in this comment to Westcott

in a letter: “Have you read Darwin? ... In spite of difficulties, I am inclined to think it unanswerable.”¹³

Joseph Barber Lightfoot, like Hort, centred his theology on the incarnation. After a brilliant eighteen-year career at Cambridge, he became Bishop of Durham until his death aged 61. Again it is the painstaking care of his historical work which marks out his scholarship and which provided a legacy for future biblical scholars and missiologists. A book entitled *Supernatural Religion* was published anonymously in 1874. Its author challenged the miracles of Jesus and supernatural religion, and popularised the findings of German radical theologians. Lightfoot responded by defending the historical authenticity of early Christian writings through stringent argument from a close reading of the texts in question in their historical context.

Lightfoot is best remembered for his commentaries. The Cambridge Three had a plan for a series of commentaries on the New Testament. While Hort produced nothing on the synoptic gospels and only a few fragments on the Catholic Epistles, Lightfoot’s work on Paul’s letters made a major contribution to Pauline studies. He was primarily an historian of the early church and drew his exegetical comments from a thorough historical reconstruction of Paul’s life and letters to the fledgling churches.

So to the final member of the trio, Brooke Foss Westcott, who after graduating from Cambridge University, taught at Harrow, the famous English public school for boys, for eighteen years. At the age of 45 he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge University for ten years and then succeeded Lightfoot as Bishop of Durham for eleven years until his death in 1901. Westcott was an original thinker and a great theologian. However, his thinking was not always clear and lucid. The story is told that “one day when a dense fog descended on London, Professor H.P. Liddon of Oxford was said to have remarked that the cause was ‘Doctor Westcott having opened his study window in Westminster.’”¹⁴

In common with Hort and Lightfoot, the incarnation was at the centre of Westcott’s theology. He believed that the historical nature of the incarnation was its strength and for him Christianity is the only historical religion, because its essence – the incarnation – is historical.¹⁵ Therefore he wished to submit the historical source document of Christianity, viz. the Bible, to intense historical scrutiny. He responded to Jowett’s challenge claiming, “I have always tried to read it like any other book and because I have done so I have come to the conclusion that it is utterly unlike any other book in the world.”¹⁶

Westcott’s major contribution to biblical studies lies in his textual work with Hort and in his New Testament commentaries, especially those on John’s gospel and the Epistles of John. Unlike Hort, who published little, Westcott was prolific both in biblical and theological works. Like his two colleagues, his thought is marked by a measured historical-critical approach, supported by a wealth of knowledge in classics and patristics which is hard to come by in today’s scholars. Westcott wrote to Hort in August 1860 that he felt there was a need “to show that there is a mean between *Essays and Reviews* and Traditionalism.”¹⁷

In summary what were the achievements of the Cambridge Triumvirate? They were able to put the historical-critical method into skilled practice and from it to draw credible results both for Christian theology and practical Christianity. The centrality of the incarnation for all three arose directly from their historical examination of the text of the

New Testament. All three were concerned with a careful and patient study of the details of the text. Of primary concern were the textual history of Greek manuscripts, the linguistic meaning and use of words, and the historical context of both words and events recorded in scripture. Testimony to this work are Westcott and Hort's critical text of the Greek New Testament, the classic commentaries of many New Testament books and Lightfoot's historical work on the Apostolic Fathers. Their credibility as scholars of a middle way orthodoxy enabled the historical-critical approach they used to gain credence and confidence in the church of their day. All three were clergymen of the Church of England, two of whom also became bishops. They preached a lively Christian faith and were not afraid to let their faith be informed by their scholarship. We can measure the impact of their scholarship by noting that "in 1860 the authors of *Essays and Reviews* were charged with heresy for reading the New Testament like any other book; in 1889 the writers of *Lux Mundi* (twelve High Churchmen from Oxford) could assume the historical method as axiomatic."¹⁸

The extent to which missionaries and missiologists at Edinburgh 1910 were wrestling with the impact of a critical reading of the Bible on both theology and mission may be seen in the work of Commission 4, 'The Missionary Message' in relation to non-Christian Religions. Here the report admits to a very current difficulty: the rise of "higher criticism" or the historical-critical method which has "divided Christian opinion." "On the one hand are genuine evangelical believers, who have heartily welcomed what their studies have compelled them to regard as assured results of a legitimate method of study as confirming their belief in a real progressive revelation of God to man. On the other hand, there are earnest Christian men who dread this whole movement as an assault not only on the outworks but even the citadel of their faith."¹⁹

But what was the impact of this critical approach upon those to whom the Gospel was offered? Throughout the report there is a deep respect for the cultures of the East, for the ancient and well-developed philosophies and religions of Islam, Hinduism and Sikhism. Many missionaries were well-acquainted with these thought forms and knew that educated people in the East would also be aware of modern Western ideas.

The report summarises the impact in this way: "Among the less cultured Moslem peoples this modern western thought exercises no appreciable influence; in India, as might be expected, it is being distinctly felt, as also in Egypt; in Turkey and Persia less so ... In India the higher criticism is welcomed as a sign of the retreat of Christianity; and the argument is advanced that it is absurd to lose home and friends by conversion to a religion, which even cultured Protestants have proved to be false ... Among the cultured, some of the missionaries recognise it will be impossible to ignore questions of Biblical criticism, as, if not discussed from the Christian standpoint, they will be presented in an anti-Christian spirit."²⁰

It is significant to note how seriously the impact of Western critical thought was taken by missionaries. Far from being fundamentalist literalists, they were aware of both the dangers and fruits of an historical-critical approach to reading the Bible. The discovery of the Hammurabi Code and other ancient near eastern texts such as the Babylonian Gilgamesh flood epic challenged the uniqueness of the Bible. These discoveries and the debates they provoked were not ignored by the reports of Edinburgh 1910 but raised with concern for discussion and action.

Developments in Biblical studies since 1910.

The historical-critical method continued to exert influence through the first quarter of the 20th century with German scholars again to the fore. The work of Schmidt, Dibelius and Bultmann in New Testament studies and Gunkel in Old Testament is to be noted in the development of form criticism. These scholars broke down the biblical text into units of oral tradition and described the genre or form of these units, eg. parables, lament, law or narrative, according to features commonly found in each genre. They then asked what the *Sitz im Leben* or social setting for each unit might be and the purpose, eg. a psalm of praise might be sung at the annual covenant renewal ceremony to remember the great acts of salvation performed by God in covenant with Israel. The history of tradition movement further developed this work by analyzing the transmission of the oral traditions into written form and comparing them with comparable texts from the ancient near east.

What could be called the climax of the historical-critical method is located in redaction criticism which examines the final stage of the development of the biblical text: the work of the author in drawing together and editing the various traditions and source material into a coherent whole. Redaction criticism was very popular from the 1950s onward in analyzing the Synoptic Problem. It was noted that the first three gospels held a lot of material in common but how had each author used these common traditions? What changes had been made in order, omissions and additions? Was there a theological motive behind each evangelist's work?

But by the middle of the 20th century a new way of reading the Bible was beginning to emerge. Instead of focusing on the historical background – “the world behind the text” (Fretheim) – attention was being paid to the text itself and meaning was made from these words – “the world within the text.” This was the new literary criticism, as opposed to the old literary criticism of the 19th century which had already explored grammar, literary forms and such features as imagery. The new approach to the Bible as literature included a number of different methods. Insights gathered from the work of the French structuralists who sought to identify the deep underlying structures of life which make sense of relationships, especially as presented in folk tales. Findings from rhetorical critics who analysed how a text achieved its intention to persuade, challenge or praise. Rhetorical devices such as argument and repetition were identified and examined as to how the meaning of a passage might be affected by their use. Narrative critics focused on the way stories are told in the Bible, exploring plot and characterisation, and such literary devices as irony and symbolism. Again, this was a continuation of Jowett's call to read the Bible as any other piece of literature.

In the late 20th century, attention again shifted, this time not to the historical background, nor to the literary nature of the text itself, but rather to the reader and the reader's interaction with the text or “the world in front of the text” (Fretheim) known as - reader response criticism. Most commentators and critics in the past had been overwhelmingly Western, highly educated males. But now insights were being made into the meaning of scripture when read from the different perspectives of women, Latin American base communities, or migrant workers in rural or urban settings. Objectivity was seen as an impossibility with the maxim, “What you see or hear depends upon where you stand.”

A natural development came with the rise of postmodernity and the recognition that there will never be only one correct interpretation of a biblical passage but rather a plurality of

meanings depending upon the culture and context of different readers. There will be post-colonial interpretations and Pacific readings, queer readings and womanist interpretations.

What then are the impacts and effects of all these various ways of reading the Bible on mission in the 21st century? Whereas mission at Edinburgh 1910 was seen in terms of obedience to Christ's final command, the Great Commission, now mission is seen primarily as God's work – the *Missio Dei* in which we participate. The idea of the *Missio Dei* gained impetus from the reflection of Karl Barth on specific Johannine passages of the New Testament. Its classical expression is seen in Trinitarian terms, “as God the Father sending the Son [John 5:36f], and God the Father and the Son sending the Spirit [John 14:26, 16:7], [and] Father, Son and Holy Spirit sending the church into the world [John 17:18, 20:21].”²¹ Rather than speaking of the church having a mission, Pritchard declares that, “The mission of God has a church.”²²

Archbishop Rowan Williams takes the idea of the *Missio Dei* further. Not only is mission about being sent but it is also about dispossession. Jesus says in John 16:15, “All that the Father has is mine.” This is the nature of God's mission – the giving away of Godself. In the same way, Jesus holds nothing back in his own mission, “even to death on a cross.” In Philippians 2:6-11 we have the scriptural expression of this kenotic christology. For Williams then, “To belong in the apostolic community is to be involved in the complex act of giving away; to be at the disposal of God's will, to give away the life which we have, so that God's life can be given through us.”²³ Jürgen Moltmann likewise neatly sums up the difference between 1910 and 2010, “It is not the church that has a mission of salvation to fulfill in the world; it is the mission of the Son and the Spirit through the Father that includes the church.”²⁴

Another effect of the plurality of readings is the diversity of mission engagement. The work of the Edinburgh 2010 work group on the theme, ‘Foundations for Mission’, draws attention to the various ways in which the Bible is read and how these bring about “new ways of understanding and engaging in God's mission.”²⁵ In our own context, Richard Randerson in his *Engagement 21: A Wake-up Call to the 21st century Church in Mission*, has highlighted through 126 case studies the tremendous variety of witness and activity of various communities of faith in Australia and New Zealand as they engage in God's mission. He writes, “But if we understand the end in terms of the renewal of the whole of creation, then mission becomes a task of engaging with God in our daily life and work to renew the whole of creation, to be agents of reconciliation, workers for justice and peace, and sustainers of the environment.”²⁶ Just as the Bible contains many layers of meaning reflecting the diverse methods and contexts of Bible readers, so the discernment of God at work “reconciling the world to Godself” can be seen in many different forms of witness and action.

Yet another impact is that of experience. In both biblical interpretation and missionary activity, the focus today is on Christian experience. Using the variety of methodologies now available to us, the challenge is to read the Bible and understand its historical and cultural nuances as thoroughly as we can and then to place ourselves before its message – to be addressed by a word from God as we reflect on our own experience of life and faith. Jürgen Moltmann puts this process of biblical interpretation in the form of a question: “Do you understand what you are reading, understand it so profoundly that it lives in you and finds expression through you?”²⁷ In the same way that reading the Bible becomes

experiential, so too the engagement in God's mission in the world is focused on a personal experience of Jesus. Joshua Iyadurai, an Indian participant in the 'Bible and Mission' transversal theme of Edinburgh 2010, sees the contrast between modern and postmodern mission in this way: "Modern mission was concerned with presenting the gospel rationally which would appeal to the intellect. In postmodernity, invitation is extended to a person to experience Jesus Christ."²⁸ While this contrast may be stated too starkly, it is certainly clear that a more holistic approach to biblical interpretation and mission is now prevalent. I would prefer a both/and analysis rather than an either/or – both rationality and experience, both history and imagination in our reading of Scripture and involvement in God's mission.

Finally there is the issue of authority. Does the practice of postmodern methods of Bible reading lead to the conclusion that the Bible can mean anything? Can we justify any interpretation of Scripture in terms of our own cultural perspectives? Does anything go in terms of missional activity?

I think the question of our authority to read, interpret, believe and act in certain ways is a matter of allowing our witness to be tested quite rigorously by ourselves and by others. Is our witness in continuity with that of Jesus, "to whom all authority in heaven and on earth has been given"? Matthew 28:18 Again we need both historical-critical methods of the past to interpret ancient scriptures and the insights of current methodologies to relate the Christian gospel to our present needs.

In conclusion, in all that I have said, the Bible remains the foundational text for Christian faith and mission. We owe the greatest debt to the 19th century biblical scholars who paved the way for Edinburgh 1910, its devotion and its dedication, its energy and its enthusiasm. As we celebrate Edinburgh 2010, let me quote Rowan Williams again: "Our mission must, like Christ's, ultimately be the 'who' that we are, action and gift, for the sake of a new humanity; and for this we need courage both to act and to repent. Learning this is our sanctification."²⁹

Endnotes

¹ Cited in David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1991, 341.

² Ibid, p 338.

³ John R. Mott "Closing Address" Vol 9 *The History and Records of the Conference* [cited 26 May 2010]. Online: <http://www.edinburgh2010.org/en/resources/1910-documents.html>

⁴ Kirsteen Kim, "Edinburgh 1910 and Edinburgh 2010: Different Theological Worldviews?" n.p. [cited 12 May 2010]. Online: <http://www.martynmission.cam.ac.uk/pages/hmc-seminar-papers.php>

⁵ Cited in Bosch *Transforming Mission*, p 338.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Andrew F. Walls, "The Great Commission 1910-2010," n.p. [cited 11 May 2010]. Internet: <http://www.towards2010.org.uk/downloads/t2010paper01walls.pdf>

⁸ Cited by Kenneth R. Ross, *Edinburgh 2010: Springboard for Mission*, Pasadena, Ca.: William Carey International University Press, 2009), p 51

⁹ R.J. Coggins & J.L. Houlden, eds., *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, London: SCM, 1990, 203.

¹⁰ Ibid., p 204.

-
- ¹¹ William Baird, *From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann*, Vol 2 of *History of New Testament Research*, Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003, p 63.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p 61
- ¹³ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴ Cited by Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, 73.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p 74.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁷ Cited in R.J. Coggins & J.L. Houlden, *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, 726.
- ¹⁸ Baird, *History of New Testament Research*, p 83.
- ¹⁹ Vol. 4 *The History and Records of the Conference*, 151, [cited 26 May 2010]. Online: <http://www.edinburgh2010.org/en/resources/1910-documents.html>
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p 151-2.
- ²¹ Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, p 390.
- ²² J. Pritchard, *The Life and Work of a Priest*, London, SPCK, 2007, p 117.
- ²³ R. Williams, *Open to Judgement*, London: DLT, 1994, p 257.
- ²⁴ Cited by Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, p 390.
- ²⁵ Peniel Jesudas Rufus Rajkumar and Emma Wild-Wood, Report of Theme 1 “Foundations for Mission,” 11 [cited 26/5/10]. Online: <http://www.edinburgh2010.org/en/study-themes/1-foundations-for-mission.html>
- ²⁶ R. Randerson, *Engagement 21: A Wake-up Call to the 21st century Church in Mission*, Wellington: Matai House, 2010, p 34.
- ²⁷ J. Moltmann, “Do you understand what you are reading?” *Theology* Vol. cxiii, No.872, Mar/Apr 2010, p 91.
- ²⁸ Joshua Iyadurai, “Mission in Postmodernity: An Asian Perspective,” *Dharma Deepika: A South Asian Journal of Missiological Research* 32 (July-December 2010) and made available here by kind permission of the editor, Dr Roger Hedlund.. [cited 11 May 2010]. Online: <http://www.edinburgh2010.org/en/study-themes/main-study-themes/3-mission-and-postmodernities/theme-3-papers.html>, 7
- ²⁹ R. Williams, *Open to Judgement*, p 265-6

Bibliography

- Baird, William *From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolf Bultmann* (vol 2 of *History of New Testament Research*). Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003.
- Orbis, 1991.
- Coggins, R.J. & J.L. Houlden, eds., *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, London:, SCM, 1990.
- Moltmann, J. “Do you understand what you are reading?” *Theology* Vol. cxiii, No.872, Mar/Apr 2010, 83-95.
- Pritchard, J. *The Life and Work of a Priest*, London, SPCK, 2007.
- Randerson, R. *Engagement 21: A Wake-up Call to the 21st century Church in Mission*, Wellington, Matai House, 2010.
- Ross, Kenneth R. *Edinburgh 2010: Springboard for Mission*, William Carey International University Press, 2009.
- Williams, R. *Open to Judgement*, London: DLT, 1994.
- Online: <http://www.edinburgh2010.org>