

**Prophetic Dialogue, East-Asian Theology and
the Changing Voice of Mission:**

*What can the Church of England
learn from East-Asian theology
in terms of Contextualizing the Gospel?*



by

Mark Yan Ying Sum Nam

A dissertation submitted to Trinity College/Bristol Baptist College in accordance with
the requirements of the degree of Master of Arts in Theology, Ministry and Mission

ABSTRACT

In the last half-century or so—with the establishment of a global economy, advancements in tele-communications, and increased migration—the U.K has undergone significant societal and cultural shifts. The Church of England (“CofE”) has struggled to keep up with the increasingly multicultural, religiously diverse and globalized context it finds itself in. Despite a wholesale adoption of the Five Marks of Mission—regarded by many within the Anglican fold to be the answer to this dilemma—the CofE has failed to contextualize the Gospel effectively and continues to slip further into irrelevancy. Whilst the CofE appears to have placed all its hopes and aspirations behind the Five Marks, a new paradigm of mission has emerged called Prophetic Dialogue, which is best represented and articulated by Stephen B. Bevans and Roger P. Schroeder in their seminal book *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today* (2004). Despite occupying a central place in the teaching syllabus of Anglican training institutions, very little—if anything at all—of Prophetic Dialogue has crossed over into how the CofE approaches mission, which remains stalwartly faithful to the Five Marks of Mission. If the CofE is to succeed in its task to contextualize the Gospel, then this disconnect between the Five Marks of Mission and Prophetic Dialogue needs to be bridged. This paper will argue that only through the introduction of a third conversation partner—namely, East-Asian Theology—can this gap be successfully closed. In so doing, it will be demonstrated that Prophetic Dialogue, as envisaged by Bevans and Schroeder, is ubiquitous to East-Asian Theology, and that therefore, East-Asian theology embodies the paradigm shift so desperately needed by the Church of England if it is to survive the 21st Century.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
ABBREVIATIONS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODOLOGY AND STRUCTURE	3
 CONVERSATION I: THE FIVE MARKS OF MISSION AND PROPHETIC DIALOGUE	 04
1. Development of the Five Marks of Mission	04
2. Influence of the Five Marks on Church of England mission and polity	05
3. Bevan's & Schroeder, <i>Constants in Context</i> , and prophetic dialogue	07
4. The Five Marks and prophetic dialogue compared and contrasted	09
 CONVERSATION II: PROPHETIC DIALOGUE AND EAST-ASIAN THEOLOGY	 12
1. Prophetic dialogue examined	12
2. A definition of East-Asian theology	16
3. East-Asian theology as prophetic dialogue	18
 CONVERSATION III: EAST-ASIAN THEOLOGY AND THE FIVE MARKS OF MISSION	 20
1. Mark I: To proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom	20
2. Mark II: To teach, baptize and nurture new believers	23
3. Mark III: To respond to human need by loving service	26
4. Mark IV: To seek to transform unjust structures of society	30
5. Mark V: To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth	36
 CONCLUSION	 40
1. Integrating East-Asian theology into the Church of England	40
2. <i>Furoshiki</i> (風呂敷) The art of wrapping things up	41
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 44-48

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	Anglican Consultative Council
BAME	Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
BLM	Black Lives Matter
CMS	Church Mission Society
CofE	Church of England
T.I.'s	Training Institutions
TEAC	Theological Education in Anglican Communion
U.K.	United Kingdom

INTRODUCTION

In the last half-century or so—with the establishment of a global economy, advancements in tele-communications, and increased migration—the U.K. has undergone significant societal and cultural changes. In what is considered to be ‘one of the 100 most significant books of the 20th Century,’¹ David Bosch—in his seminal work *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (1991)²—has stressed that the Church in the West is faced with ‘totally unprecedented challenges.’³

Thirty years on since Bosch’s pronouncement, the Church of England (“CofE”) is still struggling to formulate an effective way to contextualize the Gospel for an increasingly multicultural world. As Martin Davie—Theological Consultant to the House of Bishops—points out, the challenges facing the CofE concern the ‘changing nature of society,’ that is, ‘the process of secularization (the decline in religious activity—both practice and belief) and the growth of religious diversity (the arrival of significant other faith communities).’⁴

Despite the CofE’s wholesale adoption of the ‘Five Marks of Mission’⁵—regarded by many within the Anglican fold to be an adequate answer to these dilemmas—the Church continues to experience decline and irrelevancy.

If the CofE is unable to adapt and communicate the Gospel afresh, it is not only mission that is at stake, but also the CofE’s very own survival as an institution. As influential Anglican missiologist John Corrie warns, ‘Anglicanism needs a new paradigm for its identity if it is to survive even to halfway through this century.’⁶

¹ Brian M. Howell, ‘My Top 5 Books on Missions’, *Christianity Today*, May 2013.

² David Jacobus Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, Twentieth anniversary ed, American Society of Missiology Series, no. 16 (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis, 2011).

³ Bosch, 488.

⁴ Martin Davie, *A Guide to the Church of England* (London ; New York: Mowbray, 2008), 297–98.

⁵ Anglican Communion Office, ‘Marks of Mission’; available at: <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/mission/marks-of-mission.aspx> (accessed 18 September 2020).

⁶ John Corrie, ‘Transforming Anglicanism: Elements of an Emerging Anglican Mission Paradigm’, *Anvil* 26, no. 3 & 4 (2009): 255.

Whilst the CofE appears to have placed all of its missional aspirations into the Five Marks of Mission, several other strands of missional thought have converged upon an alternative unifying concept, which is best represented and articulated by Stephen B. Bevans and Roger P. Schroeder in their book *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today* (2004).⁷ Generally considered to be ‘the book after Bosch on mission,’⁸ Bevans and Schroeder propose a new paradigm of mission designed to engage with the increasingly globalized, pluralistic and multicultural society we find ourselves in, which they call ‘prophetic dialogue.’

In the last decade, *Constants in Contexts* has gained traction in Anglican training institutions (“T.I.’s”), with Prophetic Dialogue becoming a source of theological reflection and providing valuable insights on contextualization and mission. Yet despite all of the innovation offered by prophetic dialogue, very little—if anything at all—seems to have carried over or facilitated any change in how the CofE approaches mission, which remains stalwartly faithful to the Five Marks of Mission.

It is contended that this disconnect—between the Five Marks of Mission and prophetic dialogue—needs to be bridged if the CofE is to succeed in contextualizing the Gospel for an increasingly globalized, pluralistic and multicultural society.

This paper will argue that only through the introduction of a third conversation partner—namely, East-Asian theology—can this gap be bridged. In doing so, this paper will demonstrate that prophetic dialogue, as envisaged by Bevans and Schroeder, is ubiquitous to East-Asian theology, and that therefore, East-Asian theology embodies the paradigm shift so desperately needed by the CofE if it is to contextualize the Gospel effectively.

⁷ Stephen B. Bevans and Roger Schroeder, *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today*, American Society of Missiology Series, no. 30 (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis, 2004).

⁸ Tim Dakin, ‘Discipleship: Marked for Mission’, in *Mission in the Twenty-First Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission*, ed. Andrew F. Walls and Cathy Ross (London: Darton Longman + Todd, 2010), 175.

METHODOLOGY & STRUCTURE

In an effort to demonstrate the usefulness of East-Asian theology for broadening theological horizons, this paper will depart from the usual Western modes of inquiry expected from a paper of this type.

Instead, this paper will attempt to adopt a strategically East-Asian (Japanese) approach called *furoshiki* (風呂敷) which loosely translates into English as ‘wrapping up.’ Although at first glance, this method appears to resemble Hegelian dialectics, it predates Hegel’s Western form of dialectical synthesis by several hundred years and seeks to reconcile opposing positions to create new vistas of thought, rather than distinguishing between differences to reach concrete conclusions.⁹

Furoshiki—and East-Asian philosophy in general—is dialogical in nature. Accordingly, this paper will present itself through three conversations. Firstly, a conversation between the Five Marks of Mission and prophetic dialogue; secondly, a conversation between prophetic dialogue and East-Asian theology; and thirdly, a conversation between East-Asian theology and the Five Marks of Mission. This brings all three subjects into dialogue with one another in a ‘round-robin’ fashion.

The process of *furoshiki* is completed when the fruit of these conversations is ‘wrapped up’ to create a new trajectory or pattern of thought. This paper will then explore the ramifications of this new trajectory when applied to the CofE and conclude by suggesting ways in which this new paradigm of mission might become a reality.

⁹ In a series of articles discussing the differences between oriental and Western thought, revered Japanese theologian Kazoh Kitamori emphasizes that the West thinks in opposites, distinguishing between differences whilst oriental absoluteness accepts the opposing elements *at the same time*. Kitamori, "The Japanese Mentality and Christianity" in *Japan Christian Quarterly*, XXVI (1956, No. 3), 167-174.

CONVERSATION I: THE FIVE MARKS OF MISSION AND PROPHETIC DIALOGUE

The purpose of placing the Five Marks of Mission (“the Five Marks”) and prophetic dialogue into conversation with one another, is to determine what the CofE may be lacking or where it may be suffering blind spots in terms of contextualizing the Gospel effectively. It is postulated that Bevans’ and Schroeder’s model of prophetic dialogue will offer crucial insights, opening up vistas previously closed to or overlooked by the Five Marks.

These new insights will be transferred across—or in Japanese terms, ‘folded’—into the second conversation, which will introduce East-Asian theology to the conversation.

1. Development of the Five Marks of Mission

The genesis of the Five Marks can be traced back to the 1984 Anglican Consultative Council’s (“ACC”) meeting in Badagry, Nigeria,¹⁰ where four ‘dimensions’ of mission were proposed: 1) To proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom; 2) To teach, baptize, and nurture new believers; 3) To respond to human need by loving service; and 4) To seek to transform unjust structures of society.¹¹

These four ‘dimensions’ were received at the Lambeth Conference in 1988, which famously kick-started ‘The Decade of Evangelism’ sparking a renewed emphasis on the Church’s evangelistic task. In light of this renewed impetus, a fifth dimension was added at the 1990 ACC-8 meeting in Newport, Wales, namely: 5) To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.¹²

It is not exactly clear when the ACC dimensions of mission became the ‘Five Marks of Mission,’ but it appears that they were first referred to as such in a 1994 report from the

¹⁰ Anglican Consultative Council and Roger Coleman, eds., *Bonds of Affection: Report of ACC-6 : Nigeria 1984*. (London: Church House Pub., 1984).

¹¹ Anglican Consultative Council and Coleman, 59.

¹² Anglican Consultative Council, ed., *Mission in a Broken World: Report of ACC-8 : Wales 1990*. (London: Church House Pub., 1990), 101.

Church of England Board of Mission, that noted a ‘five-fold understanding of mission’ and asserted, ‘mission is characterized by five marks’.¹³

The Five Marks were subsequently adopted in 1996 by the Church of England's General Synod and have since become synonymous with how the CofE engages with mission. The rest, as they say, is history.

2. Influence of the Five Marks on Church of England mission and polity

The influence of the Five Marks on the CofE’s mission and polity cannot be overstated. They possess an almost omnipresent status in Anglican and Episcopal thinking.¹⁴

John Corrie—who is the lead editor for *The Dictionary of Mission Theology: Evangelical Foundations*—describes the Five Marks as ‘the new paradigm [...] in which there is a remaking of Anglicanism for a new mission of the 21st century.’¹⁵ Corrie’s enthusiasm for the Five Marks is shared by Cathy Ross, who apart from heading up the Pioneer Mission Leadership Centre for the Church Mission Society (“CMS”) in Oxford, is also editor of *Mission in the Twenty-First Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission* (2008)¹⁶ and a significant contributor to *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies* (2016),¹⁷ writing the leading entry on mission.¹⁸

Ross is arguably *the* leading advocate for the Five Marks of Mission, championing their worth and application in each and every context. Following the Centenary of the World Missionary Conference of 1910 held in Edinburgh, eight think-tanks were formed to reflect upon and produce publications reflecting the ethos of Edinburgh 2010. Ross edited a volume

¹³ Board of Mission, ed., *A Growing Partnership: The Church of England and World Mission: The Report of a Working Group to the Board of Mission on the Church of England’s Structures and Relationships in World Mission* (London: Church House Pub., 1994), 8–9.

¹⁴ Jesse Zink, ‘Five Marks of Mission: History, Theology, Critique’, *Journal of Anglican Studies Trust* 15, no. 2 (8 June 2017): 1.

¹⁵ Corrie, ‘Transforming Anglicanism’, 257.

¹⁶ Andrew F. Walls and Cathy Ross, eds., *Mission in the Twenty-First Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission* (London: Darton Longman + Todd, 2010).

¹⁷ Mark D. Chapman, Sathianathan Clarke, and Martyn Percy, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies*, First edition (Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University, 2016).

¹⁸ Cathy Ross, ‘Mission’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies*, ed. Mark D. Chapman, Sathianathan Clarke, and Martyn Percy, First edition (Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2016), 504–16.

titled *Life-Widening Mission: Global Anglican Perspectives* (2012),¹⁹ ensuring that every reflection on mission was framed by the Five Marks. Referring to this volume in *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies*, Ross insists that, '[t]he young writers agreed that the Five Marks were indeed a helpful framework and not a straightjacket.'²⁰

Amongst more popular literature, Martin Davie in the *Guide to the Church of England* (2008), describes the Five Marks as 'the closest there is to an official Church of England definition of mission.'²¹ Likewise, Marcus Throup in a similarly themed book titled, *All Things Anglican: Who We Are and What We Believe* (2018),²² describes the Five Marks as 'effectively a "manifesto for mission", setting out a pattern for life and action for all Anglicans.'²³ Whilst Davie's and Throup's assertions may appear overstated, it has been noted that at the 2016 meeting of the ACC, a resolution was proposed for the Five Marks to be considered a fifth instrument of communion.²⁴

This almost unbridled and whole-hearted acceptance of the Five Marks is reflected in the CofE's approach towards ministerial education. Currently, all candidates for ordained ministry are asked about the Five Marks at Bishop's Advisory Panels. Once candidates are approved, the Five Marks occupy a central place in formational modules, more often than not, comprising a compulsory area for theological reflection and assessment. The Five Marks accompany ordinands into their curacies, being employed as an over-arching framework through which to assess their engagement with and reflections in context.

The most recently published report by the ACC—*What Do Anglicans Believe? - A Study Guide to Christian Doctrine from Anglican and Ecumenical Statements* (July 2020)—for the Theological Education in Anglican Communion ("TEAC") states, '[f]or the Anglican Communion its fidelity to [its] vocation is expressed through its commitment to expressing five marks of Christ's mission.'²⁵ The report goes on to say, '[t]he church's fidelity to its

¹⁹ Cathy Ross, ed., *Life-Widening Mission: Global Perspectives from the Anglican Communion*, Regnum Edinburgh Centenary Series (Oxford: Regnum, 2012).

²⁰ Ross, 'Mission', 508.

²¹ Davie, *A Guide to the Church of England*, 204.

²² Marcus Throup, *All Things Anglican: Who We Are and What We Believe* (Norwich: Canterbury, 2018).

²³ Throup, 95.

²⁴ Zink, 'Five Marks of Mission: History, Theology, Critique', 1–2.

²⁵ Theological Education in the Anglican Communion, 'What Do Anglicans Believe? - A Study Guide to Christian Doctrine from Anglican and Ecumenical Statements' (The Anglican Consultative Council, July 2020), 31, https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/417436/2020-08-what-do-anglicans-believe_en.pdf.

mission is therefore intrinsic to its holiness. Holiness is in a deep way constituted by the Anglican Communion's Five Marks of Mission.²⁶ This statement by the ACC, connecting holiness—an ontological attribute of God—to the Five Marks of Mission is staggering, underlining how influential the Five Marks are in governing the CofE's mission, polity and possibly even its understanding of doctrine.

Having demonstrated the astonishing influence that the Five Marks exert upon the CofE, attention will now turn towards an alternative model of mission that is also taught in Anglican T.I.'s across the U.K.—yet for reasons which will be explored in the second part of this paper—has not had a visible impact on the CofE's approach to mission, despite the contributions it purports to make for contextualization.

3. Bevan's & Schroder, *Constants in Context* and prophetic dialogue

Widely held in missional circles to have written 'the book after Bosch on mission,'²⁷ Stephen B. Bevans' and Roger Schroeder's acclaimed *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today* (2004)²⁸ has cemented itself as a core text in Anglican T.I.'s up and down the country. A brief glance at indicative reading lists for mission related modules reveals the prominence of this text in forming clergy and leaders for mission in the CofE.

Similar to Bosch's *Transforming Mission*,²⁹ the first two-thirds of *Constants in Context* provide an overview of mission theology and mission history. Throughout this section, Bevans and Schroeder identify what they consider to be six constants of the Christian faith, namely Christ, church, eschatology, salvation, anthropology, and culture.³⁰

Bevans and Schroeder consider a variety of ways in which these six constants of faith can be communicated in different geographical and historical contexts, settling upon three perspectives which they simply refer to as A, B and C types which—as Tim Dakin points out—'correspond loosely to so-called "conservative", "liberal" and "radical" theologies.'³¹

²⁶ Theological Education in the Anglican Communion, 31.

²⁷ Dakin, 'Discipleship: Marked for Mission', 175.

²⁸ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*.

²⁹ Bosch, *Transforming Mission*.

³⁰ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 10–347.

³¹ Dakin, 'Discipleship: Marked for Mission', 175.

The purpose behind tracing the history of mission, identifying the six constants of faith and extrapolating these three types, is for Bevans and Schroeder to combine them into a new paradigm of mission for the twenty-first century, namely, ‘prophetic dialogue’:

While we believe that all three approaches [A, B and C] are valid, we also believe that *only a synthesis* of all three will provide the firmest foundation for the model of mission that we are proposing as the most adequate model for these first years of the twenty-first century: mission as prophetic dialogue.³²
[emphasis mine]

In the final chapter of their book, Bevans and Schroeder attempt to explain in more detail, ‘how this model of mission for the twenty-first century might be expressed by reflecting in some depth on the multidimensional understanding of mission that is evident in missiological thought today.’³³ To this end, Bevans and Schroeder employ six essential components of God’s mission to frame their reflections: (1) witness and proclamation, (2) liturgy, prayer and contemplation, (3) commitment to justice, peace and the integrity of creation, (4) the practice of interreligious dialogue, (5) efforts of inculturation, and (6) the ministry of reconciliation.³⁴

These six components are lifted directly from an essay that Bevans co-wrote with Eleanor Doidge in 2000, titled *Theological Reflection*.³⁵ Curiously, no explanation is given as to why these six components are chosen, save for the fact that they ‘[try] to take into account both the diversity of the elements proposed and their similarity to one another.’³⁶

Nevertheless, these six components are the means through which Bevans and Schroeder opt to expound their understanding and application of prophetic dialogue. Surprisingly, only forty-five pages are given to this endeavor³⁷—comprising less than 10% of the entire book—which is particularly surprising given the gravitas of their claim to provide a new paradigm of mission for the Church.

³² Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 284.

³³ Bevans and Schroeder, 350.

³⁴ Bevans and Schroeder, 351.

³⁵ Stephen B. Bevans and Eleanor Doidge, ‘Theological Reflection’, in *What Mission Confronts Religious Life in the U. S. Today?*, ed. Barbara Kraemer (Chicago: Center for the Study of Religious Life, 2000).

³⁶ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 351.

³⁷ Bevans and Schroeder, 353–98.

This likely explains why Bevans and Schroder felt it necessary to produce a follow-up seven years later titled *Prophetic Dialogue: Reflections on Christian Mission Today* (2011), where they have ‘adapted and developed the idea of prophetic dialogue as an expression of a comprehensive theology of mission.’³⁸ Once again, Bevans and Schroder employ the six components of mission devised by Bevans and Doidge, elevating their importance by suggesting that they now embody the dialogical and prophetic perspectives that give ‘Prophetic Dialogue’ its name.³⁹

4. The Five Marks and prophetic dialogue compared and contrasted

Before examining the Five Marks and Prophetic Dialogue in relation to one another, it is acknowledged that there has been one previous attempt by an Anglican scholar—The Bishop of Winchester and Lead Bishop for Further and Higher Education, Tim Dakin—to bring the Five Marks into conversation with *Constants in Context*.

In his essay, *Discipleship: Marked for Mission* (2011),⁴⁰—which is found in the aforementioned volume on Five Marks, edited by Cathy Ross—Dakin takes Bevans’ and Schroeder’s three types—‘A, B and C’—and corresponds them to conservative, liberal and radical theologies already present within Anglicanism. Because Bevans and Schroeder extrapolate their three types from the ‘six constants of faith,’ Dakin concludes that the six constants are therefore already contained *within* the Anglican Five Marks of Mission, as expressed through conservative, liberal and radical theologies. This presents the Five Marks as being comprehensive and broad in their scope.

It is submitted, however, that Dakin has failed to represent Bevans’ and Schroeder’s train of thought fully. His essay only engages with the first two-thirds of *Constants in Context*, which as outlined above, only concerns itself with identifying the six constants of faith expressed throughout history. Dakin does not once consider the main objective of *Constants in Context*, which is to synthesize them into a new paradigm of mission for the future. Accordingly, Dakin does not refer once to prophetic dialogue or the six components that inform it, apart

³⁸ Stephen B. Bevans and Roger Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue: Reflections on Christian Mission Today* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2011).

³⁹ Bevans and Schroeder, 2.

⁴⁰ Dakin, ‘Discipleship: Marked for Mission’.

from a cursory mention in a footnote where he concedes that there is only a partial overlap with the Five Marks:

... the final chapter in Bevens and Schroder (op. cit) where they discuss six components of God's mission in which the church is called to share: proclamation and witness; prayer, liturgy, and contemplation; justice, peace, and integrity of creation; inter-religious dialogue; inculturation; and reconciliation (pp. 351ff.). *There is some overlap here with the five marks of mission.*⁴¹ [emphasis mine]

To avoid committing the same oversight, and in order to illustrate what new insights prophetic dialogue can offer the CofE in terms of contextualizing the Gospel, the Five Marks will be brought directly into conversation with the six components that Bevens and Schroeder associate with prophetic dialogue:

The Five Mark of Mission:

1) To proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom; 2) To teach, baptize, and nurture new believers; 3) To respond to human need by loving service; and 4) To seek to transform unjust structures of society; and 5) To strive to safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth.

The Six Components of prophetic dialogue:

(1) witness and proclamation, (2) liturgy, prayer and contemplation, (3) commitment to justice, peace and the integrity of creation, (4) the practice of interreligious dialogue, (5) efforts of inculturation, and (6) the ministry of reconciliation.

By comparing and contrasting these two models, three connections or overlaps become apparent. Firstly, Marks 1 and 3 of the Five Marks generally correspond with the first component of prophetic dialogue. Secondly, the second Mark of Mission corresponds with the second component of prophetic dialogue. Thirdly, Marks 4 and 5 correspond with the third component of prophetic dialogue.

Whilst the Five Marks can be seen to overlap with the first three components of prophetic dialogue, the remaining three components appear to fall outside the remit of the Five Marks. These are, (4) the practice of interreligious dialogue, (5) efforts of inculturation, and (6) the ministry of reconciliation.

⁴¹ Dakin, 219 n.2.

What is immediately striking about these three components, is that they reflect the aforementioned challenges presently facing the CofE, that is, contextualizing the Gospel for today's religiously plural, multicultural, and globalized society. As Ryan K. Bolger asks in *The Gospel after Christendom: New Voices, New Cultures, New Expressions* (2012),

Given globalization and migration, many live between two or more cultures. How can we still be the church in this newly created space? How might we live our faith communally and in relation with other traditions?⁴²

If this is indeed the 'space' we now occupy in the U.K., if Bevans and Schroeder are correct in claiming that dialogue is the only option in today's globalized and polycentric world,⁴³ and if these remaining three components are integral to prophetic dialogue, then it appears that the Five Marks are not quite as 'wide-ranging and comprehensive'⁴⁴ or 'rich with potential'⁴⁵ as their enthusiasts assume.

It therefore stands to reason that the Five Marks of Mission—which govern so much of the CofE's understanding and approach to mission—are in need of urgent re-evaluation, if they are to avoid sliding further into irrelevancy.

⁴² Ryan K. Bolger, ed., *The Gospel after Christendom: New Voices, New Cultures, New Expressions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), xxiv.

⁴³ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 378.

⁴⁴ Throup, *All Things Anglican*, 95.

⁴⁵ Cathy Ross, 'Introduction', in *Mission in the Twenty-First Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission*, ed. Andrew F. Walls and Cathy Ross (London: Darton Longman + Todd, 2010), xiv.

CONVERSATION II: PROPHETIC DIALOGUE AND EAST-ASIAN THEOLOGY

The preceding conversation has revealed the inadequacy of the Five Marks of Mission to engage with contemporary issues and therefore the inability of the CofE to contextualize the Gospel effectively in today's multicultural society.

This next section will focus on the three components that were specifically identified as lacking consideration under the Five Marks—the practice of interreligious dialogue, efforts of inculturation, and the ministry of reconciliation—and examine how Bevans and Schroeder envisage them to be worked out in practice.

This analysis will then be brought into conversation with East-Asian theology, to determine if any parallels exist between East-Asian theology and prophetic dialogue.

The fruit of this investigation will then be 'folded' into the third and final conversation, which aims to bring East-Asian theology and the Five Mark of Mission together to identify what the CofE might learn from East-Asian theology in terms of contextualizing the Gospel.

1. Prophetic dialogue examined

As observed above, Bevans and Schroeder only reserve forty-five pages in their entire book to present their vision of prophetic dialogue in its entirety. Only seventeen of these pages are given to fleshing out what they actually mean by interreligious dialogue, efforts of inculturation, and the ministry of reconciliation.⁴⁶ Again, this is somewhat surprising given their aim to present prophetic dialogue as a fully-fledged new paradigm of mission.

What is immediately noticeable—given the focus of this paper—is that Bevans and Schroeder pay little attention to East-Asian theologians or methods employed by Christians living in or originating from East-Asia. Plenty is said about Catholic, Orthodox and Conciliar Protestant theologians, Pentecostal and Reformed traditions, African, Latin-American and former

⁴⁶ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 378–95.

colonial movements, but the absence of East-Asian voices amongst these is patently obvious, at least to someone who is sensitive to them.

There are, however, two notable exceptions. Firstly, Bevans and Schroeder mention the Roman Catholic Bishops of Asia as having expressed that mission must be done in a threefold dialogue—with the poor, with culture and with other religions⁴⁷—but other than that, no actual examples are given as to *how* this might be achieved or how the Bishops suggest this ought to be done. It is just conceptual.

The question of ‘how?’ appears to go unanswered in Bevans’ and Schroeder’s deliberations on ‘interreligious dialogue.’ Much is said about what interreligious dialogue is *not*—it is neither the models of replacement, proclamation, exclusivism, inclusivism, fulfilment, pluralist, mutuality or acceptance⁴⁸—but no examples are given as to what it actually *is* or what it looks like in practice.

The second mention of an East-Asian perspective is given to Vietnamese-American Catholic theologian Peter C. Phan, but only insofar as he concurs with Bevans’ and Schroeder’s general view of ‘inculturation’ and who provides an endorsement on the back cover.⁴⁹ Again, this section is dominated by suggestions of what ‘inculturation’ might entail at a conceptual level, but nothing of practical value is offered on how to engage effectively with people from different cultures.

In terms of ‘the ministry of reconciliation,’ examples are only given as to *when* reconciliation is required—expressed through ‘a number of different levels’⁵⁰—with global warfare, clashes between different people groups, personal relationships, and even rents ‘*within* the church’⁵¹ being cited. Bevans and Schroeder look to Robert J. Schreiter to highlight the responsibility of Christians to ‘create communities of reconciliation,’⁵² but ultimately concede that, ‘sadly such efforts [by the church] of reconciliation are all too uncommon.’ Again, instead of

⁴⁷ Bevans and Schroeder, 349.

⁴⁸ Bevans and Schroeder, 380.

⁴⁹ Bevans and Schroeder, 387.

⁵⁰ Bevans and Schroeder, 391.

⁵¹ Bevans and Schroeder, 390–92.

⁵² Bevans and Schroeder, 393.

providing concrete examples of what the ministry of reconciliation looks like in practice, the reader is left wanting.

In their aforementioned follow up volume, *Prophetic Dialogue: Reflections on Christian Mission Today* (2011), Bevans and Schroeder ‘tr[y] to reflect further on prophetic dialogue in the years since *Constants in Context* was published’⁵³ and in particular, ‘reflect further on the six elements of mission.’⁵⁴ It is important to note that in between these two publications, Bevans and Schroeder no longer use the term ‘components,’ but refer to the six as ‘elements’ instead. This reflects a deeper and more fundamental role that they play in defining prophetic dialogue.

Whilst this increased focus sounds promising, it soon becomes apparent that the book shares the same short comings of its predecessor, namely that it is overly conceptual and lacking in practical examples of how to apply the six elements. The majority of content is lifted from pre-existing essays by Bevans and Schroeder who confess in their introduction that, ‘[n]aturally, some of the original contexts of the chapters will show through, *especially in a certain amount of repetition of key ideas and favourite quotations.*’⁵⁵ [emphasis mine]

This repetition carries over into the voices and sources that Bevans and Schroeder draw from. Out of the thirty-three people identified in their acknowledgments as ‘important conversation partners on this topic,’⁵⁶ none are East-Asian. Despite their claim that the book is ‘the fruit of respectful engagement with many people of different nationalities, contexts, perspectives, and ecclesial traditions,’⁵⁷ the East-Asian voice is conspicuously absent.⁵⁸

Ultimately, Bevans and Schroeder have sketched out an incredibly attractive concept—called prophetic dialogue—that promises a new paradigm of mission, but they fail to deliver any real guidance as to how this might be achieved in practice.

⁵³ Bevans and Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue*, 3.

⁵⁴ Bevans and Schroeder, 4.

⁵⁵ Bevans and Schroeder, 5.

⁵⁶ Bevans and Schroeder, 6.

⁵⁷ Bevans and Schroeder, 8.

⁵⁸ Cathy Ross and Tim Dakin appear in this list.

At the very end of *Prophetic Dialogue*, Bevans and Schroder liken prophetic dialogue to a dance that has a ‘beautiful but complex rhythm of dialogue and prophecy, boldness and humility, learning and teaching, letting go and speaking out.’⁵⁹ What is of particular interest to this investigation is when they say, ‘[i]t is the rhythm of an African drumbeat, a salsa band, a Filipino tinkling, a protest march, a ballroom waltz.’⁶⁰

A keen eye cannot fail to notice that each of these elements describes a particular form of theological discourse. The drumbeat represents African theology; the salsa band represents Latin-American theology; the Filipino tinkling represents a very specific country in South-East Asia that has more in common with Latin-America than it does with its neighbors; the protest march represents various types of Liberation/Feminist theologies; and the ballroom waltz is presumably Western theology. There is no instrument to represent the people, voices or theology of East-Asia.

The very final sentence that Bevans and Schroeder use to close their two-volume project on prophetic dialogue reads:

How well we dance will depend—as we dance together—on how faithful we are to the rhythm of the gospel, how responsive we are to the beat of the present, and *how attentive we are* to those among whom we dance.⁶¹ [emphasis mine]

Having surveyed *Constants in Context* and *Prophetic Dialogue*, it is contended that Bevans and Schroeder have failed to be attentive to the theological contribution that East-Asians and the East-Asian diaspora might make in terms contextualizing the Gospel. This oversight has resulted in their project lacking concrete examples of effective interreligious dialogue, inculturation and reconciliation—and subsequently confines the concept of prophetic dialogue to the realm of academic study and classroom discussion.

If, however, East-Asians voices were encouraged to join in with this ‘dance,’ the bare bones of *Prophetic Dialogue* would undoubtedly begin to take on flesh, and in doing so, offer something of substance that could be integrated into the Five Marks of Mission and transform the way that the CofE goes about mission.

⁵⁹ Bevans and Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue*, 156.

⁶⁰ Bevans and Schroeder, 156.

⁶¹ Bevans and Schroeder, 156.

2. A Definition of East-Asian theology

Before exploring the link between East-Asian theology and the notion of prophetic dialogue—in terms of interreligious dialogue, inculturation, and reconciliation—it is first necessary to clarify what constitutes ‘East-Asian theology.’

As Douglas J. Elwood points out in his comprehensive volume on Asian theology, *Asian Christian Theology: Emerging Themes* (1980), the sheer size and cultural diversity of Asia prevents ‘an easily identifiable "Asian Christian Theology," as we have grown to expect of European, Latin American, and North American theologies, or even as we might anticipate from Africa.’⁶² As Phan demonstrates:

As a continent, Asia is conventionally divided into five regions: Central Asia (mainly the Republics of Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan); East Asia (mainly China, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan); South Asia (mainly Bangladesh, India, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka) South-East Asia (mainly Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam), and South-West Asia (the countries of the Middle-East, Near East, or West Asia).⁶³

This paper will begin by adopting Phan’s geographical categories to locate a distinctively East-Asian theology in the countries of China (including Hong Kong), Japan, Korea and Taiwan. One addition will be made to also include Singapore, which has a high proportion of ethnically Chinese living within its borders.

Another reason to confine East-Asian Theology to these countries is that they all—as Edmond Tang notes in his *Introduction to Third World Theologies* (2004)—‘share a common Confucian heritage [with the exception of Japan which is more Buddhist/Confucian] in both core and social values as well as a centralised form of Government.’ Moreover, they have all ‘undergone a period of intense nationalism and struggle against imperialistic domination’ all whilst having ‘embraced modernisation in the Western form in their pursuit of strong and

⁶² Douglas J. Elwood, ‘Asian Christian Theology in the Making: An Introduction’, in *Asian Christian Theology: Emerging Themes*, ed. Douglas J. Elwood, Rev. ed. of *What Asian Christians are Thinking* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980), 24.

⁶³ Peter C. Phan, ed., *Christianities in Asia*, Blackwell Guides to Global Christianity (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 2.

wealthy nation-states.’⁶⁴ Tang’s definition rests upon socio-cultural and religious contexts rather than geographical boundaries in much the same way that revered intercultural theologian, David W. Augsburger defines Western thought as ‘a state of mind, more than a geographical region.’⁶⁵

Although East-Asian theology can be traced back hundreds of years, the year 1945 is generally regarded as the watershed for Asian theology,⁶⁶ following the Second World War and the process of decolonization that took place between 1947 and 1965.⁶⁷ Despite other Third World theologies emerging around the same time, Steven G. Mackie—in his article *God’s People in Asia* (1989)—has pointed out that whilst other Third World theologies emphasized liberation, Asian theologians were more concerned with issues of culture rather than socio-political concerns.⁶⁸

As East-Asian theologies continued to develop, they were classified into four types: 1) ‘Doctrinal,’ which seeks to articulate classical doctrines of the Christian faith from an East-Asian perspective; 2) ‘Existential,’ which seeks to make theological sense of the realities of everyday life; 3) ‘Religious,’ which interprets the Christian faith through existing East-Asian religions and practices; and 4) ‘Socio-Political,’ which aims at liberation for the oppressed, but from a distinctly different angle from other Third World approaches.

Given the aforementioned developments, this paper will take ‘East-Asian theology’ to mean a theology informed by Confucius and/or Buddhist worldviews as practiced by indigenous and diaspora communities whose origins are found in East-Asia, specifically China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Singapore. Specific examples of theologians and writers representing East-Asian theology will be explored in due course.

⁶⁴ Edmond Tang, ‘East Asia’, in *An Introduction to Third World Theologies*, ed. John Parratt (Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University, 2004), 76.

⁶⁵ David W. Augsburger, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures*, 1st ed (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 15.

⁶⁶ Edmund Kee-Fook Chia, ‘Interfaith Dialogue and Christian Theology in Asia’, in *Asian Theology on the Way: Christianity, Culture and Context*, ed. Rufus Rajkumar and Peniel Jesudason (London: SPCK, 2012), 18.

⁶⁷ Simon Shui-Man Kwan, *Postcolonial Resistance and Asian Theology* (New York: Routledge, 2014), 38.

⁶⁸ Steven G Mackie, ‘God’s People in Asia’, *Scottish Journal of Theology* 42, no. 2 (1989): 216.

3. East-Asian theology as prophetic dialogue

It is widely recognized that East-Asian theology and approaches to mission are inherently dialogical.⁶⁹ As Gemma Tulud Cruz—a leading writer on intercultural and migration theologies—observes, ‘Asian and Pacific Christians live within a society in which they rub shoulders daily with non-Christians and have direct experience of the moral values and spiritualities on non-Christian religions.’⁷⁰ It is submitted that living in such environments predisposes East-Asians to embody the three components of prophetic dialogue that the Five Marks of mission sorely overlook.

In terms of ‘interreligious dialogue’—and according to Sathianathan Clarke—this historical and socio-cultural context has, ‘obliged them to work towards a theology that is at once both passionately Christian and respectfully interreligious.’⁷¹ What has been called interreligious dialogue in the West is—as Chia points out—‘something which Asians participate in on a daily basis, to the extent that it is routine it no longer constitutes a special activity.’⁷²

In many East-Asian contexts, the term ‘interfaith dialogue’ is preferable to the term ‘interreligious dialogue,’ so as not to exclude those who do not wish to be associated with religion in its institutional forms. As Chia goes on to explain, ‘religions such as Confucianism and even at times Buddhism, are often viewed more as a philosophy of life.’⁷³ Accordingly, East-Asians who comfortably engage in interfaith dialogue are also fluent in traversing ‘intercultural’ boundaries with the same level of ease and comfort.

Clarke has also recognized that Asian Christian theology is communitarian in nature.⁷⁴ When combining this ethos with the aforementioned ability to co-exist with people of different faiths and worldviews, East-Asian Christians are adept at navigating the ‘ministry of reconciliation.’ Given that Asian worldviews tend to be holistic, rather than dualistic, this

⁶⁹ Simon Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology: Thinking the Faith from the Ground Up* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity, 2014), 23.

⁷⁰ Gemma Tulud Cruz, *Toward a Theology of Migration: Social Justice and Religious Experience* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 97.

⁷¹ Sathianathan Clarke, ‘The Task, Method and Content of Asian Theologies’, in *Asian Theology on the Way: Christianity, Culture and Context*, ed. Rufus Rajkumar and Peniel Jesudason (London: SPCK, 2012), 7.

⁷² Chia, ‘Interfaith Dialogue and Christian Theology in Asia’, 16.

⁷³ Chia, 14.

⁷⁴ Clarke, ‘The Task, Method and Content of Asian Theologies’, 5.

enables Asian Christians to promote harmony and celebrate differences, as opposed to other parts of the world, where they would lead to conflict.⁷⁵

Admittedly, this is a fleeting overview of how East-Asian theology embodies interreligious dialogue, inculturation and the ministry of reconciliation. In order to substantiate this proposition further, examples of East-Asian theology will now be brought into conversation with the Five Marks of Mission. It is postulated that this fusion will demonstrate how East-Asian theology has the ability to transform the Five Marks of Mission in previously unforeseen and innovative ways.

Due to limitations on space, only a select number of voices will be chosen to represent an authentically East-Asian theology. The most obvious names to include are Japanese scholar Kazô Kitamori (1916-1998), Taiwanese intellectual Choan-Seng Song (born 1929), and Japanese theologian Kosuke Koyama (1929-2009). These three are commonly known as the fathers of contemporary East-Asian theology, given the influence their work has had over subsequent generations of East-Asian scholars, although the likes of Masao Takenaka, Shoki Coe, and T. C. Chao could very well have been included in this list.

The second set of voices that this paper will refer to belong to the second and current generation of contemporary East-Asian theologians. Singaporean Simon Chan, Chinese-Malaysian Kar Yong Lim, North Korean Jung Young Lee, and Bishop Paul Kwong from Hong Kong. These voices have been selected for their studies on post-colonialism, contextualization and diaspora missiology. Again, several other voices such as Amon Yong, Peter C. Chan, Edmund Kee-Fook Chia, Kwok Pui-lan and Ken Christoph Miyamoto could very well have been included here too, if space permitted.

Nevertheless, the voices that have been selected were carefully chosen to ensure representation from the six East-Asian countries identified above—China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Taiwan and Singapore—as well as ensuring that all four categories of East-Asian theology—doctrinal, existential, religious, and socio-political—are covered.

⁷⁵ Douglas J. Elwood, 'Man and Nature, a Workshop Report', in *Asian Christian Theology: Emerging Themes*, ed. Douglas J. Elwood, Rev. ed. of *What Asian Christians are Thinking* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980), 114.

CONVERSATION III

EAST-ASIAN THEOLOGY AND THE FIVE MARKS OF MISSION

In order to demonstrate how the Five Marks of Mission—and therefore the CofE’s approach to mission—can be augmented by East-Asian theology, each of the Five Marks will be looked at in turn and brought into contact with one or more of the East-Asian voices identified above. It is postulated that this fusion will open up new vistas for mission praxis within the CofE.

1. Mark I – To proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom

As evidenced above, interreligious dialogue is not expressly or necessarily implied under the Five Marks, despite the fact that ‘[t]he plurality of religions has now been accepted as the fact of life.’⁷⁶ Regretfully, a high percentage of people in the West—including those in the CofE—have never held a conversation about faith with people of another faith.⁷⁷ Indeed, Bosch has argued that the predominant view on non-Christian religions and non-western cultures has been one of rejection and cultural superiority.⁷⁸

In contrast, interfaith dialogue and a posture of humility are fundamental characteristics of what it means to be a Christian in the contexts of East-Asia.⁷⁹ One of the leading voices in this regard is Taiwanese born theologian Choan-Seng Song.

During the 1960’s and 70’s, Song felt that because of the colonizing influence of Western theology—and the cultural homogenization that typically followed⁸⁰—true theological responses to the divine revelation had not emerged out of East-Asia. In response, Song sought to articulate a genuine East-Asian theology in *The Compassionate God* (1982),⁸¹

⁷⁶ Lalsangkima Pachuau and Knud Jørgensen, ‘Introduction’, in *Witnessing to Christ in a Pluralistic World: Christian Mission among Other Faiths*, ed. Lalsangkima Pachuau and Knud Jørgensen, Regnum Edinburgh 2010 Series (Oxford: Regnum, 2011), 13–14.

⁷⁷ Pachuau and Jørgensen, 25.

⁷⁸ Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 291–98.

⁷⁹ Cruz, *Toward a Theology of Migration*, 97.

⁸⁰ Choan-Seng Song, ‘The Obedience of Theology in Asia: Ten Theological Theses’, *South East Asia Journal of Theology* 2, no. October 1960, 7.

⁸¹ Choan-Seng Song, *The Compassionate God* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1982).

where he attempted to give theological interpretations to ancient Confucianism and the arrival of Buddhism in China—a process he referred to as ‘transpositional theology.’⁸²

In *The Compassionate God*, Song regards God’s saving activity as a continual work of creation and re-creation throughout history to rescue humankind from captivity and destruction. Song refers to this as ‘the creation-redemption paradigm’⁸³ and takes the mandate in Gen 1:28—to multiply and disperse across the entire earth—as his starting point.

Song gives several examples in the Old Testament where humankind resist this mandate, with particular emphasis on the Tower of Babel where—out of fear of discontinuity—humankind disobey and attempt to solidify themselves. God, however, challenges this resistance by disrupting the human effort and dispersing people into nations with different languages. Song refers to this action of God as ‘disruption and dispersion,’ a central dynamic in his creation-redemption paradigm.⁸⁴

The prophetic tradition is particularly relevant in relation to this concept. Song points out Israel’s attempts to build a racially and religiously exclusive community in the name of the covenant on Mount Sinai, making election ‘their right over against other peoples.’⁸⁵ Song identifies the prophetic tradition as a rejection of such Jewish centrism and highlights the prophets repeated efforts to disrupt Israel away from this centric form of thinking and to acknowledge a God whose love extends—disperses—to people of all nations.⁸⁶

The most significant moment of disruption and dispersion is found in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Song perceives this as God’s final rejection of Jewish centrism.⁸⁷ Thus, the cross was not simply God’s judgment on the sins of the world; it was God’s judgment on any form of institutionalized religion that sought to ‘erect barriers between the saved and the unsaved, between the godly and the ungodly.’⁸⁸

⁸² Song, 16–17.

⁸³ Song, 22–23.

⁸⁴ Song, 22–23.

⁸⁵ Song, 16, 32.

⁸⁶ Song, 28–38.

⁸⁷ Song, 90–92.

⁸⁸ Song, 95.

Song then proceeds to trace his creation-redemption paradigm through the movements and histories of East-Asia, searching for clues as to the ways of God outside the Judeo-Christian traditions.⁸⁹ Song examines the ancient Chinese Confucian idea of the ‘Mandate of Heaven,’ the Buddhist infiltration of the Middle Kingdom, and the more recent democratization process in some Asian countries. In each of these instances, Song demonstrates how God has been active throughout history and argues, ‘[w]e have no alternative but to move on with God toward that vision of a community of compassion and communion of love.’⁹⁰ As Carver T. Yu observes, Song’s attempts to relate God’s redemption to the history and cultures of East-Asians is:

a clear example of what is now called ‘cross-textual hermeneutics’. The biblical text as a revelation of God has not been denied. However, in affirming the Bible as God’s revelation, one cannot deny the fact that there are non-biblical textual traditions which are life-giving and life-sustaining in their unique contexts.⁹¹

This is the idea behind Song’s ‘transpositional theology’ and one that has been widely adopted by subsequent East-Asian theologians to open up a respectful dialogue with adherents of other faiths.⁹²

As North Korean scholar Jung Young Lee points out, Song’s approach demonstrates how East-Asian theology is ‘helpful not only for the development of ecumenical theology but for the mutual coexistence of Christianity with other religions in a creative process of becoming.’⁹³

This idea of *becoming* has emerged as a key concept in East-Asian approaches to interreligious dialogue and is particularly noticeable in the way that Christians living in Hong Kong navigate their relationships. In one of the world’s most cosmopolitan cities, Archbishop

⁸⁹ Song, 17.

⁹⁰ Song, 260.

⁹¹ Carver T. Yu, ‘The Bible and Cultures in the Shaping of Asian Theology’, in *Christianity and Cultures: Shaping Christian Thinking in Context*, ed. David Emmanuel Singh and Bernard C. Farr (Nottingham: Regnum, 2008), 52.

⁹² Ken Christoph Miyamoto, *God’s Mission in Asia: A Comparative and Contextual Study of This-Worldly Holiness and the Theology of Missio Dei in M. M. Thomas and C. S. Song*, American Society of Missiology Monograph Series (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2007), 177.

⁹³ Jung Young Lee, ‘The Yin-Yang Way of Thinking’, in *Asian Christian Theology: Emerging Themes*, ed. Douglas J. Elwood, Rev. ed. of *What Asian Christians are thinking* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980), 84.

Paul Kwong describes the Church as ‘a new community becoming into being.’⁹⁴ In a paper setting out numerous practical examples of interreligious dialogue, Kwong goes on to say:

The building up of this new community is an essential part of the mission of the Church who needs to hear God's voice speaking through the experience and perspectives of those whose identities are contested or denied. Sharing God's loving and embracing presence draws us of necessity into building up of a sustainable community where all can have different identities but be able to live together in harmony.⁹⁵

It is pastor theologians such as Kwong who embody the cross-textual hermeneutics formulated by the likes of Song, and who provide concrete examples of effective interreligious dialogue. Hong Kong is a relatively newcomer to the Anglican Communion—having only been established in 1998—but it is contended that practical insights and examples like these are crucial if the CofE is to engage effectively with the world around it.

2. Mark II – To teach, baptize and nurture new believers

According to Gregg Ten Elshof in *Confucius for Christians: what an ancient Chinese worldview can teach us about life in Christ* (2015), ‘most Christians in the West—insofar as their thinking is informed by the Western philosophical tradition—are platonic Christians.’⁹⁶

It therefore stands to reason that most Christians with an East-Asian heritage—insofar as *their* thinking is concerned—are Confucian or Buddhist Christians.⁹⁷ Again, this is not necessarily referring to religious convictions, but more the philosophical worldview held by East-Asians in general, independent of their personal religious beliefs.

This realization has profound implications for how the CofE comprehends the second Mark of Mission. Historically, new converts to Christianity have been forced to break away from many—if not all—of the cultural, ancestral and religious symbols that informed their past

⁹⁴ Paul Kwong and Phillip L. Wickeri, ‘Sheng Kung Hui: The Contextualization of Anglicanism in Hong Kong’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies*, ed. Mark D. Chapman, Sathianathan Clarke, and Martyn Percy, First edition (Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University, 2016), 266.

⁹⁵ Paul Kwong, ‘Faith and Social Service’ (Seminar on HKSKH, Hong Kong, 2010), 232.

⁹⁶ Gregg Ten Elshof, *Confucius for Christians: What an Ancient Chinese Worldview Can Teach Us about Life in Christ* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 2015), 4.

⁹⁷ Choan-Seng Song, *Third-Eye Theology: Theology in Formation in Asian Settings* (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis, 1979), 4–6.

and instead, adopt the ways and practices of their newfound 'Western' faith. This is still very much the experience of many BAME (Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic) Anglicans in the CofE today.

As Paul G. Hiebert observes in *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* (1985), this leads to a "split-level" religion wherein only the rational belief level of the indigenous Christian's mind is Christianized, but the sub-rational level of consciousness remains decidedly pagan.⁹⁸

Unsurprisingly, Song takes issue with this arguing in *Third-Eye Theology: Theology in Formation in Asian Settings* (1979) that, 'if we do away with all images and symbols, then the ultimate reality they stand for is also liable to disappear from the religious consciousness of the people.'⁹⁹ In this scenario, the new convert is unable to integrate their faith into the day-to-day realities of their life, or even the ability to articulate their new found faith in words that they or their community can fully comprehend.

If the CofE is to successfully teach, baptize and nurture new believers from different cultural backgrounds, then a new approach is required that is able to accommodate these tensions. One such East-Asian theologian who has wrestled with this dilemma is Kōsuke Koyama.

Although better known for his work *Water Buffalo Theology* (1974),¹⁰⁰ it is in his later book *Mount Fuji and Mount Sinai* (1985),¹⁰¹ that Koyama explores the ramifications of being a Japanese Christian and what this means for his identity. Despite being a committed Christian, Koyama was very aware of his Japanese heritage and wrote, '[w]hen I came to Mount Calvary I brought my Japanese language, culture and psychology to Jesus Christ. No matter what I do, "Prince Shotoku" is within me, just as Moses is found in every Jew.'¹⁰²

By contrasting himself to Martin Buber, who expressed 'his identity in terms of the sacred tradition of Mount Sinai with the memory of all that happened there,'¹⁰³ Koyama expresses his identity as follows:

⁹⁸ Paul G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1985), 222–24.

⁹⁹ Song, *Third-Eye Theology*, 144–45.

¹⁰⁰ Kōsuke Koyama, *Waterbuffalo Theology* (London: SCM, 1974).

¹⁰¹ Kōsuke Koyama, *Mount Fuji and Mount Sinai: A Critique of Idols* (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis, 1985).

¹⁰² Koyama, 6–7.

¹⁰³ Koyama, 8.

A gentile and Japanese, I stand outside of the corporeality of sacred memory [of Israel]. But I do not find my spiritual home base in the tradition of the Christian cathedral either. The graveyard [...] In which I find my identity would be that of Mahayana Buddhism. [...] This profound memory is not to be scorned.¹⁰⁴

Koyama is expressing what Ken Christoph Miyamoto calls a ‘primordial identification,’ that is, ‘the attachments that refer to a Christian’s national or ethnic identity based on primordial sentiments.’¹⁰⁵ In terms of how this informs his Christian identity, Koyama explains:

When I was baptized I sensed that I was moving from the cultural world of Mount Fuji to that of Mount Sinai [...] [however], Mount Calvary is more central than Mount Sinai for me as a Christian. It is in the name of Jesus Christ that I received a new self-identity both spiritual and cultural. With this new identity I began to appreciate the tradition presented by the name of Moses.¹⁰⁶

Using the three mountains as a metaphor, Koyama is able to articulate how—through a personal relationship with Jesus Christ—he is able to reconcile his Japanese identity with the tradition that flows from ‘Mount Sinai’, namely, the Judeo-Christian tradition. Similar to Song, Koyama uses cross-textual hermeneutics to justify the acceptance of his cultural heritage to enrich his experience of living out the Christian faith. As Clarke positively points out:

This divine capaciousness (largeness) frees Asian Christian communities to grant theological value to the divine experiences that nourished their lives before they accepted Jesus as Lord. This emphasis on God’s spaciousness also permits Asian theologians working in religiously plural settings to retain, utilize and celebrate the religious and cultural resources available to their non-Christian families, neighbors and ancestors.¹⁰⁷

Koyama’s monograph demonstrates the importance of allowing new converts to continue drawing from the practices and symbols which sustained them previously—but which on account of Jesus—take on a significantly different meaning. As Vinoth Ramachandra states in his book *Faiths in Conflict? Christian Integrity in a Multicultural World* (1999), an encounter with Jesus brings about ‘radical reorientation, not substitution.’¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁴ Koyama, 8.

¹⁰⁵ Miyamoto, *God’s Mission in Asia*, 23.

¹⁰⁶ Koyama, *Mount Fuji and Mount Sinai: A Critique of Idols*, 6.

¹⁰⁷ Clarke, ‘The Task, Method and Content of Asian Theologies’, 8.

¹⁰⁸ Vinoth Ramachandra, *Faiths in Conflict?: Christian Integrity in a Multicultural World* (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1999), 134.

The second Mark of Mission also stresses the need to ‘nurture’ new believers. The word ‘nurture’ clearly carries pastoral connotations and it is postulated that a deeper appreciation of East-Asian insights—like that of Koyama’s—will enable the CofE to disciple non-western converts in a more pastorally sensitive and therefore effective way.

Although three decades old, Augsburg’s *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures* remains one of the leading texts on cross-cultural pastoral studies. Augsburg refers to Koyama when discussing interreligious dialogue¹⁰⁹ and uses a disproportionately high number of East-Asian stories and illustrations throughout his book to model best-practice. In terms of the Church’s mission, Augsburg argues that his book, ‘demonstrates that the integrity of the church’s *mission* requires those in the caring professions to be concerned with genuine dialogue among cultures, faiths, and values.’¹¹⁰ [emphasis mine].

Accordingly, if the CofE is to exercise the Second Mark of Mission effectively, it ought to follow the example of Western scholars and practitioners like Augsburg and Elshof, who have already begun integrating East-Asian theology into their praxis with positive results.

3. Mark III – To respond to human need by loving service

The aforementioned discussions on cultural sensitivity—and what the CofE can learn from East-Asian theologians like Koyama—is also applicable to how the Church responds to human needs by loving service. Chia points out that ‘interfaith dialogue in Asia, is not [just] confined to formal discussions about faith or religion. It takes multiple forms, employs multiple means and is engaged at multiple levels.’¹¹¹

The importance of engaging with community at ‘multiple levels’ has not escaped the attention of the CofE. Indeed, in the last decade or so, the Church has been at the forefront of pioneering different models of ‘community-development’—popularly referred to as ‘Fresh Expressions’—in an effort to galvanize congregations to respond to different levels of human need by loving service as a distinct form of mission.

¹⁰⁹ Augsburg, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures*, 42–43.

¹¹⁰ Augsburg, front inner sleeve.

¹¹¹ Chia, ‘Interfaith Dialogue and Christian Theology in Asia’, 20.

Whilst an in-depth study of community-development is not possible here, it is important to note that recent scholarship in this area suggests that community-development initiatives are ultimately unsustainable.

Renowned Anglican theologian and anthropologist Martyn Percy—in his book *The Future Shapes of Anglicanism: Currents, Contours, Charts* (2017)¹¹²—has exposed the promotion of ‘Fresh Expressions’ as well-meaning ‘vehicles of rhetoric and topoi for practitioners of heroic leadership,’¹¹³ but ultimately lacking in any substantial change and improvement for the needy communities they purport to serve.

This concurs with Margaret Ledwith’s assessment in *Community Development: A Critical Approach* (2011), where she acknowledges the benefits of gathering people to work together, but also warns how ‘this side-steps the very issue of the role of capitalism in creating disparities of wealth and power.’¹¹⁴

Given that after all this time, the jury is still out on Fresh-Expressions, it is arguably time to pursue alternative approaches to inject new impetus into how the CofE engages with the needy in society. Paul H. Ballard and Lesley Husselbee in *Community and Ministry: an introduction to community development in a Christian context* (2007) argue that what is needed is not another strategy, but a ‘reconfiguring [of] the relationships between congregation and the local community.’¹¹⁵

Before this paper suggests what East-Asian theology offers by way of ‘reconfiguring relationships,’ it is necessary to consider how the CofE is currently seeking to address this issue. This requires a brief look at the work of Samuel Wells, a person who many in the CofE regard as a community-developer par excellence and herald of hope.

Samuel Wells is a priest in the CofE who has written a substantial body of work that in recent years has taken on a significant missiological focus. Known for his emphasis on the

¹¹² Martyn Percy, *The Future Shapes of Anglicanism: Currents, Contours, Charts*, Contemporary Ecclesiology 19 (London ; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis, 2017).

¹¹³ Percy, 61.

¹¹⁴ Margaret Ledwith, *Community Development: A Critical Approach*, 2nd ed (Bristol, UK ; Portland, OR: Policy, 2011), 26.

¹¹⁵ Paul H Ballard and Lesley Husselbee, *Community and Ministry: An Introduction to Community Development in a Christian Context* (London: SPCK, 2007), 4.

incarnational ministry of Jesus, Wells' most popular work is *A Nazareth Manifesto: Being with God* (2008).¹¹⁶

In *The Nazareth Manifesto*, Wells outlines four models of social engagement: a) working for b) working with; c) being for; and d) being with. In short, Wells strongly rejects the 'working for' model in favour of 'being with.' Wells' main criticism against the 'working for' approach is that it encourages a relationship where one party identifies as provider and the other as receiver, thereby perpetuating a relationship of inequality.¹¹⁷ According to Wells, this leaves recipients feeling disempowered and humiliated.¹¹⁸ Having discounted 'working for' as a model of engagement, Wells proceeds to argue that 'being with is where Christian ministry, service and witness begins.'¹¹⁹

Whilst there is nothing inherently wrong with Wells voicing a preference for 'being with,' objections ought to be levelled against the way he vigorously and repeatedly discredits 'working for' as a legitimate form of service. The problem with Wells' assertion is that it fails to take into account cultural particularities, which as discussed above, is something that the CofE needs to be especially aware of in an increasingly multicultural society.

Wells claims that 'for some people it is better to struggle on alone than get on the receiving end of any kind of *working for* relationship.'¹²⁰ Whilst this might be true for western societies, it is certainly not the case for the majority world, many of whom now live in the U.K.

Wells' assumptions are evidently predicated upon post-enlightenment modes of thought—individualism, scientism, egalitarianism, and self-actualization¹²¹—and therefore incompatible with eastern contexts where being served and 'worked for' does not suggest disempowerment, but in fact represents honour, the feeling of being respected, and being part of a community. Wells' disregard for this worldview renders him what Augsburgers calls 'an

¹¹⁶ Samuel Wells, 'The Nazareth Manifesto' (Peakland Baptist Church, Lynchburg, Virginia, Duke University, 2008), https://web.duke.edu/kenanethics/NazarethManifesto_SamWells.pdf.

¹¹⁷ Samuel Wells and Marcia A. Owen, *Living Without Enemies: Being Present in the Midst of Violence* (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, US, 2011), 33.

¹¹⁸ Wells and Owen, 33.

¹¹⁹ Wells, 'The Nazareth Manifesto', 5.

¹²⁰ Wells, 3.

¹²¹ Augsburgers, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures*, 15.

encapsulated counselor,’ that is, someone who has ‘disregarded cultural variations among clients.’¹²²

Rather alarmingly, Wells’ ‘being with’ approach is gaining widespread support in the CofE, due in no small part to the way it seemingly satisfies the Third Mark of Mission. It is submitted that Wells’ approach is not enough. Apart from not doing much to impact disparities in wealth, it offers little consolation to needy communities where relationships are governed by social-rules that are incompatible with a typically Western mindset.

Given this critique of Wells’ approach, it is submitted that East-Asian theology offers a better way of reconfiguring relationships, based upon the shame-honour philosophy inherent to Confucianism which—as Jayson Georges observes in *The 3D Gospel: Ministry in Guilt, Shame, and Fear Cultures* (2016)—occupies a blind spot in most Western Christian theology.¹²³

In *Grassroots Asian Theology* (2014), Simon Chan argues that ‘an appreciation of the ancient psychology of honour and shame offers [a] more authentic cultural and historical reading of [these] dynamics.’¹²⁴ Chan turns to scripture and notes:

Recent biblical studies drawing from cultural-anthropological studies of the ancient world have underscored the importance of the shame-honor motif in the New Testament. In fact there is more said in the Bible about shame and honor than about guilt and innocence. [...] Biblical scholars have shown that by applying the honor-shame motif as an interpretive template, much of the New Testament makes better sense.¹²⁵

In terms of community-development, applying a Biblical hermeneutic informed by an East-Asian understanding of shame and honour transforms the way in which congregations might engage with those in need. As Chan goes on to explain,

since honor and shame are “socially acknowledged” values, an individual cannot escape shared responsibility. The sin of one person shames the entire community, but the honor one receives uplifts the whole community.¹²⁶

¹²² Augsburg, 22.

¹²³ Jayson Georges, *The 3D Gospel: Ministry in Guilt, Shame, and Fear Cultures*, Updated and revised (Amerika: Time, 2016), 13.

¹²⁴ Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 84.

¹²⁵ Chan, 83.

¹²⁶ Chan, 87.

In other words, the needs of poor communities can no longer be overlooked—which a culture of individualism typically associated with a western worldview permits—and the relationship between the two is radically reconfigured. It is this reconfiguration of relationships and transformation of mindset that East-Asian Theology offers the CofE.

For example, if an affluent congregation refused to help a needy community, for whatever reason, this might be seen as bringing shame on the family of God and dishonouring of our heavenly father. It becomes an issue for everyone and prevents people from wiping their hands of the issue—something that happens all too often in the CofE—particularly when it comes to issues of privilege. The shame-honour motif in the Bible urges congregations to reconsider their relationships with others, and to adjust their behavior accordingly.

4. Mark IV – To seek to transform unjust structures of society

The aforementioned reflections on shame and honour are also highly applicable to how the CofE engages with the Fourth Mark of Mission. Again, if shame is recognized positively for the way in which it presupposes an obligation to care for one another, then justice issues—such as those raised by the recent *Black Lives Matter* (“BLM”) movement—cannot be so easily ignored.

The injustice impacting black lives is an injustice that brings shame on us all. When the Church fails to respond, it is an affront to God and it dishonours his name. As Chan explains, the shame-honour motif ‘redefines the nature of Christian life as essentially communal: sinning against God and against community are virtually indistinguishable.’¹²⁷

In terms of engaging with unjust structures in society, it is customary in Anglican circles to turn to Korean *minjung* theology for an East-Asian approach. Etymologically, the word *minjung* means ‘the mass of the people’ and theologically, the *minjung* are present wherever there is ‘socio-cultural alienation, economic exploitation and political suppression.’¹²⁸ The parallels between *minjung* and Liberation theology are self-evident and it is unsurprising,

¹²⁷ Chan, 85.

¹²⁸ Hwa Yung, *Mangoes or Bananas?: The Quest for an Authentic Asian Christian Theology* (Irving: Regnum, 2004), 178.

given the similarities, that this particular expression of East-Asian theology has gained traction in the West.

It is contended, however, that *minjung* theology does not properly represent an authentic East-Asian approach to injustice. As Hwa Yung points out in *Mangoes or Bananas? The Quest for an Authentic Asian Christian Theology* (2004), *minjung* theology is:

not of, by or for the *minjung* people. Rather it is the reflection of theologians who have a guilt complex about themselves not being *minjung* [...] It tries to learn from them, and through them to trace the genuine message of Jesus for ‘sinners’ behind the pages of the New Testament, in relation to justice, love and freedom.¹²⁹

Chan is another who vocalizes a disapproval of *minjung* theology. He accuses its advocates of ‘defining the problems of the oppressed and then prescribing certain types of political (Latin American) liberation as the solution.’¹³⁰ Bosch himself warned of Liberation theology becoming ‘a new imperialism in theology.’¹³¹ This sentiment was expressed by the Asian Bishops at the Christian Conference of Asia where it was said,

It would be inappropriate if Latin American liberation theology were to take the place of Western theology in Asia. Not because we do not stand in need of liberation. Simply because the liberation we have is from our captivities, and for such liberation we need other perspectives and sensitivities.¹³²

It is contended that East-Asian ‘perspectives and sensitivities’ have not received any serious consideration by the CofE. As Timothy Tennent laments in his overview of Third-World theologies, ‘tragically, most mission training and textbooks written by Western authors have not included persecution or suffering as a theme for serious reflection.’¹³³ This paper will endeavor to look at two East-Asian engagements with suffering from two different angles—one doctrinal and the other hermeneutical—that provide an alternative mode of resistance to that of the usual range of Liberation theologies.

¹²⁹ Yung, 179.

¹³⁰ Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 27.

¹³¹ Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 438.

¹³² *CCA News*, 15, no. 6 (June 1980), 6.

¹³³ Timothy C. Tennent, *Invitation to World Missions: A Trinitarian Missiology for the Twenty-First Century* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2010), 462.

Considered to be the first Japanese theological book introduced to the English-speaking world, Kazoh Kitamori's *Theology of the Pain of God* (1946)¹³⁴ explores God's capacity for pain. Shaped by his experiences of World War II, Kitamori posits humanity's suffering in the context of a suffering God.

Kitamori's focus is the pain of Christ on the cross. Citing 1 Peter 2:24, Kitamori says, 'God in pain is the God who resolves our pain by his own' surmising that, 'God is the wounded Lord, having pain in himself.'¹³⁵ It is important to note that Kitamori appeals to Luther's *theologica crucis*, claiming that '[t]he essence of God can be comprehended only from "the word of the cross" [...] *theological crucis*, is, strictly speaking, the theology which wonders most deeply at "the pain as the essence of God."¹³⁶

To fully understand what Kitamori means by 'pain as the essence of God'—particularly from an East-Asian perspective—it is helpful to contrast his approach with that of German theologian Jürgen Moltmann, who explores a similar concept in *The Crucified God: The Cross of Christ as the foundation and criticism of Christian theology* (1973).¹³⁷

Kitamori and Moltmann's approaches are very similar. They both appeal to Luther's *theologica crucis* and they both attack western Christianity's reliance on Greek metaphysics, particularly in how it fuels the concept of 'Divine Impassibility'—the idea that God in his perfection, immutability and self-sufficiency is above and beyond the suffering of humanity.¹³⁸

Where Moltmann and Kitamori depart ways, however, is in *how* they conceptualise God's pain. Whilst Moltmann argues that God the Father suffers, empathises with and relates to us,¹³⁹ Kitamori takes a decidedly different approach. As McWilliams points out:

¹³⁴ Kazoh Kitamori, *Theology of the Pain of God*, First British Edition 1966 translated from 5th Japanese Edition 1958 (London: SCM, 1966).

¹³⁵ Kitamori, 20.

¹³⁶ Kitamori, 47.

¹³⁷ Jürgen Moltmann, *The Crucified God: The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).

¹³⁸ Kitamori, *Theology of the Pain of God*, 24; Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 227.

¹³⁹ Moltmann, *The Crucified God*, 31.

[Kitamori] is careful to distinguish the pain of God from God's empathy with human misery. Divine pain is God's response to human sin. God might also experience sorrow or grief over the human situation, but Kitamori does not develop this notion.¹⁴⁰

Instead of entertaining an empathetic and 'feeling' God, Kitamori attributes God's pain to the *conflict within himself*, specifically between his love and wrath.

The "pain" of God reflects his will to love the object of his wrath [...] Luther sees "God fighting with God: at Golgotha" (*da streydet Gott mit Gott*). God who must sentence sinners to death fought with God who wishes to love them. The fact that this fighting God is not two different gods but the same God causes his pain.¹⁴¹

The difference in views between Moltmann and Kitamori illustrates the difference between western theological approaches to social-justice and eastern ones. Moltmann provides the theological catalyst for Liberation theologies to focus on God's empathy—and even anger—to justify activism. Kitamori on the other hand, suggests that pain is part of the very nature of God—it is a divine attribute—and therefore enduring pain and suffering for the sake of the Gospel reflects God's glory and is worthy of bearing witness to.

Whilst Kitamori's method of engaging with suffering is predominantly doctrinal, Kar Yong Lim takes a decidedly more hermeneutical approach in his book *The sufferings of Christ are abundant in us: a narrative dynamics investigation of Paul's sufferings in 2 Corinthians* (2019).¹⁴² Focusing his attention on Paul's epistles, Lim observes that:

Paul provides detailed description[s] of his apostolic suffering prolonged imprisonments, near-death experiences, numerous beatings, trying tribulations, extreme dangers in his travels, physical pains and depravations, as well as daily anxiety for the churches he established.¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ Warren McWilliams, 'The Pain of God in the Theology of Kazoh Kitamori', *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 8, no. 3 (Fall 1981): 197.

¹⁴¹ Kitamori, *Theology of the Pain of God*, 21–22.

¹⁴² Kar Yong Lim, *The Sufferings of Christ Are Abundant in Us: A Narrative Dynamics Investigation of Paul's Sufferings in 2 Corinthians*. (New York: T & T Clark, 2019).

¹⁴³ Kar Yong Lim, 'A Theology of Suffering and Mission for the Asian Church', in *Asian Christian Theology: Evangelical Perspectives*, ed. Timoteo D Gener and Stephen T Pardue (Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Langham Global Library, 2019), 186.

Accordingly, Lim argues that ‘Paul’s apostolic suffering is the unifying theme that unites the entire argument of this letter.’¹⁴⁴ Apart from understanding suffering as just a natural consequence of mission, Lim argues that Paul regarded suffering as *integral* to his Gentile mission, rather than an impediment to the progress of the gospel.¹⁴⁵

Echoes of Kitamori’s theology can certainly be heard here, particularly when Lim argues that Paul claimed his suffering had missiological benefits for the Corinthians:

Paul clearly states that it was through his suffering that the Corinthians received comfort and salvation (2 Cor 1:6) and even life (2 Cor 2:15-16; 4:10-12; and 13:3. Cf. Col 1:24). [...] Suffering could possibly be the instrument through which God makes his glory known.¹⁴⁶

Lim acknowledges that accepting suffering as a necessary corollary of the Gospel is difficult for some to hear—particularly against a backdrop of triumphalist liberation theologies¹⁴⁷—but he nonetheless points out that, ‘Paul did not subject himself to the prevailing social values and conventions of his days. [...] [t]he only message Paul proclaimed was "Jesus Christ and him crucified.”’¹⁴⁸

Whilst it is outside the remit of this essay to offer deeper analysis, it is sufficient to say that both Kitamori and Lim offers a uniquely East-Asian perspective on suffering and how to engage with it. Whilst western Christians may struggle with the concept of stoicism as a form of resistance, Cruz explains its virtues when considering silence:

Silence is an example of this. It can be the antithesis of words or aggression, which are usually the normal and accepted (but very Western) modes of resistance. [...] when all the ways in which silence is engaged by Asians are taken into account, one might see that it can be seen as a form of resistance or, at the very least, a component of active resistance.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁴ Lim demonstrates how the theme of suffering is introduced in the epistolary thanksgiving section of 2 Corinthians 1:3-11, subsequently expanded in 2:14-16; 4:7-12; 6:1-11; 11:23 – 12:10 and recapitulated in 13:4.

¹⁴⁵ Lim, ‘A Theology of Suffering’, 186.

¹⁴⁶ Lim, 187.

¹⁴⁷ Lim, 189.

¹⁴⁸ Lim, 188.

¹⁴⁹ Gemma Tulud Cruz, ‘Between a Rock and a Hard Place: An Asian Theology of Survival’, in *Asian Theology on the Way: Christianity, Culture and Context*, ed. Rufus Rajkumar and Peniel Jesudason (London: SPCK, 2012), 81.

In this respect, the original wording of the Fourth Mark of Mission—To seek to transform unjust structures in society—has been exposed as insufficiently narrow, so as not to leave room for passive forms of resistance. This is why in 2012 at ACC-15—under pressure from Canada and Burundi—the Council widened the wording to read, ‘To seek to transform unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind and to pursue peace and reconciliation.’¹⁵⁰

Reconciliation is undoubtedly becoming *the* focal point for social justice. As Schreiter has pointed out in *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local* (1997), ‘postures of resistance are giving way to appeals for collaborating in a reconstruction of society. Where might liberation theologies go in this changed situation?’¹⁵¹

It is not being suggested that Liberation theologies do not have a place anymore. They continue to play a vital role in raising awareness, the emancipation of victims, and the erosion of unjust systems. But as their limitations become more apparent, it is crucial that the CofE looks to add more strings to its bow.

In recent years, Archbishop Justin Welby has emphasized reconciliation as ‘the hallmark of Anglicanism’ and ‘the heart of the gospel.’¹⁵² But if the CofE is to move beyond just making bold proclamations, it needs to seriously consider the insights of East-Asian theology in terms of how it practices the ministry of reconciliation.

Given that reconciliation is such an all-encompassing term, it will now be considered in more depth under the next Mark of Mission—concerning the environment—although everything that is discussed below applies just as much to the current Mark of Mission, which will be indicated where applicable.

¹⁵⁰ Ross, ‘Mission’, 507.

¹⁵¹ Robert J. Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local*, Faith and Cultures Series (Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis, 1997), xi.

¹⁵² Anglican Communion Office, ‘Reconciliation’; available at: <https://www.anglicancommunion.org/mission/reconciliation.aspx> (accessed 30 September 2020).

5. Mark V – To Strive to safeguard the integrity of creation, and sustain and renew the life of the earth

Analysis of the Five Marks thus far, has exposed the limited number of strings that the CofE has in its bow for each Mark of Mission. The same observation can be made of the CofE in terms of its engagement with the Fifth Mark of Mission. One only has to observe the Churches response to the recent climate crisis to appreciate its reliance on activist-driven responses.

As reported in *The Church Times*, members of Christian Climate Action—which describes itself as the Christian arm of ‘Extinction Rebellion’—brought sections of London to a standstill last year.¹⁵³ A few weeks ago, Revd. Sue Parfitt was arrested at Westminster for attempting to block the Prime Minister’s entrance to the House of Parliament.¹⁵⁴

Alongside activism, another response that has gathered momentum—albeit less confrontationally—is the concept of ‘stewardship.’ R. J. Berry points out in *Environmental Stewardship: critical perspectives, past and present* (2006) that stewardship is ‘the default position within ordinary Christian groups.’¹⁵⁵ This is certainly the case for the CofE as demonstrated by the 2005 Report *Sharing God's Planet*, which states:

God created the universe; human beings can only hope to adapt it. [...] The human role is defined as a steward of creation, exercising dominion under God, whose rule is sovereign.¹⁵⁶ [...] Dominion is an exercise of vice-regency: Lordship under God. The biblical term for humanity's relationship with creation is 'steward'. A steward is a servant who relates to God, on whose behalf s/he exercises dominion.¹⁵⁷

The downside of relying predominantly upon stewardship, is that it presupposes a Western Enlightenment subject-object distinction, where humanity is regarded as separate from the rest of nature—which as Yung points out—leads to the objectification of the latter.¹⁵⁸ The

¹⁵³ Joe Ware, ‘Rebels Say They Had Tried Asking Nicely’, *Church Times*, 18 April 2019, 8144 edition, sec. News.

¹⁵⁴ Tristan Cork, ‘Bristol Vicar Arrested Trying to Block Boris Johnson Entering Parliament’, *Bristol Live*, 11 September 2019, sec. News, <https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/bristol-vicar-arrested-trying-block-4502812>.

¹⁵⁵ R. J. Berry, ed., *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives, Past and Present* (London ; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 185.

¹⁵⁶ Church of England Report, ‘Sharing God’s Planet’ (Church House Publishing, 2005), 16.

¹⁵⁷ Church of England Report, 26.

¹⁵⁸ Yung, *Mangoes or Bananas?*, 45.

fact that the *Sharing God's Planet* report states, 'human beings can only hope to *adapt it*' illustrates this type of thinking.

The report also claims that, 'the biblical term for humanity's relationship with creation is "steward."' This is incorrect. Atkinson in *Renewing the face of the earth* (2008) has pointed out that the Bible never uses 'stewardship' in relation to creation.¹⁵⁹ The term 'stewardship' is only ever used in relation to finances. Clare Palmer picks up on this point and adds:

To be a successful steward, either in the feudal or the financial sense, it is necessary to understand that which is being controlled. But the natural world is not like an estate, nor like money in this respect. It is composed of complex ecosystems and atmospheric conditions that we do not understand and cannot predict.¹⁶⁰

This leads James Lovelock—in his article *The Fallible Concept of Stewardship of the Earth*—to conclude that, 'the idea that humans are yet intelligent enough to serve as stewards of the Earth is among the most hubristic ever.'¹⁶¹ Echoes of colonialism can be picked up in much of the language associated with stewardship, particularly where the report emphasises terms like 'Lordship', 'vice-regency' and 'exercising dominion.' It appears that the CofE is prone to repeating some of the same mistakes from its past, but in this case, against nature.

As Richard Bauckham observes in *Bible and Ecology: Rediscovering the Community of Creation* (2010), the main problem with the churches approach to environmental issues is that '[s]tewardship puts us in authority over, but not in community alongside and with other creatures.'¹⁶² The operative word here is 'community.'

Once again, it appears that the underlying issue responsible for the CofE's inadequate and limited engagement with the environment is a relational one. As was the case for Marks 3 and 4 of Mission, there appears to be a need to reconfigure or at least redefine the relationship that humankind has with creation.

¹⁵⁹ David John Atkinson, *Renewing the Face of the Earth: A Theological and Pastoral Response to Climate Change* (Norwich: Canterbury, 2008), 63.

¹⁶⁰ Clare Palmer, 'Stewardship: A Case Study in Environmental Ethics', in *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives - Past and Present*, ed. R. J. Berry (London; New York: T & T Clark International, 2006), 12.

¹⁶¹ James Lovelock, 'The Fallible Concept of Stewardship of the Earth', in *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives - Past and Present*, ed. R. J. Berry (London; New York: T & T Clark International, 2006), 109.

¹⁶² Richard Bauckham, *Bible and Ecology: Rediscovering the Community of Creation* (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 2010), 10–11.

It is submitted that East-Asian theology offers a number of solutions in this regard. One such solution is offered by North Korean scholar Jung Young Lee. In his article *The Yin-Yang Way of Thinking* (1980), Lee identifies how the ‘either/or style of theological thought’—Enlightenment thinking—‘has contributed towards the pollution of our environment.’¹⁶³ He goes on to say:

It created the dichotomy and conflict between man and nature, between body and spirit. Man must *either* conquer nature *or* nature will conquer him. [...] Man's conquest of nature is ultimately the conquest of himself. Thus, by this way of thinking, the opposites never come together into a harmonious and peaceful coexistence.¹⁶⁴

In response to this problem, Lee suggests adopting yin-yang symbolism as a possible category of theological thinking.¹⁶⁵ Yin-yang represents a normative worldview for many East-Asians and finds its origins in Confucianism. Lee points out that the main difference between Confucianism and western modes of thought, is that Confucianism does not exclude the ‘validity of the middle,’¹⁶⁶ unlike western worldviews that are informed by Aristotelian notions of dualistic absolutism.¹⁶⁷

Yin-yang thinking essentially enables the reconciliation of opposing elements, which as Elwood observes, ‘creates a deep sense of kinship between man and nature.’¹⁶⁸ It is postulated that this reconfiguration of relationships is key to the transformation of hearts and minds towards the environment. As the Bible clearly attests, it is from changed hearts that behaviors and lifestyles are truly transformed.

Integrating East-Asian perspectives will invariably impact how we live in relation to creation. As Ian C. Bradley surmises in *God is green: ecology for Christians* (1992), ‘this sense of oneness between humans and the rest of creation is an important corrective to the idea that man has been put into the world to dominate nature.’¹⁶⁹

¹⁶³ Lee, ‘The Yin-Yang Way of Thinking’, 83.

¹⁶⁴ Lee, 83.

¹⁶⁵ Lee, 85.

¹⁶⁶ Lee, 82.

¹⁶⁷ Lee, 82.

¹⁶⁸ Elwood, ‘Man and Nature, a Workshop Report’, 114.

¹⁶⁹ Ian C. Bradley, *God Is Green: Ecology for Christians* (New York: Image, 1992), 19.

As mentioned above, East-Asian approaches to reconciliation—such as the yin-yang categories of thinking—also lend themselves to reconciliation in other spheres. As Lee goes on to explain:

The Eastern symbol is much more practical than the Western to establish a point of contact between Christianity and other world religions, which have their origins in the East. Through this point of contact a Christian dialogue with world religions is possible.¹⁷⁰

Similarly, a yin-yang mode of thinking is also useful for discussions related to matters of injustice, such as those raised by BLM, where conversations tend to be—please forgive the pun—black and white. Notwithstanding the implicit Trinitarian imagery, East-Asian theology provides a third conversation partner to triangulate these difficult conversations and others like them.

Considering the myriad of ways that East-Asian perspectives can facilitate the ministry of reconciliation, and given that Bevans and Schroeder regard reconciliation as ‘an overarching category with which to understand Christian missionary activity,’¹⁷¹ it is contended that East-Asian theology is the missing link needed to connect a fleshed-out understanding of prophetic dialogue to a revitalized outworking of the Five Marks of Mission.

Accordingly, any talk of ‘future paradigm shifts’ appears meaningless, unless East-Asian theology is part of the conversations. To employ the metaphorical imagery used by Bevans and Schroeder, it is now time for the Church of England to invite East-Asians to the dance.

¹⁷⁰ Lee, ‘The Yin-Yang Way of Thinking’, 84.

¹⁷¹ Bevans and Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 350.

CONCLUSION

This paper set out to create a three-way conversation between the Five Marks of Mission, prophetic dialogue and East-Asian theology. In so doing, this paper has demonstrated that East-Asian theology is ubiquitous to prophetic dialogue by fleshing out interreligious dialogue, inculturation and ministry of reconciliation. These three elements were subsequently found to be missing from the Five Marks of Mission. Accordingly, it has been proven that East-Asian Theology can serve as a bridge to connect prophetic dialogue with the Five Marks.

More specifically, this paper has demonstrated the unique ability that East-Asian theology has in helping the Church dialogue with other religions, new believers, those in need, victims of injustice, and the environment, in ways that were previously not conceivable under the Five Marks.

Accordingly, the ultimate gift that East-Asian theology offers the Five Marks—and therefore the CofE—is that of reformulating relationships. This gift is desperately needed if the CofE is to contextualize the gospel effectively and survive into the second half of the 21st Century.

1. Integrating East-Asian theology into the Church of England

The question we are now presented with is ‘how can this gift be integrated into the life of the Church? As this paper has already discussed, East-Asian voices have been repeatedly overlooked by modern scholarship. Moreover, those who presently influence the trajectory of missional thought in the CofE appear quite content with how the Five Marks are currently operating.

As Zink points out in his critique of the Five Marks, ‘[d]espite their central role in Anglican thinking about mission, little attention has been paid to the history, development, and theology of the Five Marks of Mission.’¹⁷² The problem with this is articulated by Percy when he says:

¹⁷² Zink, ‘Five Marks of Mission: History, Theology, Critique’, 2.

The uncritical top-down imposition of the *Five Marks of Mission* might be said to be the beginning of an end game. It represents a descent from a broad, diverse church for all, to a much smaller body of followers who are in personal agreement with the current leadership.¹⁷³

Ephraim Radner and Philip Turner in their aptly titled *The Fate of Communion: The Agony of Anglicanism and the Future of a Global Church* (2006) describe the conciliar nature of the CofE. They explain that '[t]he principle of conciliarity reflects the need that the church has to consult *within itself* about its life and mission and to act accordingly.'¹⁷⁴

This inward-looking attitude is clearly apparent in what Percy calls 'the small cabal of managers.'¹⁷⁵ In his article *Transforming Anglicanism: Elements of an Emerging Anglican Paradigm*, Corrie has no hesitation admitting, 'I am being descriptive in drawing on what is already there *within* Anglicanism.'¹⁷⁶ [emphasis mine] Similarly, in Dakin's aforementioned analysis of the Five Marks and *Constants in Context*, he only concerns himself with identifying the six constants of faith expressed throughout history and as already found *within* Anglicanism. Dakin is the Bishop for Higher and Further Education.

Cathy Ross—who arguably keeps the flame burning for the Five Marks—initially seems more open. In the *Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies* she asks, 'What is the proper response from the point of view of the establishment church? What can we learn from these new migrants coming from the former colonies?'¹⁷⁷ On closer inspection, however, Ross only addresses her question to 'the former colonies.' The majority of East-Asian countries covered by this paper have not been subjected to British colonization, and therefore fall outside the scope of her consideration too. As Percy points out:

The church has, in the twenty-first century, moved against its thinkers, prophets and educators. It fears a breadth in leadership; people who can think outside the box; and who have some theological imagination. Arguably, management has seen to that.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷³ Percy, *The Future Shapes of Anglicanism*, 59.

¹⁷⁴ Ephraim Radner and Philip Turner, *The Fate of Communion: The Agony of Anglicanism and the Future of a Global Church* (Grand Rapids, Mich: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2006), 12.

¹⁷⁵ Percy, *The Future Shapes of Anglicanism*, 58.

¹⁷⁶ Corrie, 'Transforming Anglicanism'.

¹⁷⁷ Ross, 'Mission', 512.

¹⁷⁸ Percy, *The Future Shapes of Anglicanism*, 17.

To use a slightly offensive but painfully pertinent idiom, it appears that East-Asian Theology has a ‘Chinaman’s chance’ of being integrated into the CofE. As John Parratt laments in *An Introduction to Third World Theologies* (2004), even if East-Asian voices are ‘granted a hearing at all’ they will be ‘dismissed as exotics irrelevant to the “real” task of theology.’¹⁷⁹

2. *Furoshiki* (風呂敷) The art of wrapping things up

As discussed above, the East-Asian psyche leans more towards passive forms of resistance. It is therefore unlikely that many East-Asian voices will fight to be heard. East-Asian culture is one of filial piety and honour and as Augsburg points out, ‘Filial piety and fraternal submission are seen as the essential root of the five classic virtues.’¹⁸⁰ Thus, it is the East-Asian way to submit to the hierarchy within the CofE. Unless someone in a position of authority extends an invitation for them to join the conversation, they will wait on the sidelines, seemingly impassive.

In many ways, this tendency to wait impassively mirrors China’s foreign policy. For centuries, this great nation has sat by, watching the West develop and innovate. It is only in recent decades that it has suddenly sprung to life—not necessarily by invitation—but in response to the perceived breakdown of Western systems. It is this breakdown that has created the opportunity and ideal conditions for China to rise up and gain an influential foothold in global affairs.

It is submitted that unless the CofE extends an invitation to East-Asian theologians and practioners, then it will not be until the Five Marks have experienced a significant breakdown, that the opportunity and ideal conditions are created for East-Asian voices to speak out, by which time it may already be too late.

As expressed at the beginning of this paper, the art of *furoshiki* seeks to wrap conversations up to create new trajectories or patterns of thought. Whilst the future might appear bleak, it should be recalled that East-Asian responses to suffering and hardship are very different to that of those in the West. Even if the Five Marks eventually shatter due to their own

¹⁷⁹ John Parratt, ‘Introduction’, in *An Introduction to Third World Theologies*, ed. John Parratt (Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 2.

¹⁸⁰ Augsburg, *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures*, 165.

inflexibility and even if the CofE appears broken beyond repair, the East-Asian spirit will endure and provide new hope.

In closing, and to illustrate this point, this paper will employ the imagery of an ancient Japanese art form called *Kintsugi* (金継ぎ, "golden joinery"). *Kintsugi* is the art of repairing broken pottery by mending areas of breakage with lacquer dusted or mixed with powdered gold. As a philosophy, it treats breakage and repair as part of the history of an object, rather than something to hide.

As How Chuang Chua points out, ‘in terms of literary style [...] Asian theological language tends to be parabolic, metaphorical, allegorical and narrative.’¹⁸¹ Thus, in the spirit of the East-Asian voices mentioned in this paper—and with whom this writer shares a cultural heritage—this final illustration will be offered in honour of their significant, but criminally overlooked contributions to missiology, at least as it stands within the current culture of the CofE.

The Five Marks of Mission are like a pottery bowl. For the past three decades this bowl has faithfully held the Church of England’s aspirations for mission.

Unfortunately, the bowl is beginning to crack. It began cracking a long time ago, but no-one noticed. Winter has come, and it can no longer withstand the change in climate. It is no longer fit for purpose. The bowl has begun to fall apart, and with it the dreams and aspirations of the people of God.

But the Great Artist—the one who holds the bowl in his hands—is compassionate. The Great Artist is skilled at *kintsugi*. Taking the precious golden lacquer that he has preserved in his family for generations—that represents the voices of East-Asian people—he lovingly applies it to the cracks, repairing the bowl and making it stronger.

The bowl is transformed. There is no attempt to hide the previous damage. The lines of repair are now illuminated in gold. They shine. This is the gift that the Great Artist had yearned to give his Church and the gift that is still waiting.

¹⁸¹ John Corrie, Samuel Escobar, and Wilbert R. Shenk, eds., *Dictionary of Mission Theology: Evangelical Foundations* (Nottingham, England ; Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 30.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anglican Consultative Council, ed. *Mission in a Broken World: Report of ACC-8 : Wales 1990*. London: Church House Pub., 1990.
- Anglican Consultative Council, and Roger Coleman, eds. *Bonds of Affection: Report of ACC-6 : Nigeria 1984*. London: Church House Pub., 1984.
- Atkinson, David John. *Renewing the Face of the Earth: A Theological and Pastoral Response to Climate Change*. Norwick: Canterbury Press, 2008.
- Augsburger, David W. *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures*. 1st ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986.
- Ballard, Paul H, and Lesley Hesselbee. *Community and Ministry: An Introduction to Community Development in a Christian Context*. London: SPCK, 2007.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Bible and Ecology: Rediscovering the Community of Creation*. London: Darton Longman & Todd, 2010.
- Berry, R. J., ed. *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives, Past and Present*. London ; New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Bevans, Stephen B., and Eleanor Doidge. ‘Theological Reflection’. In *What Mission Confronts Religious Life in the U. S. Today?*, edited by Barbara Kraemer. Chicago: Center for the Study of Religious Life, 2000.
- Bevans, Stephen B., and Roger Schroeder. *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today*. American Society of Missiology Series, no. 30. Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 2004.
- . *Prophetic Dialogue: Reflections on Christian Mission Today*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2011.
- Board of Mission, ed. *A Growing Partnership: The Church of England and World Mission: The Report of a Working Group to the Board of Mission on the Church of England’s Structures and Relationships in World Mission*. London: Church House Pub., 1994.
- Bolger, Ryan K., ed. *The Gospel after Christendom: New Voices, New Cultures, New Expressions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Bosch, David Jacobus. *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*. Twentieth anniversary ed. American Society of Missiology Series, no. 16. Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 2011.
- Bradley, Ian C. *God Is Green: Ecology for Christians*. New York: Image Books, 1992.
- Chan, Simon. *Grassroots Asian Theology: Thinking the Faith from the Ground Up*. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2014.

- Chapman, Mark D., Sathianathan Clarke, and Martyn Percy, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies*. First edition. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Chia, Edmund Kee-Fook. 'Interfaith Dialogue and Christian Theology in Asia'. In *Asian Theology on the Way: Christianity, Culture and Context*, edited by Rufus Rajkumar and Peniel Jesudason. London: SPCK, 2012.
- Church of England Report. 'Sharing God's Planet'. Church House Publishing, 2005.
- Clarke, Sathianathan. 'The Task, Method and Content of Asian Theologies'. In *Asian Theology on the Way: Christianity, Culture and Context*, edited by Rufus Rajkumar and Peniel Jesudason. London: SPCK, 2012.
- Cork, Tristan. 'Bristol Vicar Arrested Trying to Block Boris Johnson Entering Parliament'. *Bristol Live*, 11 September 2019, sec. News.
<https://www.bristolpost.co.uk/news/bristol-news/bristol-vicar-arrested-trying-block-4502812>.
- Corrie, John. 'Transforming Anglicanism: Elements of an Emerging Anglican Mission Paradigm'. *Anvil* 26, no. 3 & 4 (2009).
- Corrie, John, Samuel Escobar, and Wilbert R. Shenk, eds. *Dictionary of Mission Theology: Evangelical Foundations*. Nottingham, England ; Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 2007.
- Cruz, Gemma Tulud. 'Between a Rock and a Hard Place: An Asian Theology of Survival'. In *Asian Theology on the Way: Christianity, Culture and Context*, edited by Rufus Rajkumar and Peniel Jesudason. London: SPCK, 2012.
- . *Toward a Theology of Migration: Social Justice and Religious Experience*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Dakin, Tim. 'Discipleship: Marked for Mission'. In *Mission in the Twenty-First Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission*, edited by Andrew F. Walls and Cathy Ross. London: Darton Longman + Todd, 2010.
- Davie, Martin. *A Guide to the Church of England*. London ; New York: Mowbray, 2008.
- Elwood, Douglas J. 'Asian Christian Theology in the Making: An Introduction'. In *Asian Christian Theology: Emerging Themes*, edited by Douglas J. Elwood, Rev. ed. of What Asian Christians are Thinking. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980.
- . 'Man and Nature, a Workshop Report'. In *Asian Christian Theology: Emerging Themes*, edited by Douglas J. Elwood, Rev. ed. of What Asian Christians are Thinking. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980.
- Georges, Jayson. *The 3D Gospel: Ministry in Guilt, Shame, and Fear Cultures*. Updated and Revised. Amerika: Time Press, 2016.

- Hiebert, Paul G. *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1985.
- Howell, Brian M. 'My Top 5 Books on Missions'. *Christianity Today*, May 2013.
- Kitamori, Kazoh. *Theology of the Pain of God*. First British Edition 1966 translated from 5th Japanese Edition 1958. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Kōyama, Kosuke. *Mount Fuji and Mount Sinai: A Critique of Idols*. Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis, 1985.
- Kōyama, Kōsuke. *Waterbuffalo Theology*. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Kwan, Simon Shui-Man. *Postcolonial Resistance and Asian Theology*. New York: Routledge, 2014. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781134702541>.
- Kwong, Paul. 'Faith and Social Service'. Hong Kong, 2010.
- Kwong, Paul, and Phillip L. Wickeri. 'Sheng Kung Hui: The Contextualization of Anglicanism in Hong Kong'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies*, edited by Mark D. Chapman, Sathianathan Clarke, and Martyn Percy, First edition. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Ledwith, Margaret. *Community Development: A Critical Approach*. 2nd ed. Bristol, UK ; Portland, OR: Policy Press, 2011.
- Lee, Jung Young. 'The Yin-Yang Way of Thinking'. In *Asian Christian Theology: Emerging Themes*, edited by Douglas J. Elwood, Rev. ed. of What Asian Christians are thinking. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980.
- Lim, Kar Yong. 'A Theology of Suffering and Mission for the Asian Church'. In *Asian Christian Theology: Evangelical Perspectives*, edited by Timoteo D Gener and Stephen T Pardue. Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Langham Global Library, 2019.
- . *The Sufferings of Christ Are Abundant in Us: A Narrative Dynamics Investigation of Paul's Sufferings in 2 Corinthians*. New York: T & T Clark, 2019.
- Lovelock, James. 'The Fallible Concept of Stewardship of the Earth'. In *Environmental Stewardship: Critiques Perspectives - Past and Present*, edited by R. J. Berry. London/New York: T & T Clark International, 2006.
- Mackie, Steven G. 'God's People in Asia'. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 42, no. 2 (1989).
- McWilliams, Warren. 'The Pain of God in the Theology of Kazoh Kitamori'. *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 8, no. 3 (Fall 1981): 184–200.
- Miyamoto, Ken Christoph. *God's Mission in Asia: A Comparative and Contextual Study of This-Worldly Holiness and the Theology of Missio Dei in M. M. Thomas and C. S. Song*. American Society of Missiology Monograph Series. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2007.

- Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Crucified God: The Cross of Christ as the Foundation and Criticism of Christian Theology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Pachau, Lalsangkima, and Knud Jørgensen. 'Introduction'. In *Witnessing to Christ in a Pluralistic World: Christian Mission among Other Faiths*, edited by Lalsangkima Pachau and Knud Jørgensen. Regnum Edinburgh 2010 Series. Oxford: Regnum, 2011.
- Palmer, Clare. 'Stewardship: A Case Study in Environmental Ethics'. In *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives - Past and Present*, edited by R. J. Berry, 63–75. London ; New York: T & T Clark International, 2006.
- Parratt, John. 'Introduction'. In *An Introduction to Third World Theologies*, edited by John Parratt. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Percy, Martyn. *The Future Shapes of Anglicanism: Currents, Contours, Charts*. Contemporary Ecclesiology 19. London ; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2017.
- Phan, Peter C., ed. *Christianities in Asia*. Blackwell Guides to Global Christianity. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- Radner, Ephraim, and Philip Turner. *The Fate of Communion: The Agony of Anglicanism and the Future of a Global Church*. Grand Rapids, Mich: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2006.
- Ramachandra, Vinod. *Faiths in Conflict?: Christian Integrity in a Multicultural World*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1999.
- Ross, Cathy. 'Introduction'. In *Mission in the Twenty-First Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission*, edited by Andrew F. Walls and Cathy Ross. London: Darton Longman + Todd, 2010.
- . ed. *Life-Widening Mission: Global Perspectives from the Anglican Communion*. Regnum Edinburgh Centenary Series. Oxford: Regnum, 2012.
- . 'Mission'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies*, edited by Mark D. Chapman, Sathianathan Clarke, and Martyn Percy, First edition. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Schreier, Robert J. *The New Catholicity: Theology Between the Global and the Local*. Faith and Cultures Series. Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 1997.
- Song, Choan-Seng. *The Compassionate God*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1982.
- . 'The Obedience of Theology in Asia: Ten Theological Theses'. *South East Asia Journal of Theology* 2, no. October 1960 (n.d.): 7–15.
- . *Third-Eye Theology: Theology in Formation in Asian Settings*. Maryknoll, N.Y: Orbis Books, 1979.

- Tang, Edmond. 'East Asia'. In *An Introduction to Third World Theologies*, edited by John Parratt. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Ten Elshof, Gregg. *Confucius for Christians: What an Ancient Chinese Worldview Can Teach Us about Life in Christ*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2015.
- Tennent, Timothy C. *Invitation to World Missions: A Trinitarian Missiology for the Twenty-First Century*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2010.
- Theological Education in the Anglican Communion. 'What Do Anglicans Believe? - A Study Guide to Christian Doctrine from Anglican and Ecumenical Statements'. The Anglican Consultative Council, July 2020.
https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/417436/2020-08-what-do-anglicans-believe_en.pdf.
- Throup, Marcus. *All Things Anglican: Who We Are and What We Believe*. Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2018.
<http://www.vlebooks.com/vleweb/product/openreader?id=none&isbn=9781786220691>.
- Walls, Andrew F., and Cathy Ross, eds. *Mission in the Twenty-First Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Global Mission*. London: Darton Longman + Todd, 2010.
- Ware, Joe. 'Rebels Say They Had Tried Asking Nicely'. *Church Times*, 18 April 2019, 8144 edition, sec. News.
- Wells, Samuel. 'The Nazareth Manifesto'. Duke University, 2008.
https://web.duke.edu/kenanethics/NazarethManifesto_SamWells.pdf.
- Wells, Samuel, and Marcia A. Owen. *Living Without Enemies: Being Present in the Midst of Violence*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, US, 2011.
- Yu, Carver T. 'The Bible and Cultures in the Shaping of Asian Theology'. In *Christianity and Cultures: Shaping Christian Thinking in Context*, edited by David Emmanuel Singh and Bernard C. Farr. Nottingham: Regnum, 2008.
- Yung, Hwa. *Mangoes or Bananas?: The Quest for an Authentic Asian Christian Theology*. Irving: Regnum, 2004.
- Zink, Jesse. 'Five Marks of Mission: History, Theology, Critique'. *Journal of Anglican Studies Trust* 15, no. 2 (8 June 2017).