

Living Church:
A Theological Practice of Evangelism
Lacey C. Warner
Keynote Address for AETE Annual Meeting, June 18, 2015

Introduction

The theme of this Academy for Evangelism in Theological Education meeting is “Scholar/evangelist—is it possible?” In this paper I would like first to answer the question:

“Yes!” And, like any dutiful compulsive researcher add at least two qualifications.

First, the scholar/evangelist binary is not merely a binary. It could be interpreted as a spectrum or series to include other important roles—perhaps pertinent to this group—such as: teacher alongside the roles of scholar, evangelist, pastor as well as the participation of the church or community of faith.

Second, a beauty of the monikers “scholar” and “evangelist” is in fact their openness and inclusivity. A scholar is not necessarily limited to academia or a particular guild. Nor is an evangelist limited to one charge, pulpit, or ministry setting. Both imply a capacity to practice a craft that goes beyond simple boundaries and constraints, and so also points to the potential of overlapping synergy existing between them. This, then, is an opportunity to draw upon interdisciplinary reflection and practice.¹

So, yes, the scholar/evangelist is not only possible, but extremely helpful, if not necessary.

In this paper I will first articulate a number of challenges to practicing evangelism, many of which occur due to a lack of thoughtful biblical and theological reflection upon texts, contexts, and practices in light of these. Then I will explore three themes informed by interdisciplinary reflection—biblical, historical, and practical—that give textured examples of how the integrated role of scholar/evangelist can be profoundly useful.

Challenges

Individualism

The first challenge to practicing evangelism is our current emphasis on the individual. American Protestant Christianity defaults to the individual and consequently, when we think of grace, faith, discipleship, vocation, we apply the terms to ourselves as individuals and not to ourselves as a community. The heritage of revivalism and democracy in the United States contributes to the difficulty of understanding ourselves as community rather than individuals. As often as the concepts of community and communities of faith are treated in the study of evangelism, much of the accessible resources focus on individuals or individuals on committees, *not* worshipping, sent communities of faith participating in God's mission. Individualism is a persistent trait of mainline and evangelical Protestant Christianity in the US.

Supernaturally Challenged

For Christian life and witness, God's great gifts are signs and wonders. But perceiving such signs and wonders—something that should be nurtured by Christian communities—is increasingly difficult in a post-Enlightenment world with its modernist emphasis on rationality. Miracles are simply judged as impossible and affluent Westerners, including many Christians, have epistemological issues with the supernatural powers of the Triune God and the Gospel. However, Christian life and witness in *communities* of practice and belief can allow us to see the signs and therefore is a good place to locate Evangelicalism

Evangelism and Post-colonialism?

It is a widespread contention that evangelism was co-opted—sometimes intentionally, sometimes not—as a tool of Western expansion and colonialism that included cultural exportation. As a result, the church has forgotten its relationship to the Triune God because the

language of “mission” was employed by the Jesuits to describe their ministries across geographic and cultural boundaries in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Over time, the language of *missio dei* became less connected to the Trinity and our participation in it, and more about converting those in other cultures, thus eventually becoming entangled with colonialism.²

But what does Christian evangelism look like in a world that has known Christianity at its best and worst? And how are we to think about the sharp dichotomies that still exist for some between evangelism and social justice.

Scripture as Primary?

At the heart of the Christian practice of evangelism is Scripture. However, today many mainline Protestant Christians seem to have lost the habit of looking to the Bible to shape our understanding of what it means to respond to God’s love and grace. Indeed, at times we seem to have fallen into the habit of seldom turning to biblical texts to inform our understanding and practice of evangelism—or worse, turning unwisely or perhaps even turning away too quickly. Instead of relying on resources grounded in epistemologies foreign or contrary to Scripture, we need to return to the Christian story narrated by Scripture for guidance.

As scholars continue to demonstrate, if the Bible teaches us about difficult topics such as sin, death, salvation, faith, and conversion, it does so not because it is a reference text but rather because it is a story.³ Christian Scripture tells the story of God’s creation, calling, and compassion for the world through God’s people Israel and ultimately his Son Jesus Christ. In the words of Karl Barth,

The Bible tells us not how we should talk with God but what he says to us; not how we find the way to him, but how he has sought and found the way to us; not the right relation in which we must place ourselves to him, but the covenant which he has made with all who are Abraham’s spiritual children and which he has sealed once and for all in Jesus Christ. It is this which is within the Bible. The word of God is within the Bible.⁴

The Bible's story twists and turns with some ambiguity and mystery, ultimately concluding with the most hopeful of endings in the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

If congregations within mainline Protestantism are to avoid artificial shallowness, or indeed destructiveness, we need to understand how the Christian practice of evangelism has been shaped and misshaped, and to do so we must turn to the Bible. Reflection upon those biblical texts that speak to a faithful ecclesial understanding of participation in God's reign, inviting individuals to faith in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit within communities of faith, informs the fulfillment of our baptisms. Baptisms of living water, informed by the living Word of God, in living communities of faith—in the living church—is our shared telos as Christians.

Therefore, I hope this project will encourage scholar/evangelists—namely pastors and those who teach them—to turn first to biblical texts and then to our Christian tradition and other fields of study as sources for imagining faithful and effective practices of evangelism in communities of faith.

From Sending to Sent

A helpful counter to the tendency toward the individual is an understanding of community that comes from Scripture. For example, in Romans 12:1—"So brothers and sisters, because of God's mercies, I encourage you to present your bodies as a living sacrifice that is holy and pleasing to God" (CEB)—Richard Hays highlights the use of "bodies," which is plural, as a living sacrifice, which is singular, to demonstrate the significance of the church's role as a community. In his *Moral Vision of the New Testament* Hays writes: "The church is a countercultural community of discipleship, and this community is the primary addressee of God's imperatives. The biblical story focuses on God's design for forming a covenant people."⁵ This acknowledgement provides an important frame within which not just to understand, but to

practice evangelism. Individuals are called to faith in baptism and initiated into the body of Christ.

Another helpful acknowledgement is of the significant role of communities of faith in the theme of *missio Dei* or God's mission. In 1952 at Willingen, Germany, the International Missionary Council, which eventually would merge with the World Council of Churches, re-positioned a self-understanding of church from a sending agency for missionaries, to a sent people participating in God's mission. This shift was unpacked in subsequent gatherings including the WCC Assembly in Evanston in 1954 and a study that was to follow from 1961–67.

The language of *Mission* has its roots in the Latin phrase *missio dei* or the mission of God. Mission is best understood in light of Scripture and theological foundations as God's sending or *Missio Dei*. However, the term mission has not always been used among Christians to indicate God's sending Jesus and Jesus sending the Church with the Holy Spirit (see John 20:21 in which Jesus tells the disciples "Peace be with you. As the Father sent me, so I am sending you"; CEB) to share the gospel with all of creation.⁶

According to David Bosch, for fifteen centuries the church used other terms to refer to what we subsequently came to call "mission"—for example, "propagation of the faith," "preaching of the gospel," "apostolic proclamation," "expanding the church," etc.⁷ The latter use of the term "mission" is historically linked "indissolubly with the colonial era."⁸

The term presupposes an established church in Europe which dispatched delegates to convert overseas peoples and was as such an attendant phenomenon of European expansion. The church was understood as a legal institution which had the right to entrust its "mission" to secular powers and to a corps of "specialists"—priests or religious. "Mission" meant the activities by which the Western ecclesiastical system was extended into the rest of the world.⁹

The inauguration of this deployment of the concept of mission dates to Pope Alexander VI, who essentially divided the non-European world between the monarchs of Portugal and Spain.¹⁰

Similar to previous pronouncements, this action depended upon the medieval view that the pope held supreme authority over the globe, whether populated by confessing Christians or not.¹¹

According to Bosch, “This right to ‘send’ ecclesiastical agents to distant colonies was so decisive that the activities and designation of the envoys were to derive their names from this action; their assignment came to be called ‘mission’ (a term first used in this sense by Ignatius of Loyola), and themselves ‘missionaries.’”¹²

Dana Robert facilitates a nuanced view of the complexities that layer the scholarship of mission history. According to Robert,

Because of missionaries’ strongly held and articulated beliefs in the universal relevance of the Christian gospel, it has been tempting to judge them by their ideas, based on whether the researcher agrees with ‘missionary ideals’ or disagrees with ‘missionary ideologies.’ What tends to be overlooked in the history of missions is how the real experiences of missionaries in specific locations, and the concrete needs and interests of early converts, both challenged and shaped the missionary visions themselves.¹³

There is unequivocal evidence of some missionaries’ capitulation to, if not participation in, the oppressive systemic structures of European colonialism. However, in the 1990s, according to Robert, “the icy grip of the ‘colonial paradigm’ over mission history began to thaw, warmed by an awakening of the realization that Christianity had become a primarily non-western religion.”¹⁴

By the year 2000 over two-thirds of Christians resided in Asia, Africa, or Latin America, representing one of the most dramatic demographic shifts in Christian history.¹⁵ Robert argues that to understand Christianity in non-Western regions, one must explore the ambiguous relationship between Western missions and European imperialism.¹⁶ “On the one hand, although missionary work often predated the coming of Western control, imperialism’s arrival inevitably placed missions within an oppressive political context that they sometimes exploited for their own benefit.”¹⁷ On the other hand, missionaries also contributed more constructively through the

establishment of missionary schools and hospitals and the training of indigenous teachers as well as doctors and nurses. Robert observes, “The irony of world Christianity from the Second World War through the 1970s was that even as scholars were writing books implicating Christianity in European imperialism, the number of believers began growing rapidly throughout Asia, Africa, and Latin America.”¹⁸ For Robert, Christianity is more than a politicized Western movement. She argues scholarship ignored the way in which ordinary people received the gospel and translated it into cultural modes that met indigenous needs.¹⁹

The term “mission” as well as “evangelism” has often been linked too quickly to the expansion of Christianity in part because of the tendency to reflect historically upon missionaries (as well as other evangelists) and their impact. However, as discussed here, this is only one way to understand the term(s). Mission—as the phrase *missio Dei* indicates—is rooted in God’s actions, in which the church is invited to participate for the sake of the world.

As Karl Barth claims in the opening of his essay on the calling of the Christian community: neither mission nor the church is a starting point in theology. What is at stake is God’s witness.²⁰ The ambiguous relationship between church and mission emerges in Roman Catholic documents such as *Lumen Gentium* and *Evangelii Nuntiandi* (1975) as a result of the Second Vatican Council.²¹ Protestants have also discussed similar themes at the world missionary and ecumenical conferences during the middle and later twentieth century beginning with Willingen in 1952.²²

Also generally acknowledged among ecumenical audiences are the related concepts that “God is the one who sends . . . [and] church and mission do not have their origin in themselves or in each other but in God’s ‘missionary’ relatedness to the world and humankind.”²³ The phrase *missio Dei*, therefore, serves a helpful role locating (and clarifying) the church’s vocation

and identity in the actions and being of the Triune God.²⁴ While the term was not used at Willingen, the shift in self-understanding by the church and recognition of its relationship to the Trinity is significant.²⁵

Signs and Wonders

A significant aspect of Jesus' ministry in proclaiming the reign of God is found in the use of signs and wonders. Indeed, these are what make the commission of the longer ending in the Gospel of Mark so "complicated." As I mentioned earlier, our contemporary mainline Protestant context has epistemological issues with the supernatural power of this "kingdom" proclamation, so until we name the ways in which the Enlightenment has enhanced as well as hindered the contemporary Church's reading of Scripture, we will not experience the full richness of the Scripture's formation on our lives together and in ministry to the world.

After all, the seemingly endless disintegration of the Church during the Reformation into Lutheran, Reformed, Anabaptist, Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian, and Quaker in continental Europe as well as England undermined the notion of sola Scriptura to form truth and virtue.²⁶ Instead, the philosophy of Descartes argued that by doubting knowledge received by tradition, including, perhaps especially, Scripture, and pursuing reason, humanity would be spared for universal truth.²⁷

The impact of this shift—from an emphasis upon the authority of Scripture to the primacy of reason—and its particular affect upon the interpretation of miracles in Christian Scripture is demonstrated in the work of Spinoza in his separation of revelation from philosophy. Spinoza claimed the object of Scripture through revelation is to inspire its hearers to obedience and piety, while philosophy's object is truth through clear reason and distinct ideas.²⁸ As a result, Spinoza argued that knowledge of God should be pursued not through Scripture, but through reason.²⁹

Another key chapter in the unfolding story of the Enlightenment is the contribution of David Hume, who attempted to ground all human knowledge in empirical experience.³⁰ Thus the Enlightenment, with its suspicion of the supernatural, seems to inoculate Christians against acknowledging the significance and power of Jesus' role as miracle or wonder worker.

Although biblical scholars have usefully addressed significant questions such as dating, authorship, and literary analyses, the sign and wonders of the Longer Ending of Mark (which, because it remains in our biblical canon, is therefore attributed some level of biblical authority and/or inspiration) also need to be explored. Consequently, I shall now turn to examine the significance of signs and wonders, while also comparing the Markan texts with other texts in the Gospels, particularly pre- and post-resurrection commissions. The following explores the significance of signs and wonders, while also comparing the Markan texts with other texts in the Gospels, particularly pre and post-resurrection commissions.

According to Joel Marcus, "the greatest puzzle of Mark's enigmatic Gospel comes at its conclusion: how did the story originally terminate?"³¹ Indeed, another biblical scholar writing early in the twentieth century claimed that Mark's ending is "the greatest literary problem in the New Testament."³² This is epitomized in no less than four possibilities existing for the original ending of the Gospel of Mark: concluding with Mark 16.8, the *Shorter Ending*, the *Longer Ending* of Mark 16:9-20, and an interpolated *Longer Ending*.³³ According to Marcus, there are three theories to which most scholars subscribe: the original ending was lost, Mark was prevented from finishing the Gospel, or he intended for the Gospel to end with the women fleeing from the empty tomb in Mark 16:8.³⁴ To be sure, the question of the Markan ending will most likely not be determined with any certainty.³⁵

Most scholars agree Mark 16:9-20 is non-Markan,³⁶ written and included at the conclusion of the gospel following the collection of the New Testament Gospels most likely by 110–120 CE.³⁷ The date of this Longer Ending's composition seems to be 120–150 CE, according to Kelhoffer, since it was most likely written prior to (1) Ireneaus's reference to Mark 16:9 as a part of Mark's Gospel around 180 CE, and (2) Justin Martyr's reference to knowledge of Mark 16:9-20 in his writings around 155-161 CE.³⁸

Though the Longer Ending was written and added later to Mark's Gospel, Kelhoffer makes a compelling argument for the author of the Longer Ending's dependence on each of the New Testament Gospels and Acts.³⁹ In addition to the resonance of themes related to signs and wonders throughout the Gospels and Acts, the text that most closely parallels the Longer Ending's purpose is Matthew 28.⁴⁰ Though there is significant revision, both texts describe a single appearance of Jesus to the disciples and a commissioning.⁴¹ In addition to the parallels with Matthew 28, each verse of Mark's Longer Ending resonates with texts from other Gospels and Acts. The following demonstrates some of the most obvious dependencies:

- V 11: Lack of belief (Luke 24:11)
- V 12: Two on the road (Luke 24:13-35)
- V 14: Reproach for unbelief (John 20:19, 26)
- V 15: Great Commission (Matt 28:19)
- V 16: Salvation/Judgment (John 3:18, 36)
- V 17: Speaking in tongues (Acts 2:4; 10:46)
- V 18: Serpents and poison (Acts 28:3-5)
- V 18: Laying hands on the sick (Acts 9:17; 28:8)
- V 19: Ascension (Luke 24:51; Acts 1:2, 9)
- V 20: General summary of Acts⁴²

Evans suggests an exercise of comparing verses from Mark's Longer Ending, for example Mark 16:12–13 or Mark 16:15–17, and with the language of the parallel texts, Luke 24 and Matthew 28:18–20 respectively.⁴³ While the language is abbreviated and summarized, each of the elements in Mark's Longer Ending has a counterpart in the parallel text, further supporting

the thesis that the writer borrowed from across New Testament traditions.⁴⁴ Therefore, Mark's interest in signs and wonders is not so much idiosyncratic as recognition of their significance throughout the synoptic gospels giving the contemporary church an impetus for reclaiming signs and wonders in our midst.

Beyond Relief: Christian Empowerment

Congregations—particularly when not lacking in time and resources—often experience self-fulfillment when providing a cup of water to the thirsty, company to the ill and imprisoned, even mosquito nets to far away neighbors. While these practices are consistent with the gospel, they do not substantially participate in or portray the fullness of the Triune God's plan for creation as described in Scripture. And more, such practices, when administered to (rather than with) individuals (and communities) not in crisis (or enmeshed in complicated socio-economic ecologies) can be destructive over a long term.

Christian non-profit organizations, congregations, and their ministries need to move beyond practices of relief in situations that are not in an urgent crisis of emergency by providing a theological and practical argument for Christian empowerment.⁴⁵ This is not to argue for the cessation of all charitable relief and outreach. Victims, and even perpetrators, of war, violence, oppression, systemic poverty as well as natural disasters, still need the church's and the world's full attention to provide benevolent relief. Rather, Christians and their congregations are called by baptism to participate in God's reign by reflecting the Triune God's love and empowerment to us that includes, but moves beyond, relief to encourage and support us in our walk of faith.⁴⁶

To be clear, there are other issues to which congregations need to attend for faithful participation in God's reign—discipleship, pastoral care, formation, worship, sacraments. However, alongside these is space for practicing healthy reciprocal relationships within and

beyond the body of Christ. Mainline Protestantism in the US has often disempowered its members, neighbors, and communities by defaulting to three main models: 1) relatively small, insular, closed communities that care for their members, but do little else; 2) congregations consisting of a constellation of relief services that are executed often with outcomes and/or measures of impact used to evaluate; 3) venues of entertainment and/or self-help with a menu of sundry worship services, concerts, bible-study, motivational speakers, etc.) This is to be contrasted with merely relieving needs, which is a Christian ministry grounded in Scripture, but is not the whole of the message of salvation or complete witness lived in communities.

Empowerment is also not to be confused with well-meaning partnerships characterized by mission teams visiting international contexts to provide a service or build a facility that offers a short-term response, but undermines long-term sustainability. Empowerment is a response to the Triune God's act of redemption in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit that pulls the doer and receiver closer to God by creating a collaboration that respects each party's contributions and gifts in fresh ways.

Robert Lupton, founder of Focused Community Strategies Urban Ministries is a practitioner and author committed to embodying and helping others to embody healthy Christian relationships across socio-economic boundaries. According to Lupton, "almost 90 percent of American adults are involved personally or financially in the charity industry."⁴⁷ What is surprising to Lupton is that the outcomes of this involvement in the "charity industry" are "almost entirely unexamined."⁴⁸ Lupton, among others, provides numerous examples to demonstrate his argument and notes, "When relief does not transition to development in a timely way, compassion becomes toxic."⁴⁹

According to Lupton, “It is delicate work, I have found, establishing authentic parity between people of unequal power. But relationships built on reciprocal exchange (what I call holistic compassion) make this possible.”⁵⁰ As a response to arguably desperate situations of disempowerment and dependency as a result of toxic charity, Lupton proposes an Oath for Compassionate Service. “These well-tested principles, applied to service work, point individuals and organizations toward practices and partnerships that empower those we wish to assist.”⁵¹

The Oath for Compassionate Service

Never do for the poor what they have (or could have) the capacity to do for themselves.
Limit one-way giving to emergency situations.

Strive to empower the poor through employment, lending, and investing, using grants sparingly to reinforce achievements.

Subordinate self-interests to the needs of those being served.

Listen closely to those you seek to help, especially to what is not being said—unspoken feelings may contain essential clues to effective service.

Above all, do no harm.⁵²

Lupton basis much of his argument on first-hand experience and practices, but also cites Dambisa Moyo. Moyo is a former consultant for the World Bank, born and raised in Zambia, and educated at Harvard and Oxford, with a doctorate in economics. In her book *Dead Aid* she makes a compelling argument for the damage caused by large-scale aid when not given during times of crisis.

Moyo describes three types of aid: (1) humanitarian or emergency aid, “which is mobilized and dispensed in response to catastrophes and calamities”; (2) charity-based aid, “which is dispersed by charitable organizations to institutions or people on the ground”; and (3) systemic aid, “that is, aid payments made directly to governments.”⁵³ Moyo quotes recipients of systemic government aid to support her point—a point echoed by Rwanda’s President Kagame in an interview with *Time* magazine in September 2007:

Now the question comes for our donors and partners: having spent so much money, what difference did it make? In the last 50 years, you've spent US\$400 billion in aid to Africa. But what is there to show for it? And the donors should ask: what are we doing wrong, or what are the people we are helping doing wrong? Obviously somebody's not getting something right. Otherwise, you'd have something to show for your money.⁵⁴

Senegal's President Wade has also made similar remarks, stating in 2002: "I've never seen a country develop itself through aid or credit. Countries that have developed—in Europe, America, Japan, Asian countries like Taiwan, Korea, and Singapore—have all believed in free markets. There is no mystery there. Africa took the wrong road after independence."⁵⁵

Moyo concludes her book with the following African proverb: "The best time to plant a tree is twenty years ago. The second-best time is now."⁵⁶

Conclusion

The practice of thoughtful and faithful missional evangelism faces a number of challenges. This was then followed by an attempt to exhibit the descriptions scholar and evangelist in their inclusivity and nuance. As I mentioned, both imply a capacity to practice their craft beyond simple boundaries and constraints—also pointing to the potential of overlapping synergy among them. The several challenges framed our exploration of three opportunities informed by biblical, historical and practical interdisciplinary reflections upon practices. A deeper understanding and tighter embrace of these practices (1) the sent-ness of the community of faith participating in God's reign, (2) seeing and testifying to signs and wonders in God's reign, and (3) healthy functional long term relationships characterized by Christian empowerment among individuals and communities of different giftedness.

Again, yes, the scholar/evangelist is not only possible, but extremely helpful, if not necessary.

¹ See Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007) for a nuanced description of practice.

-
- ² Dana L. Robert, *Converting Colonialism: Visions and Realities in Mission History, 1706–1914* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 1-20.
- ³ Bryan Stone, *Evangelism after Christendom: The Theology and Practice of Christian Witness* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2007), 63-69.
- ⁴ Karl Barth, *The Word of God and The Word of Man* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1978), 43.
- ⁵ Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996) 196.
- ⁶ David Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 228.
- ⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰ Ibid., 227. Bosch refers to the Papal Bull *Inter Caetera* (1493)
- ¹¹ Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 227. Bosch explains this is the origin of the right of patronage (*patronato real* in Spanish and *padroado* in Portuguese) in which rulers had dominion over their lands, including colonies, politically as well as ecclesiastically.
- ¹² Ibid., 227-8.
- ¹³ Robert, *Converting Colonialism*, 1.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., 2.
- ¹⁵ Ibid. See also Dana L. Robert, “Shifting Southward: Global Christianity Since 1945,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 24.2 (2000): 50-58.
- ¹⁶ Robert, “Shifting Southward: Global Christianity Since 1945,” 50.
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., 53.
- ¹⁹ Ibid. “Indigenous Bible women, evangelists, catechists, and prophets were the most effective interpreters of the faith to their own people” (53).
- ²⁰ L. A. Hoedemaker, “The People of God and the Ends of the Earth,” in *Missiology: An Ecumenical Introduction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 160-61. Hoedemaker refers to Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics* IV/3/2 (Edinburgh, 1962), 681ff.
- ²¹ Hoedemaker, “People of God,” 161.
- ²² Ibid., 161. Hoedemaker highlights Willingen (1952), Melbourne (1980) and their evangelical counterparts at Lausanne (1974) and Pattaya (1980).
- ²³ Ibid., 162.
- ²⁴ Hoedemaker somewhat disagrees claiming, “A generally current concept (mission) is linked retrospectively with a dogmatic term (missio) that belongs to the theology of the trinity and is used primarily in a passive sense to refer to the ‘sentness’ of the Son and the Spirit. What is gained by this retrospective linkage is not immediately clear” (162).
- ²⁵ Ibid., 163. As Hoedemaker observes, the phrase was used in commentary on Willingen. Hoedemaker prioritizes a salvation-historical approach, which leads to his claim that the phrase is confusing. However, Barth and Karl Hartenstein in 1928 and 1934 respectively, as well as Helen Barrett Montgomery even earlier, connect the church’s vocation and a deeper concept of mission to the doctrine of the Trinity. See G. Schwarz, *Mission, Gemeinde und Ökumene in der Theologie Karl Hartensteins* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1980), 130; Karl Barth, “Die theologie und die Mission in der Gegenwart,” *Zwischen den Zeiten* 10.3 (1932): 189-215, at 204, quoted in Hoedemaker, “People of God,” 163n.
- ²⁶ Randall C. Zachman, “The Meaning of Biblical Miracles in Light of the Modern Quest for Truth,” in *Miracles in Jewish and Christian Antiquity: Imagining Truth*, ed. John Cavadini (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 3.
- ²⁷ Ibid.,
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., 6.

³¹ Joel Marcus, *Mark 8-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Yale Bible (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 1088.

³² Albert J. Edmonds, "The Text of the Resurrection in Mark, and Its Testimony to the Apparitional Theory: With a Preface on Luke's Mutilation of Mark," *The Monist* 27 (April, 1917), 161. Quoted in James A. Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 1.

³³ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 1-2. Kelhoffer offers the following on the latter possibility, "After the Longer Ending was written, and apparently before the time of Jerome in the early fifth century (Jerome, *Contra Pelagianos* 2.15), the author of the interpolation known as the Freer-Logion placed into the mouths of Jesus and the disciples the following exchange, which occurs between Mark 16:14 and 16:15."

³⁴ Marcus, *Mark 8-16*, 1088.

³⁵ Ibid., 1092. Marcus makes an interesting argument for the possible termination of Mark at 16:8, challenging points made by others and identifying the conclusion of the Old Testament book of Jonah as a suggestive biblical parallel (1094). Summarizing a position, Marcus claims "a Markan ending at 16.8, moreover, would correspond to characteristic Markan concerns about faith, fear, and silence" (1092-94).

³⁶ Kelhoffer argues that "In addition to numerous patristic citations (e.g. Irenaeus, Tatian) and the Longer Ending's inclusion in the Byzantine lectionary readings, 99% of the surviving manuscripts agree with the Textus Receptus and preserve the reading of the LE" (*Miracle and Mission*, 1). See also Craig A. Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, Word Biblical Commentary 34B (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2001), 545. According to Evans, "Although scholars are almost evenly divided over the question of whether v 8 was the original conclusion of the Gospel of Mark (see Comment on 16:8), almost all regard both the so-called Long Ending (i.e., vv 9-20) and the Short Ending as textually spurious. Most think the longer passage is a late secondary conflation of traditions found in Matthew, Luke, John, and Acts, enriched with a few legendary details."

³⁷ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 47. The date indicates the *terminus post quem*, or the point at which the four NT Gospels had been collected and compared with one another.

³⁸ Ibid., 47.

³⁹ Ibid., 46, 121. See also Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, p. 545.

⁴⁰ Kelhoffer, *Miracle and Mission*, 242.

⁴¹ Ibid. According to Kelhoffer, "Matthew 28.8 reflects a thorough revision of Mark 16.8." The specific text parallels include Jesus' appearance in Matthew 28:16-17 and Mark 16:14; commission in Matthew 28:18-20 and Mark 16:15-18; and Matthew 28:20b and Mark 16:20bc in which Jesus' promise in Matthew broadly relates to the continuing activity in Mark.

⁴² Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, p. 546. For a more detailed study of the Longer Ending's dependence on traditional literature as well as New Testament Gospels and Acts, see Kelhoffer, *Miracles and Mission*, chapters two and three respectively, 48-122, 123-55.

⁴³ Evans, *Mark 8:27-16:20*, pp. 546-47.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ See Dambisa Moyo, *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way For Africa* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009) and Robert D. Lupton, *Toxic Charity: How Churches and Charities Hurt Those They Help (And How to Reverse It)* (New York: Harper One, 2011).

⁴⁶ This is not to argue there are not problems with empowerment language or that there needs to be a balance between antinomianism and pelagianism. Christian empowerment is also not to be confused with the prosperity gospel.

⁴⁷ Lupton, *Toxic Charity*, 2.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 3.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 6-7.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 37.

⁵¹ Ibid., 8.

⁵² Ibid., 8-9.

⁵³ Moyo, *Dead Aid*, 7.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 148-49.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 149.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 150.