

INTEGRATING MISSION IN THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

F. Hrangkhuma*

INTRODUCTION

A centenary is a time to reflect upon the past, rejoice in the present and plan for the future. This year we will be celebrating the centenary of the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, 1910. The history of the outcome of that great event will be studied from various angles. This paper concerns itself with Commission VI that dealt with the Home Base of Mission.

The purpose of this paper is to suggest why mission has not been integrated sufficiently in theological education, and ways of integrating mission concern in the entire theological education. This will be done first by looking at what transpired at the World Missionary Conference, 1910, in regard to the discussion on the contribution of theological education to mission. Secondly we will briefly trace how the suggestions at Edinburgh 1910 for the inclusion of mission courses in theological education have been implemented. Thirdly, we will briefly look into the present, generalizing the position mission study has in theological education.¹ Then a brief explanation of what mission and missiology are all about. The paper will be concluded with suggestions as to the possible obstacles to the integration of mission concern into theological education.

WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE, 1910

Edinburgh 1910's Commission VI has dealt with the importance of theological education for the promotion of doing missions worldwide. Careful investigation was made to discover whether or not missions was promoted by theological education. The first question raised was one of fact: "Are the clergymen and ministers cognizant of the prime importance and the possibilities of their leadership in missionary work?" The finding of the study was that the pastors and church leaders were not cognizant of the importance of missions. Most of the responses to the question as to why the ministers were not imbued with mission concern clearly demonstrated that the clergy (pastors) were not given enough instruction in missions in theological colleges and seminaries. A well-known leader wrote that the training given in theological seminaries "has had too little reference to the great work of missions, the preparation of missionary candidates and the training of the missionary spirit."² Another wrote, "There has undoubtedly been, and is, a great lack of missionary instruction in theological seminaries and colleges."³ The general consensus was that there was a general negligence in theological seminaries and colleges of offering courses that promote missions.

* Fanai Hrangkhuma, Ph.D. is the Head of the Department of History of Christianity at the South Asia Institute of Advanced Christians Studies. He was previously on faculty at the Union Biblical Seminary and at Serampore College. He was a pastor and General Secretary in the Baptist Church of Mizoram.

¹ Fresh research could not be attempted for this topic. I depend on my observation and the finding of some writers as will be shown in the section.

² *World Missionary Conference, 1910, Report of Commission VI. The Home Base of Missions*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan Library, 2007 or <http://quod.lib.imich.edu/cgi/t/text-idx?c=genpub.ido=1936337>. 165. Henceforth *Report of Commission VI*.

³ *Report of Commission VI*. 168.

The importance of pastoral leadership for the promotion of missions was clearly recognized. A layman said, "Wherever the minister has been aggressive in missionary leadership, it is almost certain to bring great general prosperity to his church, and when the minister has been indifferent, the church has declined."⁴ Another said, "When the pastor is awake and exercising his prerogative as a leader, the congregation is awake and beneficence flourishes; on the other hand, when the pastor is indifferent, the congregation becomes cold, and giving is meagre."⁵

In view of the lack of theological instruction on missions, various suggestions were made. It is worthwhile to quote in full:

1. A prescribed course of instruction in Christian missions may well and even should form an integrated part of the curriculum of every theological seminary or college.
2. The extent of such courses is a matter upon which opinions may differ. It would seem that the allotment of one hour a week, for only one year, is quite inadequate, and that such courses should be continued through the three years of study, increasing the fraction of time expended upon missions from one-fifth to one-fifteenth.
3. The content of the courses need not differ from that already suggested. They should certainly include the History of Missions (apostolic, medieval, and modern), Biblical Basis of Missions, the Apologetic Defence of Missions, the Apologetic Significance of Missions, the Science and Methods of Mission, Comparative Religion, Christianity and Social Progress, the Pastor and Missions, Modern Missionary Movements in the Home Church, Special Missionary Fields, and the Missionary Work of the denomination with which the particular seminary is connected.
4. The conduct of the courses might well include the use of both text-books and lectures, and should suggest collateral reading. The courses should be under the direction of a special professor or instructor, or form a definite part of the assigned duties of such an instructor. Modern missionary movements are so rapid and their problems so numerous and so complex as to demand the attention and consideration of a specialist.
5. Effort should be made to secure endowments for lecture courses, and for the continued enlargement of missionary libraries.
6. The organisation of classes for voluntary study should be encouraged. These classes are found to flourish, and to be of incalculable service, even where missions have a regular and important place in the curriculum.
7. In conclusion, while the study of missions has such wide ramifications that it can be profitably taught in connection with any one of the larger number of the usual theological disciplines, the need for its further emphasis in these courses, or its more extensive treatment in a distinct department, is made evident by the simplest reference to the specific purpose of all theological education, viz.: to prepare men to be able and efficient preachers of the Gospel among all nations. Nothing will tend more definitely to develop interesting preachers, skilful organisers, or consecrated missionaries, than such instruction as imparts missionary information, suggests missionary illustrations and inspires missionary zeal.⁶

⁴ *Report of Commission VI*, 168.

⁵ *Report of Commission VI*, 166.

⁶ *Report on Commission VI*, 179ff.

The report was presented for discussion in the plenary session. Only two out of 35 speakers in the discussion spoke about it in connection with the other home base problems. One of them, G. Reynolds Turner, of the London Missionary Society, deplored the failure on the part of a large section of the ministers to grasp the fact that “the place for missions in the life of the Church must be the central place, and none other” as the Archbishop of Canterbury uttered at the opening of the Conference. He proposed that in every theological college there should be a regular course in missions, not for missionaries only, or even chiefly, but for the ordinary ministers also.⁷ The other speaker was O. E. Brown, professor in Vanderbilt University, United States of America. He said, “the science of missions has come, and no man should go into our ministry of today without being versed in that science.” He believed that the Conference is going to make it vastly easier for finding a discipline in missions that will take rank with any other study that the present seminaries can offer.⁸ H. M. Hamil suggested the offer of a special degree MB, Bachelor of Missions, of Doctor of Missions, and this might well be put into the list of all great seminaries.⁹

No resolution was made at Edinburgh 1910 except the creation of a Continuation Committee. One of the first functions of the Continuation Committee was to appoint a number of special committees “to carry further in certain directions the investigations begun by the Commissions of the Conference, and to undertake certain fresh investigations which the proceedings of the Conference showed to be desirable.”¹⁰ Surprisingly, among these nine committees, none were charged with the study of the inclusion of missions in theological education. Myklebust comments, “In view of the strong representations made by Commission VI in regard to the study of Missions the non-appointment of a special committee to deal with this matter is difficult to explain.”¹¹ *The International Review of Missions* was launched in 1912 to become the official organ of the International Missionary Council which was founded nine years later. The first editor, J. H. Oldham, in his editorial notes proposed that the primary purpose of the Journal is “to further the serious study of the facts and problems of missionary work among non-Christian peoples, and to contribute to the building up of a science of missions.”¹² However, as already indicated from the omission by the Continuation Committee, the study of missions in theological colleges and seminaries will have a steep climb as we will see immediately.

AFTER THE WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE, 1910

Olav Myklebust had done an informative and insightful study on the follow up or implementation of the suggestions made at Edinburgh, 1910 on the subject.¹³ As should be expected, the incorporation of missions studies in the existing theological institutions have been dismal. *The International Review of Missions* carried on its fine work on building up of a science of missions. However, the service rendered by this journal has been limited mostly to the students of missions since it provides valuable sources of mission information and knowledge. It has not influenced theological

⁷ *Report of Commission VI*, 314.

⁸ *Report of Commission VI*, 315. See also Olav G. Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, Vol. Two, Oslo, Egede Instituttet, 1957, 27.

⁹ Cited by Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, 27.

¹⁰ Cited by Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, 28.

¹¹ *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, 28.

¹² *International Review of Missions*, 1912, 1.

¹³ Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, Vol 2. 13.

education to any remarkable extent. By the middle of the 20th century, only in the United States of America, the number of full-time teachers of mission increased remarkably, three times as large as that of the rest of the Protestant world combined. Not only the number of missions teachers increased, Missions has been accepted as a separate subject of study and examination in the United States.¹⁴ Commenting on the period, especially of the United Kingdom and the Continent, Myklebust has this to say,

“Normal theological study and teaching”, it was stated in an authoritative document on Christian missions and Christian unity, “does not sufficiently concern itself with the task of taking the Gospel to those outside. It largely presupposed a static, rather than a missionary church. These words well describe the situation in ministerial education, especially on the continent of Europe and in Great Britain, on the threshold of the second half-century in regard to the subject of evangelism (intensive and extensive).¹⁵

Myklebust concluded his study of the period saying, “Apart from the United States of America, up to 1950 the study of Missions had been admitted, not to the temple of theology itself, but only to what may not inappropriately be described as the court of the Gentiles.”¹⁶ His conclusion remain the same in 1989.¹⁷

Many studies have been made since.¹⁸ Various authors suggested various ways of integrating mission studies in theological education. Ramambason summarizes those suggestions into eight such as:

- a) Mission orientation theological studies
- b) “Chair”/department of missiology
- c) Recognition of missiology as a separate subject
- d) Combination of missiology with some other subjects
- e) “Mission” covered in all disciplines
- f) Required courses
- g) “Elective status”
- h) Mission ignored or avoided¹⁹

Ramambason then reduces these into four namely: 1) Mission oriented theological studies, 2) Recognition of missiology as a separate subject, 3) Combination of missiology with some other subjects, and 4) Dimensional study of mission.²⁰

¹⁴ Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, 175.

¹⁵ Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, 175. Myklebust cited the quotation from *The Calling of the Church to Missions and to Unity* (statement prepared and received by the Central committee of the World Council of Churches at its meeting at Rolle, August 1952), 7.

¹⁶ Myklebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, 287.

¹⁷ Myklebust, “Missiology in Contemporary Theological Education” *Mission Studies* 6 (1989).

¹⁸ Some of the recent ones are:- J. Dudley Woodberry, Chalres Van Engen, and Edgar J. Elliston, eds., *Missiological Education for the 21st Century*, (Maryknoll, Orbis Books, 1996); Manfred Waldemar Kohl and A. N. Lal Senanayake eds., *Educating for Tomorrow* (Bangalore, SAIACS Press, 2002); Ebeneser D. Dasan and Frampton F. Fox eds., *Missiological Education: Theological Integration and Contextual Implications* (Pune, CMS, 2009).

¹⁹ Ramambason, “The Study of Mission in Theological Education: A critical Synopsis” *Ecumenical Missiology: Contemporary Trends, Issues and Themes*, ed. By Lalsangkima Pachuau, Bangalore, UTC, 2002, 258.

²⁰Ramambason, “The Study of,” 259-267.

Elsewhere I have suggested three points as follows: 1) The curricula of studies in theological colleges should be missional, that is, the entire curricula should be permeated by the concept of God's mission and the nature of the Church's participation in it. 2) Missiology (should read mission) should be incorporated into most subjects offered in theological colleges. 3) Separate mission subjects that specifically dealt with pastoral and missiological subjects should be included.²¹

The general consensus for missional integration in theological education is much the same all over the world, that is, mission concern and commitment is not integrated sufficiently in theological education. What are the reasons? Myklebust contends that the main problem lies in the ambiguity of the subject matter of missiology. To this James Scherer agrees. To him missiology remains essentially undefined so far as its proper method and content are concerned. Ramambason concludes, "The challenge remains to continue to clarify the issues and to state the problem in a new way."²²

Granted that this is the major issue, how would we tackle the problem? Is there really any problem of clarification at this stage in the twenty-first century? Missiology is simply an academic reflection and study on God's mission and the church's participation in that mission. And God's mission includes His reaching out to His creation, especially to humanity with His boundless love, so that human beings may know Him, trust, love and serve Him, and that human societies may be transformed by the gospel of Jesus Christ. The church's mission is to participate in that mission of reconciliation by communicating and sharing the Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout the world so that God's kingdom, His redemptive rule over humankind may spread in the world so that God's will may be increasingly done on earth as it is in heaven. It is as simple as that. Could there be any ambiguity? Missiology is an academic reflection and study of all that is involved in mission and missions. It, like other departments of theological studies, could be divided into several subjects/courses such as biblical and theological studies of mission, history of missions, gospel and culture with the comprehensive study of contextualization and inculturation, and practical matters including missionary anthropology, cross-cultural communication, and church planting in cross-cultural situations, and pastor and local churches' role in missions. Fine academic tuning of missiology may be dealt with in methodology of missiology and the like.

There is no difficulty now in most theological colleges and universities, to include Missiology as a new discipline./department from the master (M.Th) levels. The difficulty of integrating mission concerns and offering mission subjects is at the Bachelor levels. I would like to suggest the following reasons for the failure to integrate mission concern in theological education.

1. The Confusion Regarding Mission Studies: The first reason is well explained by David J. Bosch for the Western context which I believe, is true to the two third worlds also. He said,

The well-known multiplication of missionary societies had a disastrous influence on the subsequent development of the study of mission as an academic discipline. When missiology was eventually granted a place in theological institutions, this was the result of pressure from mission

²¹ Fanai Hrangkhuma, "Missiological Education in India: Journey to Become Academically Authentic and Contextually Relevant" *Journal of Asian Evangelical Theology*, 13, No. 1 (2005). 118-9.

²² See Ramambason, "The Study of," 268.

societies, or (particularly in the United States) from students, or in some instances even from government. On the whole neither the churches nor the theological schools themselves welcomed the intruder. Mission was an appendix to the church; missiology would be no more than that in the theological curriculum. Traditional theology was subdivided into biblical, systematic, historical and practical disciplines and it was not clear how and where missiology should fit in.²³

This remains the major reason for the failure to integrate mission studies fully in the curriculum of theological education. Missionary movements started at the periphery of the church almost everywhere (with some few exceptions) and not from the established institutional churches. Therefore, injecting missionary studies into theological education has been looked upon as unnecessary by many church leaders and theological educators. The climate has been slowly changing, and a more serious consideration of the matter of integrating mission concerns is evidenced in curriculum revisions which have been taking place at the present time in several countries. The Senate of Serampore College includes at least four mission subjects for the B.D. Degree to be implemented from 2010. There are signs that mission concern is infiltrating more forcefully the ecclesiological centers all over the world. And we hope that it will increase until the day when entire world of theological educational is permeated by the desire to spread the kingdom of God on earth, and prayer that God's will may be done increasingly on earth as it is in heaven.

2. Satanic Interference: Another important reason overlooked so far is the works of the Devil and his hosts. In my many years of experience in theological education as student, teacher, and as administrator I have had the privilege of promoting mission concerns in those institutions where God has placed me. The opposition and hurdles that befell such attempts were surprising. For sometime, I have been sensing that something more than human misunderstanding, weakness and self-interest have been at work against promoting mission concerns, especially permeating all the other subjects with mission issues and offering mission subjects. In effect I have been pondering on the question of the possible involvement of the Devil in theological education and his possible muddling with the teaching of the Bible. And I have prayed for God's guidance. The more I pondered, the more I am convinced that the Devil's major work is to thwart the missional plan of God. And if Satan is active in his attempt to thwart the missional plan of God, I am convinced that one of his major targets would be theological institutions where ministers of God are trained.²⁴

Satan (Devil, Beelzebul) and his activities have been mentioned many times in the Bible from Genesis to the book of Revelation. Satan is the Hebrew word for adversary, the designation of which was given to the person called Satan (Job 1:6). He is variously called as the devil (Mat. 9:34; 1 John 3:8; Rev. 12:9); the prince of demons (Mat. 9:34; 12:24); the prince of this world (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11); the god of this world (2 Cor. 4:4); the prince of the power of the air (Eph. 2:2); the evil one (Mat. 13:19; Eph. 6:16; 1 John 2:13; 3:12 and the accuser of the brethren (Rev.

²³ David Bosch, "Theological Education in Missionary Perspective" *Missiology*, Vol X, No. 1, January, 1982: 13-34.

²⁴One of the first comments, jokingly done, about theological educational institutions was to dubbed theological seminaries as theological cemeteries. Factually, I have met many graduates who seem to be buried in the theological institutions they joined, losing their evangelistic fervor and missional zeal which they had before joining theological education.

12:10). The Bible tells us that we are not struggling against flesh and blood, “but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms” (Eph. 6:12). Satan and his host of demons are a reality in the Bible. And his activities are evidenced wherever and whenever God’s servants ministered in the power of the Holy Spirit down through the history of Christianity. During Jesus and the apostolic times, he was very active. No serious student of the Bible could deny this fact.

Although Satan is a defeated enemy, he is still allowed to actively work in the world. Just as he opposed Jesus, he opposes the followers of Jesus. He, along with a host of demons under his command, works, employing various tactics. He opposes all that is good and encourages all that is evil. He sometimes works with brutality and ferocity (1 Pet 5:8; Rev. 2:10). Sometimes with cunning and deceit (2 Cor. 2:11; 11:14; 1 Tim. 3:7). He works through people of evil intention and who incline to self-promotion (Acts 13:8-10; Eph. 2:1-3; 1 John 3:10, 12; Rev. 2:13). He also works through those who appear to be good (Mk. 8:33; John 8:44; Acts 5:3; Rev. 2:9; 3:9).

The following possible areas of Satan’s work in theological education are suggested for readers to deeply consider in their own contexts. One of the first works of the Devil most probably is to let people involved in theological education ignore his reality and activities. Where he is ignored, he could work without opposition and restriction. It is very important to recognize that he often appears as an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14), and constantly works using all his wisdom and might against the works of God (Eph. 6:11). Moreover, we do not seem to be aware that the Devil’s major battle field could be theological educational institutions because that is where ministers of God are educated and trained.

The second work of the Devil in theological education could be to cleverly and subtly hijack the curriculum by introducing good things and slowly pushing the vital elements for the spread of the kingdom of God on earth to the sideline. It is most often through good things the Devil tempts people especially intellectuals. Next, the Devil also lets us overemphasize academic excellence at the expense of contextual relevancy and practicability. I am not against academic excellence. But I am talking about here over-emphasis and wrong understanding of what academic means. For example, he wisely convinces us that the more practical issues such as soul winning, church planting, developing biblical godly character and the practice of prayer, ways of counseling non-Christians with the Gospel of Jesus Christ and restoring the backsliders and the likes are not really academic. The pursuit to discover new knowledge, whether or not it has to do with the spread of the Kingdom of God on earth, could be overemphasized. He pushes us to the extreme of neglecting the dynamic involvement of the Holy Spirit required for a dynamic life and ministry.

Another area the Devil seems to use most often is to muddle important theological truths newly discovered and identified, and overemphasize them. For example, the concept of contextualization is a discovery so helpful for theologizing in context and a vital tool for cross-cultural communication of the word of God. However, I am afraid there are several ways in which the Devil cleverly led us to miss the extreme usefulness of contextualization. One is to overemphasize differences of local contexts to the expense of commonality of humankind such as: their alienation from God, their basic needs for security, shelter, food, fellowship, hunger and thirst for salvation, and the feeling of loneliness, insecurity, helplessness in the midst of uncertainty and the like. Differences are very important and it is exactly these differences that call

urgently for relevant contextualization, but commonality also is very important. Our contextual analysis most often neglects and omits the common reality which humanity faces at present.²⁵ The one and only Gospel (Gal. 1:6-9) basically addressed the common needs of humanity. The concept of liberation is biblical and very vital for our understanding of God's mission. However, I am afraid the Devil surreptitiously lets us overemphasize the more observable reality in which we do mission at the expense of the eschatological reality which cannot be observed as can the other reality. Some of us see clearly the need for liberation from social, economic, and political exploitation and oppression. Most often however, the economic and social reality slowly overshadowed the other reality of oppression and our mission is reduced to social action and service, and the issue of eternal redemption and eternal life have been minimized. On the other hand, some of us overemphasize the eschatological reality of saving souls and church planting, while the other reality in which we emerged such as social, economic, and ecological issues are completely overshadowed. Thus, our mission becomes lopsided. New issues such as holistic child development, HIV/AIDS, prostitution and other social sicknesses and evils are important issues and we should not neglect any of these. But the Devil's tactic is to preach these issues and overemphasize them as if they, in themselves, are the holistic mission we talk about--thus, the other needs are overshadowed. Urban mission is a need that should not be neglected. But most often Urban Mission advocates talk about it as if tribal/urban mission is no longer a mission issue. Both are equally needed. We could multiply such one sided emphasis, and set aside the balanced holistic nature of God's mission. This caricature of issues is not helpful. It distorts the truth of God's holistic mission in which we are called to participate.²⁶

3. The Lack of World Mission Vision: A very important concept, which to my knowledge, has been largely overlooked by theological educators, which is most probably encouraged by the Devil is the concept "to the Jew first, and then to the gentile" (Rom. 1:16). When theological education, in its modern form began in Europe, the world of the Protestant churches was mostly confined to the so-called Christendom, and theological educators did not have a world vision, a vision of reaching out to the nations with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The disciplines were divided into departments, which did not include the concern for mission. Inevitably, theological education was done for the Christian exclusively. After those theological departments were canonized, the study of mission could not find a proper place. Moreover, the bible, systematic theology, history, and practical (Pastoral) theology were taught to the Christians who were trained to serve the churches without reference to the nations who were without the biblical Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Mission has no separate bible or theology or history or practical theology. The Gospel

²⁵See my chapter, "Holistic Concept of Context" in *Emerging Indian Missiology: Context and Concept*, ed. By Joseph Mattam and Joseph Vaaliamangalam (Delhi, ISPCK, 2006). 11-20.

²⁶See F. Hrangkhuma, "Interrogating Holism in Mission" in Max L. Stackhouse and Lalsangkima Pachuau eds, *News of Boundless Riches: Interrogating, Comparing, and Reconstructing Mission in a Global Era*, (Delhi, ISPCK, 2007), 124-144; for a discussion on Holistic Mission that includes human being's reconciliation with God, with one another and with the creation by means of the cross of Christ as the central concern of God's mission in which the Church participates. Every human being should be transformed by the Gospel by bring them to reconcile with God, this a call to obey the greatest commandment to love God with all our heart, mind and strength. The next that could not be severed from the first is to turn to the neighbors and learn to love them as ones love him/herself Then the third step of full conversion is to turn to the creation in stewardship care. The triad models – Redemptive, Liberative and Ecological models cover all the concerns of mission. The models study the same reality in three dimensions as interconnected and interrelated making a wholesome salvation.

we preached is the same unchanging Gospel. The divine order, “to the Jews first, and then to the gentiles” should be renewed in our theological education. That is why we suggest, and we believe it is very practicable and even logical, that the curricula of theological education should be missional, that is, the entire curriculum should be permeated by the concept of God’s mission and the nature of the church’s participation in God’s mission; and that mission concern should be incorporated into most of the subjects taught in theological education. It is that simple, yet profound. As Christopher Wright contends that “Mission is what the bible is all about.”²⁷ Teaching the Bible missionally is the most natural way to study the Bible. Since God is a missionary God, and since the churches’ nature, purpose and function is missional, *inter alia*, teaching theology missionally is the most natural way of teaching systematic theology. To simply emphasize that all these are for all the nations, to the Christians first and then to those who have not yet heard it. The Devil should not blind us anymore.

4. Teacher’s Lack of Mission Vision: Possibly one of the most important reasons is the missional commitment of the teachers. A deep commitment of the teachers to God’s mission and to the church’s participation in that mission is very vital for the integration of mission concern in theological education. As already indicated, the Gospel is for everyone – Christians or non-Christians. If the teacher is sincerely committed to mission, then she/he could not but include mission perspective in her/his teaching of any subject without lowering the academic standard in anyway. She/he would want all the students to leave the college with a burden for, and commitment to, mission.²⁸ Integrating mission concern in any course offered in theological institutions is not a problem if the teacher is committed to God’s mission.

On the other hand, if the teachers are not committed to God’s mission no amount of mission subjects the college offers will matter. Those subjects could thus be taught academically, but nominally without concern for the salvation of human beings, the transformation of human society, and the protection and development of the environment.

CONCLUSION

It is sad that most theological educational institutions still flounder to incorporate mission studies in their curriculum especially at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Some hopeful signs are evident at present. Let us remember as we train young people for God’s multiples ministries in the world that God’s concern is that everyone knows him and as a result trusts him for salvation. God wants everyone to turn to him in repentance and submit to him in faith. God wants the transformation of every individual, society and the environment by the wholesome teaching of the Bible throughout the world. Theological education, as the servant of the church should promote, more than any others, the concern of God’s mission in the world.

²⁷Christopher J. H. Wright, *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible’s Grand Narrative*, (Downers Grove IVP Academic, 2006) 29.

²⁸Personally I find it difficult to understand how any true believer in God through Jesus Christ could not be deeply committed to God’s mission. The Gospel is for everyone, everywhere, and Christ died for everyone, everywhere. It is only because of the Devil blinding believers minds that they see the Gospel as for the Christians first and then full stop.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bosch, David. "Theological Education in Missionary Perspective," *Missiology*, Vol X, No. 1, January, 1982: 13-34.
- Conn, Harvie M. and S. F. Rowen. *Missions and Theological Education in World Perspective*, Michigan, Associates Urbanus, 1984.
- Duraisingh, Christopher. "Education in Mission," in *International Review of Mission* 81, No. 321, 1992, 33-45.
- Elliston, Edgar J. "Moving Forward from Where we are in Missiological Education" in *Missiological Education for the 21st Century*, ed., by J. Dudley Woodberry and others, Maryknoll, Orbis Books, 1996, 232-258.
- Hrangkhuma, Fanai. "Missiological Education in India: Journey to Become Academically Authentic and Contextually Relevant," in *Journal of Asian Evangelical Theology*, Vol. 13, No. 1, June, 2005, 103-120.
- _____. "Holistic Concept of Context" in *Emerging Indian Missiology: Context and Concept*, ed. By Joseph Mattam and Joseph Vaaliamangalam (Delhi, ISPCK, 2006). 11-20.
- _____. "Interrogating Holism in Mission" in Max L. Stackhouse and Lalsangkima Pachuau eds, *News of Boundless Riches: Interrogating, Comparing, and Reconstructing Mission in a Global Era*, (Delhi, ISPCK, 2007) 124-144.
- Myklebust, Olave G. *The Study of Missions in Theological Education*, vol. 2. Oslo: Egede Instituttet, 1951.
- _____. "Missiology in Contemporary Theological Education" in *Mission Studies* 6, 1989.
- Ramambason, Laurent. "The Study of Mission in Theological Institutions: A Critical synopsis." in *Ecumenical Missiology: Contemporary Trends, Issues and Themes*. ed. By Lalsangkima Pachuau, (Bangalore, The United theological College. 2002). 258-271.
- Scherer, J. "The Future of Missiology as an Academic Discipline in Seminary Education: An Attempt at Reinterpretation and Clarification" in *Missiology: An International Review*, 13, 1985; 457-458.
- World Missionary Conference, 1910, Report of Commission VI. The Home Base of Missions*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, University of Michigan Library, 2007 or <http://quod.lib.imich.edu/cgi/t/text-idx?c=genpub.ido=1936337>.
- Wright, Christopher J. H. *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative*, (Downers Grove IVP Academic, 2006).

Mission in theological education is often an exotic accessory on the fringes of an already packed theological curriculum. Lamin Sanneh, Professor of History at Yale, writes of how surprised he is that so few of his colleagues at Yale Divinity School 'make regular professional use of the resources in the Day Missions Library, which contains a treasure of information about the worldwide expansion of Christianity'.¹⁴ My aim in this article is to demonstrate the necessity for integrating mission into theological education while at the same time securing a place within the curriculum for the specialized discipline of missiology. As Eddy Gibbs and Ian Coffey have noted in their stimulating book, *Church Next*. 14 *EVANGEL*, 25. 7, SPRING 2007.