

Editorial Reflections

Inreligionisation: Reconsidering that Most Vital Hermeneutical Space

On the coining of terms there seems to be no end, and for missiology there appears to be no exception. Dr. Kang-San Tan's deployment of the term *inreligionisation* at the recent ISFM 2021 meetings on "Communication(s) and Mission" will likely unsettle our evangelical missiology, for the term plays with our settled notions of religion. This neologism—*in-religion-isation*—is a spatial term ("in"), as Alan Johnson points out (23), one that calls for a more radical residency of the gospel within Buddhist, Muslim, and Hindu contexts. The connotations provoke and challenge our religious categories. They smell of religious mixture. I'd recommend we check our reflexes, for any quick pronouncement of syncretism may obscure the positive aspects of Tan's proposal. And this provocative term itself may catalyze a very crucial conversation.

Tan came to Christ from a Buddhist home, is trained in the theology of religions, now leads a prominent Western mission agency, and retains a grassroots lens on the religious pluralism of Asia. He wants the Asian church to "grapple with deeper contextual issues of discipleship within those religious systems" (10). Inreligionisation is a broad missiological reorientation that "involves the transformation of non-Christian religious systems with gospel values," one that will require "a more radical following of Jesus' model—the ushering in of the Kingdom of God." (10). Alan Johnson's assessment is that the Thai church will not cope with such a radical reorientation towards their Buddhist world. Such resistance is very understandable, but perhaps a bit too unilateral, for there are some positive signs in adjacent Cambodia (37) that Tan's proposal is not completely unreasonable. Chong and Tep are witnessing some initial success in assisting Cambodian pastors and leaders through a reconsideration of certain Buddhist rituals, somewhat reminiscent of Tan's emphasis on rituals, practices, and entire community concerns rather than doctrines and texts (6). There appear to be legitimate conversations taking place in Asian contexts.

First, by way of personal disclaimer: My partiality towards Tan's inreligionisation began during my early years in North Africa among Muslims. My conversations over frequent cups of coffee with one of my mentors, Mazhar Mallouhi, forced me

Brad Gill is the senior editor of the International Journal of Frontier Missiology.

to reinterpret many of the religious stereotypes I had carried into those interreligious encounters. This Syrian gentleman had a long resume of Christian experience, and I had intersected his journey when he seemed to be retracing his steps. You might say he was on a path of inreligionisation, trying to reconstruct and reembrace what he had lost years earlier in his conversion on those borderlands of the Muslim and Christian faiths. I recommend his biography as a more concrete portrayal of a disciple of Christ finding a way home through Sufi Islam.¹ (See the ad for Paul-Gordon Chandler's biography of Mazhar Mallouhi, 21.) He explores a new path between two faiths—a pilgrim of Christ on another religious road. His life seems to personify a certain type of inreligionisation and for me it tipped the scales towards a more positive view of the concept.

My reflections settled on three propositions, certain elements of inreligionisation that could be addressed in any future conversations. And I couldn't help but notice the way Tan's development of the concept resonates with other missiological contributions, so permit me to synthesize these with Tan's proposal.

Tan is not addressing the mechanics of contextualizing our gospel communication, but rather the relocation of message and messenger within other non-Christian religious contexts.

Inreligionisation Requires that Gospel Communication Respect Other Religious Identities

It is obvious that Tan's proposal goes beyond our normal attempts at cross-cultural communication. His resume of personal, academic, and organizational experience has led him to a more radical proposal—to re-contextualize our gospel communication through a process of inreligionisation. He is not addressing the technicalities or mechanics of contextualizing our gospel communication, but his proposal requires a relocation of message and messenger within other non-Christian religious contexts. He begins with Peter Phan's definition of the term:

... inreligionisation is the attempt by Christians coming from Asian religious traditions to "believe that it is possible and even necessary not only to accept in theory certain doctrines or practices of other religions and to incorporate them, perhaps in modified form, into Christianity, but also to adopt and live in their personal lives, the beliefs, moral rules, rituals, and monastic practices of religious traditions other than Christianity." (10)

Tan is proposing that gospel communication should happen in a space of religious identification, dialogue, and participation. In previous writings and dissertations, Tan has proposed a path of *dual-religious belonging*, a participation within both his Christian and Buddhist worlds.² This could also be the case for many believers in Asia whose Christian identity has divorced them from the religious communities of their birth. Dual identification might allow for a more effective exchange and contextualization of the gospel. How that is to take place is not as clear from Tan's short EMS presentation.

Robert Schreiter offers another way of understanding what Tan is saying about religious identity and intercultural communication. He points out that speakers and hearers

have different goals in the communication event itself. The speaker is concerned with getting the message across the cultural boundary with integrity and lodging it in the world of the hearer in such a way that it will be understood. The hearer, on the other hand, is concerned with finding a place for that message within his or her own world in such a way as to enhance the hearer's identity . . . whereas the speaker has a preoccupation with the integrity of the message in the communication event, *the hearer has a preoccupation with identity*.³ (emphasis mine)

Our abstracted view of religion lacks a grassroots religious consciousness . . . it fails to see that for most people in Asia, religion is culturally embedded, etched into the values, the codes, the norms, and the rhythms of everyday life.

Tan is addressing this same preoccupation of the hearer with identity—that is, religious identity. Tan has an intuitive grasp of identity amidst the religious pluralism of Asia, but he also recognizes that Christian communicators have typically been focused on the integrity of the gospel as they interpret the Scriptures within those religious worlds. Despite his own concern lest syncretism distort the truth of the Word of God, Tan is encouraging us to try to better understand the disciple of Jesus who is struggling to fit the message into his or her Buddhist, Muslim, or Hindu identity. Again, in Schreiter's differentiation, "the speaker is on the watch for syncretism; the hearer is struggling for synthesis."⁴ Inreligionisation, then, appears to be Tan's way of insisting that any communication respect the way hearers in other religious worlds are trying to align the message with an identity.

Inreligionisation Addresses the Strategic Loss in Religious Displacement

A deep sense of loss propels Tan's imaginative thinking about inreligionisation. Notto Thelle referred to this as a kind of "phantom pain"—that residual sense of a past that has been severed (18). Tan's turning to Christ led to this type of rupture with his Buddhist past, and his search for that lost sense of place drives this venture. His writings and dissertations over the past couple of decades reflect on this predicament, and he sees this same displacement in the Asian church. Inreligionisation is his effort to reverse this personal and strategic loss and restore a vital witness.

John Flett and Henning Wrogemann speak to this social displacement of the Christian community as

. . . the dissociation that often occurs between this new community, their history and heritage, and their wider community. To lose one's history is not to change one's identity—it is to be set adrift without an identity. This results in the local community becoming dependent on the identity of another community foreign to the context, surviving only in a relationship of dependence. It is the very opposite of the notion of conversion and the reconciliation of one's own history and identity to God in Christ.⁵

Tan believes this loss—this social and religious disembedding—is related to how Christians understand religion. Reflecting on the more abstract Christianity which has prevailed throughout his experience, Tan claims that

Western missiology is more often interested in what people believe (orthodoxy) than in what rituals people practice. Many Asian religions embrace a certain hybridity, ambiguity, and messiness when speculating about transcendence, a phenomenon which our comparative religious studies might disallow. (6)

He claims our "idealized representations of religion" are dissonant with "the lived realities of religion on these interreligious frontiers" (6). This abstracted view of religion lacks the grassroots religious consciousness that integrates belief (ideas), ritual (practices) and community (sacred spaces). It fails to see that in Asia, religion for most people is culturally embedded, etched into the values, the codes, the norms, and the rhythms of everyday life. A unilateral religious displacement will automatically trigger the almost-complete loss of familiar social and cultural realities.

In his recent book, *Insider Jesus*, William Dyrness interacts with Tan's Buddhist-Christian journey and speaks to this same displacement. He notes that a modern view of religion has

. . . become radically disconnected from any sense of place. Thus, we have lost sight of the deep rootedness of religions in their cultural and historical situations and their contingent and fluid character. . . . This abstraction of religion from any particular

setting has become so normal, especially for Protestants, that we do not see in the long history of humanity, and even among the varieties of Christianities, how unusual this is.⁶

One is reminded of Willie James Jennings' piercing indictment of the modern Christian imagination in his study of African displacement, where the process of conversion to Christ was understood as a type of creation *ex nihilo* and a total extraction from the believer's context.⁷ The problem, he claims, is deep within our religious imagination.

Dyrness responds to this modern tendency by canvassing our Scriptures for a way to reimagine religion. His survey culminates with a focus on Acts 17 where Paul addresses the Athenian philosophers on Mars Hill. It's here, he believes, we are able to exegete Paul's view of religion.

In his address on Mars Hill Paul stressed that God had allotted to each people group times and spaces, "so that they would search for God and perhaps grope for him and find him" (Acts 17:27). Religion, then, in its basic sense represents the practices associated with the human search for God, and the times and spaces they employ in this search. . . . I find it telling that Paul should underline that God allotted to people places and times because this puts forward an essential dimension of all religions. That is, *they grow out of and express the texture and feel of places people call home*.⁸ (emphasis mine)

Tan's inreligionisation can be understood as an effort to retain or regain the texture and feel of places people call home. This home, this time and place where people seek God through culturally embedded religious forms, is an identity that should be retained. As Dyrness suggests:

Religion for most people is an expression of identity tied to the traditions of a particular place, and often expressed in stories, legends, aesthetic artifacts, and rituals. [It calls] for a more holistic understanding of religion that includes all these dimensions. . . . Wherever the gospel goes, if it will be understood at all, it must be framed in the imaginative logic and the social and aesthetic patterns that make that place into a home. . . . If it is true that religion represents the core both of people's identities and of their sense of place, then the news about God's love in Christ must be framed in terms of that religion—that is, in terms of the search after God by which they frame their identity.⁹

Tan speaks to the way Christian mission typically seeks to *replace* this original identity, that we should resist inappropriate disassociation and displacement. But identity studies today face a new complexity. Tan recognizes that we're in an age of globalization and chooses to focus singularly on the religious frontier. He would agree that today's Buddhist, Hindu, Muslim, or Christian is not just negotiating interreligious borders, but each must face an increasing pluralism, secularism, and social hybridity. If this conversation on inreligionisation continues, I would want to hear Tan address how this interreligious process of mutual belonging

and personal integration might happen in such increasing socio-religious complexity. Any concept of inreligionisation must address the impact of globalization on religion.

Tan's inreligionisation can be understood as an effort to retain or regain the texture and feel of places people call home— where people seek God through culturally embedded religious forms

Inreligionisation Allows for a Fresh Hermeneutical Space

In review, Tan's redefinition of an older, ecumenical term, inreligionisation, can perhaps be understood as a response to an unfortunate social displacement of the church in Asia. The term is repurposed for a new path of religious identification that promises more effective communication of the gospel. In his presentation Tan attempted to develop a framework for entering and interpreting these other religious contexts.

When I speak of developing contextual frameworks on these religious frontiers, I refer to those dynamic interpretive lenses which communities use to frame different ways of understanding truth and interpreting realities whenever such interreligious exchanges occur on these frontiers. (5)

When Tan speaks of "dynamic interpretive lenses," he's respecting the hermeneutical process that is operative in inreligionisation. In any interreligious encounter each participant brings his own contextual frameworks, his own interpretive lenses, to that exchange. This communication is a hermeneutical exercise, a gradual process of grasping, comprehending—even empathizing with—another religious reality.

It appears that Tan is aligning inreligionisation with the emerging field of intercultural hermeneutics. I'd suggest that his dynamic interpretive lenses are fleshed out more comprehensively by Henning Wrogemann in his recent volume on intercultural hermeneutics.¹⁰ This interdisciplinary field of mission studies assumes that any concept of understanding (hermeneutics) is interdependent with one's concept of culture and religion (intercultural)¹¹—an assumption I hear deep within Tan's use of inreligionisation.

Hermeneutical Space

Again, I refer to Bill Dyrness, who has captured much of this process in what he describes as a "hermeneutical space." He exegetes this hermeneutical process in the first century

biblical account, and he identifies this same kind of sacred and reflective space in peoples who have turned to Christ down through the centuries. But he also addresses specifically the emergence of more contemporary insider movements among Muslim, Buddhist, and Hindu populations. He adds a richness and depth to Tan's "interpretive filters" and "contextual frameworks." I would sum up Dyrness's description of this hermeneutical space as follows:

- It is an interreligious space where other culturally embedded religious practices are respected, simply because they reflect man's need and search for God.
- While these practices do not constitute the full way of salvation, they reflect the local hermeneutical tools which are indispensable to these spaces.
- These are generative spaces, where a new diversity is an opportunity to work out new and emergent meanings of the biblical story.
- Since they are places of new integration, they can be fraught with tension. They are not culturally neutral, but rather are locations where different reigning perceptions collide and very distinct linguistic and cultural categories are contested.
- It involves a hermeneutical process, one which grants the Spirit of God the freedom to create something new.¹²

This kind of interpretive space—so resonant with Tan's understanding of inreligionization—is evident throughout the history of world Christianity. Admittedly, I am conflating two distinct experiences in this same hermeneutical space. Dyrness is speaking directly to those grassroots movements where believers remain inside other religious worlds, be they Muslim, Buddhist or Hindu. While Tan's inreligionisation includes these insiders, he also includes those who have been displaced from their original religious world and who are attempting to re-identify and communicate in that world. The former, the insider, *remains* in that world; the latter is trying to *regain* that world. One is at the grassroots and intrinsic; the other more reflective and extrinsic. They each operate from different vantage points, and they should not be confused. But Tan includes them both in his proposed inreligionisation. Both are similarly trying to establish their identity in the religious pluralism of a globalized and hybridized Asia. And both ask similar questions of synthesis.

- What is the theological value of other religious traditions?
- Can this interreligious encounter inform the development of a gospel witness?
- What is the relationship between the gospel, local culture and religion within the place I call home?
- How is one discipled and nurtured in this non-Christian religious context?
- What freedom is there to experiment with non-Christian religious practices? (10)

Dyrness presents examples of this hermeneutical space among Jesus followers remaining inside their original religious worlds,¹³ but more come to mind who are trying to reassess and regain a prior identity. I would hope this random selection might be considered in any further conversations.

**It is an interreligious space
where other culturally embedded
religious practices are respected,
simply because
they reflect man's need and search
for God. (Dyrness)**

The African and Primal Religion

Over the latter part of the twentieth century, a hermeneutical process has been developing in African missiology. Mission scholars, like Lamin Sanneh, Kwame Bediako, and Ogbu Kalu, not only insisted that we hear the African voice, but that we understand the critical function of an African hermeneutical process. Like Tan, their reappraisal reflected back on their African experience and on those African movements to Christ. This is the hermeneutical process that Alan Johnson appeals to in his assessment of Tan's inreligionisation (22 and 28). He cites Sanneh's claim that Bible translation was the critical agent in fostering these grassroots movements. Johnson was also helpful in citing Sanneh's observations on an opposite process of "diffusion," in which a foreign cultural imposition has historically alienated the church in Africa from its immediate religious world—one that both Tan and Johnson describe in Asia:

The experience of a diffusion process by the recipients of the gospel explains the ongoing perception that Christianity is the faith of the Western foreigner. Whether imposed or unconsciously imported, gospel transmission as diffusion fossilizes the message, its framing, and its forms in the life of God's people with the version of faith from the sending culture. (29)

Johnson asserts the role of translation as an alternative to being "in" or belonging to another religious world (inreligionisation). But I would venture to say that any further discussion with Tan may turn on what Sanneh understands to be the "interpretive religious vocation" of the African recipients of the gospel.

The new interest in creating vernacular Scriptures for societies that had no Scriptures of their own ushered in a fundamental religious revolution. . . . One of the most dramatic changes was undoubtedly the popular, mass participation

of Africans in this process. It began to dawn on the African populations that *missionary adoption of vernacular categories for the Scriptures was in effect a written sanction for indigenous religious vocation*.¹⁴ (emphasis mine)

These local translators wielded hermeneutical tools from their primal religious worlds. Their tools (language, methods, models, codes, logics) helped foster new meanings, created new integrations, and allowed for vital new forms to emerge. One senses that Tan is in tandem with Sanneh, but he presses further into the nature of local participation. As in translation, inreligionisation allows for vernacular *religious* categories, which then sanctions local participation in the actual hermeneutical process.

Makoto Fujimura, a Japanese-American artist, raised to a popular level a fresh intercultural hermeneutic for understanding the historic resistance of the Japanese to Western Christianity.

A Japanese Process

In the case of Japan and the gospel, we might inquire as to the relevance of Tan's version of inreligionisation. Makoto Fujimura, a Japanese-American artist, raised to a popular level a fresh intercultural hermeneutic for understanding the historic resistance of the Japanese to Western Christianity. Fujimura reached as far back as the 17th century Tokugawa era of Japan to begin understanding Christ's presence in Japan. In his interpretive study of Shusaku Endo's famous novel, *Silence*,¹⁵ Fujimura attempted to exegete the Japanese values of suffering and beauty etched into the early Catholic movement by the devastating persecution of the Tokugawa shogunate.¹⁶ Fujimura's unique reinterpretation is counterintuitive to typical evangelical and missionary perspectives of that same history. His artistic intuition and bicultural experience enlighten his biblical interpretation as well. In his most recent book, *Art and Faith*, he calls artists "border stalkers" in a cultural ecosystem. "They cross tribal norms to see the whole, to navigate in between the walls erected to protect the tribes."¹⁷ Fujimura is in that hermeneutical space which Dyrness has described so well. His Japanese sensibility guides the questions and highlights those portions of scripture which are most relevant—the Genesis creation account, II Corinthian 5:17, and Jesus at Lazarus' tomb, for example. It's a generative process, one that promises new insights, reconciliation, and conversion.

An African American Hermeneutic

Shifting contexts again, Esau McCauley proposes a new African American biblical hermeneutic. In his book, *Reading While Black*, he reminds us how easy it is to submerge grassroots ecclesial voices. In this globalized age, the subaltern voices of the marginalized are being heard across the world, and they bring their own local interpretive tools. He makes explicit a grassroots method of Black ecclesial interpretation that has arisen from southern roots. From "an unabashedly located reading" it raises new questions and perspectives for the biblical text.¹⁸ He characterizes this hermeneutical process in the following way (my edited summary):

- Unapologetically canonical and theological
- Socially located, in that it clearly arises out of a particular context
- Willing to listen to the ways in which the Scriptures themselves respond to and redirect issues and concerns
- Willing to exercise patience with the text trusting that a careful and sympathetic reading of the text brings a blessing
- Willing to listen to and enter into dialogue with opposing critiques of the Bible in the hopes of achieving a better reading of the text

I believe Tan would applaud McCauley's hermeneutic of the African American ecclesial experience. Both recognize that the interpretive process involves more than simply drawing meaning from Scripture. It also involves what Duerksen and Dyrness call a "reverse hermeneutic"—a process "in which the cultural situations interpret the gospel in their own terms, providing both illumination and obfuscation."¹⁹

Yet Tan would most likely be restless with McCauley's almost singular focus on *textual* hermeneutics. As mentioned above, Tan states that too often a Western hermeneutic focuses entirely on belief—the core propositions, the dogma, the cognitive affirmation, the essentials of faith—and dims the significance of an inreligionisation that involves participation in ritual and belonging to community. In another forum on religion McCauley might articulate a more holistic sense of religion among the African Americans ecclesial experience.

Buddhist Ritual

The respect for a more holistic view of religious life is apparent in a recent Cambodian effort. Claire Chong and Tep Samnang, in a working group with two other leaders, Rev. Sophy and Rev. Vuthy, have given primacy to ritual in their facilitation of a dialogue between the Cambodian church leadership and their Khmer Buddhist world (41). Chong suggests that in Asia any interreligious dialogue must first recognize a different epistemological orientation.

Critical textual analysis, abstraction, and formulation of doctrinal concepts is not the way Cambodians conceive of religion. Ritual, on the other hand, is a Khmer way of faith and life; it is the heart language of the Khmer people. Through its unique

language, people learn through enactment, and embody morality and truth. Ritual is also the center of gravity of communal life where belonging and identity are forged. Unfortunately, ritual is the very aspect of faith and life that Protestant Christians have conventionally ignored, or rather, scorned, because we evaluate it solely through the tenets of religious dogma. (39)

The hermeneutical dialogue of Chong, Tep, and their team has spotlighted the central Khmer rituals of marriage, death and ancestor veneration. Tep points out that any reinterpretation of these Buddhist rituals involves a process of scriptural interpretation; yet I'd suggest the priority given these rituals involves a reverse hermeneutic—a process that listens to the values, meanings, and realities of a more grassroots religious ritual.²⁰

Some of these rituals represent a long history of anguish for the Asian church, which is particularly the case with ancestor veneration. The Asian theologian Simon Chan is convinced this practice should cause evangelicals to rethink aspects of their very own creeds. The article in the Apostles' Creed which states, "I believe in the communion of saints," should be reexamined from a Christological perspective.

Those who have died in Christ can be called the living dead. Just as the traditional ancestor is believed to exist in solidarity with the living, the communion of saints includes both saints on earth and saints in heaven united in one church in Christ . . . the serious defect of Protestantism is that its ecclesiology is largely sociologically constructed; it has no doctrine of the church as an ontological reality.²¹

In Asia, where the family and the "living dead" are given such unsurpassed value, "the juxtaposition of the doctrine of the communion of saints with the Asian practice of ancestor veneration could become *mutually enriching*."²² I am suggesting Chan's perspective on ritual because it clearly indicates the kind of interreligious dialogue that Tan posits with inreligionisation. It weaves together ritual, scripture, participation, mutual reciprocity, and religious identity in a hermeneutical process that anticipates growth and maturation.

Conclusion

These quick reflections on Tan's venture with inreligionisation are simply to suggest the benefits of a broader interface with other missiological perspectives—something Tan is calling for. Other voices need to be represented at the same table, and inreligionisation is just the kind of proposal that can catalyze such a conversation. It might force us to reimagine our categories of religion and identify crucial elements in this hermeneutical space. There is a kind of *synthesis* happening in this space (Schreiter²³), something *emergent* (Duerksen/Dyrness²⁴), something vital at the *ecclesial grassroots* (Chan²⁵), something that will expose the *barriers* we create with these other religious worlds (Pennington²⁶). The interreligious frontiers in Asia require we step back from our communication and recognize the vital role of this hermeneutical space. **IJFM**

Endnotes

- ¹ Paul-Gordon Chandler, *Pilgrims of Christ on the Muslim Road: Exploring a New Path between Two Faiths*, (Lanham, UK: Cowley Publications, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2007).
- ² Kang-San Tan, "An Examination of Dual Religious Belonging Theology: Contributions to Evangelical Theology" (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2014).
- ³ Robert J. Schreiter, *The New Catholicity: Theology between the Global and the Local*, (MaryKnoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004), 35.
- ⁴ Schreiter, *New Catholicity*, 69.
- ⁵ John G. Flett and Henning Wrogemann, *Questions of Context: Reading a Century of German Mission Theology*, (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2020), 223.
- ⁶ William A. Dyrness, *Insider Jesus: Theological Reflections on New Christian Movements*, (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016), 101.
- ⁷ Willie James Jennings, *The Christian Imagination: Theology and Origins of Race*, (New Haven: Yale University, 2010).
- ⁸ Dyrness, *Insider Jesus*, 101.
- ⁹ Dyrness, 104–5.
- ¹⁰ Henning Wrogemann, *Intercultural Hermeneutics*, vol 1 of *Intercultural Theology*, (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2016).
- ¹¹ Wrogemann, *Intercultural Hermeneutics*, 38–44.
- ¹² Dyrness, 58, 67, 90, 97–98, 101, 114, 117, 128, 139, 145.
- ¹³ Dyrness, 68–99.
- ¹⁴ Lamin Sanneh, *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*, (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998), 159.
- ¹⁵ Shusaku Endo, *Silence* (Tokyo: Monumenta Nipponica, 1969; re-released, New York: Picador, St. Martin's Press, 2016). This book was made into a major motion picture by Martin Scorsese, and released in December 2016.
- ¹⁶ Makoto Fujimura, *Silence and Beauty: Hidden Faith Born of Suffering*, (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2017), 15.
- ¹⁷ Makoto Fujimura, *Art and Faith: A Theology of Making* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021).
- ¹⁸ Esau McCauley, *Reading While Black: African American Biblical Interpretation as an Exercise in Hope*, (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2020), 17.
- ¹⁹ Darren T. Duerksen and William A. Dyrness, *Seeking Church: Emerging Witnesses to the Kingdom*, (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2019), 25.
- ²⁰ Henning Wrogemann, *A Theology of Interreligious Relations*, vol III, *Intercultural Theology*, (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2019), 334f. Wrogemann claims that the popular idea that Buddhism is primarily a religion of meditation is inaccurate. Ritual has primacy even with 95% of Buddhist monks.
- ²¹ Simon Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology: Thinking the Faith from the Ground Up*, (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2014), 117.
- ²² Chan, *Grassroots Asian Theology*, 190.
- ²³ Schreiter, *The New Catholicity*, 34–35, 68–73.
- ²⁴ Darren Duerksen and William Dyrness, *Seeking Church: Emerging Witnesses to the Kingdom* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2019), 59–81.
- ²⁵ Chan, 27–35.
- ²⁶ J. Paul Pennington, *Christian Barriers to Jesus: Conversations and Questions from the Indian Context* (Denver: William Carey Publishers, 2017).