

## 8

# OUTSIDE MANY GATES: ORLANDO E. COSTAS AND THE ECUMENICAL CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

*S. Mark Heim*

Orlando Costas' life and work were of tremendous importance for the ecumenical church. By "ecumenical church" I mean the church across its various current divisions—the church which in its brokenness *ought* to be one. But I also mean also the church of the future, the church which *will* be one. In ways that I want to note, Orlando pioneered paths that our ecumenical struggle is only now taking up.

It is appropriate always to remember the communities out of which Orlando's voice arose, the communities of North American Hispanic Protestants and Latin American Protestants. His was always an unapologetically located voice and he proudly regarded himself as a contextual theologian. But he was not and never simply a contextual theologian, any more than Augustine was simply a North African theologian, Calvin a French theologian or Jonathan Edwards a New England theologian. The drive behind Orlando's work was a passion for the whole church and the mission of the whole church.

One thing Orlando absolutely would not allow you to do was to marginalize his insights and his vision by segregating them from the ecumenical tradition. In his tireless way, he ransacked Christian history and thought to show that the things that impassioned him were an integral part of the tradition as well. In *Liberating News* he catalogued these many points

of reference: thirteenth century Franciscans and Dominicans, sixteenth century Spanish mystics and Anabaptists, Bartholomé de Las Casas in the seventeenth century, the Moravians and Wesleyans in the eighteenth, the nineteenth century abolitionist and holiness movements, the civil rights movement and the base ecclesial community movement in the twentieth century.

His genius was a *connective* genius. This is reflected in his own account of his “four conversions.”<sup>2</sup> The first was conversion to Christ, when Orlando came to know him as personal Lord and savior. We might call this his evangelical conversion. The second, he called a cultural conversion, a “conversion to Christ among my people.”<sup>3</sup> “As I followed Christ, I discovered that I needed to see him, to understand him, from my own particular cultural position. I rediscovered Christ in Puerto Rico, not simply as a universal Lord that has no identity... By his death and resurrection... Jesus had become universal, by which the Christian faith meant that he became the Lord of all peoples and, therefore, was identified with each particular group in their own situation.”<sup>4</sup> If this second conversion led him to a Puerto Rican understanding of Christ, his third was “conversion to Christ among the poor.”<sup>5</sup> Orlando dated this from his work as a pastor in Milwaukee. “I discovered that Jesus was among them [the poor] and that if I wanted to follow him as a faithful believer and minister of the gospel, that I had to be converted to the cause of the poor, the powerless and the oppressed.”<sup>6</sup> The people on the underside of history, on the periphery—these were the mass of the people for whom Christ died, indeed among whom Christ died. As a result of this conversion, a text from Hebrews became deeply important to him and would provide the title for one of his most important books: “And so Jesus also suffered outside the city gate to make the people holy through his own blood. Let us then go to him outside the camp, bearing the disgrace he bore.” (Hebrews 13:12-13) He tells us that he went to Costa Rica with that political conversion already in place, primed and ready for interaction with the new liberation voices emerging there.

Then, perhaps most unexpected of all, Orlando says that his experience in Latin America gave him “an understanding of my real mission, which was to be in North America.”<sup>7</sup> This fourth conversion he called his “Macedonian conversion,” when he responded to the calls (first from Eastern Seminary and then from Andover Newton) to “come over and help.” Just as the Macedonian call to Paul had been the means by which the gospel passed into the European world, Orlando saw this call as one by which the renewed gospel might come again to the dominant European culture of North America, where (as he put it) the North American Hispanic

### *Outside Many Gates*

community and other racial minority communities were “the bridge between mainstream North America and the peoples on the periphery of the world.”<sup>8</sup>

This is an extraordinary personal story, which in fact put Orlando “outside many gates.” As he liked to point out, he, belonging to one of the peoples who had been the subjects of both evangelization and colonialism, had in turn himself become a missionary in Latin America, sent by the same mission board that had sent out the first missionaries from North America. In fact, he finally became the dean at the very school that had trained those first missionaries and held the chair of missiology named for the most famous of them, Adoniram Judson. In a real sense, it was time to evangelize the culture that had evangelized. He had gone from Puerto Rico to the U.S., and from the U.S. to Central America, and from Central America back to the U.S. He was inside the evangelical community, he was inside the ecumenical community. He was outside each. He was a missionary; he was a liberation theologian. He was a pastor; he was a teacher. He was a Hispanic leader; he was a global Christian. But this is much more than an extraordinary personal story. God calls each of us to a vocation. But a few, like Orlando, are called to a vocation which is itself a prophetic model for the whole church.

I would call our attention to the deep ecumenical significance of the story I have just outlined. Just as the mission movement was the very heart of the modern ecumenical movement, Orlando’s passion for mission drew him inexorably into contact with a wider world and a wider church. It is the missionary’s constant calling to place themselves outside familiar cultures and contexts, to rediscover the church. And in a real way that is the ecumenical calling as well. These four conversions were cumulative, each an unfolding of the others. And here is perhaps the most telling model for us. Orlando was a prophet who did not only bear a message and a challenge. He was a prophet whose vocation was to undergo conversions. And each of these conversions knit together a fuller unity of the church.

He remembered how, as late as 1973 when he attended a meeting of the World Council of Churches commission on world mission and evangelism, he saw an Indian Syrian orthodox priest and wondered what this person was doing at a meeting on evangelism. For his view of the Orthodox was that they were bound in an anti-missionary tradition and imprisoned in cultural ghettos. Orlando wrote “Then as I heard him share his evangelistic experiences in South India, witnessing to Hindus about Jesus, the light and Savior of the world; as I knelt down in prayer with him and heard him pray for the millions around the world who were without personal knowledge of Christ; when I became aware of his courageous stand against

poverty and injustice and his equally strong commitment for the proclamation and celebration of the gospel in his own cultural, anti-Christian environment, I sensed what Peter must have sensed at Cornelius' house, when he and his companions saw that the Holy Spirit had fallen upon Gentiles."<sup>9</sup>

These conversions defined Orlando and they increasingly drew him into many diverse Christian communities, but made him a restless, even prickly member of any. People who know little else about him, know that he was virtually alone in his generation as being someone who had full membership, if one might put it that way, in the community of evangelical missiology and in the community of liberation thought. By virtue of his first and third conversions, Orlando truly belonged to both of these movements, with all his heart and soul. And he was a blessed thorn in the side of each, as well. He was an unusual reality, a voice that could speak critically to each of these communities from *inside* it. Even more striking, Orlando tended to save his most passionate advocacy of ideas that one group would approve for moments when he stood in the midst of the other group! Evangelicals never felt Orlando was more one of them than when they heard him in ecumenical circles and his "mainline" church friends never saw his affinity with them more than in overhearing him speak in evangelical circles.

Thus among evangelicals and missiologists he was known for championing the cause of justice and liberation, for questioning cultural triumphalism and for sharply reminding people that growth in numbers was not the same as growth in the depth of the gospel. In one of his books, Orlando recalled a mainline denominational executive applauding him for these critiques of evangelical missions and saying "That's what we have been doing for years. We don't emphasize growth in numbers, but quality growth, theological content." Characteristically, this drew a rather scathing response from Orlando. "Oh really?," he said. Then why does the theology of your churches seem like nothing but the latest pragmatic, liberal, pop philosophy that is dominant in your culture? Why do so many of your people regard the Bible as a dead book? Why is there so little dynamism and energy to live a life of faith?<sup>10</sup>

He would castigate evangelical missions for their lack of attention to structural justice. But to liberal churches who prided themselves on dropping evangelism in favor of a "social mission," he could be just as critical. At a conference where a speaker made a somewhat smug presentation about how for decades his own church had gotten beyond the imperialism of conversion to Christ and exhorted others to follow this lead, Orlando responded sharply. He said that the shift (in the later nineteenth century and

early twentieth century) of some Protestant mission agencies from an emphasis on church planting to an emphasis on a “civilizing” mission represented the highest degree of imperialism. In such programs, Orlando pointed out, western culture was not inadvertently imposed on others as a by-product of evangelization: spreading western culture, education, ethics, government, economics became the entire *intent* of mission work. It prided itself on giving others western literature, western social practices, western morals, western business and western political models and not mentioning Jesus or Scripture. Speaking from the point of view of the receiving end, Orlando said this trade did not look all that appealing.<sup>11</sup>

He was always happy to have “mission” as the overarching label for his work. He delighted in his title here -- the Judson Professor of Missiology -- and he had hardly been here fifteen minutes, it seemed, before we had both a department and a requirement in it. For Orlando, mission was about all four of the conversions we have noted. Understood that way, mission was the entire soul of the church. Christian faith is transitive. The desire to share necessarily involves vulnerability and new contexts. The nature of the gospel is that it has to be received from another and it has to be lived out in community. It is only alive when it is in the process of being passed on, in life and witness.

Orlando’s journey to Andover Newton was part of his Macedonian conversion, and it involved a vision of what he called a “theology of the crossroads.”<sup>12</sup> This involved a hope that the bridge he represented in one person could be expanded, that instead of one individual shuttling back and forth between different camps it was possible to have a community where mission, evangelical commitment, and biblical passion could be renewed among North American mainline Protestants and where liberation and social justice imperatives could be extended among evangelicals and where the multicultural contexts for the gospel could be explored by all. And ultimately it was a vision for the whole church.

The most fundamental division of the churches that true ecumenism must address is the division not of confessional families but of the more evangelical and the more liberal strands of the church. What Orlando embodied and made so irritatingly clear to both groups was that their refusal to engage each other was hypocrisy of the highest order in each case. How could so-called ecumenical and liberation-oriented Christians rest content in isolation from many -- maybe most -- of the world’s Christians and certainly most of the Christian poor? How could so-called mission-minded Christians rest content without the resources of the whole church for the great task of witness and evangelism?

I

So far, I have tended to follow the path of Orlando's biography. But I believe we can see in his vocation a wider pattern for the ecumenical church and indeed for theological education oriented to the ecumenical church. I would like to turn now to some brief indications of that pattern. I am convinced that this is not an idiosyncratic view on my part. As I survey developments on the world ecumenical scene in the brief time since Orlando's death, it seems to me that they bear out the pattern he had pioneered. Just to point to examples in the World Council of Churches, I think that the World Conference on Faith and Order in 1993 with its unification of traditional ecumenical theology, mission and justice and the later World Mission Conference in Brazil with its profound focus on the gospel and its various cultural embodiments are two events that have Orlando's characteristic concerns stamped all over them.

Let's put it this way: what are the universal horizons of the church, the horizons that define its mission and challenge its validity? Christian faith offers a critical perspective over against the conventions and assumptions of our immediate cultural and historical context. It involves a formation process oriented toward producing people who belong to particular cultures but are not entirely defined by them. To that task it brings the voices of tradition that span many centuries, races and cultures. It brings a missional impulse, a desire to enter new cultures and contexts.

If the gospel claims to be a universal message, it necessarily invites some kind of universal tests. If Christianity is to make good its universal claim it must engage the dominant *standards* for universality in a particular context. In the West over recent centuries, it has been assumed that those universal tests were primarily enlightenment philosophy, critical historical study, social scientific analysis and scientific method. Theological disciplines took certain conversation partners to provide the test for the universal intent of the theological enterprise. These were the literary-historical-critical methods of the modern humanities and social sciences, the critical analysis of modern philosophical systems and (to a lesser extent) the disciplines of modern science. These have largely shaped theological education among the elite churches. And the relative authority granted these disciplines has been one of the key disagreements separating both more "conservative" and more "liberal" Christians in North America and North American Christians generally from those in much of the rest of the world, who have not gone through the tradition of European enlightenment in the same way, as Orlando often pointed out.

Within the West itself these have been the grounds upon which Christian particularity tried to vindicate its universality. But these disciplines, or at least the humanities and social sciences, have increasingly been dropping their own universal horizons and tending toward factionalized particularity. These disciplines increasingly bear the mark of a postmodern suspicion of objectivity or non-local perspectives. Even the hard sciences, though for the most part unruffled in their inner practice, are subject to aggressive interpretation in these terms by those in other disciplines.<sup>13</sup>

We have the ironic spectacle of theological disciplines, which have conscientiously tried to engage with the “objective” norms of their secular counterparts, being instructed by new developments in those disciplines about the contextual and cultural character of all perspectives, about the “scandal of particularity.” On this point, the structure given to the theological curriculum by an *opposition* with which it had grown familiar suddenly gave way, like the collapse of a wall you are leaning against.<sup>14</sup> The cutting-edge of secular disciplines has altered in a way that leaves traditionally modern theological education somewhat marooned. This is notably true at the heart of theological education: biblical studies. The critical-historical skills and conclusions which have defined literacy as understood in oldline theological schools are neither the burning concern of many (probably most) of their entering students nor (increasingly) the exclusive paradigm of the biblical disciplines themselves.<sup>15</sup>

I would suggest that the crucial horizons of universality for Christianity have decisively shifted, both internally and externally. In an uncanny way, Orlando already was aware of this. The first case is the reality of global Christianity. It was Orlando’s passion for mission that made him aware of this. Even a basic description of what it means to be “Christian” requires some knowledge of what we might call “representative Christianity.” Critics and adherents of Christianity alike tend to assume that representative Christianity is European Christianity. Andrew Walls has imagined a professor of Comparative Inter-planetary Religions who makes time-travel visits to earth every few centuries on a grant to study Christianity.<sup>16</sup> On strict scientific grounds, where should she visit to take a representative sample? Walls suggests she might visit Jerusalem in the first century, Egypt or Syria or Armenia in the fourth century, England in the nineteenth and Nigeria or Brazil in the twentieth. He points out that Christianity has been marked by serial expansion, unlike religious traditions like Hinduism or Islam that remain dominant in and centered on their culture of origin. Europe has been one passing phase in that serial pilgrimage. It was only many centuries into Christian history that Europe became an arguably representative (though

never exclusive) site. This is a status it (and North America as well) has now clearly and definitively lost. Representative Christianity is African, Latin American and Asian and will become dramatically more so.

This has profound implications for education in and about Christianity. If by the “ecumenical church” we mean the whole, empirical church, then we have to attend to this reality. European and North American Christianity will very likely become, like North African or Syrian Christianity, important loci in the story of what the church has been, but very limited determinations of what the church currently is. Theological education requires recognition of this fact (itself rare) and some rudimentary information about the character of the faith that most Christians practice. One of the first exercises I remember Orlando instigating in the faculty was for us to meet in divisions to go over each others’ syllabai, asking to what extent various perspectives (African-American, Hispanic, Asian, women’s) were represented there.

This was a valuable experiment. But I have to confess that at the time it only sank in to a certain level. I tended to think of it as a matter of giving a variety of students entry points and identification with the area of study, of “spicing up” the subject with contemporary topics. It still had not truly come home to me that this was about an “objective” or universal picture of Christianity and about the *universal* standard to which statements about what is “Christian” had to be held. It has taken much longer for it to sink in that this was not a matter of adding on certain pluralistic voices, significant though that might be, but was a matter of questioning the catholicity and ecumenicity of the treatment of the discipline across the board.

Andrew Walls tells how he first taught church history in his native Scotland and how -- implicitly -- the point of the whole story of church history was how the Church of Scotland came to be. Then later, as a missionary in West Africa he taught church history again, and tried to teach it as he had before. But eventually he came to see that tacking on African Church history at the end of his unchanged course, under the heading of “missions” was not quite right. There was an African Church history that went back to the very beginning on its own: an Ethiopian church, an Egyptian church, a Sudanese church). And there was a contemporary indigenous African church that had only a tangential relation to western mission. Then, after a missionary period, he taught church history back in England, and realized that he had to reconceive it also. It was not that his old form of church history was the “default mode” he could return to, and the version he had taught in Africa was a special case. He could teach European church history also as a kind of “mission” history, the story of a specific particular,

contextual part of the church. In this perspective, one recognizes, for instance, that Augustine, though a western church father, is such as an African theologian, a category important historically and theologically. I think this trajectory that Walls describes in personal terms, as I have described Orlando's trajectory in personal terms, is also the trajectory of our disciplines.

What "we call third-world theology is too much an 'echo' of western theologies, [but] there is another kind, 'namely, that which is being continuously produced in the languages of the churches of the Third world -- in the form of preaching, catechesis, song, story, and drama.'"<sup>17</sup> Our educational institutions, church-related or not, are not very well equipped to provide this. In seminaries this is due to the fact that such information is not readily available in library resources, does not figure in the doctoral formation of teachers in the various disciplines (Bible, theology, etc.) and (where it exists) is often segregated into courses about mission. In religious studies programs these factors are frequently augmented by a dogmatic conviction that in non-Western societies Christianity is an alien intrusion and that study should be concentrated on more "authentic" cultural traditions even if they are numerically less significant than Christianity. Thus one often finds that more serious scholarship on this topic must be sought in political science, economics or area studies departments. This poses a key challenge for theological education, since the resources to educate about world Christianity cannot be developed unless teachers and institutions are willing to work "outside the box" of traditional guilds and rewards. The ethnic-minority Christian churches of the U.S. (Hispanic, Asian, African) in many cases represent very different dynamics from those that may characterize churches on other continents, but they are also crucial links to world Christianity.

This perspective clearly has much to do with Orlando's "second" or "cultural conversion." But it actually has just as much to do with his first, to Christ as his personal Lord and Savior. It was Orlando's passion for mission and evangelism that drew him into contact with the global church. But that contact itself made him aware, as most of us have not been of the deep evangelical character of that church: not "evangelical" in all the strict North American "party" or cultural senses that he himself often critiqued, but evangelical in the Christ-centered, Spirit-filled, Bible-loving, conversion oriented, personal life-changing, healing expecting, maybe tongues-speaking, open testimony-giving sense that puts many New York Times readers' teeth on edge. It was because his own faith and spirit breathed that air that he could genuinely contact the world church. For in truth, that spirit takes

you closer to African Roman Catholicism or for that matter Northeast Indian Presbyterianism than a degree from a Jesuit university or a course in Reformation history.

This leads us to a second crucial horizon of universality, the horizon of ecumenism. In one sense this is an old horizon, as old as the council at Jerusalem in Acts 15. But the modern ecumenical movement, coincident with globalizing trends in economy, technology and culture, has made it increasingly impossible for Christian churches to live in effective isolation from each other. At the same time, distinctly new parties to ecumenism have arisen, most notably Pentecostal churches and indigenous churches (especially in Africa). In the variegated world environment, if the Christian church is to hope to have any coordinated impact as the unique resource it is -- the single largest and most universal human organization -- it must be able to find ways of realizing its own ostensible and professed unity. At the same time, if individual Christians or groups are to be honest witnesses to their non-Christian neighbors, they must be able to give a true account not just of their peculiar denomination but some general picture of Christians in their diversity.

Both of the considerations I have just mentioned, the collective impact of the Christian church in the world and the accurate description of it to others, have an external orientation. But I would put special emphasis on an internal concern that seems to me a matter of deep concern, particularly at the level of individual Christian congregations and in areas where only one or two Christian denominations may be predominant. It is crucial that those who inquire into Christian faith and those who seek to grow deeply into it should have access to the full range and depth of its resources. In one sense, the vicissitudes of mission and history have advanced this end in a rough way, "transplanting" Eastern Orthodoxy to the U.S. and Pentecostalism to Russia, and making these ways of being Christian available in both places. But I have in mind something much more intentional. It seems to me that no clergy person or church leader, at least, is "literate" who does not have some basic sense of the strengths and visions of the Christian faith and life as it is displayed in various major strands of the church. The most crucial dimension of this knowledge is not historical or abstract but directly practical. It has to do with spiritual diagnostics. Christian leaders unable to direct others in basic terms to the devotional exercises, liturgical options, theological developments or communal practices that may be the most fruitful for their own growth in Christ are guilty of a certain kind of pastoral malpractice. They lack a skill one can reasonably expect them to have. The person who appears in a Baptist congregation

may have need of the spirituality of the *Philocalia* from Orthodox tradition. A Roman Catholic may have need of the biblical exegesis of John Wesley (or the hymnody of Charles Wesley). A good example of this cross-fertilization is found in the work of Roberta Bondi who has demonstrated the way that the writings of the desert fathers might become a significant feature in the spirituality of many feminist Protestants.[18] Literacy requires a basic familiarity with the horizon of Christian diversity, across time and traditions.

If ecumenism and world Christianity represent two internal horizons of universality, there are three external horizons that are of crucial importance. The first of these is the primary holdover from those critical disciplines that shaped the existing theological curriculum. Science is one of the universal horizons of modernity that will continue to be with us, and in even more powerful terms. Although critical literary-historical study, philosophy and science were the three avenues to “critical literacy” in religion, the first two have had a far more pervasive impact in theological education than the third. In fact, in the study of religion it is the social and not the natural sciences that have been most vociferous to claim the mantle of science. With a few exceptions (like the doctrine of creation), specific scientific material and theory has not become integral to theological education. This is changing, in part because of the confusion in the other disciplines and in part because of a renewed explicit interest in the relation of religion and science.

Science increasingly takes a more direct role in many of the social disciplines that have been closely associated with theological education. Examples would be greater emphasis on neuro-physiological perspectives in relation to psychological issues and the increasing application of evolutionary psychology in discussing personal and social ethics. Contemporary scientific discussions of the origin of the universe and the origin of life manifest a new openness to theological considerations. But the primary venue for interaction promises to rest in the understanding of our own humanity, through questions like artificial intelligence and biological technology. This is an area where religious literacy must have a scientific dimension because of the ever-expanding roster of practical and pastoral issues that will require concrete response in the life of the church. Within this broad area, investigation of the relation between faith, health and spirituality is a specific frontier that will receive increasing attention. On all these fronts, theological literacy will be tested less by familiarity with theories from the humanities and social sciences and more with understanding of relevant work in scientific fields themselves. In the most concrete terms, this was

not a special interest of Orlando's, but in a broader sense it was. Part of the Macedonian call had to do with Orlando's appreciation for what was good in North American education. Rigorous study, in traditional modes, was something he respected and had practiced himself. There was nothing anti-intellectual or withdrawn about his outlook. He was clear that the church needed intellectuals to enter these fields of study and to connect them to the life of the church.

A second external horizon of universality is constituted by the world religions. Mission and evangelism were once unifying themes of theological education and compelling vocations that helped to define the nature of effective literacy -- knowing enough about the faith to pass it on to others. But today these are points of division among and within the churches, which differ over the nature and practice of relation with other religious traditions. The religions are a horizon of universality analogous to that which critical-historical study once provided: one is not religiously literate if adherence to Christianity exists in ignorance of alternative faiths and their criticisms of Christianity. Much of theological education is ill-equipped to address this concern, because the missiological studies that addressed these issues have largely disappeared as part of the curriculum and they have not been replaced with any coherent study of world religious traditions. Orlando's passion for missiology, which some people might view as nostalgia for a discipline whose time was past, addressed this very point. The scope of this study is daunting, because of the number and depth of the traditions and because of the limited resources and curricular space. But an awareness of the global church and its context for mission makes attention to the religions inevitable.

The third horizon of universality is constituted by the struggle for economic, political and social justice. This is Orlando's third conversion to the poor or the periphery. He liked to point out what a minority opinion, what a fringe phenomena lack of concern for this horizon is. That is, once we have a truly universal view of the church we recognize that the overwhelming majority of the church is poor and weak, as is the vast majority of the non-Christian world within which the church would witness.

Gustavo Gutierrez, writing from a Latin American context which was ostensibly virtually one hundred percent Christian, posed a question. What is the prime challenge to Christian faith? Is it secularism, scientific accounts, the world religions? For Latin Americans he said, the fundamental challenge is non-humanity. People cannot believe because they can hardly be human, because basic dignity and survival are denied them. The location from which you did theology had always been recognized to be

significant in one respect: theology was done from faith, and the set of questions raised by that assumption formed a very traditional part of theological discussion. Can you do theology without faith? In what ways does faith have to be presupposed? How does it distort theology and make it “biased” that it rests on faith and is not “disinterested” inquiry? But liberation theologies pointed out that there were other crucial ways in which this same dynamic held---theology needs to be done from the perspective of the weak -- and that the method of theology itself could be reconceived on this basis.

## II

In this brief review we have seen how Orlando in his own life embodied the ecumenical church and set a pattern for the ecumenical church. The good news is that this pattern is increasingly being seen in other places and movements. It is easier to see now than it was even a few years ago that this striking and unique life was not just that of a single man, an event that happened and is finished. It was much more like a biblical sign of the times. We could take the text from the little apocalypse in the Gospel of Mark, where Jesus says “From the fig tree learn its lesson; as soon as its branch becomes tender and puts forth its leaves, you know that summer is near. So also, when you see these things taking place, you know that he is near, at the very gates.” (Mark 13:28-29) Orlando’s life and work were that tender branch, which put forth shoots and fruit, to tell us that a new church is near: it is at the very gates. Like his Lord, Orlando went outside the gate to see it first, to run to meet it, to call to us excitedly about it, to usher it in.

### **End Notes**

- <sup>1</sup> This text is adapted from an address given for a symposium celebrating the life and work of Orlando E. Costas, held at Andover Newton Theological School, March 23, 1999.
- <sup>2</sup> See the interview by Dannelle G. Costas Icuspit, Appendix B in Galarza, D. T. *The Emergence of a Latino Radical Evangelical Social Ethic in the Work and Thought of Orlando E. Costas: An Ethico-Theological Discourse From the Underside of History*, Drew University: 1992, p378.
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 345
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 345
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 347
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid. p. 346
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid. p. 348
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid. p. 349

- <sup>9</sup> Costas, O. E. *The integrity of mission: the inner life and outreach of the Church*. San Francisco, Harper & Row: San Francisco, 1979, p. 90
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid. p. 51
- <sup>11</sup> Carman, 1978 #649
- <sup>12</sup> Costas, O.E. *Theology of the crossroads in contemporary Latin America: missiology in mainline Protestantism, 1969-1974*. Amsterdam, Rodopi. 1976
- <sup>13</sup> A good compressed picture of this discussion is presented in the response to physicist Alan Sokal's successful hoax submission to the journal *Social Text*. See Fish, Stanley. "Professor Sokal's Bad Joke," *New York Times*, May 21, 1996, p. 23 and Sokal, A.D. "A Physicist Experiments with Cultural Studies." *Lingua Franca* (May/June 1996): 62-64.
- <sup>14</sup> This is the dynamic pointed out in relation to the social sciences in Milbank, J. *Theology and social theory: beyond secular reason* Blackwell: Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass., 1993
- <sup>15</sup> See for example Levenson, J.D. "The Bible: Unexamined Commitments of Criticism." *First Things* (30/ 1993): pp. 24-33 and Levenson, J.D. *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and historical criticism: Jews and Christians in biblical studies*. Westminster/John Knox Press: Louisville, KY., 1993.
- <sup>16</sup> Walls, A. F. "The Gospel as Prisoner and Liberator of Culture. The Missionary Movement in Christian History": *Studies in the Transmission of Faith* Orbis Books: Maryknoll, NY, 1996, pp. 3-15.
- <sup>17</sup> Hunsberger, G. R. *Bearing the Witness of the Spirit: Lesslie Newbigin's Theology of Cultural Plurality* Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1998. p.262
- <sup>18</sup> Bondi, R. C. *To love as God loves: conversations with the early church* Fortress Press: Philadelphia, 1987 & Bondi, R.C. *To pray & to love: conversations on prayer with the early church*. Fortress Press: Minneapolis, 1991