

VERBUM SVD

Volumen 54	2013	Fasciculus 1
Editorial / Vorwort		5- 7
<i>Roger Schroeder SVD</i>		
Interculturality and Prophetic Dialogue		8- 21
<i>Robert Kisala SVD</i>		
Theological Foundations of Interculturality		22- 34
<i>vanThanh Nguyen SVD</i>		
Biblical Foundations for Interculturality		35- 47
<i>Franz-Josef Eilers SVD</i>		
Interculturality, Communication and the SVD		48- 59
<i>S. M. Michael SVD</i>		
Interculturality and the Anthropos Tradition		60- 74
<i>Philip Gibbs SVD</i>		
Encountering Difference: Interculturality and Contextual Theology		75- 89
<i>Michael G. Layugan SVD</i>		
Evangelizing the Kalingas of the Cordillera Region in the Philippines: Syncretism as an Approach to Inculturation		90-111
<i>Ennio Mantovani SVD</i>		
Who Do You Say I Am? My Journey of Faith as a Missionary		112-126
BIBLIOGRAPHIA		
FELICITY JENSZ, German Moravian Missionaries in the British Colony of Victoria, Australia, 1848-1908. Influential Strangers (P. B. Steffen SVD)		127-128
DAMIAN CICHY SVD (Hg.), Ludzie w drodze. Nauki teologiczne o migracjach i migrantach (W. Necel SChr)		129-131
MOSES ASAAB AWINONGYA, The Understanding of Family in Ghana as a Challenge for Contextual Ecclesiology (L. Müller SVD)		131-134

*Roger Schroeder SVD**

INTERCULTURALITY AND PROPHETIC DIALOGUE

The SVD General Chapters of the 21st century have focused around two fundamental themes or concepts—“prophetic dialogue” and “interculturality.” The author describes, first of all, interculturality from the social science and missiological/theological perspectives, and secondly, prophetic dialogue as “prophecy” and “dialogue” separately, and then as the two dimensions together. The article then brings the two concepts into conversation with each other and proposes how prophetic dialogue and interculturality can mutually shape, enrich, and complement each other. In conclusion, the author draws missionary implications.

The last three General Chapters of the Society of the Divine Word have been considered a trilogy for articulating a Society-wide mission statement, vision statement, and action plan. Respectively, the 15th Chapter (2000) introduced the term “prophetic dialogue” for understanding SVD mission “ad extra”; the 16th Chapter (2006) applied “prophetic dialogue” to the inner dynamics of SVD life “ad intra”; the 17th Chapter (2012) developed congregational directions around the theme of intercultural life and mission. While the interconnections of these three General Chapters can be mined from various perspectives, in this article the focus will be on the relationship between two central themes—*interculturality* and *prophetic dialogue*. Such a study is particularly relevant for the SVD, but it likewise has something to offer to all those concerned with the understanding and practice of mission today.

Interculturality

The term “intercultural” had been used already in the 1988 SVD General Chapter in reference to the importance of “intercultural communications” and in later chapter documents as another term for “international”, that is, the mere physical presence of different cultural/national individuals or groups in the same province or community.¹ In contrast to the latter use, the understanding of intercultural-

* Born 1951 in Defiance, ordained in 1979; he worked for six years in Papua New Guinea (1975-77, 1980-83, 1986), and earned a doctorate in missiology at the Gregorian Pontifical University in 1990. Since then, he has been teach-

ity in the 2012 General Chapter explicitly moves far beyond mere co-existence “to emphasize and make more explicit the essential mutuality of the process of cultural interaction on both the personal and social level.”²

Social Science Perspective

In order to establish a more in-depth and foundational understanding of the meaning of interculturality, let us turn to the social scientists, who have been studying this phenomenon for a long time. First of all, they describe and analyze the universal human tendency for *ethnocentrism*, whereby an individual, group, and/or nation consider their culture as superior and normative in relation to others. Accordingly, they “prejudge people’s behavior and explain differences as if they were the result of perceived physical and mental differences (racism) or spiritual and moral differences (elitism).”³ The counterpoint to ethnocentrism is cultural relativism, which presupposes that “each culture can be understood and appreciated only in its own context.”⁴ This perspective of course is a key component for mutual interculturality.

A second and more recent approach that is generating much attention is in the area of *de-coloniality*. While the external forms of political colonialization have for the most part been dismantled, this period of post-colonialism is still marked by “colonial” actions and “colonial” thinking in the areas of economics, social organization, and, I would add, church life and mission. Ethnocentrism is of course underlying this phenomenon. Interculturality offers a new counter-colonial framework, which substitutes attitudes and actions of superiority and paternalism with those of self-determination and mutual interdependence. In other words, interculturality fosters a situation

ing at Catholic Theological Union of Chicago, where he is now Professor of Intercultural Studies and Ministry and holder of the Bishop Francis X. Ford, MM, Chair of Catholic Missiology. He is the past president of the American Society of Missiology and is starting his third term as the International Coordinator of Anthropos Institute. He has authored *What Is the Mission of the Church?* (2008), and co-authored with Stephen Bevans, SVD, *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today* (2004) and *Prophetic Dialogue: Reflections on Christian Mission Today* (2011).

¹ Robert Kisala, Formation for Intercultural Life and Mission: *Verbum SVD* 50 (2009) 334.

² *Ibid.*, 335.

³ Michael Rynkiewich, *Soul, Self, and Society: A Postmodern Anthropology for Mission in a Postmodern World*, Eugene, OR: Cascade Books 2011, 24.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 27.

“where differences are not cast in terms of values of plus and minus degrees of humanity.”⁵

A third major study in the social sciences focuses on the phenomenon of *globalization*. One of the major consequences of globalization is the creation of a universal meta-culture, often at the expense of local culture and identity. At the same, the world is experiencing many radical movements for local autonomy through culturally rooted violent conflicts, usually at the expense of others and the common good. The idea and practice of interculturality is intended to avoid the dangers of this polarization between globalization and fundamentalism. Franz Xaver Scheuerer describes interculturality as “a third way between monoculturalism and radical pluralism, or between a centralist universalism and a relativistic ethnophilosophy.”⁶

These sociological studies point to the potential destructiveness of ethnocentrism, post-colonialism, and globalization in promoting systems and relationships based on superiority, uniformity, and exclusive self-interest. And these systems and relationships are not only in the areas of personal interactions, politics, economics and social/cultural identity, but they also can shape the understandings and practices within missionary life and work. At the same time, it is very interesting that the social sciences highlight the potential of true interculturality for contributing to the creation of a world in which individuals, communities and nations interact in a more appropriate and mutually-enhancing fashion.

Missiological/Theological Perspective

The cornerstone for a missiological/theological foundation for interculturality was laid with the Second Vatican Council. The operative missionary theology before the Council reflected two primary motivations for mission. First of all, the Catholic Church was focused on the salvation of souls, and it saw itself as bringing God in a one-directional movement to people in a lost world and bringing them safely on board the “ark of salvation.” The second motivation for mission was the establishment of the visible presence of the church,

⁵ Walter D. Mignolo, *Delinking: The Rhetoric of Modernity, the Logic of Coloniality and the Grammar of Decoloniality*: *Cultural Studies* 21 (March/May 2007) 499. For an excellent article on the implications of decoloniality from a philosophical perspective, see: Enrique Dussel, *A New Age in the History of Philosophy: The World Dialogue between Philosophical Traditions*: *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 35 (2009) 499-516.

⁶ Franz Xaver Scheuerer, *Interculturality – A Challenge for the Mission of the Church*, Bangalore, India: Asian Trading Corporation 2001, 35.

which considered its Western form as normative and non-Western cultures as inferior. However, in the opening paragraphs of the missionary decree *Ad Gentes*, the Vatican Council grounded mission and the church itself in the *mission of God (missio Dei)*, who, in ways only God knows, had from the beginning been actively present in all of history and creation, drawing all people and every created thing to Godself, the source of life. The church plays a key role in God's mission by being a faithful witness to and sacrament of God's salvation, love and justice (*Lumen Gentium* 1, 5), but God is bigger than the church. As an instrument of God's mission, the church is to acknowledge and engage God's Spirit somehow already present in other Christian churches and denominations, all religions and secular society, all cultures, the world and all of creation. The church recognized a need for a shift "from the old heroic, paternalistic model of mission—reaching down to 'save' and 'help' another person—to a model of humility and mutuality—developing a reciprocal relationship out of respect for how God is already present in the other."⁷

Of particular importance for our treatment of interculturality was the Vatican II shift to a more *positive assessment of culture*, especially non-Western cultures. It was actually the first time the term "culture" appeared in a conciliar document. The Council encouraged Christians and local churches to "be familiar with their national and religious traditions and uncover with gladness and respect those seeds of the Word which lie hidden among them" (*Ad Gentes* 11). Post-conciliar developments over the past fifty years have further refined the process of what has become known as inculturation.⁸ This is based on the theology that *every* culture/society contains *both* the seeds of the Word of God and those elements which are contrary to God's Reign. Therefore, the intercultural interaction among individuals, cultures and local churches is crucial for mutual enrichment and for the recognition of the continual call to conversion for all.

The basic idea of mutual exchange is reflected in the post-Conciliar understanding of mission. Before the Second Vatican Council, missionary activity was basically seen in geographical terms—from Europe, North America, and Australia to the rest of the world. With Vatican II's understanding that the entire church and every local church is "missionary by its very nature" (*Ad Gentes* 2) and that

⁷ Roger P. Schroder, *What is the Mission of the Church? A Guide for Catholics*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 2008, 4.

⁸ See: Stephen B. Bevans/Roger P. Schroeder, *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 2004, 385-389; Gerald Arbuckle, *Culture, Inculturation, and Theologians: A Postmodern Critique*, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 2010.

God's mission is stirring on all six continents, every local church is to be both mission-sending and mission-receiving. In order to express this multi-directional mutual exchange in mission around the globe, a number of people now propose complementing the phrase "*ad gentes*" ("to the nations") with "*inter gentes*" ("among the nations").⁹ Former SVD Superior General Antonio Pernia described "mission inter gentes" as "mission as dialogue WITH people, mission as encounter BETWEEN peoples, mission as finding a home AMONG the people."¹⁰

Much more can be written to develop more fully and appropriately the missiological/theological, as well as the sociological/anthropological (and one could add the biblical, historical, and spiritual) foundations for interculturality.¹¹ Sufficient for this article is the brief overview of the understanding of interculturality from the perspectives of the social sciences and missiology/theology. They indicate converging and complementary conversations about the potentiality, challenges, and need for transformation in order to foster and create real in-depth mutual relationships and exchanges among cultures, on both the individual and communal levels. We will now describe the second major theme of the past three SVD General Chapters—prophetic dialogue.

Prophetic Dialogue

Origins of the Term

In one of the small working groups of the 2000 SVD General Chapter, the term "prophetic dialogue"¹² surfaced as an expression of the SVD missionary response to many contexts. It was accepted by

⁹ For example see: Jonathan Tan, *Missio Inter Gentes: Towards a New Paradigm in the Mission Theology of the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences (FABC): Mission Studies* 21 (2004) 65-95; William Burrows, *Formation for Mission "Missio Ad et Inter Gentes": SEDOS Bulletin* 39 (May/June 2007) 106-118.

¹⁰ Antonio Pernia, *Missio Inter Gentes: Arnoldus Nota* (November 2009) 2.

¹¹ Refer to other articles in this issue of *Verbum SVD*.

¹² It is interesting that, in an essay on mission and prophecy published in 1992, Indian missiologist Michael Amaladoss uses the phrase in passing: "Religion is called to enter into a prophetic dialogue with the world." See Michael Amaladoss, *Mission as Prophecy*, in: James A. Scherer/Stephen B. Bevans (eds.), *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization 2: Theological Foundations*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 1994, 64-72 (the quotation is from 72). The original article appeared in French in *Spiritus* 128 (September 1992) 263-275.

the entire assembly and served as a central idea of the final chapter document.

It is in dialogue that we are able to recognize “the signs of Christ’s presence and the working of the Spirit” (*Redemptoris Missio*, 56) in all people, that we are called to acknowledge our own sinfulness and to engage in constant conversion, and that we witness to God’s love by sharing our own convictions boldly and honestly, especially where that love has been obscured by prejudice, violence, and hate. It is clear that we do not dialogue from a neutral position, but out of our own faith. Together with our dialogue partners we hope to hear the voice of the Spirit of God calling us forward, and in this way our dialogue can be called prophetic (*In Dialogue with the Word*, par. 44).

While the individual SVD source for the initial coining of the term is unclear and probably unimportant since it was created and adopted through a communal process, some have proposed that it represented the combination and complementarity of two different perspectives and contexts regarding the understanding and practice of mission. The large group of Asian SVD delegates at the chapter understood mission primarily as “dialogue”—reflecting the post-Vatican II reflections of the Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conferences (FABC) in terms of dialogue with the poor, cultures, and religions. The large group of Latin American SVD chapter delegates primarily understand mission as “prophecy”—reflecting the post-Vatican II reflections of the Latin American Episcopal Council (CELAM: Consejo Episcopal Latinoamericano) in terms of confronting injustices and embracing a “preferential option for the poor.” Although the use of the idea of “prophetic dialogue” didn’t generate an in-depth theological discussion at its inception, further reflection and study has shown that this term brings together two essential dimensions of the practice and theology of mission in all contexts.

For example, Stephen Bevens SVD and I have developed and proposed “prophetic dialogue” as an insightful way to synthesize current mission theology and practice not only for the SVD, but also for the broader Christian world.¹³ We shall briefly describe dialogue and prophecy separately as two essential dimensions of the *missio Dei*, and then look at them together.

¹³ Bevens/Schroeder, *Constants in Context*, 281-395; Stephen B. Bevens/Roger P. Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue: Reflections on Christian Mission Today*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 2011.

*Mission as Dialogue*¹⁴

Reflecting the shift in the church's attitude to the world during the Second Vatican Council, described above, Paul VI wrote: "it seems to Us that the sort of relationship for the Church to establish with the world should be more in the nature of a dialogue" (*Ecclesiam Suam* 1964, 78). For example, *Nostra Aetate*, the council's declaration on non-Christian religions, described the presence of "rays of Truth which enlightens all human beings" (2) who are followers of world religions.¹⁵ Almost twenty years after Vatican II, the Vatican's Secretariat for Non-Christians stated: "Dialogue is thus the norm and necessary manner of every form of Christian mission, as well as every aspect of it, whether one speaks of simple presence and witness, service, or direct proclamation. Any sense of mission not permeated by such a dialogical spirit would go against the demands of true humanity and against the teachings of the gospel."¹⁶ Dialogue is based on the *missio Dei*. Just as God is dialogical in Godself and is engaged in the world, so the church needs to give of itself in service to the world and to learn from the world, its cultures, its religions—and so learn more about God's unfathomable riches. Just as God's missionary presence is never about imposition but about persuasion and freedom, so must the church never neglect the freedom and dignity of human beings. Finally, just as God "humbled" Godself in the incarnation, so the church needs to do mission not out of superiority, but in humility and vulnerability.

¹⁴ For a fuller development, see Bevens/Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue*, Chapter 2, "We Were Gentle Among You: Christian Mission as Dialogue," 19-39.

¹⁵ "Christian theology had always had a strong, if perhaps subaltern, tradition of the possibility of grace and salvation outside the boundaries of the church and explicit faith in Jesus Christ—from the second-century theologian Justin Martyr through Thomas Aquinas to Pius XII in the 1940s" (Bevens/Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue*, 23). See Jacques Dupuis, A Theological Commentary: Dialogue and Proclamation, in: William Burrows, *Redemption and Dialogue: Reading "Redemptoris Missio" and "Dialogue and Proclamation,"* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 1993, 123 and 133-35.

¹⁶ Secretariat for Non-Christians, *The Attitude of the Church toward the Followers of Other Religions: Reflections and Orientations on Dialogue and Mission* (Pentecost, 1984), 29.

*Mission as Prophecy*¹⁷

While mission is dialogical, “mission is and must be prophetic because God’s inner nature is also prophetic, and because God is prophetic in dealing with creation.”¹⁸ To begin, a prophet must be grounded in dialogue. A prophet strives to listen to God’s Word, to discern God’s presence in the “signs of the times” (*Gaudium et Spes*, 4), and to dialogue with the worldview and context of the people. Secondly, a prophet “speaks forth” a message about the future. However, rather than “fortune telling,” it is an *annunciation* of God’s plan of salvation—as Ezekiel prophesied over the dry bones (Ezek 37) and Jesus prophesied about the immanent Reign of God (Mt 5:1-11)—both of which were happening but people didn’t see it. Prophecy includes telling the world about Jesus. Thirdly, a prophet is involved in “speaking against” or pronouncing a *denunciation* of something that is contrary to the Reign of God—as Amos denounced injustices toward the poor (Hos 6:1-11) and Jesus a very narrow understanding of religious stipulations (e.g., Mt 12:1-14, Mk 2:13-17). This must be done with a spirit of love for God and the people, and the prophet must always be aware of his/her own sinfulness. Finally, it is important to note that both *annunciation* and *denunciation* can be done with and without words.¹⁹

Mission as Prophetic Dialogue

Dialogue and prophecy are understood here not as two totally separate actions, but rather they are *complementary* dimensions of the *missio Dei*, which should underlie *every* form of Christian mission/ministry. In other words, every theology and practice of mission needs to be both dialogical and prophetic as a part of the *missio Dei*. For example, proclamation is not only a prophetic non-forceful presentation of the good news of the gospel, but as stated by the late Archbishop Marcello Zago, proclamation “presupposes and requires a dialogue method in order to respond to the requirements of those to be evangelized and to enable them to interiorize the message received.”²⁰ At the same, interreligious dialogue is not only dialogical in its many forms, but is also prophetic in that Christians maintain and

¹⁷ For a fuller development, see Bevans and Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue*, Chapter 3, “I Am Not Ashamed of the Gospel: Mission as Prophecy,” 40-55.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 41.

¹⁹ See *ibid.*, 43-48.

²⁰ Marcello Zago, “The New Millennium and the Emerging Religious Encounters: *Missiology* 28 (January 2000) 17.

respectfully witness to their own Christian beliefs with those of other faiths, just as the others do with their religious beliefs. I have addressed this particular relationship of proclamation and interreligious dialogue in more detail in another article.²¹ While dialogue and prophecy are always theologically fully present, in practice it is better to think of these two dimensions in terms of a continuum, whereby the dialogical dimension may be more prominent in some contexts, while the prophetic dimension is prominent in others. However, Christian participation in the *missio Dei* always includes both the dialogical and prophetic dimensions to some degree.

Balancing dialogue and prophecy at the same time as “prophetic dialogue” is parallel to the insightful and challenging call for “*bold humility*” by the late renowned South African missiologist David Bosch over twenty years ago. “It is ... a bold humility—or a humble boldness. We know only in part, but we do know.”²² JNJ (Klippiess) Kritzinger, former colleague of Bosch, maintains that Bosch’s ecumenical missionary paradigm, including “bold humility,” needs to be understood in terms of “creative tension.”²³ At first, Stephen Bevans and I considered the two dimensions of “prophetic dialogue” more as a synthesis (2011, 2). However, after conversations with those who understand and experience this as creative tension, we are beginning to image “prophetic dialogue” as a “*synthesis in creative tension*.”²⁴ No matter how it is phrased, this theological foundation shapes and is shaped by mission practice. Furthermore, in paraphrasing Robert Schreiter,²⁵ “prophetic dialogue functions more as a *spirituality* than

²¹ Roger Schroeder, Proclamation and Interreligious Dialogue as Prophetic Dialogue: *Missiology* 41 (January 2013) 50-61.

²² David Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology and Mission*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 1991, 489. See also Willem Saayman/Klippiess Kritzinger (eds.), *Mission in Bold Humility: David Bosch’s Work Considered*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 1996.

²³ JNJ (Klippiess) Kritzinger, “Mission as...’ Must we choose? A dialogue with Bosch, Bevans, Schroeder and Schreiter in the South African context,” unpublished paper delivered at a conference on “Mission as Prophetic Dialogue?” at the University of South Africa (Unisa), Pretoria, on April 16, 2010. See Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 367, 381-89, 507-10.

²⁴ Schroeder, Proclamation and Interreligious Dialogue, 54. Theologically, Catholics tend to strive for a synthesis, while some Christians of other traditions seem to prefer holding them in creative tension. David Tracy describes and contrasts these two approaches in terms of an “analogical imagination” and a “dialectical imagination,” respectively. See *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism*, New York: Crossroad 1981.

²⁵ Robert J. Schreiter, *The Ministry of Reconciliation: Spirituality and Strategies*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 1998.

a strategy.”²⁶ And it requires on-going conversion to be both dialogical and prophetic.

Interculturality and Prophetic Dialogue

Having described the two major themes of the past three SVD General Chapters, we shall now examine the mutual interrelationship between them for the sake of mission.

Prophetic Dialogue Shaping Interculturality

The vision of prophetic dialogue has the potential to enhance and complement the pursuit of interculturality, through its mission theology, practice and spirituality. *Missio Dei* theology provided interculturality with a solid foundation for a positive attitude toward culture and for a mutual exchange among cultures on an equal basis. Prophetic dialogue with this same Trinitarian *theology* clarifies the necessary interplay of the two dimensions in any intercultural exchange/relationship: a) dialogical acknowledgement of the presence of the seeds of God’s Word in all cultures, and b) prophetic acknowledgment of those elements contrary to God’s Reign (denunciation) and of blindness to God’s movement (annunciation) in all cultures. This theological background provides a framework for the *practice* of interculturality that aims for a middle path between universal monoculturality and exclusive particularity. In the face of ethnocentrism, post-colonialism, and globalization, the theological/sociological/mis-siological challenge is to a) promote mutual enrichment and critique among all individuals, groups, and nations, and b) to avoid claims of cultural superiority and dominance, by either a global power of influence or a particular individual/group. In other words, it promotes unity in diversity and it avoids uniformity and fundamentalism in intercultural dynamics and relationships. The idea of prophetic dialogue finally, and perhaps most importantly, provides a profound and inspiring *spirituality* for those striving for true interculturality. Being a person of dialogue and prophetic vision within an intercultural context demands deep attention and response to God’s stirring among others and within oneself. Holding prophetic dialogue in those same settings like a “synthesis in creative tension” requires a real spirit of discernment. Striving for mutual interculturality requires openness and self-confidence, vulnerability and courage, and in the words of David Bosch, “humility” and “boldness.”

²⁶ Bevens/Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue*, 2.

Interculturality Shaping Prophetic Dialogue

Now by reversing the perspective, let us see what the idea of interculturality has to offer to the understanding and practice of prophetic dialogue through its content, methodology, and training. The current *content* of the general study of culture—as something dynamic and changing, and not a harmonious integrated whole—and the more particular studies of interculturality—such as on ethnocentrism, post-colonialism and globalization—provide excellent information for understanding the many different contexts of mission today.²⁷

Bevans and I have proposed prophetic dialogue as the underlying framework for the understanding and practice of every form of Christian mission today—witness and proclamation; liturgy, prayer and contemplation; justice, peace and the integrity of creation; interreligious and secular dialogue; inculturation; reconciliation.²⁸ Not only the basic knowledge of the theory but also the *methodology* of studying culture, context and interculturality can serve as essential tools for an in-depth contextualization of every element of mission—mission as prophetic dialogue.

From its beginning, one of the distinguishing characteristics of the SVD charism was the importance placed on the social sciences for mission. This vision originated with Arnold Janssen, was carried out in the academy and field work through the organization of Wilhelm Schmidt, and it was enfolded in practice by Joseph Freinademetz in China. Former SVD Superior General Antonio Pernia called this the “Anthropos Tradition” and he described it in this way: “Our Anthropos tradition is really a way of doing mission which considers an appreciation of people’s culture as a necessary precondition for genuine evangelization. A way of doing mission whereby the gospel message is not simply parachuted from outside, but enters into dialogue with the culture of the people. And so, a way of doing mission whereby the missionary is ready not just to change people but to be changed himself, or as EN [*Evangelii Nuntiandi*] (e.g. no. 15) puts it, a way of evangelizing whereby the evangelizer not only evangelizes but allows himself or herself to be evangelized.”²⁹ In this powerful

²⁷ For anthropological resources for mission, see Louis Luzbetak, *The Church and Cultures: New Perspectives in Missiological Anthropology*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books 1988; Rynkiewicz, *Soul, Self, and Society*.

²⁸ See Bevans/Schroeder, *Prophetic Dialogue*, Chapter 5, “Unraveling a ‘Complex Reality’: Six Elements of Mission,” 64-71.

²⁹ Antonio M. Pernia, SVD, Expectations of the Generalate of the Anthropos Institute: *Verbum SVD* 45 (2004) 34.

statement, Pernia proposes the study of culture as “a necessary precondition” for mission and for an intercultural encounter, which enables enrichment and change—that is prophetic dialogue—within both parties. In the first part of the twentieth century, the SVD study of culture was primarily focused on rural communities of people of traditional religions. Today, SVD missionaries are living in different contexts on all six continents, where an understanding of migration, ethnic identity, family life, youth culture, globalization, urbanization, and post-colonialism is relevant. The theme of interculturality provides an excellent opportunity for the SVD and other missionaries to use the content and methodology of the social and religious sciences for both its mission *ad extra* and its community life *ad intra*.

The third area of interculturality which can benefit all aspects of mission is *training*. Training is understood here not so much in terms of learning content and methodology, but rather being trained or formed with the appropriate perspectives and attitudes. In other words, how do we understand the world of the other from the perspective of the other? For example, Milton J. Bennett has developed an excellent training program for developing intercultural sensitivity, whereby participants move along a continuum, from wherever they begin the process, between six stages from ethnocentrism to ethno-relativism.³⁰ Such a process would dovetail with the spirituality of prophetic dialogue described earlier.

Missionary Implications

Missionary anthropology, or anthropology for the sake of mission, was often understood in the past on the level of using the tools of the social sciences to accomplish the goals of mission. However, bringing together interculturality and prophetic dialogue moves beyond a mere instrumentalist understanding of the relationship of the social sciences with mission. Rather than considering the social sciences as only a secular pursuit, interculturality and prophetic dialogue, as presented in this article, are both grounded in a post-Vatican II *missio Dei* theology and both are based on the principle of mutual enrichment and exchange. Furthermore, each is concerned with the essential interplay between theory/theology and practice, and I propose that they can enrich, complement, and challenge each other.

³⁰ Milton J. Bennett, Toward Ethnorelativism: A Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, in: R. Michael Paige (ed.), *Education for the Intercultural Experience*, Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press Inc. 1993, 21-71. Consult the link for Bennett's Intercultural Development Inventory: <http://www.idiinventory.com/>

Philip Gibbs described the intersection in this way: “In order to take *anthropos* [humanity] seriously we need both a theological and a cultural anthropology that informs our missiology, and we need an intercultural hermeneutics to help us navigate through multiple cultural identities.”³¹

Finally, both prophetic dialogue and interculturality see the need for a process of transformation and conversion of perspectives and attitudes. This is the fundamental point of convergence that occurs not only in the head, but primarily in the heart. Jon Kirby SVD calls this “cross-cultural conversion,” and John Prior “intercultural conversion”³²—out of the contexts of Ghana and Indonesia, respectively. Missiologist and anthropologist Darrell Whiteman describes Peter’s encounter with Cornelius in Acts 10 as an ideal example of such a conversion that is essential for a missionary, when Peter realized that God does not have favorites (Acts 10:34).³³ VanThanh Nguyen has treated the entire Peter-Cornelius incident as a story of conversion and mission in an insightful way.³⁴ And this was also a moment of prophetic dialogue for Peter, in that he recognized God’s stirring in the life of the Gentile Cornelius (dialogue) and he witnessed to and proclaimed the gospel of Christ (prophetic).

ABSTRACTS

Die SVD-Generalkapitel des 21. Jh. haben sich auf zwei fundamentale Themen bzw. Konzepte – „prophetischer Dialog“ und „Interkulturalität“ – konzentriert. Der Autor stellt zunächst Interkulturalität aus sozialwissenschaftlicher und missionswissenschaftlich/theologischer Perspektive dar, dann den prophetischen Dialog, „prophetisch“ und „Dialog“ je für sich sowie beide Dimensionen zusammen. Anschließend werden die beiden Konzepte miteinander verglichen und Vorschläge gemacht, wie prophetischer Dialog und Interkulturalität sich gegenseitig beeinflussen, bereichern und ergänzen können. Zuletzt zeigt der Autor die missionarischen Konsequenzen auf.

Los Capítulos Generales del Verbo Divino del siglo 21 han enfocado dos temas o conceptos principales – el “diálogo profético” y la “interculturalidad”. El autor describe primero la interculturalidad a partir de perspectivas de las ciencias sociales y de la misionología y teología. Después enfoca el diálogo

³¹ Philip Gibbs, *The Context of God’s Mission in Papua New Guinea: Intercultural Relations and an SVD Tradition: Verbum SVD* 53 (2012) 84.

³² John Mansfield Prior, *Learning to Leave: The Pivotal Role of Cross-Cultural “Conversion”*: *Verbum SVD* 53 (2012) 225, 232.

³³ Darrell Whiteman, “The Conversion of a Missionary: A Bible Study from Acts 10,” unpublished manuscript.

³⁴ vanThanh Nguyen, *Peter and Cornelius: A Story of Conversion and Mission*, Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications 2012.

profético como “profecía” y “diálogo” por separado y luego como dos dimensiones relacionadas. El artículo conjuga después los dos conceptos y sugiere cómo el diálogo profético y la interculturalidad pueden configurar, enriquecer y complementarse mutuamente. En la conclusión, el autor presenta las implicaciones misioneras.

Les chapitres généraux SVD du XXI^e siècle ont principalement traité deux thèmes ou concepts fondamentaux – le *dialogue prophétique* et l'*interculturalité*. L'auteur décrit d'abord l'interculturalité du point de vue des sciences sociales et du point de vue missiologique/théologique; puis le dialogue prophétique dans chacun de ses aspects, comme prophétie et comme dialogue, et ensuite dans ses deux dimensions conjointes. L'article fait ensuite dialoguer les deux concepts et montre comment, selon lui, le dialogue prophétique et l'interculturalité peuvent mutuellement se façonner, s'enrichir et se compléter. En conclusion, l'auteur en dessine les implications missionnaires.