

# Fellowship a missional experience essay



## Contents

- Partnerships, for better or worse

### **Introduction and cardinal vocabulary**

The research inquiry for this thesis, “ Is fellowship a missionary experience? ” implies apprehension of two foundational footings or constructs normally used in Christian vocabulary, in the academy every bit good as in the Church. In fact, these two footings are clearly Christian slang and seminal to missiological and theological treatment in this research.

In many corners of the ‘ Christian universe, ‘ nevertheless, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, one term, family, rings much more familiar than the other, missionary. The newer term missional now normally identifies the nature of the church ‘ s activity, under the larger contextual umbrella of the “ mission of God ” ( misso Dei ) . Up through the center of the twentieth century, a instead usual and possibly even traditional apprehension of mission was — -sending missionaries out to ‘ bring the Gospel ‘ to the un-churched, non-Christian universe. This definition, though still widely held and used, has been changed radically by the treatment of missio Dei. “ In the new image mission is non chiefly an activity of the church, but an property of Goda^}. Mission is thereby seen as a motion from God to the universe ; the church is viewed as the instrument for that mission. [ 1 ]

In the late 1990 ‘ s as portion of this alteration, the adjectival ‘ missional ‘ emerged in North America as a new label or ticket form for the self-understanding of the Church ‘ s really life every bit good as for the single fold ‘ s battle in ‘ mission. ‘ [ 2 ] While missionary is unimpeachably a newer term

and one still in procedure of being defined, the word family has been standard vocabulary since the first century in speaking about what Christians ' do. ' In theological and ecclesiological treatments, it is frequently listed as one of several features depicting the nature of the church ( proclamation/kerygma, worship/liturgia, service/diakonia, testimony/martyria and fellowship/koinonia ) . In day-to-day idiom, family reflects or depicts one often-named, usual and placing ' activity ' of the Church universal and the local fold, that of engagement, Communion, or sharing. On the local degree it would mention to conversation or sharing in life experience, in learning state of affairs, in survey or supplication groups, in household or house church meetings. Though the theological mention is sometimes understood as the communicating between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit ( the family of the three individuals in the Trinity ) [ 3 ] , most Christians sitting in the church bench would understand and utilize ' fellowship ' in mention to what they do. This of course, ranges from java hour to Bible survey groups, to what ' happens ' when Christians gather for worship, service, common repasts, encouragement, and merriment. However understood, if it is used as a form of what Christians ' do ' while being ' church ' , family is improbable to be labeled mission or a missionary activity.

It was recognized by the German and US originators, that the plan Berlin Fellowship was a Christian-to-Christian ' fellowship ' event, a trial across boundary lines, an activity of the church being the church in an ' ecumenical ' sense. In fact, it was the growing of the oecumenic motion following WW2 which was instrumental in readying and launching of the early stages of the

Fellowship plan, and in so far as the influence of the post-war oecumenic motion is lighting to this subject, its function shall be considered.

During the early old ages 1961-1967, as this trial plan emerged, there was regular treatment in the US about the sense and way of this oecumenic undertaking, the disbursal, the intent of the visits and grounds for go oning. [ 4 ] In the GDR, the archives reveal at that place was at the same clip a medium-sized but influential circle of eastern church leaders, lay and clergy, who embraced the attempt, come ining into rating and planning for ‘ fellowship ‘ visits. However, on neither side of the ocean, did at that place look to hold been inquiries whether this was mission or missionary, ecclesial or oecumenic. Berlin Fellowship ‘ happened ‘ or some might state it evolved or unfolded, turning out of the times, and so in a really existent sense, it was a pneumatological phenomena every bit good, though this facet will non be addressed straight in this thesis.

The modern-day, evident and possibly superficial gulf between missionary and family in today ‘ s vocabulary, nevertheless, does so warrant reference, for it pulls at the imaginativeness and begs bold scrutiny of both words. Furthermore, the missiological, theological, and ecclesiological treatments to which family, missionary and related footings might belong hold proven to be about bare sing the family facet of church life and the fellowship facet of missionary battle, though the World Council of Churches and the Faith and Order Commission have focused their attending in this way in the last 15-20 old ages. More significantly, in visible radiation of the comparative famine of missiological research stuff reflecting peculiarly the ‘ recipients ‘ point of views, experiences, remembrances, appraisals of mission activity aimed at

<https://assignbuster.com/fellowship-a-missional-experience-essay/>

them, this thesis shall examine how family, shared and reciprocated, might so be an unmarked facet of missionary activity and missiological self-understanding.

What constitutes the parametric quantities of intending for these cardinal footings, family and missionary? Once defined, can both footings and related constructs provide a model or grid for filtering, understanding and measuring the eastern participants' positions of the Berlin Fellowship trial plan? Was this trial plan, a non-mission but mission-like activity of the church ( terminology pre-Bosch ) , a missionary enterprise ( 2009 vocabulary ) ? From the position of the receivers, what can this sort of family experience reveal about the nature of such missionary activity? What made this intercultural crossing of boundary lines ( all mode of boundary lines ) a alone missionary enterprise and one that merits scrutiny? Is Church being Church across boundary lines somehow other or more than oecumenic exchange?

The cardinal constructs necessary for this treatment, integrated in the missio Dei kingdom of contemplation, include reconciliation/recognition and contextualization or interculturalization ( traversing boundary lines ) , and memory/oral history and hermeneutics ( retrieving, stating and listening to the narrative ) . All warrant elucidation, for each is built-in to both the missional and fellowship treatment of the information. This interlacing household of words and constructs may every bit good light the dry run of the written history in chapters 3 and 4 and the analysis of ' perspectives ' from the eastern participants' unwritten interviews, Berlin Fellowship ' s unwritten history in chapter 5.

**Family**

Since the primary activity which the trial plan being discussed engaged in was 'fellowship' in and between Christians, the nature of family, as defined chiefly by the New Testament, shall foremost be considered. Dietrich Bonhoeffer's *Life Together* so affords a position of no little import. Finally, studies produced in recent old ages by the World Council of Churches fill in facets of definition that give farther dimension and theological context to fellowship.

**Biblical positions**

General usage and apprehension of 'koinonia' (Gk.) in the Bible is shaped chiefly by Paul's usage of the noun and related words, and the term family is most normally defined as Communion, engagement, family, sharing. As noted in "The Nature and Mission of the Church" (Faith and Order Paper No. 198, WCC, p. 8-10), the term has fallen in some periods of church history out of trend, but family has late been 'reclaimed today as a key to understanding the nature and mission of the Church.' [5] Fundamental in both Old and New Testaments is the compact relationship between God and the chosen people and the resulting communion/fellowship with God (Californium. Ex. 19: 4-6). This purposed relationship in bend enables Communion among and between people and with the created order. However, wickedness distorts, decompression sickness and breaks the relationship and destroys the family (Gen. 3-4, Rom. 1: 18ff.). God's relentless fidelity demonstrated in Jesus Christ restores brokenness on all sides and family in all mode is renewed.

What it is that is held by participants ' in common ' , as ' shared ' , ' participated in, ' or somehow ' acted together ' upon is cardinal to this treatment of family. Possibly, nevertheless, it is non so much a inquiry of keeping but instead that of being held, and this shared province of being held has to make chiefly with the person/object ' in whom ' the family is found or through whom family is enabled.

Paul addresses this straight and repeatedly throughout his epistles, saying it is because of Christ and ' in Christ ' ( 2 cor. 5. 17 ) that family happens, can be realized, is made possible. It is non something produced but instead received and shared. It is in and through Christ ' s decease and Resurrection and by the power of the Holy Spirit that Christians may come in into family with God and one another. [ 6 ] Both sacraments are cardinal to the Paul ' s apprehension of koinonia, as seen peculiarly in 1 Cor. 10: 16. Paul here identifies the staff of life broken as the participation/sharing/koinonia in the organic structure of Christ and the cup of approval as well engagement or koinonia in the blood of Christ. In jubilation of the Eucharist, the ' body of Christ ' refers to Jesus ' organic structure on the cross, and his blood, that which was poured out at his decease. However, Paul is non merely mentioning to the organic structure of Christ but besides to the organic structure of trusters, the community. [ 7 ] Likewise, the sacrament of baptism consequences in a relationship with Christ and in a shared relationship with the community. [ 8 ]

How this ' sharing ' is described and manifests itself is varied in the NT use, from mentions to partnership in work ( 2 Cor 8. 4, 23 ) to postpone family ( Acts 2: 42ff ) to sharing in the agonies of Christ ( Phil. 3. 10 ) every bit good

<https://assignbuster.com/fellowship-a-missional-experience-essay/>

as in his glorification ( Eph. 2. 5-6, Rom. 8. 17 ) . This engagement and shared position in the Gospel is both an person and corporate act ( i. e. aggregations brought to Jerusalem ) . Christians are called into family foremost with Christ ( 1 Cor. 1. 9 ) , but this occupied engagement with the Son is every bit good engagement and sharing with other followings, in any figure of active ways. One illustration of this is found in Philippians where Paul thanks God for the trusters who portion “ in the Gospel from the first twenty-four hours until now. ” ( Phil. 1. 5 ) That is, the Philippians shared “ in the message about Christ that Paul preached, by believing, so that a local ‘ fellowship in the Gospel ‘ resulted. “ [ 9 ] Subsequently in this epistle Paul refers to the Philippians sharing the Gospel with others ( Phil. 4: 15-16 ) , that is straight sharing from their resources of money and individuals. “ Koinonia therefore involves sharing in the Gospel for redemption and sharing it with others in mission. “ [ 10 ]

“ Family with Christ means family with other Christians in a partnership of religion and service. “ [ 11 ] Fellowship manifests itself in sharing of stuff wealth ( Gal. 2. 9, Rom. 15. 27 ) every bit good as partnering with those publically abused, persecuted, or treated ill ( Hebrews 10: 33 ) . Pauline thought reiterates that the jurisprudence of family dictates single agonies are the load of the full community. ( Col. 1. 24, 2Cor. 1: 5, 7 ) [ 12 ]

It may be noted at this occasion in the treatment that the original call from the German church to the Presbyterians came in the face of the loads the Christians of the freshly divided state were transporting, particularly those of in the divided metropolis of Berlin. In 1959 Bishop Otto Dibelius said, “ They ( East Germans ) need to cognize there are Christians in other parts of the

<https://assignbuster.com/fellowship-a-missional-experience-essay/>



universe who know about them and who do truly care about them, who still claim them as portion of the worldwide community of trusters. ” [ 13 ] Long before Berlin Fellowship began directing squads, Christmas bundles were sent from the US to households in both parts of the divided metropolis. In response and gratitude, Alfred Schroeder, young person curate for the whole of Berlin, wrote, “ I wish we could make more from our side in order to demo you how thankfull we are for this Christian belonging togethera^! ” [ 14 ]

The activity of family as portrayed in 1 John ( four occurences of koinonia ) describes this belonging together in a concrete manner, as an brush, specifically an experience or brush with what is ‘ heard, seen, touched ‘ ( 1 John 1. 1-3 ) and so it is testified to and announced. In the brush with the life Christ, the writer makes it clear something has happened in footings of personal experience. “ What we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes, what we have looked at and what we have touched with our custodies, refering the word of lifea^! ” is a disclosure of life, in some manner — “ this life was revealed, and we have seen ita^! ” . John so states further that in declaration of the experience, family occurs, is made possible, and this family is foremost with the Father and the Son ( 1 Jn. 1: 3 ) . Furthermore, “ we declare to you what we have seen and heard so that you may hold family with usa^! ” ( 1: 3 ) The really message being shared about the experience seems so in the really sharing, to unify all participants! Or possibly the announcement is merely a reminder to all of the fact of their Communion, their family. Regardless, the usage of family here, every bit good that found in Paul ‘ s letters ( Gal. 2. 9 ) , is active acknowledgment of and sharing together — -‘ being in Christ. ‘ 1 John may travel farther, nevertheless, for

the proclamation itself is both a acknowledgment of the cogency of the experience described ( touch, seen, heard ) and a acknowledgment of the ‘ other ‘ , of the receiver of the message. The ‘ other ‘ so in the hearing is reminded of the accommodating act of Christ unifying trusters to God the Father AND to other trusters, be they talkers or hearers. Together they all participate in the common act of sharing the message, that is stating and listening.

In these opening poetries of 1 John, the shared family is farther described as a affair of ‘ walking in the visible radiation ‘ , holding been cleansed from wickedness by Jesus Christ ( 1 Jn. 1: 6-7 ) ; “ if we walk in the visible radiation as he himself is in the visible radiation, we have fellowship with one another ” . Jesus Christ has made this koinonia/fellowship possible, and by walking in his visible radiation, the followings find each other together and merely so by nature of the visible radiation to which they have all responded.

What did this koinonia ‘ walking in the visible radiation ‘ of Christ look like in the early church? The brief description of the first organic structure of trusters gathered after Pentecost in Acts 2: 42 ff. provides a paradigmatic description of some of the fellowship ‘ doings ‘ of early Christians. “ They devoted themselves to the apostles ‘ instruction and family, to the breakage of staff of life ( common repast and the sacrament ) and the supplications. “ ( Acts 2: 42 ) . Further sharing included holding all things in common, selling private goods and administering the returns to those in demand, disbursement clip together in the temple, eating together, praising God, and holding good will for all ( Acts 2: 43-47. ) The image here is one of people in relationship, in a moral force of giving and receiving, a ‘ loving ‘ and

synergistic family which implies friendly, unfastened and swearing communicating, common apprehension, willing Acts of the Apostles of kindness, concern, involvement and common support. This description of the Communion occasioned by common religion and subject ( surely experimental and nascent in these early chapters in Acts ) remains an ideal for those in the Church to this twenty-four hours and has been instrumental and foundational for the World Council of Churches, the Lutheran World Federation, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and other oecumenic ecclesial and mission organic structures.

### **A brief review-World Council of Churches and Faith and Order Movement, ecumenics, and KOINONIA**

It is so dry that in the really old ages when the political relations of a divided Germany separated Christians, the oecumenic motion was being launched and deriving a bridgehead in many parts of the larger Church universe. The Cold War splitting line, as symbolized in 1948 by the Iron Curtain and after 1961 by the Berlin Wall, was a rough boundary line and a blunt reminder that any and all western contact, conversation and support was unwelcome and viewed with a high grade of intuition ( see chapter on Stasi and BF ) . In malice of this splitting wall, two church organic structures, the Ev. Church in West Berlin and the Presbyterian Church from the United States made a really modest attempt at being ‘ ecumenical ’ — – via family, encouragement and conversation.

The developments in the larger oecumenic domain during the post-war old ages were even conducive to some of the initial stairss made by the Christian churches from both sides in WWII, that division between the Allies

and their former enemy Germany. In fact, it was thanks to the programmatic attempts of and encouragement from the Brethren Service committee, the freshly founded World Council of Churches, and CIMADE that the early commission work squads of college pupils from the 1st Presbyterian Church of Hollywood went to Europe in 1950.

The oecumenic motion 's history, growing, and ongoing developments, on the other manus, played merely an indirect function in the existent Berlin Fellowship activities after 1961. However, in this visible radiation, it is interesting to observe that coincident to BF ' s pre-history actions ( 1950-1961 ) of oecumenic work trips, WCC and Faith & A ; Order were hard at work, clear uping and specifying their identified end — – the ' unity of the Church. ' The WCC determined at its initiation in 1948 to intensify the apprehension of this end and to seek ways to recognize it. [ 15 ]

The Faith and Order Commission, and every bit good as the World Council of Churches, have repeatedly focused on integrity and, Communion ( besides to be understood as koinonia ) with changing grades of strength over the class of the last 60 old ages. Since its beginning, and especiallyEven every bit early as 1927, a at the First World Conference, Lausanne, Switzerland, the Faith and Order Movement identified the integrity of the Church as the really ground for its being. " [ 16 ] Their call to this twenty-four hours to maintain at it, to go on to seek that which is a given, integrity in Christ, is based end point from on clear apprehension of and committedness to the common and shared koinonia fact of being made one in Christ, the gift of koinonia. Equally late as October 2009, the Faith and Order Plenary committee meeting on Crete called for churches to regenerate their committedness to seek unity.

Continuing to stress the mutualness of call, Called to be the One Church in 2005, the reminds member churches that they “ have non ever acknowledged their common duty to one another, and have non ever recognised the demand to give history to one another of their religion, life, and witnessa^; , every bit good as to joint the factors that keep them apart. “ [ 17 ] As late as October 2009, the Faith and Order Plenary committee meeting on Crete once more called for churches to regenerate their committedness to seek this integrity. The 9th WCC in Porto Allegre, Brazil reiterated the importance of the ‘ ecumenical journey ‘ and invited churches to regenerate conversation on the “ quality and grade of their family and Communion. “ [ 18 ]

F ellowship or koinonia has therefore been used to place global Church dealings and has been seen as an attach toing mark of Church self-understanding, foundational to dialogue, to sharing, to solidarity. However, three peculiar studies/papers are notable and merit brief consideration for their penetrations and remarks about koinonia, particularly as these ideas relate to the Berlin Fellowship and its activities. These declarations represent the 80 ‘ s, the 90 ‘ s and the first decennary of new millenary.

Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry ( WCC, 1982 ) , as indicated by the rubric, focuses on the sacraments and the work of the Church universal, the worldwide organic structure of trusters ( oikumene mentioning the universe ) . This survey paper defines and identifies the nature of the sacraments and the call to ministry and service, seeking to remind member churches of their common bond. Pertinent to the instance of Berlin Fellowship, the

undermentioned mentions illumine some facets of this bond or this

Communion:

“ Through baptism, Christians are brought into brotherhood with Christ, with each other and with the Church of every clipp and topographic point a^!.. Therefore, our one baptism into Christ constitutes a call to the churches to get the better of their divisions and visibly manifest their family. “ [ 19 ]

“ Within a family of informant and service, Christians discover the full significance of the one baptism as the gift of God to all God ‘ s people. “

[ 20 ]

“ The Eucharistic Communion with Christ who nourishes the life of the Church is at the same clipp Communion within the organic structure of Christ which is the Church. The sharing in one staff of life and the common cup in a given topographic point demonstrates and effects the unity of the partakers with Christ and with their fellow partakers in all clipp and topographic points. “

[ 21 ]

Each of these germane choices of text refer to some facets of the experience of ‘ fellowship. ‘ The brotherhood in Christ through baptism and affirmed at the Lord ‘ s Table is about so much an premise as to be overlooked, but this was the initial base apprehension for the commission squads every bit good as the footing for the integrity embraced by the early squad visits, guest and hosts likewise. Fellowship is non an terminal in itself ( basking good conversation and one another ‘ s company ) , but it is a gift of brotherhood with Christ and with one another, which breaks down division, and is seeable

in informant and service. Furthermore, this family is a topographic point of find and acquisition for all involved.

**Continued mention to sacraments, ministry and mission declares:**

\* “ The really jubilation of the Eucharist is an case of the Church ‘ s engagement in God ‘ s mission to the universe. This engagement takes mundane signifier of announcement of the Gospel, service of the neighbour, and faithful presence to the universe. “ [ 22 ]

“ The Church is called to proclaim and prefigure the Kingdom of God a^! In Jesus the Kingdom of God has come among usa^! Living in this Communion with God, all members of the Church are called to squeal their religion and to give history of their hope. They are to place with the joys and agonies of all people as they seek to witness in caring love. a^! This mission needs to be carried out in changing political, societal, and cultural contexts. “ [ 23 ]

Most interesting in these statements is the mention to God ‘ s mission to the universe. Here, a new facet of family ( already established in baptism and Holy Eucharist ) is named ; non merely are announcement and service indispensable but besides “ faithful presence. ” Family surely does n’t except good conversation or common enjoyment, but the act of family in day-to-day footings is defined as relation and hearing to the good intelligence, taking attention to observe the demands of the neighbour ( acquiring to cognize the neighbour ) , and being dependably present in all mode on a day-to-day footing. When family happens, it is so a gift ( as seen in the sacraments ) , but it is, every bit good, surely manifest in these sorts of really knowing, concrete, day-to-day, and identifiable activities.

How the Kingdom of God makes itself known is here defined in the Church and its life battles. This Church is, as the BEM paper provinces, clearly a pre-figuring, — a intimation or a glance of that Kingdom. Members of the Church in squealing their religion, give history of their hope, place with the joys and agonies of all people, witnessing in caring love. “ In order to carry through its mission dependably, ( members ) will seek relevant signifiers of informant and service in each state of affairs. “ [ 24 ] Though mission and informant are most frequently considered something done for the interest of the foreigners, the non-believers, those yet to hear the good intelligence, there is, I believe, an astonishing relevancy within the walls of the Church as good ; faithful service and informant among and between Christians and folds in a ministry of presence, is foundational to fellowship, encouragement and up edifice. This ‘ place ‘ ( as referred to above ) happened to be in a peculiar societal, political and cultural context, the GDR, and the neighbour was a former enemy.

On a concluding note, in this 1982 paper, a statement made in mention to the function and ministry of adult females ( of all time every bit much an issue so as today, in some corners ) reads, “ Where Christ is present, human barriers are being broken. “ [ 25 ] Though the context of this statement in BEM is really specific, it has wider applications. The nature of family and the experience of the Berlin Fellowship participants, because of Christ ‘ s presence, were so boundary breakage. This subject shall be farther addressed in the undermentioned subdivision on rapprochement.

In the old ages following the BEM papers and through the 1990 ‘ s, koinonia and family began to look as cardinal words in major studies and survey



documents. [ 26 ] From the Canberra Statement, The Unity of the Church, Gift and Calling, koinonia is labeled a naming and a gift, expressed in common confession of religion, in a common sacramental life, in a common life where members and ministries are recognized and reconciled, and in a common mission witnessing to all of God ' s grace. [ 27 ] Repeating the scriptural description of the early Church in Acts the oecumenic motion ' s advancement is described ; churches walk together in common understandinga^|common agony and common prayera^|shared witness and service, and they draw near to one another. [ 28 ] This pulling close happens when people are in each other ' s presence, when they engage in common acknowledgment of each other and each other ' s lives, ministries, demands and challenges. This facet of koinonia, acknowledgment, is so cardinal to realized and participated-in oecumenic brush.

In Santiago de Compostela, the message to its World Conference, “ On the Way to Fuller Koinonia “ states the “ koinonia we seek and which we have experienced is more than words. It springs from the Word of Life, ' what we have seen with our eyes, what we have touched with out custodies. ' ( 1 John 1: 1 ) [ 29 ] This, I believe, so identifies the really existent but ' hard to set words around ' experience of brush and ' live ' battle with another individual, in Christ. To exemplify the point, local oecumenic undertakings and base communities are named, people to people ventures. “ The koinonia which we portion is nil less than the accommodating presence of the love of Goda^| This koinonia comes to us as a gift we can merely accept in gratitude. Gratitude, nevertheless, is non passiveness. Our koinonia is in the Holy Spirit which moves us to action. “ [ 30 ] In the instance of Berlin Fellowship, both

hosts and invitees were badly restricted in ways to populate out, even to to the full show the significance of the brushes, but both sides in this quasi-partnership, were unwilling to deny the surprising cogency of the experience and therefore the ‘ action ‘ was to go on for 28 old ages with knowing meetings. Why? It would look for the interest of the family itself!

The 1994 book, *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia*, contains a chapter on ‘ biblical ‘ informant to koinonia which concludes with several exegetical observations worthy of notice: [ 31 ]

Koinonia is spoken of as a affair of religion, life and informant, faith wholly tied to God ‘ s fidelity, life is tied to Jesus ( life now and life in the ultimate land to come ) . The present life is with one another in community, in solidarity, in agony, including the sharing of ego every bit good as fundss for the needy.

Koinonia is about worlds holding a portion in the Gospel, family with Christ, family in the Spirit, partnership in the church for mission and service. ( Koinonia may be non be equated with the definition of ekklesia/church or with the life of the Trinity ) .

Though mentions in Paul are sufficient to state there is a divinity of koinonia, really small in either Old or New Testament divinities is found sing koinonia.

Koinonia is non an interim measure on the manner to being church nor is it a name for the ecclesia itself. It is “ alternatively an early and of import facet of the church and its integrity, in religion, informant and life, including baptism and the Lord ‘ s supper. “

Whether there was ‘ fellowship ’ between early church groups poses a inquiry the New Testament narrative is non concerned with. It begs guess. Most likely, koinonia worked on the local, community degree, sharing what was held ‘ in common, ‘ the “ Christ-event as the manner to God. ”

Koinonia, a non-existent term in the Hebrew Bibles, is ne’er used by Jesus, is portion of the ‘ new creative activity ‘ ( 2 Cor. 5: 17 ) , but its use in the NT letters offers the church today a position and possibly even a new apprehension of the nature and mission of the church.

Koinonia reflects a clear crossing of boundaries and “ involved for New Testament Christians the look of a universe of shared Gospel experiences and associations in Christ and the Spirit, but presented in the vocabulary and thoughts of Grecian idea. Therefore, the Grecian term was brought into the service of the Gospel. The Gospel, in bend, reshaped the societal classs of that universe and its universe, with new accents on solidarity with agony, the hapless and human demands. ”

This crossing of boundaries may be in ecclesial friendly relationship, on a oecumenic or on a world-level graduated table, but it may every bit good be in occasions of Christians meeting Christians in all mode of hospitable sharing, in malice of barriers and boundary lines.

Last, in 2005, *The Nature and the Mission of the Church, A Stage on the W ay to a Common Statement* ( Faith and Order Paper 198, WCC, Geneva ) was published, but one in a long series of publications turn toing the kernel and individuality of the Church. Its opening chapter, ‘ The Church of the Triune God, ‘ examines the church as koinonia/communion. Though koinonia ca n’t

<https://assignbuster.com/fellowship-a-missional-experience-essay/>

and should not be equated with the church in footings of definition, koinonia is “reclaimed as a key to understanding the nature and mission of the Church.” [ 32 ] Although there is no direct mention in the OT to koinonia, the compact relationship between God and the chosen people is named as an illustration. God’s relentless fidelity in of all time and once more reconstructing the koinonia between God, worlds and the created order is a mention point for other scriptural nomenclature which metaphorically describe the relationship ; i. e. vine, bride of Christ, the holy metropolis. [ 33 ]

This paper rehearses the already named marks of new life in koinonia or Communion and but unlike some earlier papers, concludes with, “The Communion of the Church consists not of independent persons but of individuals in community, all of whom contribute to its flourishing. The Church exists for the glorification and congratulations of God, to function the rapprochement of humankind. The Church as Communion, is instrumental to God’s ultimate intent ( cf. Roms. 8: 9-21 ; Col. 1: 18-20 ) . [ 34 ]

### **Dietrich Bonhoeffer Life Together**

In factan wholly different context, the nature of Communion, koinonia, is described in instead specific footings in Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s Life Together, a description of and contemplation about the Christian community. Bonhoeffer and other immature theologians attempted for a brief period of clip at Finkenwalde. Get downing with a statement that the Scriptures supply for “life together under the Word,” [ 36 ] Bonhoeffer’s opening chapter pigments a multi-dimensional images of the lived experience of family. Admitting that Christians, like Christ, are not called to a cloistral being but

instead are called to populate in the thick of the universe and even “ in the midst of enemies, ” [ 37 ] Bonhoeffer opens his work by stating that life in seeable family with other Christians is a approval and a gift but non needfully a given. For the captive, the ill, those alone or populating apart from the community, seeable family is a approval. “ The physical presence of other Christians is a beginning of uncomparable joy and strength to the truster. “ [ 38 ] “ The truster lauds the Creator, the Redeemer, God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, for the bodily presence of a brother, ” [ 39 ] for that really individual is a “ physical mark of the gracious presence of the triune God. Visitor and visited in loneliness recognize in each other the Christ who is present in the organic structure. They receive and meet each other as one meets the Lord; ” [ 40 ] Knowing that such family is a gift, which “ may any twenty-four hours be taken from us ” he reckons with the fact “ that the clip that still separates us from arrant solitariness may be brief so. “ [ 41 ] In fact, Bonhoeffer boldly asserts, “ Christian religion means community through Jesus Christ and in Jesus Christ. No Christian community is more or less than this. Whether it be a brief, individual brush or the day-to-day family of old ages, Christian community is merely this. We belong to one another merely through and in Jesus Christ. “ [ 42 ]

The activities of such community are wrapped up in the bodily presence of the ‘ other ’ , the brother or sister in religion. Repeating 1 John, Bonhoeffer mentions one of those activities, meeting or meeting the life Word of God, as mediated by another individual. “ When one individual is struck by the Word, he speaks it to others. “ [ 43 ] Christians need other Christians to talk God ‘ s Word to them; in times of disheartenment and solitariness, for entirely no 1

is able to assist herself. “ The Jesus in his ain bosom is weaker than the Christ in the word of his brother ; his ain bosom is unsure, his brother ‘ s is certain. ” In this is the kernel and end of Christian community or family: meeting one another as “ bringers of the message of redemption. ” [ 44 ]

This brush is merely possible by rapprochement through Jesus Christ, says Bonhoeffer, for, “ he is our peace. ” ( Eph. 2: 14 ) . Reconciliation occurs between world and God, but this rapprochement besides unites truster to believer, and the resulting family “ consists entirely in what Christ has done to botha^| ” [ 45 ] It is at this point where Bonhoeffer states the fellowship/community ( christliche Gemeinschaft ) is non an thought but a godly world. In reply to those who might desire more or those with a desirous thought of spiritual community and family, he concludes the gap chapter by repeating that day-to-day family, day-to-day Christian community is bound by religion, non by experience, that family is founded in Jesus Christ, and that ‘ participation ‘ in Christ is what constitutes echt community. [ 46 ]

Bonhoeffer ‘ s apprehension of community and his ‘ theology of sociality ‘ is launched in *Sanctorum Communio* ( californium. Clifford Green, Bonhoeffer, *A Theology of Sociality* ) . *Life Together*, affords a brief but sufficient glimpse at some cardinal facets of Bonhoeffer ‘ s anthropological and Christological apprehension and contemplations upon the nature family.

The *Cost of Discipleship*, Bonhoeffer ‘ s talks on Christology and several transitions in *Letters and Documents from Prision* amend and heighten the position and warrant brief consideration in add-on to *Life Together*. ?? IS

THIS THE BEGINNING OF YET CONTINUED BONHOEFFER DISCUSSION OR CAN I FOREGO IT HERE?

Mechteld: How much needs to be added here? I ask myself, do I even need to compose anything more at this point? Might further citations/points from DBonhoeffer non better tantrum ( if at all ) in the findings treatment?

These varied and complimentary is definitions of koinonia or Christian community in from Life Together ( and other plants from DB ) , from and the NT definition of koinonia and from WCC and Faith and Order treatments surveies must may do in general footings affording parametric quantities for an overview of ‘ daily ‘ Christian family happening within the confines of a individual fold or confession and in the instance of the oecumenic circles, between and among assorted confessions.

However, for the intents of this research, an equal and possibly more urgent concern and inquiry is, can such Christian family really be realized in a cross-cultural, erstwhile meeting or brush? Can this Communion, engagement, sharing which the Church proclaims as feature of its nature and an indispensable portion of its very life truly be realized in a brief conversation, in a few hours of duologue or treatment, or in a twenty-four hours spent with other Christians, particularly when those ‘ others ‘ are aliens, once unknown to each other? Furthermore, is such possible when the participants have been labeled former or current enemies? Does this definition and do the general theoretical account parametric quantities of family activities work with people across boundary lines — - from another civilization and linguistic communication, another political or economic system, or even an ‘ enemy ‘

political system? Can those factors which might obviously divide the persons otherwise be overcome in the context of Christian family, particularly in the 'brief brush' signifier, where no warrant of a 2nd meeting or an continuance of the conversation by station can be entertained. ?

It is merely that 'overcoming' even in its experiential signifier which must now be examined that warrants being addressed and examined, for it is so precisely within the 'walls' of the Christian family, found surely within the wall of the 'Church' (ekklesia) that get the better ofing can happen or may be enabled. My treatment therefore far points to the centrality of Jesus Christ; for it is 'in Christ' that koinonia is found, experient and lived out. However, koinonia is, every bit good, frequently viewed as built-in to a foundational definition of the Trinity. In fact, even though the NT does not straight advert the 'fellowship' of the Godhead, the well-developed theological and classical apprehensions of the Trinity, its community and communicating (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) can not be wholly overlooked. Assorted philosophies of the Trinity provide suited paradigms for the sharing and engagement in church individuality and common life. If the three is a relational, dialogical and colloquial foundation and theoretical account for communicating, family, and community [ 47 ], this Trinitarian concept or paradigm may besides function as a paradigmatic context. Both the Three so and the scriptural designation of "being in Christ" service to umbrella and encompass the experience and treatment of such affairs as rapprochement (katallasso, to accommodate), church-to-church partnerships, and most surely activities key to this survey — -crossing boundary lines, stating and



listening to the ‘ story ’ , that is, in today ‘ s idiom, the Church being ‘ missional ’ .

MECHTELD: I am hesitating to give the Trinity more infinite, largely because it is n’t something I can acquire my caput around for the intents of this paper ( and I have tried, but it does n’t experience right ) . I think the narrower Christological focal point in Bonhoeffer, the NT and the WCC/F & A ; O treatment therefore far is sufficient. WHAT TO Make? ? Is touching to the Trinity ‘ s possible function in the treatment sufficient?

Insofar as Berlin Fellowship was both at its origin and throughout its short history a signifier of rapprochement activity within the model of oecumenic battle, the subject of partnership should be noted, but in actuality partnership played no function. Although the Presbyterian Church ( as represented by the Synod of So. Cal. and Hawaii ) and the Evangelical Church of Berlin-Brandenburg ( West ) were witting and supportive of BF plan, formal or even knowing partnership between the single squad members from the USA and scattered folds in the full GDR was barely thinkable at the clip. The GDR and the Western Alliess, the USA included, were on the opposite political sides of the cold war universe, standing watchtower to watchtower along the inner-German boundary line. Furthermore, for all practical intents, economic systems, civilization, linguistic communication and political relations further separated BF participants.

However, in malice of these separations, the east German hosts ‘ and the US travellers ‘ repeated conversations and brushes mirror a sort of battle and

committedness to an experiential family experience, to a sort of ‘ partnership ‘ ideal, in a alone signifier. The undermentioned scrutiny of the nature of this experiential battle, a reconciliatory and border-crossing brush, every bit good as a brief expression at the phenomena of church-to-church partnerships contributes to the treatment.

### **Recognition, rapprochement, and partnerships**

Post WW2 old ages witnessed many efforts to re-build non merely war-worn states and societies but to turn to the root issues of hostility and discord, intuition and patriotism, which had led to the devastation. Many of these attempts at rapprochement ( Aktion Suhnezeichen in Germany being one of the better known groups ) sought to happen a new manner of relating, opening what had been thus-far century-long closed doors between civilizations and states. Ambitious attempts like the United Nations, NATO, the World Council of Churches all recognized the black effects the personal businesss the 1st half of the twentieth century had wrought. Putting hope in the difficult work of brush, duologue, acknowledgment and recognition of the others ‘ rights and sovereignty, states and national groups, and the Church ( largely Protestant organic structures ) began attempts at conferences, in duologue and larning from each other, to happen new ways on many degrees to collaborate, to reciprocally profit from joint attempts at work outing common jobs, and to detect avenues for productive and peaceable meeting and go oning duologue. Berlin Fellowship, a miniscule and modest attempt at this very thing, had its roots planted in these post-war old ages and began as an action of rapprochement.

## **Recognition and Reconciliation**

If the first measure to any act of rapprochement is observing the interruption, admitting the breach and at the same clip admitting the other, the ‘ action ‘ Begins in that minute of acknowledgment. Though there are surely other factors to see, for the intents of this brief treatment, I begin here, looking foremost to the text of the Bible for definition, specifically from the apostle Paul and one key transition in 2 Corinthians.

Talking to the church at Corinth ( 2 Cor. 5: 16ff, ) Paul identifies God ‘ s holding reconciled world to himself through Jesus Christ, and this as the launching tablet for his listeners ‘ ‘ ministry of rapprochement ‘ in and among themselves every bit good as with those around them ( Jews and Gentiles likewise ) . Paul is the primary user of the term, and this term is a basic construct in his theological statement. [ 48 ] The verb katalasso and related words occur merely eight times in the NT ( californium. Romans 5: 10-11, 11: 15, 1 Cor. 7: 11, Col. 1: 21-22 and Eph. 2: 16 ) . In general footings, katalasso refers to Restoration of a relationship one time hostile or broken.

Reconciliation with God is a gift from God ( Romans 5: 11 ) as is the ministry of rapprochement ( 2 Cor. 5: 18 ) , a ministry of being entrusted with a message — that any and all in Christ are new creative activities, with their wickednesss non counted against them. What has been therefore far detached and divided is made whole. In OT footings, the compact is restored. Paul so asserts that the undertaking of those reconciled with God is to go ambassadors on God ‘ s behalf, God doing ‘ his entreaty ‘ for rapprochement through them, the couriers.

This transition and its metaphor of ambassador clears with the funny phrase, ‘ From now on, we regard no 1 from a human point of position even though we one time knew Christ this waya^; ” ; something has happened to alter the ‘ viewpoint ‘ , the ‘ perspective ‘ , and as Paul continues to reason, the ground for the alteration in vision is that anyone in Christ is a new creationa^|. in this instance both the one ‘ regarding ‘ every bit surely as the one being ‘ regarded. The ‘ other ‘ and whatever in the ‘ other ‘ which has been tainted or broken or even falsely understood is no longer a consideration, for in Christ, the ‘ vision ‘ , the brush, and the conversation is new ; the ‘ creation ‘ in the other individual and his/her individuality is made new, as is the ‘ creation ‘ in one screening. This so opens the door for mutualness, for relationship, for engagement, for communicating with the ‘ other, ‘ furthermore echt and swearing duologue, family, community.

This definite theological and Christological position and resulting treatment is non limited to Pauline thought, for in other ‘ realms ‘ of modern, post-modern philosophical idea and treatment, ( i. e. the ‘ politics of acknowledgment ‘ and Charles Taylor ‘ s parts ) , it is said that in duologue and in relationship, individuality is forged and constituted. Identity is formed, by acknowledgement given and received ; worlds are shaped by the acknowledgment or by the misrecognition of others [ 49 ] and every bit granted self-respect and worth as worlds in relationship, in a life-long dialogical procedure. [ 50 ] It seems that this philosophical stance, every bit good as the well-researched sociological and psychological facts about human development, all echo. Pauline divinity barely differs, though the cardinal enabling factor in overtly Christian thought is godly and extremist

intercession in the procedure, that synergistic and dialogical invasion of and cardinal accommodating function of Jesus Christ in the equation.

“ But now in Christ Jesus you who one time were far away have been brought near by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace ; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the splitting wall, that is, the ill will between us. “ ( Eph. 2. 14NRSV ) Granted, the original audiences for these words were Gentiles and Jews seeking to happen a manner to populate together in belief and community, but Paul ‘ s idea continues, “ so he came and proclaimed peace to you who were far away and peace to those who were nigh ; for through him both of us have entree in one Spirit to the Fathera^|. You are no longer strangersa^|. but members of the family of Goda^|. joined together and construct together into a religious home topographic point for God. ” ( Eph. 2. 17-22 ) The facts Paul emphasizes here are that aliens now belong in the household ( family of God ) , and the household is non a concept of their imaginativenesss but instead the really dwelling topographic point for God. They are being bound to each other, happening themselves no longer aliens but instead spouses, with God and with each other.

Reconciliation so seems to get down with God ‘ s dual acknowledgment of the breach and the spouse, the ‘ other ‘ in the relationship. That acknowledgment is made manifest in the individual of Jesus Christ, in his embodiment, his instruction, forfeit, decease and Resurrection. Having been ‘ recognized ‘ and reunited or restored to relationship with God, the ‘ strangers ‘ ( those who stood separated ) are no longer strange or separated

but now members of the family and co-reconcilers with the ‘ others ‘ therefore far ‘ outside ‘ or separated or unusual.

In the instance of the Berlin Fellowship the boundaries and the breach were clear, for the political and historical world and divisions of the Cold War universe were non unseeable. As regular and perennial engagement in a trial plan developed, former enemies, ‘ strangers ‘ but Christians reconciled in Christ, came to recognize each other as brother or sister in the family of God. Being present with and for one another, the ‘ others ‘ ( in both waies ) were recognized or became more clearly identified, non as the enemy or even as strangerAA but as the fellow Christian. Participants who were ‘ other ‘ became the sister or brother whose universe, albeit culturally, politically, geographically distanced seemed really closer, and even somehow the same universe because of and in Christ. These former aliens came to expect the annual visits and embracings that punctuated familiarities being renewed or run intoing new familiarities, every bit good as emotional farewells and farewells.

Though it was but one manner of communication, the ‘embrace ‘ or the American ‘ hug ‘ became a regular experience for Berlin Fellowship participants, irrespective of host or invitee position, irrespective of German or American background. This insouciant and really un-German mode or salutation and command farewell is interestingly plenty a helpful metaphor for some concluding ideas on rapprochement. In Professor Miroslav Volf ‘ s ‘ theological geographic expedition of individuality, distinctness and rapprochement, ‘ Exclusion and Embrace, the subject of rapprochement,

though addressed from a different context, is, I believe, illuminated by Volf ' s geographic expedition of the metaphor of a clinch.

In short, his ' drama of embracing ' entails an integrated and continual motion. It begins with the gap of the weaponries, as a ' code of desire ' for the other ( and I would add open acknowledgment of the other ) . This gap of weaponries is a mark that ' I ' am disgruntled alone or self-enclosed ; " I want the other to be portion of who I am and I want to be portion of the other. " This action entails doing infinite in oneself for the other to come in and traveling out of oneself to come in the other ' s infinite, created and unfastened and waiting. This act is an invitation, a " soft knock " on the other ' s door, says Volf. There follows an act of waiting, waiting for the other to react. Here the ego waits at the boundary of the other, till that individual ' s weaponries open every bit good. This waiting is necessary and a mark of awaited mutual action. In Act Three of this play of embracing, the end is reached, and " each is keeping and being held by the other, both active and inactive. In an embracing, a host is a invitee and a invitee is a host. Though one may have or give more than the other, each must come in the infinite of the other, experience the presence of the other in the ego and do its ain presence felt. Without such reciprocity, there is no embrace. " Finally, the weaponries must open once more, for the minute of embracing is non a welding together but a mutual retention and releasing of the ego and the other, in full and ongoing acknowledgment. [ 51 ] ( CF. M. Volf p. 51

Exclusion and Embrace JH: make up one's mind if you want to utilize this quotation mark or non? )

As intriguing as this metaphor for rapprochement might look, there is a gimmick, and that gimmick comes in the center of Act Three as Volf describes it, in that a ‘ soft touch ‘ is necessary. A ‘ bear clinch ‘ negates and deviants, destructing boundaries of those involved and get downing the other and potentially the ego every bit good. This sounds really much like the sort of tenseness encountered in cross-cultural interchange and communicating. In the pretense of holding understood the other, understanding based on one ‘ s ain footings, it is easy to presume mutualness and commonalty. This is a usual but non easy identified phenomena in cross-cultural brushes, particularly of a brief nature. However, In order to continue the ‘ alterity ‘ , the distinctness of the other, Volf claims it is necessary “ to get the ability to non to understand the other. “ [ 52 ] ( underlining mine )

### **Partnerships, for better or worse**

Coincident to the low attempts at duologue and a slackly defined signifier of ‘ partnership ‘ on the local and experiential degree of Berlin Fellowship ‘ s early developmental old ages ( 1960 ‘ s and early 1970 ‘ s ) , there were major attempts at partnership and knowing battle in the mission universe of the WCC and its spouse organisations, assemblies and committees. The International Missionary Conference in Edinburgh 1910 called for cooperation between mission bureaus and it called upon those bureaus to develop dealings of partnership with the local or national churches. Over the class of the following 100 old ages, ‘ partnership ‘ became standard vocabulary in international mission circles, with changing grades of strength reflected in the rhetoric of many assemblies and conferences. With the connection of the



International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches in 1961, mutualness in directing and having missionaries, stopping unequal power relationships, common committedness to mission, churches recognizing their own individuality and many other reforms in mission redefined ‘ partnership ’ and thrust it to the head. The subject persists to the present ; the 1986 “ Guidelines for the Ecumenical Sharing of Resources, ” stressed “ opening to one another as friends in common trust and answerability, sharing with one another our demands and jobs in relationships where there are no absolute givers or absolute receivers. ” [ 53 ] In 1989, at the San Antonio CWME conference, “ Your Will be Done: Mission in Christ ’ s Way, ” subdivision IV of the study ‘ exchange visits ’ were encouraged, saying that “ the intent of international relationships would be to assist churches portion joys and sorrow, endowments and demands. Relationships should be characterized by: common credence as spouses ; acknowledgment of cultural diverseness as an enrichment, joint planning and execution of policies. ” [ 54 ] Furthermore, renewed missional dealings were to be typified by “ committedness to moving together wherever a common attack is required a transparency in dealings and the sharing of responsibilities. reciprocity in determination devising. ” [ 55 ]

In the old ages environing the autumn of the Berlin Wall and the independency motions in the Warsaw Pact states of cardinal Europe every bit good as in the Soviet Union, regional audiences in mission ( CWME, 1988-1992 ) touched on such cardinal issues as: mutualness and reciprocity, mission still intending traversing geographical frontiers, oecumenic squad visits, common visits which provide exposure to each other ’ s world and ‘

enable scrutiny of one 's world through a spouse 's eyes, ' determinations for action made jointly, exchange of thoughts and resources, cultural diverseness, taking attitudes of donor/receiver, sharing theological penetrations, openness, transparency, solidarities in battle, spouses together in God 's mission. [ 56 ]

These ' characteristics ' of partnership, though non thorough, are admirable and worthy ends for any international relationship, and might hold been considered by Berlin Fellowship participants as cardinal to their apprehension of BF and its ministry/mission. However, can there truly be partnership between unequals? In the instance of BF, the eastern Germans had no hope or chance for contrary visits, which along with other differences, surely calls equality into inquiry?

Asking merely this inquiry, Dr. Kai M. Funkschmidt examined assorted mission constructions and how they facilitate get the better ofing unequal or unfair relationships or how they make get the better ofing impossible. [ 57 ]

Looking at three separate organisations ( CEVAA, CWM, UEM ) and their self-declared intent to make mission together ecumenically, this writer underlines the complexness of such ' relationships ' due to money, linguistic communication, the organisation 's self-understanding, composing and history. Most interesting and germane is mention to put people at the grassroots being excluded or side-lined in mission attempts because of the ' organizational constructions, ' church political relations, bureaucratism.

Naming several ways to avoid that, Funkschmidt refers to the ' twinning ' partnership thought, which enables direct long-run partnerships between folds or territories in two different parts. These relationships might include

<https://assignbuster.com/fellowship-a-missional-experience-essay/>

common visits, missive exchange, intercession, partnership Sunday services, fiscal sharing. [ 58 ] Labeling this as a democratic or bi-lateral option, he refers to a an extended survey of merely such partnerships between German and African folds discussed in *Miteinander leben lernen. Zwischenkirchliche Partnerschaften ALSs okumenische Lerngemeinschaften/Learning to Populate Together: Interchurch Partnerships as Ecumenical Communities of Learning*, by Lothar Bauerochse.

Bauerochse ' s extended survey of ' ecumenical communities of larning ' high spots the strengths and failings of longer-standing formal church-to-church partnerships ( on local, mid-governing and national degrees ) . Though Berlin Fellowship can non be compared to any similar sort of formal twinning or sustained spouse relationship, The remarks and observations made by participants, and repeated appraisals about the significance and significance of the relationships and meetings echo with appraisal and contemplation of BF participants. Bauerochse ' s survey reveals failings in the relationships over the old ages, troubles with linguistic communication and communicating, the one-sidedness of German-initiated actions ( making dependences ) , markedly different outlooks from spouses in both waies, and the dependance on persons or really little groups in the German folds and largely church leaders in Africa. However, there are repeated and consistent remarks throughout this 300+ page book which underscore that the personal contact and friendly relationship and the meetings themselves, between Germans and Africans, are really of import if non paramount. “

Partnerschaften entstehen in der Regel von persönlichen Verbindungen Oder Kontakten. “ [ 59 ] It seems the partnerships are therefore shaped by

personal influence and involvements of the establishing individual or group, and in most instances, the laminitiss are non merely instigators but remain active and influential over many old ages. [ 60 ]

An brief study on the African remarks about the partnerships noted, “ Partnerschaften bedeuteten in diesem Kontext dice Ermoglichung von grenzüberschreitender und versöhnender Christliche Gemeinschaft. “ [ 61 ] Regularly, it is noted at the parish and non merely on the leading degree that family is one of the most of import facets of the partnerships, and the mentions are about what happens when a deputation comes to see. “ Allein, hyrax sich Menschen aus Europa auf einen weiten und muhsamen Weg machen, hyrax sie weder staubige Strassen noch ungewohnte und einfache Lebensbedingungen scheuen, um ihre afrikanischen Partner Zu besuchen, das macht dice Partnerschaften fur viele so wertvoll. “ [ 62 ] Discoursing the different motivations and experiences, the writer notes, “ Die unmittelbare und nahe Begegnung und Gemeinschaft Massachusetts Institute of Technology lair Gasten kann dann viel Begeisterung auslosen und zum Ansto? fur ein intensiveres Engagement in der Partnerschaft werden. “ [ 63 ]

Though the German spouses wished for more correspondence contact, the partnership meant something different, for the Africans, it was the ‘ visit ‘ or the ‘ trip. ‘ The significance of the partnership and the meetings, the relationships are therefore described, “ Innere Anteilnahme, Gedanken und Gefuhle sine ebeso eingeschlossena^; Von geradezu schlie? licher Bedeutung, dice zwischenmenschliche Beziehung. Inhaltliche Diskussionen spielen keine Rolle. ( narrative of two adult females who saw each other after 14 old ages and fell into each others weaponries ) “ Sie empfinden sich ALSs  
<https://assignbuster.com/fellowship-a-missional-experience-essay/>

Freundinnen und erhalten dies Freundschaft über Tausende von Kilometern und über Jahre hinweg, auch wenn es keinen regelmäßigen Kontakt und Austausch gibt. “ [ 64 ]

Though both spouses have different outlooks and appraisals of ‘ success ‘ in the partnerships, there is a joint and shared desire to be together and to be in contact, and when the existent meetings happen, the visits themselves become the cardinal event for both sides, bringing forth new enthusiasm for the partnership. [ 65 ] In a more systematic rating, programmatic ends did not look to be every bit of import as the meetings with people. In malice of major differences in the worldviews ( i. e. the Germans desiring to make something about the poorness they encountered, and the Africans merely encompassing the partnerships as they were for they had had no other similar experiences ) , and in malice of the partnerships looking to hold had small if any consequence in the life of the larger fold or the church territories, it is reiterated that those most greatly effected were the persons. [ 66 ] Bauerochse labels this a failing, and yet I would situate, is at that place any other degree on which ‘ meaning ‘ is embraced.

Finally, this survey asks inquiries about mission and partnership apprehension in both groups, and though ‘ mission ‘ and ‘ ecumenical ‘ were viewed otherwise by the spouses, they both saw the meetings and the relationships as an opportunity to see integrity. The survey closes on two notes, one that reinforced the credence of the ‘ other ‘ as advantageous and good piece besides admitting that the ‘ other ‘ can easily be regarded as a ‘ subject ‘ OR as person merely like me ; this is, in both instances, a warning of the ever-present unstable nature of partnerships. [ 67 ]

Second, though this really thorough and elaborate study on spouse church relationships between four German church territories and four African church territories and their folds offers cardinal penetrations into how the duplic