Culture, Society and Contextual Theologies

ROBERT J. SCHREITER

Introduction

It has become commonplace at this point in time to insist upon respecting the cultural situation when we engage in the development of theology in a specific context. Called by a variety of different names — inculturation, indigenization, contextualization — this attitude in investigating the cultural context in constructing theologies for a local church or community is now part of the rhetoric, if not always the method, of anyone concerned with developing Christian situations. Haleblian (1983) has chronicled some of the history of these developments. What is certainly clear is that this call to sensitivity is now heard in virtually every branch of the Christian family, albeit with different emphases and suggestions of different approaches.

Why the concern for culture? There seems to be three principal reasons for it. First of all a methodological one: theology does not fall from the sky. While all Christians hope that their theological expression is firmly rooted in biblical witness, they also know that it is shaped by language and concepts, both of which have strong culture-specific components. Thus, a theological expression which may be eminently clear to one culture, or to one generation within a culture, may be less so for another time or place. Even the same word can be understood differently or undergo significant change within a single culture over a period of time. Certainly the controversies which swirled around the use of *physis* and *hypostasis* in fifth and sixth century Christianity, and by extension, our use of "person" to translate that today, are all too poignant examples of what can happen. Bible translators can produce a broad range of examples of the problem of crossing a cultural boundary with a biblical concept. Thus at a very minimum, we need to attend to the question of culture as a context of our means of expression, in order to obviate potential misunderstanding and confusion.

Dr. Robert Schreiter is Dean and Associate Professor of Theology at the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago. He is Associate Editor of Missiology.

The second reason for concern with culture is a more sociological one, brought to our attention by a sociology of knowledge. Theology does not develop in a social vacuum or dwell within some abstract history of ideas. What issues get taken up, which methods are used to address them, and what solutions are considered acceptable reflect at least obliquely the social conditions in which the discussion takes place. This becomes particularly evident in trying to understand what constitutes authority in theological argument. In the tenth century, the Rhenish theologian Notker Balbulus could invoke Augustine as a source of authority to settle any argument ("Si Augustinus adest, sufficit ipse tibi" — if Augustine is there, this is enough for you). But the following century saw such certainty crumble in the wake of the development of dialectic. In the twentieth century, the appeal of a Latin American theologian of liberation to the experience of basic Christian communities as an authoritative theological resource can be met with incomprehension by a continental European academic theologian. And the battles around the use of historical criticism of the Bible are familiar examples to all. While theology is by no means unilaterally determined by historical circumstances, we are coming to realize how great a role environmental influences do indeed play in how our theologies develop. By studying the tensions and needs within a culture, we can come to realize more effectively what kinds of problems will be raised and how they might be resolved most effectively.

The third reason is a more theological one. If we take the notion of the Incarnation seriously, then our theology should reflect the same anti-docetism as does our christology. No matter how much creation and human life has been tainted and twisted by sin, they were nonetheless deemed by God to be seen as a worthy vessel for His revelation in Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is a person who took on the fullness of our own life; He is not a cosmic idea uniting with the concept of humanity. To comprehend what God has done for us in Jesus Christ, and to discern that saving presence in our world today, we must engage ourselves in the same kind of concreteness as does this God of history. We cannot restrict our interaction with culture to what we perceive to be its "religious" dimensions, nor to its realm of ideas alone. The theologies of liberation have certainly taught us that in an eloquent fashion: the totality of culture becomes the stage for God's saving activity. Thus for profoundly theological reasons, we need to attend to culture.

To be sure, this concern for culture is far from new. Already the second century Apologists consciously dealt with the problem of making a Semitic tradition intelligible to Hellenistic audiences. Justin Martyr's speculation on Stoic and Middle Platonic understandings of the Logos provided a basis for translating biblical concepts into a new cultural setting. The recovery of Aristotle's lost works in the early medieval period in the West provided the opportunity for a radical recasting of theology more in tune with the emerging urban and mercantile society. The humanist and Reformation insistence of return to biblical languages helped refresh what had become a tired and often

jaded theology. And historical and philological advances in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries within that same tradition are still being absorbed in Western theology today.

At times, of course, that interaction has led to a culture dominating and blunting the prophetic Word in the Bible. The excesses of medieval Western Christianity, the *Kulturprotestantismus* of late nineteenth-century Germany are painful reminders of what can happen.

Yet in one kind of way, the importance which the concept of culture has taken on for theology and evangelism today is somewhat new for Christianity. The Apologists and the Alexandrines were really only addressing the educated stratum of their societies. The writings of Western medieval mystics give clear indication that the theology of the universities did not give voice to the full range of experience in medieval Christianity. And how can one account for the rise of pietism in northern Germany or evangelicalism in England if the theology of the established churches was truly conscious of the full range of issues which the culture was presenting?

H. Richard Niebuhr (1951) has given us paradigmatic formulations of how Christ and culture relate, rethought by Kraft (1979) in terms of cultural anthropology. Tillich (1959), among others, has tried to think the theological implications of culture. What this paper hopes to do is to explore a bit further the impact of the culture concept on our attempts to develop theology in local situations. At this point, taking culture seriously has become *de rigeur* for theology. But what are the assumptions behind this move? And where will this decision really lead us? Still much of the theology being done under the banner of cultural sensitivity is mainly rhetorical; i.e., it speaks of what needs to be done rather than actually doing it. But if we really follow out cultural sensitivity as a procedure, what kind of theology will emerge? What will its preoccupations and problems be?

Three Basic Questions

These considerations evoke many questions, and all of them could not begin to be treated here. I would like to concentrate on just three questions, which sketch something of the beginning, middle and end of the range of issues entailed:

1. What constitutes the cultural unit for developing theology?

Anyone who has been engaged in the contextualization of the Christian message knows that this is an immediate problem. What are the boundaries within which one is to operate? Is it the immediate clan or village? The language group? The region or nation? Is it the basic Christian community, a larger congregational unit or the national church? In other words, where does the cultural unit end which one has to take into consideration? No one seems to have found a satisfactory solution to this problem. The debates that continue around homogeneous unit principles of church growth are indicative of that, as are Roman Catholic concerns about what happens to universality

when such attention is paid to particularity. What I will try to address here is where our assumptions about culture might be coming from, and how they influence in turn our answering of these questions.

2. *Is culture the best category to use?*

Particularly, African theologians in the Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians (EATWOT) have challenged the assumption that culture is the appropriate category with which we should be working (1979). Does too much concern with the intricacies of *culture* not result in an antiquarian ethnography which does not address or analyze the pressing problems of domination and oppression so present in the world today? Would not *society,* that is, the interaction of persons and groups, economic and political forces, be a more suitable category for developing theology? Does not an analysis of culture create a theology based on realities being obscured or superseded by technological and urban advancement? This is a serious question which cannot be sidestepped.

3. *What are some of the characteristics of a culturally or socially sensitive theology?*

If we want to move beyond rhetoric, will these new theologies look like the ones we are used to? How will they use the Bible? What will be their impact on evangelism and the development of basic Christian communities and national churches? Some envisioning of what might happen may help promote the process whereby they will come about.

Cultural Assumptions Behind the Cultural Unit

Western understanding and appreciation of cultural diversity goes back at least as far as the Greek historian Hesiod. But the understandings of culture most pertinent to the discussions here date more from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Specifically, three different currents come together.

The first merges the concept of culture with the concept of civilization. One finds this particularly prominent in Enlightenment cultures in France and Germany in the eighteenth centuries (Elias 1939; cf. also Lemaire 1976). In this context, culture is something achieved in human society: a level of refinement in art, literature, music and philosophy which reflects the best of the human species. In English, this reflects one meaning of the word *culture;* namely, that aspect of artistic and intellectual development of a people. This is sometimes also referred to as *high culture*.

While this understanding of the culture concept has served as the basis for a theology relating to one stratum of a society, it will not be our immediate concern here. In many parts of the world today, to restrict cultural sensitivity to this dimension would smack of an unacceptable elitism. However, inasmuch as these products are genuine expressions of a people's sensibilities, they should not be excluded from the reflective process which creates a theology.

A second understanding is one perhaps the most common in the English-speaking world, deriving particularly from the work of Tylor (1871) who combined ethnographic description with an evolutionary framework. In this approach, there is a progression from a simpler or more primitive configuration of social life, to a more complex or advanced configuration. While the late nineteenth century may have seen this approach as one which allowed for an accounting of the diversity and the relationship between cultures, by the mid-twentieth century it was to come under direct attack, notably by Claude Lévi-Strauss (1962). From the perspective of the late twentieth century, one can now be somewhat amused how the more advanced culture was always represented by the ethnographer, rather than the people studied.

The ethnography initiated by Tylor professed to be both comprehensive (i.e., taking in all aspects of the social life of a people) and commonsense (i.e., attending especially to the empirical data available to any observer). It did not expend much energy on trying to establish the foundations for its method. Rather, it saw its task as describing what was available for all to see. While this produced a mass of great and rich detail, those same data were easily prey to be seen in configurations more reflective of the ethnographer's culture than of those being described. Hence, it is not surprising, although still dismaying, to see Tylor periodically ridiculing the cultures he describes.

Although this second understanding has been the most influential in the English-speaking world through the development of functionalism, we need to turn to the third understanding to discover some of the assumptions which inform our culture concepts, and therefore our sense of cultural units.

This third understanding grows out of the Enlightenment, but mainly in reaction to it. One finds it expressed strongly in the work of Giambattista Vico, *La Scienza nuova* (1725; 1952), but perhaps more importantly for our purposes here in the work of Johann Gottfried Herder. While Vico is the older of the two, it was Herder's work on history and language which influenced thinking in the nineteenth century German universities profoundly, and so had a direct impact upon our own century. Herder seems to have known of Vico's work, but had developed his own thoughts independently of him. It is to Herder that we wish to turn here.

Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803) was a man of eclectic interests and learning. The results of that learning, as found especially in his *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* (1784-91) are not systematic, but attempt rather to broaden horizons on how to approach the question of human history. His writings can be read as a reaction to the universalizing concepts of the Enlightenment philosophers. Herder felt that one cannot take a single pattern of categories, and then impose it upon the history of peoples. Rather, each people needs to be studied according to its own inner dynamic and historical evolution. Each history of a people represents an innerly coherent pattern of action, and so to impose the pattern of Reason from the outside will only lead to misinterpretation. One must begin with a study of the people and

let categories emerge from the study. Herder was fascinated with the pluralism of human life, and felt that writing human history no longer could mean simply a history of the West; to this end, he included histories of China and India in his *Ideen*. Nor could one hope to study language by applying Renaissance grammatical concepts derived from Greek and Latin to newly discovered languages. Each language might have its own grammatical structure, which would reveal best the inner workings of that language.

While such a brief sketch does not do justice to the luxuriant character of Herder's thought, it does point to elements which continue to influence how we think about culture today. The results of his programmatic *Ideen* provided the wellspring of a tradition which would run counter to the project of the Enlightenment. The Enlightenment was to become the progenitor of the primacy of reason in Western culture, with its attendant developments in mathematics, natural science and technology, Herder's counterstroke provides the impetus for romanticism, concern for the particular, and more psychologistic modes of inquiry. The implications of Herder's emphasis need to be set out in more detail.

A key assumption arising from Herder's work is that the real or the genuine is to be found in the particular, not in the universal. Thus, whatever reveals to us the particular will reveal the real as well. The distrust of Cartesian method and the Enlightenment's prostration before the altar of Reason is much in evidence here. In the German academy, Herder's influence can be seen in three areas.

1. History comes to be a more particularist enterprise. History of individual peoples, rather than histories of the world, come to take precedence. This is evident in the great historical projects undertaken in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Germany, such as Burckhardt's famous history of Renaissance Italy (1860; 1890), Moeser's *Osnabrückische Geschichte* (1780) or the works of the historians Nitzsch (1892) and Freytag (1892). Related to this historiography of peoples is an attempt to get at their unique identity. In German historiography, this expressed itself as a concern for the *Volk* or *Volksgeist,* as reflected in such works as Karl Lamprecht's *Deutsche Geschichte* (1891f; see also Weintraub 1966:166-174). Today we would be more likely to speak of the special or specific values of a culture or the uniqueness of a culture, but the ancestry of such an approach lies with this concern for the *Volksgeist* in the nineteenth century.

2. Hermeneutics takes a psychologistic turn. If the real is to be found in the particular, then it becomes important to probe deeper into that particular. Language is studied on the basis of its own forms, with dialects becoming a manifestation. And the mind or intention of the author becomes the key to understanding the meaning of a text. Inner criteria come to predominate over exterior (or universal) ones. The rational must make room for partners such as feelings, unconscious motives and intuitions. Wilhelm Dilthey was to pick up these threads and weave them into a theory of great interpretive power, one which was to influence strongly twentieth century biblical criticism. He

crystallized this distinction of outer and inner in his distinction between natural sciences and the humanities (*Natur-* and *Geisteswissenschaften*); namely, that to inquire into human areas requires an entirely different method than the one used in the inquiry into the physical universe. The groundwork for distinguishing nature and culture was complete.[1]

3. Anthropology becomes an independent mode of inquiry. This same thing was happening in Great Britain, but the developments in Germany concentrated more on the discovery of meaning. This was to be brought to the United States by Franz Boas, and is evident in the concerns of his students for discerning the patterns in culture (one thinks of Ruth Benedict in this regard). The connecting of anthropology with the study of meaning was to lay the groundwork for the growth of the symbolic anthropology movements in the United States beginning in the 1950's, but growing especially strong in the 1970's and 80's (Singer 1984:39). Among anthropologists in Germany, the search for the cultural unit can be seen in the *Kulturkreislehre* of Wilhelm Schmidt and Leo Frobenius.

Now what does all of this have to do with the cultural unit? Let us begin by reviewing the assumptions which move behind this third understanding of culture:

1. To move from the general to the particular will obscure the revelation of genuine meaning. It will, in fact, result in an intellectual hegemony by the culture which puts forward the so-called universal concept. There is, therefore, a suspicion of universals, and therefore an implicit trust in pluralism. But the more pluralism is seen as the paradigmatic, the more nominalist becomes the methods and the descriptions.

2. The unconscious or irrational is at least as important, if not more important, than the conscious or rational in determining cultural meaning. Thus, looking only to the articulated provides but a partial disclosure of cultural meaning.

3. Because particularity is the prime category, that particularity has to be caught in all its fullness. Hence, there is an emphasis on holist description, intended to capture the totality of culture, and not simply certain expressions of it. Clifford Geertz's "thick description" may be the best known example of this attempt at holistic description (1973:3-30).

And now to respond to the question: this third understanding of culture, imbued with the romantic spirit of Herder and nineteenth century life, ends up militating against the very things it tries to preserve in culture: particularity, individuality and totality. The distrust of universal categories makes the development of cross-cultural categories more difficult. The concern for interiority means the full reality is never articulated, and therefore never available fully for common discourse. And the quest for totality militates against drawing of any boundaries which might permit closer observation. Since I think it would be fair to say that the cultural sensitivity advocated in this third understanding supports much of what is going on in the contextualization of theology, one has to then ask what really does determine

the boundaries of the cultural unit for contextualization. I would suggest that it ends up not being anything internal to the culture itself, but rather is developed out of the interests of those involved in forming the theology. In other words, a theory of culture developed along the lines of this third understanding cannot provide its own criteria for boundaries; they have to be derived from elsewhere. Thus, one hits upon homogeneous unit principles, artificially drawn national boundaries or denominational differences imported from Europe and the United States as the bases for determination of the units for contextualization. I think that theologians outside Europe and North America have suspected as much, and for that reason have questioned the emphasis on the culture concept in the contextualization of theology. This brings us to the second question.

Culture or Society as the Basic Concept?

Given the suggestions made in the previous section, perhaps theologians of a liberation persuasion are correct: one should make society the basic concept for the contextualization of theology, rather than culture. The arguments which can be adduced for this position are impressive ones. With the increasing urbanization of the planet, what counts more in the day-to-day lives of most people (and therefore should be central to the reflective process of theology) is the interaction of groups and social forces in the environment. Many of the customs, symbols and celebrations so dear to cultural analysts are often left behind in the *campos* or the bush when rural peoples move to the cities. The average age of a Christian today is the mid-teens; how much do these know of the old ways? And concerns for the old ways deflect from the conscientization of communities and individuals about their own power in Latin America or from the gnawing pains of hunger in Africa. Is perhaps the interest in culture but a conservative ploy of those church leaders who do not want to face the social realities of their people?

At another level, is not the ambivalence toward social analysis and the preference for cultural analysis but the latest variant upon Christianity's ambivalence toward the world? Starting with the comments about "the world" in the Johannine writings of the Bible, through the uneasy relations of church and world in the early Church and the *fuga mundi* of the monks and the sectarians of the Radical Reformation, Christians have maintained an ambivalent relation with the world. The working through of these complexities is found in all those discussions of church bodies about politics and political action on the part of church people.

The debate of cultural versus social analysis is not restricted to Christian theology. A similar discussion went on in the 1950's between anthropologists and sociologists. The history of those discussions is too complex to recount here (see Kroeber and Parsons 1958); suffice it to say that those discussions led to seeing a complementarity between the ideas of cultural and social systems. But that notion of complementarity suggests one solution to the question for the contextualization of theology.

One could define the task of the contextualization of theology as twofold: to help shape Christian identity and to help respond to the need for social change. Cultural analysis has a particular strength in uncovering that which is enduring through time and change which can give a people that sense of sameness or identity. Developments in symbolic or semiotic anthropology (e.g., Singer 1984) point particularly to the role of symbols in shaping human community. In view of the fact that so much of Christian theology is tied up with symbols and metaphors (e.g., the metaphors and symbols for salvation: redemption, justification, the cross and so on), these anthropological approaches are particularly apt for use in the contextualization of theology. No matter what happens to a community, or how the sense of identity might change, there is a need to return to those questions of what make us who we are.

Social change, a fact in most parts of the world, calls for particular attention to the interaction of groups and social forces. The urgency and the gravity of responding to oppression, exploitation and rapid social change in general will no doubt call for a special set of tools especially attuned to these interactions. Debate continues about what sociological tools provide the best means of analysis, particularly given the reluctance of some Christians to revert to methodologies related to Marxism.[2] Yet what others are available which take change seriously and do not see it merely as deviation from some homeostatic state? This is certainly one of the most important questions facing Christian theology and evangelism today. Models of social change cannot presume a return to some previous state once the turbulence is over.

Thus what is being suggested is that the mode of analysis, cultural or social, will be determined by the current state of need in a situation. Ultimately, both are needed, since too rapid a social change can destroy a society as readily as too great an inflexibility in the face of change. An example of the need for both can be found in developments in liberation theology. In 1971 Gustavo Gutierrez published his *Theology of Liberation,* which presented a social analysis of what had been happening in Latin America. To a great extent, it was already then a reporting of past events to the rest of the world in language which the northern hemisphere might be able to understand. Concurrent with this was a quest for a suitable spirituality of liberation, i.e., an integration of these new realities into the identity of a community. The popular piety of the people was investigated, and the stories of the people were listened to by the theologian in search for guideposts to this new spirituality. An example of this is a recent volume by Gutierrez himself (1984).

Both cultural and social analysis need to be attended to in the contextualization of a theology. The priority of one over the other will be determined by the immediate needs of a community: consolidation of identity or response to change?

Characteristics of a Contextual Theology

Can we look ahead to see what some of the characteristics of a theology

more sensitive to cultural and social issues might look like? Such a look ahead has its hazards but from the contextual theologies already emerging, three things deserve to be noted here.

1. Theology will reflect more of a wisdom tradition.

Theology has been cast into many genres in its long history in Christianity. Since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, there has been a bias in western Christianity for theology as *scientia* or sure knowledge. Clarity, certitude and precision are characteristics of this theology, which finds its most comfortable home in the academy.

What seems to be happening in many parts of the world, however, is the development of a theology closer to the older traditions of *sapientia* or wisdom. Instead of theology improving the quality of one's knowledge, theology is seen as a path to wisdom and contemplation of the Godhead. In its forms turned outward, as in liberation theologies, wisdom theologies are concerned with the unity of life, the unity of theory and practice. Whether looking inward or ahead to the realization of the fullness of the promise of God's Kingdom, wisdom theologies are preoccupied with experience — the internal experience of spiritual growth or the external experience of the cause of justice. Narrative and the recounting of experience are prime vehicles of this kind of theology. If one looks to the kind of theology being practiced in basic Christian communities, one will find this type going on.

This wisdom theology is certainly not without precedent; the Johannine literature of the Bible, much of the theology of the Patristic period, mystical theology in East and West have all continued that tradition. But it is going to lead to difficulties in communication with the older churches (and their schools of theology) in the West, where the *scientia* model is predominant. I have dealt with the problems of the relationships between these two forms elsewhere (Schreiter 1978), but would suggest that the communication difficulties between the two need to be continued to be explored, inasmuch as they have an impact on how national and international church policy come to be formed.

2. Oral and written forms of theology.

Recent studies on oral forms of communication versus written forms (Ong 1982; Kelber 1983) are raising questions for those interested in assessing the growth of contextual theologies. These studies are pointing out how these different forms of communication cannot be reduced to each other, but represent fundamentally different ways of organizing thought. What impact does this have on contextual theologies, particularly in all those areas of the world where orality is predominant? It is probably too early to assess these differences and what they will mean. We know that much of the theology of liberation is and has been oral and never written down. Now we must ask: Is "being written down" the final stage of a theology or only the final stage of one kind of theology? This question deserves more treatment than the mere

raising of the issue given here. Reformers have long known the power of hymnody for illiterate peoples. Are we in a position now to start looking at the question in a different way?

3. The point of departure for theology.

Theologies tend to have an explicit or implicit point of reference. Creation stood at the center of theology for medieval scholastics, whereas Luther called for putting Christ at the center of theological reflection. The Church as the *mystagogia* for the Christian can be found at the center for some Orthodox theology. While none of these positions contradicts the other, they are a matter of emphasis, an emphasis shaped to a great extent by circumstances. What circumstances shape some of the newer contextual theologies?

I would suggest that the experience of community, either the community of the family or the community of the basic Christian community, is providing the point of departure for these theologies. Thus the shared experience of the Word of God and the common celebration of sacraments will form a special point of departure. Ecclesiology, then, becomes the keystone for theology, for the interpretation of the Scriptures and for Christian action. This again will create a difference from more recent experience of Christianity in Europe and North America, but will be another area of communication with which Europeans and North Americans will have to deal.

Conclusion

Our commitments to taking culture seriously in the processes of evangelization and development of Christian community are indeed sincere. Yet we need to continue to explore the implications of our doing so, for the sake of being faithful to both the commitments to those cultures and especially also to the Gospel. Some of those implications in the contextualization have been explored here; others have only been alluded to. It is hoped that this will help promote that necessary dialogue.

Notes

1. See especially the essays in the seventh volume of his *Gesammelte Schriften,* as well as his correspondence with Graf Yorck von Wartenburg.

2. A recent example is the review of liberation theology given by Josef Cardinal Ratzinger of the Vatican Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith (Ratzinger 1984). While a private interpretation by the Cardinal, it necessarily has greater significance than that, given his position. A major problem he has with the theology of liberation is its use of Marxian analysis, which he associates with class struggle. While class struggle is certainly a part of classical Marxism, it would seem dangerous to reduce all of a complex system of thought to a single premise. It would be similar to saying that Aquinas should not have used Aristotle because of the Aristotelian doctrine of the eternity of the world.

References Cited

Appiah-Kubi, Kofi and Sergio Torres (eds)
    1979   *African Theology en Route* Maryknoll: Orbis Books

Burckhardt, Jakob
1860   *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien* Leipzig: E. A. Seamann

Dilthey, Wilhelm
1914ff   *Gesammelte Schriften* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner

Elias, Norbert
1939   *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation* Bern: Francke

Freytag, Gustav
1892   *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit* Leipzig: S. Hirzel

Geertz, Clifford
1973   *The Interpretation of Cultures* New York: Basic Books

Gutierrez, Gustavo
1972   *A Theology of Liberation* Maryknoll: Orbis Books

Gutierrez, Gustavo
1984   *We Drink from Our Own Wells* Maryknoll: Orbis Books

Haleblian, Krikor
1983   "The Problem of Contextualization" *Missiology* 11:95-111

Herder, Johann Gottfried von
1784f.   *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* Riga: J. F. Hartknoch

Kelber, Werner
1983   *The Oral and the Written Gospel* Philadelphia: Fortress

Kraft, Charles
1979   *Christianity in Culture* Maryknoll: Orbis

Kroeber, Alfred and Talcott Parsons
1958   "The Concepts of Culture and of Social System" *American Sociological Review* 23:582-583

Lamprecht, Karl Gotthard
1891f.   *Deutsche Geschichte* Berlin: R. Gaertner

Lemaire, Ton
1976   *Over de waarde van kulturen* Baarn: Amboboeken

Lévi-Strauss, Claude
1962   *La Pensée sauvage* Paris: Plon

Moeser, Justus
1780   *Osnabrückische Geschichte* Berlin: F. Nicolai

Niebuhr, H. Richard
1951   *Christ and Culture* New York: Harper and Row

Ong, Walter
1982   *Orality and Literacy* New York: Methuen

Ratzinger, Josef Cardinal
1984   "Equivoci della teologia della liberazione" *Trenta Giorni* (March 3, 1984) 48-55

Schreiter, Robert
1978   "Theologie in context: Naar een sociologie van de theologie" *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 18:3-24

Singer, Milton
1984   *Man's Glassy Essence: Explorations in Semiotic Anthropology* Bloomington: Indiana University Press

Tillich, Paul
   1959   *Theology of Culture* New York: Oxford University Press

Tylor, Edward Burnett
   1871   *Primitive Culture* London: J. Murray

Vico, Giambattista
   1725   *La Scienza nuova* Bari (Facsimile Milano: Mondadori, 1952)

Weintraub, Karl
   1966   *Visions of Culture* Chicago: University of Chicago Press