

THE REFORMERS AND MISSIONS: WARNECK, LATOURETTE, NEILL, KANE, WINTER, AND TUCKER'S ARGUMENTS – PART 2

*Elias Medeiros**

ABSTRACT

Since the nineteenth and the early twentieth century, mission historians such as Gustav Warneck and Kenneth Scott Latourette have tended to portray the Protestant reformers as indifferent to foreign missions or world missions. The author describes the reasoning of such historians and argues that they and several of their more recent disciples do not deal adequately with the primary sources. All too often, many of them simply rely on secondary sources and do not make the effort to evaluate the original documentation that might provide a different perspective on the subject. In so doing, they help to perpetuate an unjustified bias against the reformers and missions. It is imperative to assert the importance the reformers attributed to the universal spread of the gospel and the reasons they were not so emphatic about missions as compared to later generations of Protestants.

KEYWORDS

Protestant reformers; Foreign missions; Martin Luther; John Calvin; Gustav Warneck; Kenneth S. Latourette.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the previous article and this article is to investigate the statements and the reasoning of Warneck, Latourette, Neill, Kane, Winter, and

* Elias dos Santos Medeiros earned his master (M.A., Th.M.) and doctoral (D.Min., D.Miss., Ph.D.) degrees from Reformed Theological Seminary, in Jackson, Mississippi. He is a lecturer of Missions at this seminary and a visiting professor at Andrew Jumper Graduate Center. He authored the book *Evangelization and Pastoral Ministry*. The first part of the article was published in *Fides Reformata* XVIII-1 (2013).

Tucker regarding the reformers and “missions.” This present article continues the study of the subject in the previous article (Part 1), highlighting Warneck’s arguments against the apparent “silence” of the reformers, and adding final comments on the main arguments of the other mission historians and on their own silence regarding the necessary documentation to support their claims against the reformers.

1. WARNECK’S ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE SILENCE OF THE REFORMERS

Most of Warneck’s critiques are directed toward the sixteenth-century Lutheran theologians, especially Martin Luther.¹ Ten out of sixteen and a half small print pages on the subject are critiques of Martin Luther (1483-1546) and Philip Melancthon (1497-1560). Warneck dedicates one page to Martin Bucer (1491-1551) and Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), one and a half pages to John Calvin (1509-1564), one and a half pages to Adrianus Saravia (ca. 1532-1613), and a half page to Theodore Beza (1519-1605).

Throughout his chapter dealing with the Reformation, Warneck supports several verdicts. He clearly states that the reformers in general, with the exception of Adrianus Saravia, were devoid of any “missionary action,” lacked “missionary zeal,” were strangely silent on “the recognition of the missionary obligation,” darkened “the permanent missionary task of the church,” did not speak of “foreign mission work,” had “no proper missionary ideas” due to their eschatological position and their concept of history, understood “the missionary commandment [of Matthew 28:20]” as being “valid only for the Apostles,” knew nothing about “the duty of instituting missions,” did not recognize “such a duty,” and assumed that “a special institution for the extension of Christianity among non-Christian nations, *i.e.* for missions, is needless.”²

Warneck’s arguments can be classified under biblical, theological, and historical categories. In the biblical category is the interpretation and the implications of the so-called missionary texts, Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15; Luke 24:46-48; John 20:21; Acts 1:8; 12:21; 26:16-18 (including the views on the apostolate). The theological category includes the doctrines of predestination, eschatology, and the sovereignty of God: “The kingdom of Christ is neither to be advanced

¹ Numerous Lutheran scholars have already addressed the issue of Martin Luther and missions. See, for instance, Klaus Detlve Schulz, “Lutheran Missiology of the 16th and 17th Centuries,” in *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 43:1 (March 2003), 4-53; Ingemar Öberg, *Luther and World Mission: A Historical and Systematic Study with Special Reference to Luther’s Bible Exposition*, translated by Dean Apel (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2007); James A. Scherer, “Luther and Mission: A Rich but Untested Potential,” in *Missio Apostolica: Journal of the Lutheran Society of Missiology* 2 (May 1997): 17-24, reprinted in *Luther Digest: An Annual Abridgement of Luther Studies* 5 (1997): 62-68; Rhonda J. Hoehn, “Martin Luther and Mission...”

² Gustav Warneck, *Outline of a History of Protestant Missions from the Reformation to the Present Time*. 3rd ed. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1906, 8-23.

nor maintained by the industry of men, but this is the work of God alone.”³ Under the historical instances Warneck includes the attempt of “the planting of a French colony in Brazil” in 1555. He does not, however, consider this undertaking to be a church initiative, explaining it instead as part of “the ecclesiastical duty of the civil authority; in particular, of the colonial civil authority.”⁴

Warneck concluded that the reformers were silent concerning the work of missions (the sending of “missionaries” to non-Christians) and that the primary causes were their theological beliefs and their interpretation of the “missionary” texts. Under the biblical arguments, Warneck asserts that the reformers, with the exception of Adrianus Saravia,⁵ held the following views regarding the “Great Commission” texts: they always thought of “τὰ ἔθνη in the sense of the Christian nations who have sprung from the heathen;”⁶ even when they (especially Luther) maintained the emphasis on “the universality of Christianity”, it is “never set in connection with a summons to send messengers of the Gospel where its message has not yet come;”⁷ such “world-wide preaching of the Gospel... is regarded by him [Luther] as accomplished;”⁸ and “the missionary commandment [was] valid only for the Apostles.”⁹

³ Ibid., 20. The doctrines of predestination and the sovereignty of God were one of the key doctrinal issues behind Warneck’s arguments against the reformers and their “silent” regarding “the Christianization of the world,” as Warneck defines it.

⁴ Ibid., 23. Unfortunately Warneck does not use a primary source that reports the “missionary” journey of Reformed ministers sent from Geneva. He instead uses William Brown’s *The History of the Christian Missions of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, Eighteenth, and Nineteenth Centuries*, 3 Volumes (London: Ober Against Charterhouse, 1864). His quotation from page 7 of Brown’s first volume appears to be a mistake, since that page does not deal with the mission enterprise in Brazil. The first chapter, pages 1-6, of Brown’s work discourses on the “Propagation of Christianity by the Swiss: Brazil.” Warneck’s statement that “four clergymen ... actually made the journey” (Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 23) is also a mistake based on an apparent superficial reading of Brown on Jean de Léry’s document. This shows that Warneck’s critique of the “French colony in Brazil,” besides being very superficial, does not represent the reality of that “missionary” endeavor.

⁵ Warneck comments on Adrianus Saravia’s treatise of 1590, *De diversis ministrorum evangelii gradibus, sic ut a Domino fuerunt instituti* [Concerning the different orders of the ministry of the Gospel, as they were instituted by the Lord], by saying that “it is not indeed a directly missionary treatise, but it deals with missions in a special chapter, in which he adduces proof that the Apostles themselves could only have carried out the missionary command in a very limited measure, and therefore this command applied not merely to them personally, but to the whole Church in all subsequent times” (Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 20). Warneck recognizes that Saravia was defending “the episcopal constitution over against the Calvinistic” and that Saravia speaks of “missions” when he argues for the planting of new churches beyond “the maintenance and strengthening of existing” ones (Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 21).

⁶ Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 12.

⁷ Ibid., 12.

⁸ Ibid., 14.

⁹ Ibid., 17.

It seems that no comment of Luther would convince Warneck of the reformer's vision for preaching the gospel to all nations. Warneck always finds a way to dismiss his "mission" ideas. An example is his quoting the following from one of Luther's Ascension sermons:

"Go into all the world" raises a question ... as to how it is to be understood and held fast, since verily the Apostles have not come into all the world, for no Apostle has come to us, and also many islands have been discovered in our day where the people are heathen and no one has preached to them: yet the scripture saith their voice has sounded forth into all lands. Answer; their preaching has gone out into all the world, though it has not yet come into all the world. That outgoing has been begun and gone on, though it has not yet been fulfilled and accomplished; but there will be further and wider preaching until the last day. When the Gospel has been preached, heard, published through the whole world, then the commission shall have been fulfilled, and then the last day shall come.¹⁰

Warneck even declares that "these and similar sayings... are repeatedly found" throughout Luther's writings. After quoting Luther, however, and making such statements regarding his writings, Warneck immediately dismisses the Reformer's commitment to the preaching of the gospel to the nations by claiming "here again there is no reference to any systematic enterprise."¹¹

Another clear example of his preconceived attitude toward the reformers is observed in Warneck's comments on Zwingli's position. Warneck quotes the reformer: "[There are apostles still, and] their office is ever to go among the unbelieving, and to turn them to the faith, while the bishop remains stationary by those committed to his care."¹² He also highlights Zwingli's express assertion that the New Testament apostles "did not go everywhere; and he [Zwingli] infers from this that the work of world-missions which was begun by them must be continued."¹³ Saying that Zwingli "does not draw the conclusions" (perhaps, to send missionaries?), the German missiologist then offers the following theoretical conclusion:

At best his view can be thus explained: if in the present time messengers are willing to go at their own risk beyond the bounds of Christendom, they ought to be certain that they have the call of God to their mission, but in what he says there is not a word as to the duty on the part of the church to send out missionaries.¹⁴

Warneck falls prey to one of his own criticisms toward scholars who defend the missionary ideas of the reformers. He earlier dismisses scholars

¹⁰ Ibid., 14

¹¹ Ibid., 14.

¹² Ibid., 19.

¹³ Ibid., 19.

¹⁴ Ibid., 19.

who try “by isolated quotations, principally from the writings of Luther ... to disprove” the theory that the reformers were not interested in missions. Warneck continues his reasoning by saying,

On closer examination these quotations do not bear out what they are meant to prove; and less and less has the fact come to be called in question that the insight into the permanent missionary task of the church was really darkened in the case of the Reformers.¹⁵

Does not Warneck do that as well? Does not he use some isolated quotations without serious exegetical consideration of the contexts and doctrinal presuppositions, to make startling claims against the reformers? The same occurs when he considers the case of the Huguenots in Brazil, failing to explore the original work of Jean de Léry and others, but merely assuming the report and conclusions of the nineteenth century mission historian and pastor William Brown.

One of Warneck’s main criticisms of Calvin is for the reformer’s view that the apostolate is a *munus extraordinarium* (extraordinary office) “which as such has not been perpetuated in the Christian church”¹⁶ and that “the Kingdom of Christ is neither to be advanced nor maintained by the industry of men, but this is the work of God alone.”¹⁷ Warneck then turns back to the argument of silence, contending that such silence is one factor that led the reformers to view any “special institution for the extension of Christianity among non-Christians” as “needless.”¹⁸

Warneck, however, does not take into account the controversies of Calvin’s time. Part of George Robson’s editorial comments on Warneck’s criticism of Calvin reveals some nuances within the context of the reformer. Robson writes:

The sound exegesis, historic insight, largeness of view, and fine regard to the general scope of the passage, which distinguished Calvin as a commentator, have not failed him in his exposition of these words of the Risen Lord; but they are polarised by the controversies of his time. And so the words of our Lord are shown to be in clear and broad antagonism to certain Romish and Anabaptist teachings.¹⁹

A careful reading of Calvin’s comments on Matthew 28:16-20; Mark 16:15-20; and Luke 24:50-53 would have given the German missiologist a more precise picture of the biblically grounded “missionary” enthusiasm of the reformer of Geneva. Calvin’s statements on Matthew 28:20 offer an example.

¹⁵ Ibid., 9.

¹⁶ Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 19.

¹⁷ Ibid., 20.

¹⁸ Ibid., 20.

¹⁹ Robson’s editorial comment in a footnote. Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 20.

“Teach all nations.” Here Christ, by removing the distinction, makes the Gentiles equal to the Jews, and admits both, indiscriminately to a participation in the covenant. Such is also the import of the term: go “out;” for the prophets under the law had limits assigned to them, but now, “the wall of partition having been broken down” (Ephesians 2:14), *the Lord commands the ministers of the gospel to go to a distance, in order to spread the doctrine of salvation in every part of the world.* For though, as we have lately suggested, the right of the first-born at the very commencement of the gospel, remained among the Jews, still the inheritance of life was common to the Gentiles. Thus was fulfilled that prediction of Isaiah (49:6) and others of a similar nature, that Christ. was “given for a light of the Gentiles, that he might be the salvation of God to the end of the earth.”²⁰

Consider also Calvin’s application based on the same passage:

“Even to the end of the world.” It ought likewise to be remarked, that this was not spoken to the apostles alone; for the Lord promises his assistance not for a single age only, but “even to the end of the world.” It is as if he had said, that though the ministers of the gospel be weak and suffer the want of all things: he will be their guardian, so that they will rise victorious over all the opposition of the world. In like manner, experience clearly shows in the present day, that the operations of Christ are carried on wonderfully in a secret manner, so that the gospel surmounts innumerable obstacles.²¹

Even though the reformers were not explicit in the application of Matthew 28:18-20 due to their anti-Catholic and anti-Anabaptist postures, it would not necessarily and logically follow that they were silent or anti-mission at all. A person’s opposition to the creation or establishment of missionary organizations or mission agencies for the recruiting, supporting, and sending of “missionaries,” does not imply that he or she opposes the preaching of the gospel to all nations nor the planting of churches among all peoples. It may simply mean that the person believes the church is the only means instituted by God for that endeavor and that ordained ministers of the gospel are the ones to preach the gospel everywhere according to God’s sovereign choosing and leading. After all, that was the case in the church of Antioch of Syria:

Now in the church that was at Antioch there were certain prophets and teachers: Barnabas, Simeon who was called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, *the Holy Spirit said*, “Now separate to Me Barnabas and Saul *for the work to which I have called them.*”²²

²⁰ Calvin on Matthew 28:20. Italics added.

²¹ Ibid. Italics added.

²² Acts 13:1-2. Italics added.

Very closely related to the “apostolate” subject is the case of Adrianus Saravia, which has been used out of proportion as an argument against the reformers in general. George Robson, the editor of Warneck’s history, made a relevant observation regarding this matter.

What ought to be noticed is that neither Erasmus nor Saravia, to whom Dr. Warneck afterwards refers, saw the missionary duty of the church in such a light as to make it matter of a special treatise or of a distinct call to action. Their views on missions were expressed incidentally, by the one in a treatise dealing with homiletics, by the other in a treatise dealing with Church polity.²³

Most of those critiques referred not to the reformers’ interpretation of the biblical passages, but the application of such passages to “missions.” But to conclude that someone does not apply a passage in a particular way does not mean that the scholar is purposely opposing other applications of the passage. When Calvin, for instance, deals with the so-called Great Commission texts, his concerns have to do with the controversies of his time and “so the words of our Lord are shown to be in clear and broad antagonism to certain Romish and Anabaptist teachings.”²⁴ This does not mean that Calvin was purposely silent and opposed to the evangelization of the world. Without exegeting Calvin more carefully in his context, Warneck simply concluded that his apparent silence meant opposition to the spread of the gospel to the whole world. Unfortunately, Warneck did not explore all of Calvin’s theology of the sovereignty of God, nor any other numerous texts in which he explicitly teaches about the preaching of the gospel to the whole world.

A superficial look at John Knox and his ministry in Scotland during the sixteenth century may suggest that Knox did not care for the spreading of the gospel in other lands. Besides his declaration to Queen Mary against the Roman Catholic Church, the other most quoted and publicized words of John Knox are “Give me Scotland or I die.” What is overlooked is that Knox and his colleagues were very concerned with the evangelization of the world, in spite

²³ See footnote 1, page 9, of Warneck’s *Outline of a History*. Adrianus Saravia was not criticizing the reformers. The title of Chapter XVII of Saravia’s book is this: “The command to preach the gospel to all nations is still binding on the church, although the apostles are removed to heaven: and apostolic authority is necessary thereto” (1840, 161). When carefully read, we immediately realize that he follows the same exegetical principle of John Calvin when dealing with Matthew 28:20. Saravia writes: “The command to preach the Gospel and the mission to all nations were so given to the Apostles, that they must be understood to be binding on the Church also. The injunction to preach the Gospel to all nations of unbelievers had respect not only to the age of the Apostles, but to all ages to come till the end of the world” (161). Saravia’s 276-page tract appeared in 1590 and was first printed in England in 1591. On July 9, 1590, Saravia was “incorporated at Oxford being before D.D. of the University of Leyden” (Preface of the translator, v). This treatise was about ecclesiastical polity or church government. Saravia was not criticizing the reformers regarding the subject of missions.

²⁴ See George Robson, footnote 1, page 20, in Warneck’s *Outline of a History*.

of the conditions of the Reformation in Scotland and the “practically excluded opportunity or room for the consideration of the duty of the church to the heathen world.”²⁵ The Scottish Confession of 1560 ends with this prayer: “Arise (O Lord) and let thy enemies be confounded; let them flee from thy presence that hate thy godlie Name. Give thy servands strenth to speake thy word in bauldnesse, and let all Natiouns cleave to thy trew knowlege. Amen.”²⁶

Under the theological arguments, Warneck asserts that the reformers’ doctrines of predestination (sovereign grace) and eschatology “paralyze every thought of missionary work among them [the heathen and the Jews].”²⁷ Warneck goes on to quote the reformers and make inferences without considering the context in which they were addressing such affirmations. He claims that the doctrine of election led the reformers to the following conclusions: “God Himself cares for the extension of the Gospel through the world,”²⁸ “a human missionary agency does not lie in the plan of His decree;”²⁹ “a regular missionary institution lay entirely outwith the circle of [their] ideas;”³⁰ “special missionary institutions on the part of the church after the times of the Apostles are therefore not necessary;”³¹ and, “Christians are required to do nothing else than what they have done hitherto; let every one occupy his station for the Gospel, and the Kingdom of Christ will grow.”³²

Warneck was simply assuming and implying that the reformers were not active in the preaching of the Gospel. On the contrary, the reformers understood that they were servants of a sovereign God and that this sovereign God would be using them for the spreading of the gospel in their place and in due time throughout the world. Such attitude, however, did not stop Calvin, for instance, from training preachers and sending them throughout Europe and even South America.³³

²⁵ See George Robson, footnote 1, page 20, in Warneck’s *Outline of a History*.

²⁶ In Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, Volume 3 (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), 479. The English words are quoted according to the Old Scottish English format.

²⁷ Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 15.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 18. Warneck implies that the reformers assumed that since, it is God responsibility, we should stay out of His way and let Him do His Work without our participation.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 16.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

³² *Ibid.*, 19. Warneck does not offer any explanation on the context of Martin Bucer’s statement. Bucer is not teaching that Christians should be passive, but that they should be found faithful in the place where the Lord had put them. Of course the reformers, due to their biblical ecclesiology, understood that the work of the preaching the gospel to all nations was given to the church “through special Apostles [preachers]” not to an institution such as the Roman Catholic orders. Unfortunately, Warneck does not explain the theological and biblical background on which the reformers grounded the preaching of the gospel. And once again he appeals to the “argument of silence” by criticizing Bucer for knowing nothing “of the duty of instituting missions” (Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 18).

³³ See chapter 5 of my Ph.D. dissertation.

The reformers' understanding of eschatology and its implications for the preaching of the gospel worldwide was correct. Since the time of the apostles the work of expansion of the true Christian faith had been related to the work of the Holy Spirit. The reformers did not idly wait for a might work of the Spirit but actively engaged in preaching and spreading the true gospel throughout Europe and, when the doors were opened, beyond Europe.

Warneck and Latourette clearly believe that the work ought first to be doctrinally established before attempting work among the heathen. Their definition of heathen, however, does not correspond to the biblical definition and description of such groups. Besides, Warneck (and Latourette) later report in their works that the rapid spread of the gospel among all the nations did not take place until the first Evangelical Awakening, which took place among those of Calvinist tradition. Unfortunately neither historian went back to correct his critique of the sixteenth-century reformers. At the end, the reformers were correct in their interpretation of the Scriptures, and in their perseverant waiting for the day when doors would be opened wide for the preaching of the gospel. Consider the following findings issued by both Warneck and Latourette.

Warneck wrote that “there must first come a religious revival to make the dead bones live, and this revival came – one of the greatest and most permanent known in Christian church history.”³⁴ This awakening took place during the eighteenth century, and especially through Calvinist preachers like George Whitefield and Jonathan Edwards. When writing on “the present age of missions,” Warneck understood that “the new spiritual revival quickened evangelical Christendom to the understanding of the missionary signal, which God gave in a series of historic events by which He opened the doors of the world.”³⁵ Warneck missed the reformers' eschatological prediction. The reformers understood that such revival would come and that until then they would continue to preach the gospel wherever they were and whenever doors were opened. Revival would not quicken the “understanding of the missionary signal,” but would boost the evangelization of the world – a desire already expressed and taught by the reformers.

The reformers rightly taught that God is the One who works through his servants, but in His time. He rules over every event. Warneck says, “Independently of the religious revival, events happened which drew attention to the non-Christian world,” but he overlooks the fact that at the time of the Reformation the reformers were already alerted toward such events as well. Warneck continues his thesis by declaring that “Through the conjunction of these events with the spiritual awakening, which was a clear evidence of the Divine leading, the Holy Ghost recalled the almost forgotten missionary

³⁴ Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 70.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 74.

commandment, and, by thus giving to the newly awakened life of faith a missionary direction, brought about the present age of missions.”³⁶ That was precisely what the reformers were praying and waiting for. Such commandments had never been forgotten by the reformers, especially John Calvin and the Puritans in general. This subject has been extensively dealt with by scholars such as De Jong, Rooy, and Murray.³⁷

Latourette comes to the same conclusion, but there is a nuance in his report that distinguishes it from the underlined critiques of Warneck. Latourette understands that the Great Century of Mission was preceded by a constant attempt of the Protestants to evangelize the world. He does not say, as Warneck does, that only now the “missionary commandment” was taken seriously by the Protestants. He instead uses terms like “more vigorous” or “increased” to describe the development of the expansion of the Protestants. He, therefore, assumes that such initiatives had been present since the beginning, even at the time of the Reformation. Latourette had always been very condescending toward the reformers and their involvement and commitment to the spread of the gospel worldwide during the Reformation.³⁸ Latourette believes that, with the eighteenth century Protestant revival (awakening), “interest of Protestants in extending their faith to non-Christian peoples *increased with each century* and did not, like that of the Roman Catholics, have a brilliant rise followed by a discouraging and prolonged decline.”³⁹ Latourette seems to assume that the desire and attempts to evangelize the world were already present during the Reformation.

Latourette also states that “as the eighteenth century wore on religious awakenings brought new life to British Protestantism, both in the British Isles and in North America.”⁴⁰ He becomes more explicit, however, regarding the role and the place of the awakenings in world evangelization when he concludes in his fourth volume that “the new Protestant missionary movement was largely the outgrowth of the awakenings of the seventeenth and especially of the eighteenth century and was to be reinforced by the many revivals of the nineteenth century.” Also significant is his statement that “it was chiefly an

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ See James A. De Jong’s doctoral dissertation, *As the Waters Cover the Sea: Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions 1640-1810* (Laurel: Audubon Press, 2006), original publication by J. H. Kok N. V. Kampen, Netherlands, 1970; Sidney H. Rooy’s doctoral dissertation, *The Theology of Missions in the Puritan Tradition: A Study of Representative Puritans: Richard Sibbes, Richard Baxter, John Eliot, Cotton Mather & Jonathan Edwards* (Laurel: Audubon Press, 2006), original publication by Eerdmans, 1965; and Ian H. Murray, *The Puritan Hope: Revival and the Interpretation of Prophecy* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth, 1991), first published in 1971.

³⁸ See chapter 5 of my Ph.D. dissertation.

³⁹ Kenneth Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity: Three Centuries of Advance A.D. 1500-1800*, Vol. 3 (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1939), 50. Bold added.

⁴⁰ Ibid., Vol. 3, 49.

expression of the strain within Protestantism which is sometimes known as Evangelicalism.”⁴¹ Personal and communal revivals are the work of God. As the Psalmist prayed: Will You not revive us again, that Your people may rejoice in You?”⁴² Or as Habakkuk the prophet prayed: “O LORD, I have heard your speech *and* was afraid; O LORD, revive Your work in the midst of the years! In the midst of the years make *it* known; In wrath remember mercy (3:2).”

In the category of historical arguments, Warneck uses only one case study: the French attempt to establish a colony in South Brazil in 1555. A priori, Warneck cautions his readers “against magnifying [this undertaking] into a great missionary effort on the part of the Reformed church”⁴³ and he stresses Durand de Villegagnon’s initiative, personal interest, and treason, rather than the work of the Reformed group from Geneva sent by Calvin and by the Genevan “Venerable Company of Pastors.” It appears that Warneck did not carefully consult any primary historical information regarding this South American case.

Warneck comments more on Villegagnon than on the Calvinist group from Geneva and their work while on the Brazilian coast. Villegagnon turned against the Reformed group from Geneva and went back to the teachings and practices of the Catholic Church. He persecuted and even murdered some of those Genevan believers, and was finally forced to leave Brazil by the Portuguese who had occupied the region since 1500. Without looking into the primary sources,⁴⁴ and without reading and exegeting them carefully, Warneck simply concludes that despite the hope raised by one of the Genevan pastors “that ‘these Edomites [referring to the natives in Brazil] might still become Christ’s possession’ [45] if new settlers [more Huguenots] should come, the enterprise [of 1556-1558] certainly never got the length of an earnest missionary endeavour.”⁴⁶ This

⁴¹ Kenneth Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity: The Great Century A.D. 1800-A.D. 1914: Europe and the United States of America*, Volume 4 (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941), 65.

⁴² Psalm 85:6. See also Psalm 71:20; 80:18; 119:25, 37, 40, 88, 107, 149, 154, 156, 159; 138:7; 143:11.

⁴³ Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 23.

⁴⁴ Primary sources include Calvin’s correspondence, Calvin’s commentaries, Jean de Léry’s ethnographic report to the Genevan’s Reformed group to Brazil, Jean de Léry’s account of the deaths of three of his Huguenot’s friends under Villegaignon, the register of the Company of Pastors of Geneva in the time of Calvin, just to mention some. Warneck could not access the sources which are now available and relatively easy to obtain through inter-library loans, online resources, and microfilms. Numerous other research in English, German, French, Portuguese, Dutch, and Spanish has been done and published on this topic in the past hundred years (since Warneck’s death). Most are available in libraries and bookstores throughout the world.

⁴⁵ Statement attributed to Richier according to William Brown and quoted by Warneck (*Outline of a History*, 23).

⁴⁶ Warneck, *Outline of a History*, 23.

was the final evaluation and judgement of Warneck regarding the Calvinist undertaking to reach the non-Christians in South America.

Warneck then comes to his final comments and explanation for the lack of any “real missionary activity” after the Reformation, especially in Germany.⁴⁷ “The reason of this,” states Warneck, “did not lie only in the fact that the world beyond the sea had never as yet come within the purview of German Protestantism,” nor in the fact “that the political conditions, chiefly the unhappy Thirty Years’ War, did not allow missionary enterprise to be thought of.”⁴⁸ The main reason for such silence towards any “real missionary activity” among the reformers and especially after the Reformation, according to Warneck was this: “The reason still lay in the theology which either did not permit missionary ideas to arise at all, or, if these began to find desultory expression, most keenly combated them.”⁴⁹ In other words, after everything is said and done, Warneck’s main bias toward the reformers comes to one single point: he disliked and misrepresented their theology, especially the doctrine of the sovereignty of God and election.

I discussed Warneck’s doctrinal argument in Chapter 5 of my Ph.D. dissertation. It is sufficient to keep in mind that the doctrines of the sovereignty of God and predestination are the ultimate theological card sustained by Warneck. The other has to do with his historical reasoning in order to dismiss the Genevan and Dutch missions to South America where Reformed pastors and other members of the Reformed community were sent to plant churches and to establish Protestant colonies in the New World. Let us now turn to how Latourette, Neill, Kane, Winter, and Tucker have ostensibly assumed and appropriated Warneck’s arguments and propagated them through their works.

2. LATOURETTE, NEILL, KANE, WINTER, AND TUCKER: WARNECK’S FOLLOWERS

The purpose of this section is to highlight two things. The first is the fact that Warneck was, as Bosch and others have already stated, “one of the first Protestant scholars who promoted” the view that the reformers were silent regarding even the “idea of missions.”⁵⁰ The second is to evaluate how directly or indirectly Latourette, Neill, Kane, Winter, and Tucker follow the theses of the contemporary “father of missiology,” which have been discussed.

⁴⁷ Ibid. Warneck had already generalized this final thesis in Chapter I of his book when he dealt with selective writings of both Lutheran and Calvinist theologians.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 25.

⁴⁹ Warneck does not see any other explanation but that “it was still essentially the views of the Reformers which determined the attitude of orthodoxy to missions, only these views assumed a much more systematic and polemical cast” (Ibid., 25).

⁵⁰ David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 244. For more information regarding the literature on this thesis, see Chapter 2.

2.1 *Kenneth Latourette, the contemporary broadcaster – the main arguments*

Warneck never ministered outside Germany, although his influence went beyond his geographical borders. Latourette, on the other hand, had a very limited cross-cultural experience, spending less than two years (July 1910-March 1, 1912) in China, teaching American History through the Yale-China program. He returned to the United States on March 1, 1912 due to ill health and the oncoming Chinese revolution.⁵¹ Latourette's identifiable causes can be traced back to Warneck's main arguments. Let us consider such arguments in light of the reformers' perspectives, logical reasoning, and historical evidence. Latourette summarizes his arguments under six main subheadings.⁵²

First, due to "the initial stages of the movement [theology, controversies, organization] its members had little leisure for concern for non-Christians outside of Western Europe." Latourette's apparent caustic remark – "little leisure" – implies that "missions" (the preaching of the gospel beyond the borders of Western Europe) was not in the reformers' radar. Second, "several of the early leaders disavowed any obligation to carry the Christian message to non-Christians." Who were those "early leaders" to whom Latourette refers? What did they really say and write that explicitly "disavowed any obligation" to reach out to the non-Christian world? What does Latourette mean by "non-Christians" and what historical data (evidence) does he use to support his claim that the early leaders of the Reformation "disavowed any obligation?" These are questions that Warneck tries to answer, but on which Latourette is simply silent.

Third, "preoccupation with the wars which arose out of the separation of the Protestants from the Roman Catholic Church," and who were so preoccupied with those wars that they dismissed any initiatives to preach the gospel beyond Western Europe. Was Western Europe really Christian? What kind of people groups were present in that part of the world at that time? Fourth, "the comparative indifference of Protestant governments to spreading the Christian message among non-Christians." The argument here favors the Roman Catholic governments and assumes that Catholic monarchs were "mission-minded" Christian leaders. Were the Roman Catholic governments really concerned with spreading the true gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ among the non-Christians?

Fifth, "Protestants lacked the monks who for more than a thousand years had been the chief agents for propagating the faith." This seems to be a

⁵¹ Latourette was commissioned at the annual meeting of Yale-in-China at the "Yale Commencement" in 1910. He calls those years in China, "The Missionary Years" in his autobiographical work *Beyond the Ranges: An Autobiography* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967), pages 37-46. He hoped to return to China "In March, I left for the United States, hoping that a long summer in my old home in Oregon would bring complete restoration. So confident was I of resuming my work in Changsha that I purchased a round-trip ticket on a Yangtze steamer" (page 45). He was never able to return to Changsha.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 25-27.

fallacious theory intended to please Roman Catholics. First, it is mentioned by Warneck. Now, it is broadcast by Latourette. It assumes that the monks were really spreading the biblical faith and that the Protestants should have established Protestant orders. Calvin was not opposed to the Roman Catholic orders just because he was anti-everything that was Catholic. It was due to his ecclesiology.⁵³ The reformers believed that it was the role and the responsibility of the church through its leadership, especially its ordained ministers, to train, support, and send those preachers with the ecclesiastical authority to preach the gospel. Calvin was ecclesiocentric, not para-church oriented.⁵⁴ Para-church organizations have become the clutches of the local body of believers. Most local churches and denominations are not willing or are limited in their ability to take over the responsibility of reaching out to the world with the gospel. Every mission agency and mission organization should be accountable theologically, strategically, and financially to the local body of believers. After all they recruit their workers and support from the local churches.

Sixth, “the chief reason why in general Protestants were not active in propagating the faith among non-Christians was that until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they had relatively little touch with non-Christian peoples.” The question is: was such “little touch” due to their indifference and unwillingness to reach out to the Moslems and to pagans? Was not John Calvin interested in reaching out to the pagan Roman Catholics as well as the natives in the Americas?

2.2 Stephen Neill: main arguments

The late Stephen Neill (1900-1984) is the historian who does not borrow his position from Gustav Warneck (1834-1910), as most of the other Protestant historians do. His arguments are deduced from oversimplified and generalized observations: “In the Protestant world, during the period of the Reformation there was little time for thought of missions. Protestants everywhere wasted their strength, with honourable but blind and reckless zeal in endless divisions and controversies.”⁵⁵ It is understandable that Neill would look at doctrinal controversies in such light terms. His inclusivist ecumenical concerns as an active historian of the World Council of Churches would lead him to foster such

⁵³ Calvin’s “ecclesiocentric” concerns will be considered in chapter 5. At least two dissertations on this subject are already available. See Carl David Stevens, *Calvin’s Corporate Idea of Mission*. Ph.D. diss., Westminster Theological Seminary, 1992; and Peter Jonathan Wilcox, “Restoration, Reformation and the Progress of the Kingdom of Christ: Evangelisation in the Thought and Practice of John Calvin, 1555-1564” Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1993.

⁵⁴ See Peter Jonathan Wilcox, “Restoration, Reformation and the Progress of the Kingdom of Christ...”

⁵⁵ Stephen Neill, *A History of Christian Missions*. Revised for the Second Edition by Owen Chadwick (London: Penguin Books, 1990), 187-188.

reactions against doctrinal matters. As the ecumenical slogan goes, “doctrine divides but work unites.”⁵⁶

But Neill went beyond those comments. Believing that there were other reasons for such indifference to “missions” during the Reformation, he said, “In the sixteen century the Protestant powers were not in touch with the wider world outside Europe.”⁵⁷ Also, “the geographical limitations were strongly reinforced by the psychological limitations of the concept of the regional Church, the *Landeskirche* [⁵⁸]. *Cuius regio, eius religio* [⁵⁹] – in each area the ruler is responsible for the spiritual welfare of his people. He has no responsibility for anything outside.”⁶⁰ In other words, the reformers enclosed themselves in their own limited cities, states, or countries and understood their mission to be inside their assigned areas.

Neill uses a critic of the sixteenth century, “Roman Catholic controversialist Robert Bellarmine,” as a source against the Protestants. Paraphrasing Bellarmine, Neill states that the reformers “had no comparable missionary activity.” “In Poland and Hungary [the Lutherans] have the Turks as their near neighbours, [but] they have hardly converted even so much as a handful.”⁶¹ Neill interprets such a comment as “a damaging charge, and it cannot be said that the Protestants were happy in their attempts to answer it.”⁶² Neill continues: “The Protestants tended to say ‘Missions are neither obligatory nor desirable, and our lack of them cannot be held against us as blindness or unfaithfulness.’”⁶³

⁵⁶ John H. Leith, “Reformed Theology,” in Donald K. McKim, ed. *Encyclopedia of the Reformed Faith* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press; Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1992), 367. Other statements have appeared with similar connotation: “theology divides but love unites,” “Jesus unites, theology divides,” or “theology divides but love unites.”

⁵⁷ Neill admits that “the whole situation underwent radical alteration in the seventeenth century, when Holland and England became great maritime powers” (Neill, *History of Christian Missions*, 188). But he insists that such geographical alteration did not affect the theological climate.

⁵⁸ The church of an independent state (land or region); a “national church.” According to John Miller, “During the Reformation era the churches were organized on the territorial principle (*Landeskirche*), whereby the prince or ruler of a state in the then-existing Holy Roman Empire determined the confession of his subjects” in *Missionary Zeal and Institutional Control: Organizational Contradictions in the Basel Mission on the Gold Coast, 1828-1917*. Foreword by Richard V. Pierard. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003, xii.

⁵⁹ “Whose the region, his the religion” was a principle adopted by the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555) by which the rulers decided the religion of their realms See Thomas M. Lindsay, *A History of the Reformation: The Reformation in Germany from Its Beginning to the Religious Peace of Augsburg* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1906), 397.

⁶⁰ Neill, *History of Christian Missions*, 188.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 189. The source used by Neill is a quote from Robert Bellarmine’s book *Controversiae*, Book IV. This quote was mentioned by Carl Mirbt in his book: *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des Römischen Katholizismus* (3rd ed., 1911).

⁶² *Ibid.*, 189.

⁶³ *Ibid.*

He concludes: “Yet, when everything favourable has been said that can be said, and when all possible evidences from the writings of the Reformers have been collected, it all amounts to exceedingly little.”⁶⁴ Some phrases in this previous quote would surprise any researcher. Consider, for instance: “when everything favourable has been said,” or “when all possible evidences have been collected,” and “all amounts to exceedingly little.”⁶⁵ These statements ignore or at least diminish the relevance of the historical data (facts and texts).

1. “During the period of the Reformation, there was little time for thought of missions [because] until 1648 the Protestants were fighting for their lives.”

2. “Protestants everywhere wasted their strength, with honourable but blind and reckless zeal, in endless divisions and controversies.” Neill called it an “inner weakness.”

3. “The Protestant powers [Holland, England, Germany] were not in touch with the wider world outside Europe.”

4. “The Germans mostly stayed at home. And the geographical limitations were strongly reinforced by the psychological limitations of the concept of the regional church.”

5. “The Protestants tended to say: “Missions are neither obligatory nor desirable, and our lack of them cannot be held against us as blindness or unfaithfulness.” The interesting words are simply the fruit of Neill’s interpretation of Lutheran theology, most of which is based on some of Johan Gerhard’s writings and a few passages of Luther’s commentaries.⁶⁶

2.3 Kane, Winter, and Tucker: main arguments

This section considers aspects of the life and work of historians Kane, Winter, and Tucker that are relevant to the subject. It includes analysis of their statements and reasoning about the reformers and mission, the sources they have used, how they use them, how they access and assess them, why they use those sources, and how their presupposed definition of terms affects their choice of sources and their interpretation of them in their writings on the reformers and missions.

This section concludes by organizing what these historians have in common, how they relate to each other, and the strengths and weaknesses of their work. Consideration is given to who started the anti-Reformed movement concerning the reformers and missions and their immediate successors and to whether the historians reviewed in this research are correct in their interpretation (hermeneutics and exegesis) of even their selective sources and facts.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Neill comments, “Everything that can be said is carefully set out by H. W. Gensichen in his *Missionsgeschichte der neueren Zeit* (1961), pages 5-7.” (Neill, footnote 4, 189).

⁶⁶ Cf. Neill op. cit., 189; Warneck, op. cit., 28-32; and Verkuyl op. cit., 20.

2.3.1 Herbert Kane's Arguments

The late J. Herbert Kane wrote: "One would naturally expect that the spiritual forces released by the Reformation would have prompted the Protestant churches of Europe to take the gospel to the ends of the earth. But such was not the case."⁶⁷ Other theses stated or supported by Kane throughout his writings, including his revised and enlarged edition of Glover's *The Progress of World-Wide Missions*, confirm his criticisms of the reformers. Glover's work states, "Mighty as were the changes wrought, and far-reaching as were the influences exerted by the Reformation, it is to be borne in mind that that movement was not missionary in its character,"⁶⁸ and "Indeed, there is all too abundant evidence that most of the leaders of the Reformation, including *Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Zwingli, and Knox*, seem to have had no serious sense of responsibility for direct missionary efforts in behalf of heathen or Muslim."⁶⁹ Glover summarizes his position at the end of a short, five-page⁷⁰ chapter, "Period of the Reformation from Luther to the Halle Missionaries (1517-1650)" with these words: "Of missionary efforts on the part of the Reformation Church there is sadly little to record."⁷¹

These are serious accusations that deserve some documentation by the mission historian who boldly and categorically comes to such conclusions. Although he does not mention Warneck's name in his book, Glover seems to be parroting Warneck when he refers to the leaders of the Reformation. By mentioning the names of those leaders of the Reformation. Glover does not quote any of the reformers nor documents such bold statements. All five pages of his chapter on the Reformation period from 1517-1650 are supported only by four secondary sources: two works published in 1880 and 1894 and two published in 1901 and 1912.

Kane seems to be in total agreement with Glover. The main arguments used by Kane to support such "findings" are the following. First, Kane attests that the reformers did not prompt "the Protestant churches in Europe to take the gospel to the ends of the earth"⁷² because of their theology. He presents

⁶⁷ J. Herbert Kane, *A Global View of Christian Missions: From Pentecost to the Present* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1971 [1972]), 73. And *A Concise History of the Christian Mission: A Panoramic View of Missions from Pentecost to the Present*. Rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978 [1982]), 73.

⁶⁸ Robert Hall Glover, *The Progress of World-Wide Missions*, revised and enlarged by J. Herbert Kane (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1960) 40.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁷⁰ Glover dedicates two pages of the five to "missionary" work of the Roman Catholic church through Francis Xavier (1506-1552), one page of which is a four-paragraph quote from Arthur T. Pierson's appreciation for Xavier's career as the "Romish Apostle to the Indies."

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 44.

⁷² Kane, *A Concise History*, 73.

three theological factors: their interpretation of Matthew 28:20, the doctrine of predestination, and the apocalypticism,⁷³ especially of Martin Luther. For each of these theological arguments, Kane offers no substantial documentation. Nor does he consider different positions, interpretations, and applications among Luther and Calvin and other reformers. He also takes two quotes he uses – one from Calvin and the other from Luther – out of context without giving necessary explanations about the sense in which both Calvin and Luther use them.

Kane quotes Calvin without documenting the source and without exegeting Calvin's sentence.⁷⁴ Without making any distinction between Luther's and Calvin's eschatology, Kane tries to justify such apocalypticism during the Reformation by writing, "In his *Table Talks* he [Luther] wrote: 'Another hundred years and all will be over. God's Word will disappear for want of any to preach it.'⁷⁵ With no reference to Luther's specific document and no explanation of what Luther meant by "another hundred years and all will be over," Kane assumes that Luther's statement represented the view of all the reformers and the Protestant churches during the Reformation period.

The second factor presented by Kane has to do with the context in which the Protestant churches found themselves between 1517 and 1650. A minority in Europe, they were confronting the Counter Reformation launched by the Roman Catholic Church, suffering the consequences of the Thirty Years' War, and fighting among themselves – Lutherans versus Calvinists – over doctrines. According to Kane, their survival mood may excuse them "for having neither the vision nor the vigor necessary for world evangelization"⁷⁶ and the "interne-cine warfare" among themselves impeded them from doing "a better job with evangelism at home and missions overseas."⁷⁷ Kane's critique seems to assume that fighting for purity of doctrine is not important. Kane also assumes that their concern for the evangelization of Roman Catholics throughout Europe was not part of world evangelization, and that "evangelism" and "missions" are two different categories of work. The assumed distinction between "evangelism" and mission is not biblical, but is imposed based on "mission strategy."

Kane's third reason why the reformers had "neither the vision nor the vigor necessary for world evangelization" has to do with Protestant Europe being isolated "from the mission lands of Asia, Africa, and the New World."⁷⁸ Asia,

⁷³ Kane takes apocalypticism in its basic meaning as the belief that the end of the world is eminent. For a more detailed historical explanation on the origin and meaning of the term, see David E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Cambridge: James Clarke and Co, 1988), 226-252.

⁷⁴ As already stated, most of these mission historians exegetical precision regarding the texts and the contexts in which the quotes were issued by the Reformers.

⁷⁵ Kane, *A Concise History*, 74.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

Africa, and the New World were under the power of Spain and Portugal – both Roman Catholic countries. Pointing to the Dutch East India Company, founded in 1602, which “stated that one of its objectives was to plant the Reformed Faith in its territories overseas,” Kane asserts, “seldom did they work at it.”⁷⁹ This again is a bold conclusion for which Kane offers no documentation, nor gives any indication of having researched even the secondary literature dealing with the primary sources about the work of the Dutch companies (East and West).⁸⁰

Kane’s fourth factor is “the absence in the Protestant churches of the religious orders which played such prominent role in the spread of the Catholic faith throughout the world.”⁸¹ Just as Neill accepted Bellarmine’s critique, so Kane simply quotes a critique from Joseph Schmidlin, a Roman Catholic mission historian.⁸² To put Kane’s argument in contemporary terms, a key reason for the supposed indifference of the reformers towards the evangelization of the world was the lack of para-church organizations. Do the Scriptures ever teach or encourage any other group outside or parallel to the church to carry out the evangelization of the world. Kane, along with some other mission historians, downplays the fundamental place of “pure doctrine” and especially ecclesiology – the doctrine of the church – presented, defended, and lived by reformers like John Calvin.

2.3.2 Ralph Winter’s Arguments

Ralph Winter, in his “Perspectives” course states:

Here we go again – despite the fact that the Protestants [during the Reformation period] won on the political front, and to a great extent gained the power to formulate anew their own Christian tradition and certainly thought they took the Bible seriously, they did not even talk of mission outreach.⁸³

He goes even further, making a non-historical statement, when he asks and answers a question.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 75.

⁸⁰ Part of the work of the Dutch West India Company has been well researched by Frans L. Schalkwijk. The work of the Dutch India companies will be considered in the reply to the mission historians presented in chapter 5.

⁸¹ Kane, *A Concise History*, 75.

⁸² Schmidlin’s critique of the leaders of the Reformation has already been addressed by Samuel Zwemer when he commented on the literature already available in the German language in *Theology Today* 7 (July 1950) 2:206. For an extended commentary on Zwemer, see the chapter of my Ph.D. dissertation dealing with the “Contemporary Mission Historians and the Reformation Period: A Literature Review.”

⁸³ Ralph D. Winter, ed., “The Kingdom Strikes Back: Ten Epochs of Redemptive History” in *Perspectives of the World Christian Movement: A Reader* (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1999), chapter 33; 211. This document is available online at: http://www.uscwm.org/mobilization_division/resources/perspectives_reader_pdf's/B01_Winter_TheKingdom.pdf.

But why did the Protestants not even try to reach out? Some scholars point to the fact that the Protestants did not have a global network of colonial outreach. Well, the Dutch Protestants did. And, their ships, unlike those from Catholic countries, carried no missionaries.⁸⁴

These bold declarations, represented as historical fact, lack any supporting documentation. Winter, like Kane, is accepting at face value secondary sources that have not been well exegeted or considered in the light of original sources.

Winter also assumes that the reformers' lack of "religious orders," and even their opposition to them, contributed to their mission inactivity. In his overused article, "The Two Structures of Redemptive Mission,"⁸⁵ Winter laments the fact that the "Lutheran movement did not in a comparable sense readopt the sodalities, the Catholic orders, that had been so prominent in the Roman tradition."⁸⁶ Such "omission," according to Winter's evaluation, "represents *the greatest error of the Reformation and the greatest weakness of the resulting Protestant tradition.*"⁸⁷ Winter goes further in his evaluation by concluding that "Once this method of operation was clearly understood by the Protestants, 300 years of latent energies burst forth in what became, in Latourette's phrase, 'The Great Century.'"⁸⁸ Winter, therefore, sees the lack of Protestant "orders" as the main cause of the reformers' indifference toward even the "talk of mission outreach."

Winter's theory of modality/sodality is too simplistic and lacks any consideration of the reformers' biblical exegesis and theology of the church. Winter, like Kane, assumes too much regarding the Roman Catholic orders. He does not deal with the doctrinal and theological merits of such orders and assumes that any opposition to the so called missionary religious orders implies opposition and indifference to the preaching of the gospel to the whole world. Winter imposes his "two structures" model (modality and sodality) upon the biblical text and uses this model borrowed from the Roman Catholic Church to criticize the reformers' opposition to the use of any "missionary society" (Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, etc.) apart from the church. The debate

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Winter's article is easily accessed and can be downloaded from several webpages. Check, for instance, the following webpages: <http://www.undertheiceberg.com/wpcontent/uploads/2006/04/SodalityWinter%20on%20Two%20Structures1.pdf>; http://resources.campusforchrist.org/images/4/48/The_Parachurch.pdf; <http://pcmsusa.org/articles/The%20Two%20Structures%20of%20God%27s%20Redemptive%20Mission.pdf>.

⁸⁶ Ralph D. Winter, "The Two Structures of Redemptive Mission" in *Perspectives of the World Christian Movement: A Reader*, Ralph Winter ed. (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1999), chapter 35; 226.

⁸⁷ Winter, "The Two Structures," 226. Italics added.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 227.

regarding the use of para-church organizations as a substitute for the work of the local churches is an old one.

Faith and ecclesiology are doctrinal issues that have to be considered in the light of biblical teaching and exegesis. Warneck, Latourette, Neill, Kane, Winter, and other mission historians seem to care more for the expansion of any kind of “Christianity” than for doctrinal truth. The Old Testament prophets, the Lord Jesus Christ, and his apostles were concerned with the content of the gospel being spread. Doctrine divides and unites, but the work per se does not unite. The work must be done according to the teaching of the Scriptures. Theology matters. Bad theology results in bad strategy and in heretical Christianity. Strategy is not an independent endeavor that can be designed without any scriptural and theological judgment.

Winter’s desire and passion to reach out to every “unreached people groups” and finish the “great commission” by the year 2000 A.D.⁸⁹ has never left him. Winter truly believes that if the contemporary evangelical church lives as it has been in the United States of America, we will never be able to finish the “great commission.” There is nothing wrong with such passion in working toward such goals. The problem is when we began to downplay the work of other brothers in the past in order to promote a strategic agenda that we have embraced.

2.3.3 Ruth Tucker’s Arguments

In her most read text, *From Jerusalem to Irian Jaya: A Biographical History of Christian Missions*, Ruth A. Tucker introduces the Reformation period and missions with these words: “World-wide missions was not a major concern of most of the Reformers.”⁹⁰ Following this thesis she presents four main arguments, all of which had already been made, but not documented, by Herbert Kane.⁹¹ Mission historians’ use of the arguments of previous historians without even mentioning their names indicates that such arguments are assumed to be exegeted, documented truths.

The four main arguments used by Tucker are these: Catholic Counter-Reformation, lack of overseas opportunities, lack of religious orders, and the reformers’ theological beliefs – “the imminent return of Christ” (Luther’s Apocalypticism), the claim that “the Great Commission was binding only on

⁸⁹ See Ralph Winter’s articles, books, and essays published since Lausanne I, 1974. Winter is a prolific writer and a hard working brother. He has started, inspired, and supported numerous projects and movements. See for example the “Perspectives on the World Christian Movement” course; the magazine, *Mission Frontiers* (the magazine can be directly accessed through its webpage: <http://www.missionfrontiers.org/>); Caleb Project webpage: http://www.calebproject.org/main.php/about_us (Caleb Project produces the *Perspectives* courses as well); and the US Center for World Missions--<http://www.uscwm.org/>.

⁹⁰ Ruth A. Tucker, *From Jerusalem to Irian Jaya: A Biographical History of Christian Missions* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983), 67.

⁹¹ See the subheading on Kane in this chapter.

the New Testament apostles,” and “the doctrine of election that made missions appear extraneous if God had already chosen those he would save.”⁹² All of these arguments take less than one page of Tucker’s work.

The Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation forced the Reformed churches to just hold “their own in the face of Roman Catholic opposition and breaking new ground in Europe.”⁹³ Therefore, the Reformers had “little time or personnel for overseas ventures.”⁹⁴ The Protestants lacked opportunities because the Roman Catholics had “dominated the religious scene in most of the seafaring nations.”⁹⁵ As for the para-church groups, “the Protestants did not have a ready-made missionary force like the Roman Catholic monastic orders.”⁹⁶

According to Tucker, the reformers’ theological beliefs by practical implication cut any meaningful initiative of the Protestants toward missions. Without further explanation or comment regarding the available literature that has dealt with these theological arguments, Tucker reasons as follows:

Martin Luther was so certain of the imminent return of Christ that he overlooked the necessity of foreign missions. He further justified his position by claiming that the apostles...had fulfilled their obligation [the Great Commission] by spreading the gospel throughout the known world, thus exempting succeeding generations from responsibility. [And] Calvinists generally used the same line of reasoning, adding the doctrine of election that made missions appear extraneous if God had already chosen those he would save.⁹⁷

She makes all these statements without a single comment or reference to any primary, secondary, or even tertiary literature on the subject. At the end of chapter 3, “The Moravian Advance: Dawn of Protestant Missions”, in which less than one page is dedicated to the Reformation period, Tucker has a selected bibliography of six sources related to that chapter. Five of them are about the history of the Moravian church and mission and one is about the missionary work of Hans Egede in Greenland.

Tucker does recognize that “Calvin himself was at least outwardly the most missionary-minded of all the Reformers.” She takes into consideration that Calvin “not only sent dozens of evangelists back into his homeland of France, but also commissioned four missionaries to establish a colony and evangelize the Indians in Brazil.”⁹⁸ It seems that Tucker had not read Jean

⁹² Tucker, *From Jerusalem to Irian Jaya*, 67.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

de Léry's report about the voyage to South America in 1556. The church in Geneva sent two ministers of the gospel, not four, and they were never called "missionaries" but "ministers of the Word of God." By using the biblical term "minister of the Word," when referring to those sent with the responsibility of preaching the gospel, Calvin preserved the Scriptural terms and did not fall into the temptation to reason from alien terminologies.

Tucker concludes with this sad note: "None of these ventures had real staying power."⁹⁹ Does that mean then that martyrdom does not count as "missionary" success? Does it mean then that we only call it "missions" if it succeeds in terms of church planting and church growth?

SUMMARY OF THE TWO ARTICLES

The previous article (Part 1) and the present one (Part 2) have considered some aspects of the life and research of mission historians Warneck, Neill, Kane, Winter, and Tucker, with particular attention given to their writings related the reformers and missions. An examination of the sources they used calls into question whether their use and interpretation of the sources corresponds to the historical reality of the sixteenth-century mission enterprise. Their use of contemporary missiological terminology has undoubtedly affected their assessment of the reformers. The prevailing thesis that the reformers were silent and even indifferent to the idea of missions began long ago based upon inadequate research.

Warneck and Latourette were doubtless the main proponents of the theory that dismisses the reformers' concern for or even thought of "missions," as the two historians define, categorize, and applied it. The overall spread and popularization of such beliefs, however, should be credited to Warneck and Latourette's followers and friends, including Neill, Kane, Winter, and Tucker. Their writings and arguments have been translated into several languages and their influence throughout the world cannot be denied.¹⁰⁰ Unfortunately numerous mission professors, most theological students, missionary candidates, and mission-minded members of the church in general never question such statements, nor research the documented literature that deals more seriously with the subject commented on here. Even less take the time to find and read the sixteenth-century documents and the writings of the reformers.

Why have reputable mission historians made such declarations so lightly? Are they consciously manipulating the data to demise the theological beliefs and

⁹⁹ Ibid., 68.

¹⁰⁰ The prolific missiological writings of Warneck and Latourette have a limited audience, but the mission histories of Neill, Kane, Winter, and Tucker have reached a broader and more popular audience, even Sunday School classes.

practices of a group of Protestant leaders during a period of Protestant history in order to foster a more ecumenical and universal approach to world evangelization? Are they simply trying to motivate the evangelical and Reformed Protestant groups to continue the enthusiasm which began in the eighteenth century for spreading the gospel and planting churches among all people groups of this world and finishing the Great Commission of the Lord Jesus Christ? Of these two options, the latter is more likely. Some of their arguments do, however, foster a kind of Christian ecumenical endeavor that compromises the doctrines of the Reformed faith and of evangelicalism in general.

Unfortunately, one thing these mission historians have in common is their uncritical approach to the historical data. With the exception of Warneck, they merely paraphrase one another, or even worse, simply make bold statements without any supporting documentation. Although the general missiological contributions of Neill, Kane, Winter, and Tucker are to be acknowledged, their statements concerning the reformers and “missions” must be regarded as not authoritative. We should pursue those studies whose authors explored the original sources and writings of those who lived throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

RESUMO

Desde o século 19, historiadores de missões como Gustav Warneck e Kenneth Scott Latourette, têm revelado a tendência de retratar os reformadores protestantes como indiferentes às missões estrangeiras ou missões mundiais. O autor descreve o raciocínio desses historiadores e argumenta que eles e diversos de seus discípulos mais recentes não tratam as fontes primárias de modo adequado. Com frequência, muitos deles simplesmente se apoiam em fontes secundárias e não se esforçam por avaliar a documentação original que poderia fornecer uma perspectiva diferente sobre o assunto. Ao fazê-lo, eles ajudam a perpetuar um preconceito injustificado contra os reformadores e missões. É imperativo afirmar a importância atribuída pelos reformadores à difusão universal do evangelho e as razões pelas quais eles não foram tão enfáticos acerca de missões em comparação com gerações posteriores de protestantes.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Reformadores protestantes; Missões estrangeiras; Martinho Lutero; João Calvino; Gustav Warneck; Kenneth S. Latourette.