

The Apostolic Priority: Why Long-Term, Culture- and Language-Competent  
Workers doing Church Planting Among the Unreached is Still Our Highest  
Missions Priority

Alan R. Johnson\*

*Abstract*

Sincere voices are telling us the world and the church are changing and the missionary enterprise needs to change with it. We will be wise if we take seriously their critique and cautions; but we also need to drill down on what does not change. This article addresses God's unchanging redemptive plan, the apostolic priority to proclaim the gospel and plant the church where Jesus is not yet known, the need for language and culturally competent Spirit-empowered workers. The distinction between the apostolic mission band and local church does not promote elitism but rather provides channels to express giftings where they are most effective.

*Introduction*

I have spent the bulk of my adult life working in a people group with a small Christian presence. For three decades I have lived in a society where I am surrounded by millions of non-Christians who live in a different religious tradition. In recent years I have become deeply concerned by practices I observe that are becoming popular with sending churches, not just in North America, but in the Majority World, and proposals about the role of missionaries in a changing world. I worry that conceptions of cross-cultural missions are being driven not by the Bible but by cultural trends. Specifically I am afraid that views of global missions are changing in ways that endanger our ability to engage people groups that lack access to the gospel. In this paper I begin by reviewing some of these proposals for new ways of doing cross-cultural missions. I then query these ideas in light of the Bible's vision of God's redemptive plan and show that they are unable to deal adequately with the cross-cultural dimension of global mission

---

\*Alan R. Johnson has served in Thailand with Assemblies of God World Missions (AGWM) since 1986. He is a member of AGWM's missiology think-tank and is the secretary on the Missions Commission of the World Assemblies of God Fellowship (WAGF) that seeks to catalyse cross-cultural sending to unreached peoples from the WAGF national churches. He also serves as an adjunct professor for the Intercultural Studies Doctoral program of the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary.

or produce cross-cultural workers capable of fulfilling this task. I then counter these proposals by arguing that looking at world mission through the lens of the two redemptive structures found in Acts, which are the local church and the Pauline mission and missionary band, provides a sharper focus on cross-cultural missionary labor and a more helpful way of conceiving the role of local churches and their members' role in global mission. I conclude by exploring implications of the different roles of the two redemptive structures and my assertion that the apostolic priority of proclaiming Christ and planting the church where He is not known by workers embedded in the language and culture of the people, needs to remain the fundamental work for missionaries from which all other activity entails.

### *Voices Calling for Reassessment of the Missionary Role*

My first realization that something was up in terms of conceptions of global mission and the missionary role came from talking with missions-interested young people while visiting several of our denominational schools back in 2004 and 2005. When explaining their calling to global missions, it was either conducting or facilitating short-term trips or starting in one place for a few years and then moving elsewhere or doing some kind of social compassion ministry. It became clear to me that those of us out on the ground in places around the world, steeped in the missiology of evangelizing, discipling, planting indigenous churches and church movements, training leaders, and serving in Jesus' name, all from the power of the Holy Spirit, were going to be seeing people come into the organization with a conception of missions vastly different than ours.

My concerns grew when I started finding proposals in print from cross-cultural workers advocating for changes in the nature of the missionary role. A number of these articles begin by *describing* changes in the world and the church with respect to global missions, and then go on to *prescribe* what they think the nature and conduct of cross-cultural missions should be in light of the shifts observed in the world and church. The kind of thinking expressed seems to include a critique of Western missionary enterprise and combine it with current trends to propose a new way of doing cross-cultural mission. It also is based in the reaction to the historical disjunct between church and mission. Bosch in *Transforming Mission* highlighted this in his chapter on the emerging ecumenical paradigm, by starting with reflections on the rediscovery of the role of the church in mission.<sup>1</sup> The inheritance of the modern missionary movement is seen as abiding

dichotomies between churches that send and churches that receive missionaries, between the home base and the mission field, between those called by God to serve Him and ordinary Christians, and between the life of the church at home and its mission in the world.<sup>2</sup> The argument is that 100 years after Edinburgh in 1910, these bifurcations have broken down<sup>3</sup> as “the contemporary missional era encompasses a wide variety of initiatives and impulses,” with that list including short-term missions, business as mission, children at risk, human trafficking, racial reconciliation, relief and development, environmental concerns, and evangelism and church planting.<sup>4</sup> In what I have read where the authors move towards a prescriptive mode, four themes stand out: a change from an evangelistic role to a facilitative or supportive one, a shift from cross-cultural work as a special calling to everyone being a missionary, a short-term approach that is project oriented rather than an emphasis on long-term workers embedded in language and culture, and the content of cross-cultural mission work shifting towards compassion ministry.

*Evangelism is Out and Facilitating is In*

Sometimes the massive growth of the church in what is often called the Global South leads both pastors and mission leaders to conclude that an evangelistic and church planting role for missionaries from the West is no longer needed. Yeh, overviewing the missiological landscape in 2010, draws a series of conclusions from the massive changes “in the political, theological, and spiritual landscapes,” arguing that “If more Christians now live in the non-Western world than in the West, it calls into question the older concept of Western missions to the non-Western world being primarily evangelistic.”<sup>5</sup> He notes that “evangelism is no longer what non-Western Christians need” and that the days of Western paternalism are gone.<sup>6</sup> In his view the new way is facilitating partnerships where “donating books and starting seminaries are better and more effective uses of missions resources” than preaching on street corners or planting churches.<sup>7</sup>

A pragmatic version of this shift is based in efficiency and effectiveness. One mega-church North American pastor, upon learning about a church planting movement in Thailand originated by a local Thai, gave a large amount of money to help them with logistics, such as travel, printing, and some building. His comment was, “The world has shifted and changed. I believe the day of the great white missionary is gone.”<sup>8</sup> He sees now a direct church connection with local pastors and movements to support and encourage those who are making evangelism

happen in unreached places. In some scenarios this would eliminate the role of the cross-cultural worker altogether. Other versions of this might retain global workers to function as facilitators and conduits for that relationship. This view is not only held by pastors looking for tangibility and return on investment, it is also articulated by some mission leaders. Grant Haynes believes “There isn’t a real need for Westerners to be those pioneer, apostolic, reach-every-last-people-group kind of missionaries . . . . We should be there for encouragement, coaching, and possibly theological training.”<sup>9</sup>

Another version of the facilitator role is proposed by Waltrip, who argues that changes in the world and trends in global missions mean that cross-cultural workers are evolving to adapt, and that leads towards a role change which involves “becoming highly specialized missionaries working in a diversity of contexts to assist the growing indigenous churches.”<sup>10</sup> Such workers he calls “global missionaries,” who were career workers at one point, and gained specialized skills which they are now utilizing across many cultures, presumably among existing local church movements. Waltrip’s proposal appears to be advocating adaptation to the trend of short-term trips and the accompanying project mentality and retrofitting the career missionary role to it.

*Everyone is a missionary*

Wonsuk Ma points out that the primary missionary paradigm of the second half of the second millennium was a natural creation of the social context.<sup>11</sup> The world was divided into Christendom and the heathen, thus mission was “out there,” while home was considered evangelized. The places where workers went to labor were radically different than their home societies so that they needed to be specially trained and supported, and the home base churches were separated from mission and could only help by sending aid and lifting up prayers. He concludes, “consequently mission became an elitist movement, left to the hands of experts.”<sup>12</sup> He argues that the rise of global Christianity has led to a changed social context and a revision of the conception of mission the he encapsulates in the idea of democratization.<sup>13</sup> Democratization is “a theological concept referring to a process through which a privileged status or call, initially granted to a small group of select people, is eventually expanded to include the whole community of God's people.”<sup>14</sup>

The changed social contexts, in this Age of Global Christianity, means that this revision process needs to challenge the unidirectional flow of mission from the West to the rest,

broadening the nature of mission to a larger vision than just evangelism, and break free from the elitism of the old paradigm, so that the whole church, North and South, participates in mission.<sup>15</sup> This feat is accomplished by bringing the notion of the mission field from “faraway” to nearby daily life and the workplace, fostering a holistic view of life, so that their lives become a testimony to God’s saving grace as well as their words and works.<sup>16</sup>

Ma’s argument for revisions in the conception of cross-cultural mission are nuanced in both theology and history. At the popular level in North American Christianity, anything with “mission” in it brings a gravity to the activity, and the slogan “everyone is a missionary” is seen as motivating Christians to view their everyday life as a mission field and thus appropriate for evangelism.

*Short-term is here to stay but less clear than ever as to what it means*

Eldon Porter makes the point that local churches no longer want to simply support missions, as they now want to be involved. He suggests that missions agencies need to change to accommodate this kind of desire to participate from local churches in the sending base. A primary way of involvement is through short-term missions trips (STMs). A recent article in *Christianity Today* pointed out the controversial nature of short-term missions trips, even before their boom in the 1980s and 1990s. They noted that the missions community initially saw them as “little more than a recruiting tool for full-time missionary service” and then as things progressed, STMs “appeared like a threat to longer-term work,”<sup>17</sup> with research showing that “as much as a third of all U.S. Christian dollars channeled abroad on behalf of ‘mission’ is mediated through mission trips.”<sup>18</sup> However, with their rapid growth, some 2 million people a year participating in the U.S. alone, STMs “were eventually embraced as an alternative missions strategy altogether.”<sup>19</sup> Olsen and McNeel document the increasing amount of critique of STMs starting about a decade ago, but their article shows that this activity, which “by conservative estimates, American Christians alone spend billions of dollars per year,” is increasingly unclear as to what short-term trips done well resemble.<sup>20</sup> Their article, which explores some of the ways that STM is changing, observes that there appears to be “a growing willingness among some evangelicals ... to embrace virtually any kind of travel as a tool for the kingdom.”<sup>21</sup>

Some go beyond the argument that mission practice should be shaped by what the sending base churches want, to advocating the view that short-term mission work actually gets us

closer to Biblical missions. Larry Poston argues that Paul's work laid the precedent for short-term work and that this was the "original pattern for the spread of the [g]ospel that was designed and implemented by the Holy Spirit and revealed by Him through the New Testament writers" and that this represents, "not an innovation but rather a return to a New Testament pattern of mission."<sup>22</sup>

### *Compassion ministry resonates with the senders*

If short-term trips are the primary vehicle for creating personal involvement for churches, the preferred ministry content of those trips tends to be compassionate ministry. Social justice is a hot issue in North America, and not only among Christians. According to Steve Porter, there is a "heightened sensitivity and renewed commitment to social action in American society" and refers to this socio-cultural value as the "social turn" or "social justice turn."<sup>23</sup> I participated recently in a project of the AGWM Missiology group where we talked with several USA AG pastors about their missions practices and reasons for them. A major theme that emerged was compassion ministry expressed through the vehicle of short-term trips. In explaining this concept some of our interviewees noted that compassion ministry "resonates" with church members, thus making it easier to raise funds and mobilize action.

### *The Problematic Nature of These Proposals for a New Missionary Role*

I find these proposals for new models of doing global missions problematic on several levels. In this section I take the activities advocated for cross-cultural work by these proposals and create a composite picture of the missionary role, and then critique the model in terms of Biblical goals, task complexity, and the demographic realities of where the church does and does not exist.

#### *Problematic in Terms of Biblical Goals*

In my own reading I have not yet encountered anyone who has ever examined the practical implications of the changes they are advocating in terms of the Biblical vision of proclaiming the gospel to all the *ethne* (Matt. 24:14). The key component parts of these suggestions on how to do mission when put into a composite picture show:

- everyone is considered a missionary and all outreach of any kind is by nature missionary
- a geographic conception of mission means that whenever anyone crosses a geographic boundary, they are doing mission, thus making all diaspora people and migrating people missionaries by default fit in this category
- cross-cultural workers go on short terms trips from their home base with a project focus for ministry
- they do little evangelism and do not participate in church planting
- they work in partnership with the existing church and do not pioneer in new areas or with helping people groups
- they work in a supportive/facilitative role for the host church
- the ministry they do tends toward an emphasis on compassion and social ministry

This composite, for the most part, is built from current trends both in the world and the church that the various authors identified. The key question to now ask is: can missionary workers that look and operate like this help accomplish God's redemptive purpose as laid out by the Bible? A quick overview of the goals and activities found in just the five commissions in the Gospels and Acts<sup>24</sup> (Matthew 28:16-20, Mark 16:14-18, Luke 24:44-49, John 20:21-23 and Acts 1:4-9) yields the following:

- GOALS - make disciples of all the *ethne*, proclaim the gospel to every creature, preach repentance and forgiveness in Jesus' name to all the *ethne*, and witness to Christ from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth.
- ACTIVITIES - proclaim good news, repentance, and forgiveness, incorporate them into the family of God through baptism, teach them to obey everything Jesus commanded, wait for the promise of the Father, Spirit-empowered witness to Jesus crossing cultural boundaries to the uttermost parts of the earth, sent into the world as Jesus was sent into the world by the Father, extending forgiveness in Jesus' name.

What we see here is a task of immense complexity that is global in scope, embraces all the diversity of humanity, requires cross-cultural efforts and the need for abilities in evangelism, discipling, teaching, and planting faith communities and has the logic of ongoing transmission within cultural segments where the church is birthed, as well as continuing ongoing cross-

cultural transmission into all the *ethne* (Mt 24:14; Mark 13:10) and is committed to the whole Church.

It is very clear that someone looking at this task and the activities to accomplish it would never propose a cross-cultural worker force made up of untrained, short-term people who are to facilitate or train the existing church that they do not understand culturally nor know their language and that are oriented towards social ministry. In addition to this point there is nothing in all of Scripture to indicate that any people or segment or era of the church gets a pass on doing their part towards the goal of God being glorified among the nations.

*Problematic in Terms of Task Complexity*

A consistent weakness in my view in the literature on the mission of the church and these proposals for changes in the missionary role is lack of attention paid to the cross-cultural dimension that is clear in the Biblical vision of God's redemptive plan. Once you take evangelism, discipleship, and church planting cross-culturally, you increase the number of variables and multiply complexity. While the church participates in God's mission, and in this sense, the mission (singular) of the church is broad, the conclusion drawn from it is incorrect. An example of this matter is Deborst's observation on the broad view of mission:

Far from being restricted to the task of a few "professional" missionaries, mission is the responsibility and privilege of each and every Christian, who is called to offer all she or he is and does as an act of worship.<sup>25</sup>

This is a wonderful statement that is true. But as it is worded, the writer tries to make her true point at the expense of trained cross-cultural workers. It implies that the whole of the mission of the Church, including its cross-cultural dimension, can be accomplished by local Christians. Missions history shows that what Ralph Winter called missiological breakthrough among a people group without access to the gospel rarely happens without intentional cross-cultural efforts by structures dedicated to this task. Other complex tasks in our society routinely require training and preparation; it is hard to understand how taking the Christian message into the cultures of the world across both generations and physical distances could be construed as a task to be tackled by short-term workers or local Christians, who by definition are "local" because they are not moving.



Democratization of the task fits much better in a mono-cultural situation than a cross-cultural one. When Christians are on the move and relocating and thus forming diaspora communities, they do not, as a rule, automatically start reaching local non-Christians, nor do they suddenly practice contextually sensitive ministry. When they do think of “missions” outside the border of their now home country, they generally begin with wanting to help in some way people back in their birth homes. The reality that people think their culturally-embedded version of faith is *the correct* version means that methodologically they practice a diffusion mode of gospel sharing, inviting others to join them in the way they follow Jesus rather than helping develop indigenous forms of faith. “From everywhere to everywhere,” or “from everyone to every place” are great slogans, but they do not solve the problems of taking the gospel to the world. In fact they would exacerbate virtually everything on the list of criticisms of traditional western mission.

To assume that untrained individual operators moving around the world would correct the excesses and errors of a colonial approach to cross-cultural mission is not reasonable. The literature is full of critiques about the paternalism, inefficiency and ineffectiveness, elitism, cultural insensitivity, and hubris of the modern missionary movement. What career workers on the ground see with short-term amateurs in mission forays is all the same problems of superiority, control, waste, creating dependency, and cultural insensitivity.<sup>26</sup> The very proliferation of writing about short-term missions and the need for best practices, along with the current angst I noted above, shows us that “everyone a missionary” does not play out well in actual cross-cultural interaction.

*Problematic in Terms of the Demographic Realities of Where the Church Does not Exist or is Very Small*

The current demographic realities of taking the gospel to all the tribes and tongues of our world show that the suggestions for a new kind of missionary are poorly aligned with the remaining task. Sixty percent of all non-believers in the world have very few followers of Jesus in their own people group; they are the classical *unreached people* defined as having less than 2% Evangelicals among them and less than 5% of any form of the Christian faith present. People living in such settings still need people from outside their culture to come, learn their languages and witness to Jesus. The problem of hearing the gospel is increased when we ask the question of the cultural relevance of the gospel message that they have available to them. Many of the small

churches that exist among unreached peoples are minorities that have a very foreign form of the Christian faith, and the average non-Christian sees them as having left their ethnic identity for an alien faith and identity. Thus, while the chances are low to even meet a Christian, the chances of meeting someone who follows Jesus in a way they see as not forsaking their ethnic cultural inheritance is even smaller.

Sixty percent of the non-Christian world having little access to the gospel is a large number, but what happens when that database of the world's ethnolinguistic groups is filtered at the 0.1% level? We find that fully 25% of the world's population lives in social systems where 1 in 1000 or less are Christian: a stunning 1.85 billion people. Right at 40% of the world lives with little access to the gospel, with just under half of that population living in places that are 0.1% or less that identify as Christian. Add to this point the fact that the vast majority of all cross-cultural workers are located among the non-Christians who already have significant numbers of Christians among their own people. The well-meaning suggestions for revamping cross-cultural global Christian mission, when juxtaposed with demographic realities, shows itself to be driven by what is happening in societies where the church exists and by the interests and sensibilities of Christians in those societies rather than the trajectory of God's redemptive mission.

*A Way Forward: Pauline Mission as Paradigmatic*

If the new proposals I reviewed for doing cross-cultural mission are not up to the task as defined in the Gospels and Acts, where do we go from here? In this section I explore a way forward that follows from Luke's tracing of the Pauline apostolic band and Paul's letters. The overview essays that I cited above and the proposals growing out of descriptive work showing trends in how cross-cultural mission is happening want to broaden both the scope of the activities of mission and the participants doing them. Practically that translates to the rhetoric of every person as a missionary and virtually any activity in any place being "missions" of some variety. As I pointed out above, the serious flaw is the lack of recognition of the implications of what crossing culture with the gospel means. I will argue here that the Book of Acts and Paul's letters provide a path forward that allows for both broad and narrow views of mission and incorporates full involvement for every believer and full integration of evangelism and social responsibility. This view takes seriously the cross-cultural dimension of global mission and the need for

dedicated structures and workers to address that task, all while making the work of every believer serving in word and deed strategically significant as well.

The Book of Acts shows us that the cross-cultural dimension in taking the gospel to the world spawned a distinct structural response. Ralph Winter's seminal article on God's two redemptive structures shows how in Acts we see the local church and apostolic mission band.<sup>27</sup> The Acts narrative shows the Spirit working through already existing structures and repurposing them rather than requiring the invention of something new from scratch. Local church fellowships meeting in houses were modeled after the synagogue and the Greco-Roman forms of the ancient household, political assembly, and voluntary association.<sup>28</sup> Winter argues that Paul most likely was following the procedures of Jewish proselytizers who worked all through the Roman empire.<sup>29</sup> Robert Banks points out that when Paul is talking about his missionary band, he uses the Greek term *ergon* (work), concluding that the mission band was a task group with a specialized work.<sup>30</sup> They were involved in a common task, their gifts were aimed at the evangelization of outsiders rather than edification of the body, and while the churches all had multiple authority figures, in the mission band it was Paul who was in charge.<sup>31</sup> The missionary band was not characterized by things that mark the Church such as the gathering of its members, the importance of mutual edification nor the use of the body metaphor.

It is crucial to note that each of these structures, local churches and cross-cultural missionary bands, do different things well and have different strengths in God's redemptive mission. The narrow work of the Pauline apostolic band was *to plant churches who would then be able to participate in the mission of God*. The broader mission of the Church incorporates all we know from both Testaments about the people of God. "Mission" in the singular is "used to define the scope of all that God has given His Church to accomplish with the *missio Dei*."<sup>32</sup> Examples of this breadth of scope can be found across a spectrum of scholars writing on the mission of the church; they include proclamation of the gospel, making obedient disciples, teaching, planting new churches, responding to human needs with loving service, seeking to transform unjust structures, creation care, bearing witness to Jesus and the love of God, bringing God's forgiveness, living as a community in a way that demonstrates the inbreaking of God's rule in Jesus as instrument, serving as a sign and foretaste of the Kingdom of God, sanctification, unification, and reconciliation.<sup>33</sup> Where they will differ is on the relative weight and priority of some of these elements, but the central components are widely shared as being on the broader

radar of the activities of God's people. What is important here to my point is that in the very clear Biblical trajectory of God's redemptive plan to all the cultures of the world, the missionary band is best suited to the complex task of the initial penetration with the gospel and planting the church and strengthening it. However, once local churches rooted in their communities and ethnic groups exist, even in very early stages, they are a stronger vehicle for the cross-generational work of evangelizing their own society and tackling the broader social issues that are implicated in the calling of God's people to reflect his character to the world and see his rule established.

Art Glasser makes the point that the worship and fasting of Acts 13 by the multicultural and very evangelistic Antioch church came about because of the realization that the mandate from their Scriptures, as Jesus had taught his apostles to understand it, was greater than what they could accomplish with their house church structure in one place.<sup>34</sup> Acts 13 is thus a pivotal moment not because it was starting a cross-cultural movement of the gospel; that had already happened with Philip in Samaria and Peter and Cornelius in Antioch, when Gentiles were evangelized. Rather, it was the use of a new structure, the mobile missionary band, that took the gospel across geographic and cultural boundaries for the purpose of establishing local church structures among new places and peoples. Jerry Ireland argues that Luke's articulation of the mission of the church emphasizes "the eschatological orientation of the church to the nations" and reveals a primary mark of the church.<sup>35</sup> In this view the "setting apart" of Barnabas and Saul for cross-cultural witness in Acts 13:

constitutes an important corrective for the holistic mission movement, which largely has failed to recognize the way in which missions sodalities born of this concern for the nations in Acts differ in purpose and function from the modality of the local church. In other words, ecclesiology and missiology, though they overlap, are not the same thing and this is especially evident in Acts in key places where missionary teams are set apart for the church's cross-cultural church planting efforts.<sup>36</sup>

Bowers notes that Paul's missionary labors have been the dominant model for Christian expansion in part because of the way that Luke-Acts highlights his work.<sup>37</sup> However, it is now widely acknowledged that Luke was not just a historian but also a theologian. Roger Stronstad argues that Luke's narratives fall into a combination of four categories: episodic, typological, programmatic, and paradigmatic.<sup>38</sup> By the latter he means that the episode shows normative features for the mission and character of God's people living in the last days. I want to argue that

Luke's honing in on the Pauline band goes beyond being merely programmatic in the sense of pointing to the unfolding of future events, such as the progress of the gospel across cultural lines to being paradigmatic for the conduct of the cross-cultural transmission of the gospel both structurally and in terms of goals and practices.<sup>39</sup> What Paul experiences in meeting Jesus and then does in obeying his call in the Book of Acts and talks about in his letters shows us the nature of his calling, his understanding and interpretation of that call, and the practices he followed to fulfill it.

*Paul And His Apostolic Band: Calling and Practice*

The nature of Paul's call

The record of Acts shows that Paul was a chosen instrument who was to carry the name of Jesus to Gentiles, kings and Israel (9:15) and who would suffer for the name of Jesus (9:16). He was chosen to know God's will, see Jesus and hear words from his mouth (22:14), and to be witness to all men of what he saw and heard (22:15). Jesus appeared to him to appoint him as a servant and witness of what he saw when he met him and what he would reveal to Paul (26:16). He was sent to open people's eyes, turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, so that people would receive forgiveness of sins and place among God's people who are sanctified by faith in Jesus (26:17-18).

Paul's interpretation of his call

It is what Paul did in terms of where he went, what he did, and why, that we get insights into how he understood his call. It is easy to read the story as if his decisions and movements were fixed. When we get to Acts 13, Paul has already been planting churches in Cilicia before Barnabas came to bring him to Antioch. We also know from Acts 1-12 that in addition to Cilicia there were fellowships of believers present in Jerusalem, Samaria, Damascus, Caesarea, Cyprus, Cyrene, Phoenicia, Syria, and that the gospel message was carried to Ethiopia by the returning servant of Candace.

In each of the three recorded journeys that focus on Paul and his band, from Acts 13 until he arrives back in Jerusalem with the offering for the church there in Acts 21:15 ff., they begin by passing through places where the church already existed. On Cyprus in Acts 13:4-12 they do evangelistic labors and strengthen the churches in Syria and Cilicia in Acts 15:41 and Galatia

and Phrygia in Acts 18:23. But the trajectory was always set on carrying the gospel to new places. Bruce notes that starting with the Jewish synagogue was a “regular feature” of their procedure and “a practical expression of the principle laid down by Paul in Rom. 1:16—that the gospel should be present ‘to the Jew first.’” Bruce points out that Paul’s understanding of his ministry as primarily to the Gentiles, while Peter was an apostle to the Jews, did not preclude him from going to the synagogue because it was a bridgehead for reaching Gentiles due to the God-fearers who would be present.<sup>40</sup> Bruce concludes, “It was regularly the God-fearing Gentiles who attended the synagogue that formed the nucleus of Paul’s ‘churches of the Gentiles.’”<sup>41</sup>

Paul’s reflections on his calling shows that he understood it as proclaiming the Good News of Jesus to places “where Christ was not known” (Rom. 15:20) and not building on another’s foundation. Paul applies Isaiah 49:6 in the second Servant Song that the New Testament applied to Jesus (Luke 2:29-32) to himself and Barnabas in the particular aspect of Gentile evangelization. His visiting of churches to strengthen them in Acts 15:41 and 18:23 at the start of his travels are likely fellowships that he helped to found and that he must pass through, in order to continue to seek new areas where the gospel had not yet come. I think it is significant that Paul did not see his work as going to places where the church existed that he did not help found. His letter to the Romans again shows him in movement, not avoiding the church, but wanting to share mutual encouragement (Rom. 1:11-12) and more importantly to have them assist him on his way to evangelize in Spain (15:24). This trajectory of seeking to take the gospel to new ground is confirmed by the Acts narrative where there is movement from Cyprus to evangelization in Asia Minor, the direction of the Spirit to not evangelize in Asia or Bithynia (Acts 16:7), and the resulting call to Macedonia on the western Aegean. In the third journey he plants the church in Ephesus in the province of Asia where he had previously been forbidden to work by the Spirit (Acts 19:1). Even when Paul is interacting with a church he helped to start his hope is to see his team’s area of influence enlarged “so that we may preach the gospel in lands beyond you” (2 Cor 10:15-16).

#### Paul’s ministry practices

Again, it is easy to read the story in Acts of Paul’s journeys and see what he did as fixed rather than as decisions made within a range of choices based on his understanding of his calling

and the guidance of the Spirit. As we have noted, Paul followed the direction of the Spirit, and when he arrived in each place, he proclaimed the gospel in public and private settings, with signs and wonders manifested. From those who believed, he formed house fellowships, and from both Acts and his letters, we see that local leadership was left in place before moving on (see Acts 14:23 on the first journey, Acts 20:13-37 meeting the Ephesian elders, Phil. 1:1, I Thess. 5:12-13 as examples). Paul also passed on a spirituality and self-understanding to the churches that equipped them with the ability to multiply and reproduce. O'Brien says that although "the calling and gifts of Paul's converts were different from his own, the logic of the gospel demanded that they be committed to its ongoing dynamic advance."<sup>42</sup> Acts 19:10 indicates that Paul's daily discussions with disciples at the lecture hall of Tyrannus over two years led to the whole province of Asia hearing the word of the Lord. Reflecting later in his life on his labors, he can say in Rom. 15:19-20 that from Jerusalem to Illyricum, he had fully proclaimed the gospel of Christ. While there are differences of opinion on precisely what is meant by these two geographic places, Dunn notes that Illyricum was the northeast coast of the Adriatic and would mark the northwestern limit of Paul's missionary work.<sup>43</sup> The question must be asked, in what way had Paul "fully proclaimed" or as Dunn translates "completed the preaching of the gospel"? What happened at Ephesus suggests that Paul raised up disciples who were able to make other disciples. Dunn concludes:

He saw his work very much as the one who laid the foundation (v 20); and his strategy seems also to have included the encouraging of fellow workers to go out from the urban centers where he had established the work to the region around (Col 1:6-8; cf. Acts 19:10, 2 Cor 1:1). . . . So the claim to have reached the borders of Illyricum could refer to missionary work done at Paul's behest and with his encouragement and not just to his own personal mission.<sup>44</sup>

Newbigin observes that in Rom. 15:23, when Paul says there is no longer room for work in the regions that he had worked in, he did not mean that all the population was converted or all their social problems were solved.<sup>45</sup> He says, "the point here is that [Paul] has completed his missionary task in the creation of believing communities in all the regions through which he has passed."<sup>46</sup>

I have already noted how Paul strengthened churches by visits and his letters also showed their ongoing relationships from a distance. It is in this continuing relationship with the churches that we see a difference in the way that Paul sees the primary task of the apostolic band and how

local fellowships, as God's people in the world, are to live and engage their world. Winter's distinction between the local church and missionary band as redemptive structures can be seen in this material. Paul's call and interpretation of it and his practices show a narrow view of his task: to take the gospel where Christ is not known, and then to plant indigenous local fellowships with the ability to reproduce and multiply. But when it comes to what local churches are to be and do Paul shows that there is a broader arena that the church as God's people is to engage.

Often a narrow and focused view of cross-cultural mission, as planting the church among those who do not have the gospel, is seen as competing with or as antithetical to broader views where the gospel can be expressed in proclamation word or loving deeds. However, the two redemptive structures of local church and missionary band shows a complementary working together of the narrow and broad views: the missionary band has a narrow task of planting the church where it does not exist and giving it the full DNA of the people of God, and those local churches then engage their social worlds in the broader view that encompasses both word and deed.

While there were many social needs present as Paul moved throughout the empire, it is significant that he did not tackle them head on in his missionary band. He did not use them as starting points out of which he hoped to see people come to faith. However, when people believed, he both demonstrated and taught them that they were to express care and concern first within the family of God and beyond. In Acts 20:34-35 Paul shows that he personally modeled for the Ephesian church care for the *asthenes* (weak, which can refer to economic weakness and poverty), he is concerned that the church cares for widows (I Tim. 5:3-16), reminds the Galatians to do good to all people (Gal. 6:10), and advises Timothy that the rich in this present world are to be "rich in good deeds and to be generous and willing to share" (I Tim. 6:18). While Paul did not attack issues such as slavery and relations between men and women directly, his theological work challenged the dominant social views and eventually led to societal changes that today we take for granted. Life in Christ through the power of the Spirit and Jesus as Lord relativized all human relationships so that the human distinctions of Jew and Gentile, slave and free, male and female, patrons and clients, were erased.

Bruce Longenecker observes that when it comes to Paul, the conventional understanding is that the poor are peripheral to his main theological concerns.<sup>47</sup> However, his work on Paul's letters in relation to the poor reveals that "consistent trace of 'theological DNA' [which] show[s]



Paul to have been uncompromising in promoting care for the poor.”<sup>48</sup> Longenecker concludes from nine of Paul’s letters and Luke’s depiction of Paul in Acts that:

It is best to believe that Paul expected concern for the indigenous (and deserving) poor to be a hallmark of Jesus-groups that he founded...no doubt as an outworking of the story of Israel’s deity of justice, refracted now through the story of the Galilean Jew who stood alongside the poor in the promise of divine blessing.<sup>49</sup>

His argument is that Paul saw care for the poor by his primarily Gentile communities of faith as “an expression and embodiment of the invading triumph of the deity of Israel who had made [H]imself known in the scripture of Israel, in the life, death[,] and resurrection of Jesus, and now through the Spirit/spirit that enlivened small groups of Jesus-followers.”<sup>50</sup>

What we see here is that the local church/apostolic band distinction does not keep cross-cultural workers from being involved at the personal or team level in expressing compassion in various ways as they pass on God’s ethical vision for His people. They integrate word and deed into their lifestyle and participate with the local churches when with them. But it is clear they are not doing stand-alone social ministry; rather, their focus is to see local church movements formed that both evangelize and show care and compassion, serving as a prophetic voice and alternate community to the world around them.

#### Comparing the Pauline Mission Band with Proposals for a New Missionary Role

How do the current proposals for cross-cultural missionary work I overviewed above compare with what we see in the book of Acts and Paul’s missionary band labors? While the new proposals feature shorter-term personnel primarily working on a project basis with the existing church in supportive, facilitative, and social roles, it is clear that the Pauline mission was about planting reproducing churches in places where they did not previously exist. The suggested change appears to be motivated by what sending base churches are interested in doing, rather than seeking to align with the trajectory of God’s redemptive mission. It is also clear that Paul’s work within the confines of the Roman Empire with shared language and culture was not at all “short-term” in the way that term is currently used. The logic of cross-cultural mission from the commissions in the Gospels and Acts demands language and cultural competence that cannot happen in short-term, project-oriented work.

When Paul or his mission band members worked with or communicated with the existing church, it was with churches they had planted or where his authority was accepted in his role as

apostle to the Gentiles. Continued relationship with local churches was in the interests of a robust indigeneity. Personal visits, letters, and team members worked with the goal of helping churches to be obedient to the faith and live as God's people under His rule, proclaiming the gospel and caring for the family of God and beyond. His movements were not forays for supporting and facilitating, nor was he some kind of specialist operating in settings where he was unfamiliar with the cultural dynamics in churches unknown to him. All this also shows that Paul was not a "global missionary" in the sense of bringing specialized training to help existing churches; all that he and his team members did grew out of their pioneer church planting labors.

While Paul was deeply concerned that the new churches expressed concern for the poor and marginalized in their midst and in the broader society, his mission band did not use social ministry as a starting point, nor did they operate social ministry on a standalone basis. They lived and participated in the churches they were with in an integrated fashion, both teaching and modeling care and concern for people. However, it was the local churches that were to express the compassion of Jesus rather than it being the primary work of the mission band.

Finally, many of these descriptions of what is happening in cross-cultural missions or suggestions as to how it should happen, are an attempt to help believers see themselves as part of God's mission, rather than being on the sidelines while professional missionaries do the work. Certainly Paul would affirm that all of God's people need to be participating fully in God's redemptive plan by the power of the Spirit, but he recognized a special apostolic role in the body of Christ that not all have (1 Cor. 12:27-31; Eph. 4:11) and that there is a need for people to be sent so that others can hear (Rom. 10:14-17). While this terminological issue was not on his radar or that of the churches, it seems unlikely that Paul's experience of his own calling and the work of his apostolic band would lead him to use the same terminology for local church members as for himself.

### *Implications of the Paradigmatic Nature of the Pauline Mission for Current Cross-Cultural Work*

In this final section I explore some of the implications for current missions practice that grow out of seeing Paul's missionary labors as paradigmatic rather than being one style among many.

The apostolic priority of planting the church among people groups where it does not exist is at the core of missionary labor and should remain our highest priority.

Putting it very simply, if Luke's tracing of the Pauline mission in Acts is to set a paradigm for the cross-cultural expansion of the gospel, then *cross-cultural ministry* should be seeking to do what Paul and his band did. In an environment where virtually everything qualifies as "mission," we should drill down and focus our efforts on identifying those with little access to the gospel and make church planting among such people groups our highest priority. All cross-cultural work should align with the Biblical trajectory of the church being planted in all the cultural diversity of humanity.

Using the "priority" word makes a lot of people nervous, but priority does not mean that there is only one thing to do nor does it mean that other things are not important. If the church planting task among people groups that do not have access to the gospel is the central focus of the apostolic band, other kinds of cross-cultural ministry should *align* with that big Biblical vision. Alignment means that cross-cultural ministry expressions other than direct church planting should *entail* from that church planting goal. We have seen that Pauline church planting passed on multiplicative DNA to these fellowships. The goal was not a minimalist one of a handful of house churches but to see movements that extended the gospel much further than the original location. Planting robust indigenous church *movements* is a highly complex task. Think of all the kinds of cross-cultural work that flows from this goal: in addition to the initial proclamation of the gospel and founding of a fellowship there is discipling new converts, teaching them to obey all that Jesus has commanded, training leadership, helping the church to understand its role as God's people called to demonstrate in word and deed what God has done in Jesus Christ, encouraging them to function as God's temple and alternative community that lives under God's rule and are shining lights and prophetic voices to their social worlds, and coming full circle by sending their own cross-cultural workers to those without access to the gospel. All of these things grow out of that initial breakthrough in the planting of the church. There is a need for the ongoing presence of boots-on-the-ground, language and culturally competent laborers with multiple giftings that serve alongside the emerging church in humility.

Local church structures and apostolic band structures as redemptive structures are interdependent.

Some might struggle with the thought of there being two redemptive structures, because they feel it is the Church that is sent into the world, and in that view the apostolic band lies outside of the Church in some way. Another way to look at this fact is to use Paul's body metaphor in 1 Cor. 12, but to apply it to this situation. Everyone who is in Christ belongs to the body, but the body has different gifts distributed in it. Apostolic bands are made up of gifted people who can cross cultural boundaries to plant the church. Local churches have gifts within them to help build up God's people, including apostolic roles for people working monoculturally. Because these are *redemptive* structures, the Spirit works through both those who proclaim the gospel and bring people to the obedience of faith. The logic of the relationship is interdependent in that apostolic bands plant local church structures, and in turn, it is local church structures that nurture those who are called to go cross-culturally and send them forth.

Both redemptive structures need trained workers.

You cannot read Acts or the letters of Paul without coming away with the sense that there was structure, training, and some kind of leadership happening in both local churches and apostolic bands. I find it stunning that nobody argues that "everyone is a pastor," and yet assertions that "everyone is a missionary" are ubiquitous. I think we will do better if we say that all of God's people are sent into the world, and we are to use the gifts we are given from the Spirit, acknowledging that the more complex ministry tasks like shepherding God's people or working to evangelize and plant the church cross-culturally by their very nature all require training. People want their doctors and airline pilots to be elite in the sense of having excellent training for the complex tasks. It seems unreasonable to muddy the waters by saying everyone is a missionary, in light of the complexity of the cross-cultural task before us.

We need room for Spirit-empowered laser focused missionary bands AND Spirit-led cross-cultural contact.

To argue for a paradigmatic understanding of the missionary task based on the Pauline mission is not to put the Spirit in a box, as if He could not or would never use people outside of that framework. Acts shows us divine cross-cultural encounters that are one-time events, such as

Philip meeting the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8, cross-cultural encounters by Peter, an apostle whose primary work was monocultural among his own Jewish people but who the Spirit used to take the gospel to the Gentile Cornelius in Acts 10, and Paul's burden for his own people, although his primary calling was to Gentiles.

The emphasis to awaken the church to its missional responsibility, to those both geographically and culturally near and far, is a wonderful thing. Local Christians everywhere need to be ready for any encounter, to bear witness to and to lovingly serve people like them and people who are radically different from them. The Spirit today is using people who are moving in the world both voluntarily and involuntarily as they find themselves in different cultural settings. Our lives should always be participating through the Spirit, with God's mission and not just instrumentally using our relationship with the living God for our personal benefit.

Having said that however, we need to remember that dedicated missionary band structures are Biblically and historically the primary channel by which the gospel moves into new societies that lack access to the Good News.<sup>51</sup> Andrew Walls talks of the rise of voluntary missionary societies in the 18th century as a "fortunate subversion" of the church.<sup>52</sup> He notes how the classical forms of church government were seen as immutable in the 18th century but says, "it suddenly became clear that there were matters—and not small matters, but big matters, matters like the evangelization of the world—which were beyond the capacities of these splendid systems of gospel truth."<sup>53</sup> The new voluntary society missionary structure also subverted the power base of the church by releasing lay people and women into ministry in ways they could not have participated in at home. Walls says, "as the societies developed, people—whether clerical or lay, who had previously been of no particular significance in their churches—came to be of immense significance in the societies."<sup>54</sup> The irony is, considering the criticism today that missionary enterprise has created an elitist professionalized domain, these early societies were formed from non-elite populations. It was inside of the missionary societies, over time through experience and accumulated wisdom in the work, that training could increase the effectiveness of new cohorts of workers over the years. To have trained competent professionals in any field does not denigrate the work or participation of the non-professional; it just means they have different roles that are appropriate to their skill levels. The fact that there are professional airline pilots does not mean other people do not fly planes; to have professional doctors does not mean that others cannot help with sickness in some way; to have culturally competent and language

capable workers planting and strengthening the church does not mean that others cannot participate. But in each of these illustrations, the *primary* labor to accomplish the task, whether it is the airline industry moving large numbers of people safely over distances, the medical field treating serious illnesses, or the complex task of proclaiming the gospel and planting the church cross-culturally, all actions are accomplished by a trained professional corps of workers.

Chris Wright draws on Newbigin's distinction between the *missional dimension* of all Christian life, meaning that "everything the church is and does should be connected in some way to our very reason for existence as the people of God" and when the church acts with *missional intention* where "it engages in specific actions and initiatives that are planned, resourced[,] and carried out with deliberate intention of bearing witness, in word and deed, to the good news of the kingdom of God."<sup>55</sup> Cross-cultural contacts by local Christians, whether geographically near or far, needs to be undertaken with a missional dimension, but the broader task of planting the church among the *ethne* cannot be accomplished by that way alone, it requires missional intention through dedicated apostolic bands made up of linguistically and culturally competent workers.

### *Conclusion*

A wise pastor friend once told me that the more things change, the more we need to clarify what does not change. Sincere voices are telling us the world and the church are changing and the missionary enterprise needs to change with it. We will be wise if we take seriously their critique and cautions; but we also need to drill down on what does not change. God's redemptive plan for the world, which ends with redeemed people in all the diversity of humanity, remains unchanged, the Spirit's empowerment to bear witness to Jesus remains unchanged, and the apostolic priority to proclaim the gospel and plant the church where Jesus is not yet known remains unchanged. The need for linguistically and culturally competent Spirit-empowered workers that are boots-on-the-ground working in apostolic bands among the people groups of the earth that have no access to the gospel and who work to develop and strengthen indigenous church movements remains unchanged. The need for local churches and movements living integrated lives in word and deed to their social worlds and who are open to the Spirit to use them in every situation with people like them or different than them remains unchanged. The distinction between the apostolic mission band and local church does not promote elitism but

rather provides channels to express giftings where they are most effective. It is these ongoing Biblical functions that remain unchanged and not current trends that need to be the bedrock upon which we build our cross-cultural ministry strategy and practices in any age. The task is great, and the workers are few, so we need all of God's people working in their giftings, in the structure best designed to see them flourish to bring in the harvest.

### ***Bibliography***

- Adeney, Miriam. "Mcmissions: Short-Termers Have Their Place, but Not at the Expense of Career Missionaries." *Christianity Today* 11 November 1996 (1996): 24-25.  
<https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/1996/november11/6td014.html>.
- Banks, Robert. *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Cultural Setting*. revised edition ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Bosch, David J. *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*. Vol. 16, 21 vols. 9 ed. American Society of Missiology Series. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. *The Book of Acts*. Revised ed. The New International Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1988.
- Deborst, Ruth Padilla. "An Integral Transformation Approach: Being, Doing and Saying." In *The Mission of the Church: Five Views in Conversation*, edited by Craig Ott, 41-67. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Dunn, James. D. G. *Romans 9-16*. Vol. 38b. Word Biblical Commentary, edited by Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, John D. W. Watts, Ralph P. Martin, James W. Watts, and Lynn Allan Losie. Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1988.
- Glasser, Arthur F., Charles Van Engen, Dean S. Gilliland, and Shawn B. Redford. *Announcing the Kingdom: The Story of God's Mission in the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Ireland, Jerry Michael. "The Missionary Nature of Tongues in the Book of Acts." *PentecoStudies* 18, no. 2 (2019): 200-23.
- Johnson, Andy. *Missions: How the Local Church Goes Global*. 9marks: Building Healthy Churches. Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2017.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty and the Greco-Roman World*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company 2010.

- Ma, Wonsuk. *A 'Fuller' Vision of God's Mission and Theological Education in the New Context of Global Christianity*. The State of Missiology Today: Global Innovations in Christian Witness. Edited by Charles Van Engen. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2016.
- Newbigin, Lesslie. *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1989.
- Newell, Marvin J. *Commissioned: What Jesus Wants You to Know as You Go*. Saint Charles, Illinois: ChurchSmart Resources, 2010.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *Gospel and Mission in the Writing of Paul: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1995.
- Olsen, Andy and Bekah McNeel. "Don't Paint the Orphanage: After Years of Debate over the Merits of Short-Term Missions What Are We Left With?" *Christianity Today* 63, no. 7 (October 2019): 33-39.
- Ott, Craig, ed. *The Mission of the Church: Five Views in Conversation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Padilla, C. Rene. "The Ebb and Flow of Kingdom Theology." In *Regnum Edinburgh 2010 Series*, edited by Beth Snodderly and A. Scott Moreau, Evangelical and Frontier Mission: Perspectives on the Global Progress of the Gospel, ed. Knud Jorgensen, Kirsteen Kim, Wonsuk Ma, and Tony Gray, 274-85. Oxford, UK: Regnum, 2011.
- Porter, Steve L., Felicia Heykoop, Barbara Miller, and Todd Pickett. "Spiritual Formation and the Social Justice Turn." *Christian Scholar's Review* XLIV, no. 3 (2015): 263-84.
- Poston, Larry. "Re-Thinking 'Career Missions' in Light of Paul the 'Short-Term Missionary'." *Global Missiology* (October 2008). GlobalMissiology.org.
- Priest, Robert J. "A New Era of Missions Is Upon Us." In *Regnum Edinburgh 2010 Series*, edited by Beth Snodderly and A. Scott Moreau, Evangelical and Frontier Mission: Perspectives on the Global Progress of the Gospel, ed. Knud Jorgensen, Kirsteen Kim, Wonsuk Ma, and Tony Gray, 294-304. Oxford, UK: Regnum, 2011.
- Sexton, James S., Jonathan Leeman, J. H. Christopher Wright, John Francke, and Peter Leithard, eds. *Four Views on the Church's Mission*. Edited by Stanley N. Gundry, Counterpoints Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2017.
- Shellnutt, Kate. "Hq Trivial?" *Christianity Today* 62, no. 5 (2018): 17-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Making Missions Count: How a Major Database Tracked Thailand's Church-Planting Revival." *Christianity Today* 63, no. 3 (2019): 28-37.
- Spitters, Denny and Matthew Ellison. *When Everything Is Missions*. Bottom Line Media, 2017.



Stegemann, Ekkehard W. and Wolfgang Stegemann. *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First Century*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press 1999.

Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.

Stroope, Michael W. . *Transcending Mission: The Eclipse of a Modern Tradition*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2017.

Walls, Andrew F. "Missionary Societies and the Fortunate Subversion of the Church." In *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*, 241-54. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1996.

Walls, Andrew F. and Cathy Ross, eds. *Mission in the 21st Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Mission*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2008.

Waltrip, Blayne C. "The Global Missionary: The Emerging Roles of North American Missionaries in the Twenty-First Century." *International Journal of Pentecostal Missions* 6, no. 1 (2019): 42-53.

Winter, Ralph D. "The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Mission." In *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement: A Reader*, edited by Ralph D. Winter and Steven C. Hawthorne, 220-30. Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1999.

Yeh, Allen. *Polycentric Missiology: Twenty-First-Century Mission from Everyone to Everywhere*. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2016.

---

<sup>1</sup> David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, 9 ed., vol. 16, 21 vols., *American Society of Missiology Series* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 368-89.

<sup>2</sup> C. Rene Padilla, "The Ebb and Flow of Kingdom Theology," in *Regnum Edinburgh 2010 Series*, ed. Beth Snodderly and A. Scott Moreau, *Evangelical and Frontier Mission: Perspectives on the Global Progress of the Gospel* (Oxford, UK: Regnum, 2011), 276-80. and Robert J. Priest, "A New Era of Missions Is Upon Us," in *Regnum Edinburgh 2010 Series*, ed. Beth Snodderly and A. Scott Moreau, *Evangelical and Frontier Mission: Perspectives on the Global Progress of the Gospel* (Oxford, UK: Regnum, 2011). For a review of problems with the missionary enterprise see Michael W. Stroope, *Transcending Mission: The Eclipse of a Modern Tradition* (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2017), 1-30. Career cross-cultural workers will benefit from taking seriously the critiques of these writers about Western missionary enterprise. However there are a few things that need to temper that critique as well. First, Bosch acknowledges the attack of Christian mission from many directions, but reminds his readers that "throughout most of the church's history its empirical state has been deplorable" from Jesus' first circle of disciples on (*Transforming*, 518-519). He points out that we cannot limit mission to this "empirical project" but it is *missio Dei* that is mission (*Ibid.*, 519). Chris Wright also pushes back on the condemnation of mission work in the modern era being predominantly Western, colonial and culture-homogenizing (James S. Sexton et al., eds., *Four Views on the Church's Mission*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry, *Counterpoints Bible and Theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2017), 143). He reminds readers of three things: Christian missionaries often resisted colonial powers, it was not just simple collusion, there are many forms of mission in the past that do not reflect that stereotype, such as the Syriac, Celtic, Moravian, and the more recent indigenous missions, and the fact that "the tendency to export cultural assumptions and domination are not confined to Western colonialism," as the same accusations are made and even recognized by some majority world sending. In my view it is wisdom to make a

distinction between Biblically mandated functions, such as taking the gospel to the world, from inappropriate practices and applications of God's people as they try to carry out that function in their era.

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed list of these changes see Priest, "A New Era," 296-301.

<sup>4</sup> Priest, in *Regnum Edinburgh 2010 Series*, 301.

<sup>5</sup> Allen Yeh, *Polycentric Missiology: Twenty-First-Century Mission from Everyone to Everywhere* (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2016), 18.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Kate Shellnutt, "Making Missions Count: How a Major Database Tracked Thailand's Church-Planting Revival," *Christianity Today* 63, no. 3 (2019), 37.

<sup>9</sup> Kate Shellnutt, "HQ Trivial?," *Christianity Today* 62, no. 5 (2018), 18.

<sup>10</sup> Blayne C. Waltrip, "The Global Missionary: The Emerging Roles of North American Missionaries in the Twenty-First Century," *International Journal of Pentecostal Missions* 6, no. 1 (2019): 42.

<sup>11</sup> Wonsuk Ma, *A 'Fuller' Vision of God's Mission and Theological Education in the New Context of Global Christianity, The State of Missiology Today: Global Innovations in Christian Witness* (Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic, 2016), 92.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 93.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 93-97.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>17</sup> Andy Olsen and Bekah McNeel, "Don't Paint the Orphanage: After Years of Debate over the Merits of Short-Term Missions What Are We Left With?," *Christianity Today* 63, no. 7 (October 2019): 34.

<sup>18</sup> Priest, "A New Era," 298.

<sup>19</sup> Olsen and McNeel.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> Larry Poston, "Re-Thinking 'Career Missions' in Light of Paul the 'Short-Term Missionary,'" *Global Missiology* (October 2008), GlobalMissiology.org.

<sup>23</sup> Steve L. Porter et al., "Spiritual Formation and the Social Justice Turn," *Christian Scholar's Review* XLIV, no. 3 (2015): 263.

<sup>24</sup> See how Marvin Newell sees a compelling unity in these commissions, given on five different occasions, and feels they serve as a charter for the church of all ages. Marvin J. Newell, *Commissioned: What Jesus Wants You to Know as You Go* (Saint Charles, Illinois: ChurchSmart Resources, 2010), 23-28.

<sup>25</sup> Ruth Padilla Deborst, "An Integral Transformation Approach: Being, Doing and Saying," in *The Mission of the Church: Five Views in Conversation*, ed. Craig Ott (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2016), 59.

<sup>26</sup> For a perceptive critique of some of the problems with amateurization, see Lawrence Radcliffe, "A Field Worker Speaks out About the Rush to Reach All Peoples," *Mission Frontiers* January-February (1998), accessed 26 July 2020, <https://www.missionfrontiers.org/issue/article/a-field-worker-speaks-out>. and Miriam Adeney, "Mcmissions: Short-Termers Have Their Place, but Not at the Expense of Career Missionaries," *Christianity Today* 11 November 1996 (1996), <https://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/1996/november11/6td014.html>.

<sup>27</sup> Ralph D. Winter, "The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Mission," in *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement: A Reader*, ed. Ralph D. Winter and Steven C. Hawthorne (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1999).

<sup>28</sup> Ekkehard W. Stegemann and Wolfgang Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First Century* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press 1999), 286.

<sup>29</sup> Winter, "The Two Structures," 220-221.

<sup>30</sup> Robert Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in Their Cultural Setting*, revised edition ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 159-60.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 160-62, 69.

<sup>32</sup> Denny Spitters and Matthew Ellison, *When Everything Is Missions* (Bottom Line Media, 2017), 36. Dean Flemming in *Why Mission* makes a similar distinction: ". . . mission, from a broad perspective, is anchored in God's sweeping project to bring about salvation in every dimension. . . . the mission of God's people is no less than a participation in the mission of the triune God (the *missio Dei*), a mission that is as wide as creation itself" (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2015), xviii.

<sup>33</sup> Andrew F. Walls and Cathy Ross, eds., *Mission in the 21st Century: Exploring the Five Marks of Mission* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 2008). James S. Sexton et al., eds., *Four Views on the Church's Mission*, ed. Stanley N. Gundry, Counterpoints Bible and Theology (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2017). Craig Ott, ed. *The Mission of the Church: Five Views in Conversation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2016). Andy Johnson, *Missions: How the Local Church Goes Global, 9marks: Building Healthy Churches* (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway, 2017). See Chapter 12 Elements of an Emerging Ecumenical Missionary Paradigm in Bosch.

<sup>34</sup> Arthur F. Glasser et al., *Announcing the Kingdom: The Story of God's Mission in the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2005), 301.

<sup>35</sup> Jerry Michael Ireland, "The Missionary Nature of Tongues in the Book of Acts," *PentecoStudies* 18, no. 2 (2019): 209.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> W. Paul Bowers, "Mission," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, ed. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1993), 609.

<sup>38</sup> Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 8-9.

<sup>39</sup> Winter in "Two Structures" uses the term "prototypical" to capture the sense in which the Pauline mission serves as a way of fulfilling the Biblical function of cross-cultural boundaries with the gospel that has continued over time but in different forms.

<sup>40</sup> Frederick Fyvie Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, Revised ed., *The New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1988), 247.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 266.

<sup>42</sup> Peter T. O'Brien, *Gospel and Mission in the Writing of Paul: An Exegetical and Theological Analysis* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1995), 130.

<sup>43</sup> James. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, vol. 38b, *Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1988), 864.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> Lesslie Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1989), 121.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> Bruce W. Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company 2010), 135-36.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 140.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 155.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 299.

<sup>51</sup> Winter, "The Two Structures," 229.

<sup>52</sup> Andrew F. Walls, "Missionary Societies and the Fortunate Subversion of the Church," in *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1996).

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 247.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 249.

<sup>55</sup> Christopher J. H. Wright, "Participatory Mission: The Mission of God's People Revealed in the Whole Bible Story," in *Four Views on the Church's Mission*, ed. James S. Sexton et al., *Counterpoints Bible and Theology* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2017), 90-91.