

Collaboration and Conflict in Europe around the Early Tranquebar Mission

Daniel L. Brunner, associate professor of church history and spiritual formation, George Fox Theological Seminary, Portland, Oregon

Some 300 years ago, on July 9, 1706, a new epoch in Protestantism began when Bartholomew Ziegenbalg and Heinrich Plütschau landed as missionaries at Tranquebar on the eastern coast of southern India.¹ This mission, though not as well known as later Moravian Brethren missionary efforts or William Carey's momentous journey, must be regarded as the first on-going Protestant foreign mission work.² The cooperative nature of this endeavor throughout much of the eighteenth century has frequently been noted³ and stands in stark contrast to the more insular character of missions in the nineteenth century. It is the story of how an Anglican voluntary society in England supported a Royal Danish Mission in the sending of Lutheran missionaries from the Pietist center of Halle to Tranquebar.

It is easy to romanticize the unprecedented national and denominational collaboration and even to see the early stirrings of ecumenism. Indeed, coming out of well over a century of religious warfare, the East India mission is noteworthy. However, as in all pioneering efforts where precedents are scarce, this journey was filled with conflict, all-too-human personalities, and disputed practices on the mission field. The purpose of this article is to highlight two of the early European conflicts surrounding the Tranquebar mission—between English Anglicanism and German Lutheranism and between German Lutheran Pietism and Danish Lutheran Orthodoxy. In an epilogue we will touch briefly on the fruit born through this endeavor, despite or even through the conflicts.

English Anglicanism versus German Lutheranism

It was a German Pietist in London, Anthony William Boehm, a former student of Francke and chaplain at the German Lutheran Chapel Royal at St. James's,⁴ who first brought the East India Mission to the attention of the English public by bringing to print *Propagation of the Gospel in the East*.⁵ In these books, which went through numerous editions, Boehm published translated letters from the missionaries in Tranquebar. Not long thereafter, Boehm inspired the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK), the first of the great Anglican voluntary societies, to support the Tranquebar mission and even to appoint a special committee to oversee the society's involvement.⁶ Boehm wrote excitedly to Francke in Halle: "A God-inspired mind will recognize also here the finger of God and take delight in it. Though the whole work is yet an embryo and tiny seed, from which one cannot quickly harvest ripe fruits, it already serves that by such approval of eminent people the project could be commended to others rather better and more forcibly and be made known in the whole land."⁷

Before long, though, it would be clear to Boehm and the missionaries that not every "eminent" person approved of the enterprise without qualifications. After seeing a catechism from the mission, the archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison, complained to the SPCK about the possible spread of "sectarian Lutheranism."⁸ Luther's catechism, which had been translated by the missionaries into both Tamil and Portuguese, was the basis of instruction at Tranquebar. Tenison noted that the Tranquebar catechism had omitted the second commandment in the Decalogue against false images, which appears in the Anglican and Reformed but not in the Lutheran and Catholic numbering of the commandments. When the special committee heard about the angry archbishop,⁹ they forwarded the matter to the whole society. The SPCK's secretary reported on the lengthy deliberations:

The major part [of the society] seemed to wish the matter had never come in Question before them for it was no secret to them that the missionaries are Lutherans or at least pass for such, in which it cannot be supposed they are countenanced and encouraged by the Society . . . The Members who have solicited for charities to this Mission have thought it their prudence and Charity to avoid as much as they could putting it into the heads of Benefactors that the Missionarys

were Lutherans or Ministers not episcopally ordained, etc. because Mankind are too apt to catch at objection to save their Purses; and they considered that if it should please God to make these men instruments of propagating Christianity under some disqualifications, it would not misbecome good men, not only to rejoice at it, but to encourage such instruments, in hopes that their defects might by the good Providence of God be hereafter supplied. They considered that, though they unfeignedly wished to see the Gospel in its purity propagated without any bias to the sects or opinions that unhappily divide Christians, yet that it is rather to be conniv'd at that the heathen should be Lutheran Christians rather than no Christians.¹⁰

The members of the SPCK were conscious of the fact that the missionaries were ordained Lutherans, but they did not want to harm through public debate the more vital opportunity for mission. Even though the society regarded the omission as “one of the Raggs of Popery that has been unfortunately handed down among the Lutheran Reformers,”¹¹ they were hopeful the archbishop would mollify his “just Resentments of the Proceedings of the wel-meaning Men at Tranquebar” while the society attended to the situation.¹²

The special committee asked Boehm to write the missionaries, requesting that they rewrite the catechism with the second commandment included “in the manner used by the Church of England,” and informing them “with much respect and Christian Tenderness of the offence that has been taken by some Gentlemen, their Benefactors at the omission, and particularly by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.”¹³ Boehm’s letter is a fascinating example of the complications involved in a bi-denominational effort of this magnitude.¹⁴ In it, Boehm also gives evidence of his distinctive ecumenical spirit. He begins by reminding Ziegenbalg and J. E. Gründler, his close associate, of the far-reaching implications of their work. Modestly pointing to his own weak efforts, Boehm drew attention to the fact that many in England were now seeing the possibility of becoming involved in some way with the mission to India. Since the missionaries were forging new ground, they had a responsibility to use “wisdom and prudence” and to conduct themselves with “godly ingenuity,” especially since they were being watched by friend and foe alike.¹⁵ Turning to the prime occasion for the letter, Boehm reported on the archbishop’s suspicion that the missionaries were “intending to

introduce coarse or sectarian Lutheranism” in India. For some Anglicans, to omit the second commandment against graven images was particularly ill-advised in a polytheistic milieu like Tranquebar. Others had told Boehm that it did not seem possible that the missionaries would have learned to plant a strict Lutheranism from their professors in Halle. The situation was dangerously sensitive:

You can easily see, that through this unexpected objection (especially since it was made by the most noble theologian in the whole land) much disruption and animosity has developed, though indeed I spared no effort from my side to pacify minds and to forestall further damaging results. The Archbishop went so far that he informed the Society that he would instruct the clergy strongly not to take up in the least bit further or to assist in any way such a mission which aimed at planting sectarian Lutheranism.

Having no idea such unrest would be stirred up by a “trifle,” Boehm assured the missionaries that Tenison had been a friend and benefactor of the mission and that he had read their translated letters with pleasure.¹⁶

Boehm, who clearly considered this matter *adiaphora*, or something indifferent, gave specific counsel on how to resolve the matter most simply. In the next edition of the catechism the Decalogue should be printed as found in Exodus 20, without numbering the commandments. Urging the missionaries to abstain from using human or partisan names, he advised removing Luther’s name from the catechism, since it raised misgivings that they were simply propagating a sectarian position. Luther’s name would have no authority with Indian natives; instead, Boehm stressed that the faithful love and hard work of the missionaries themselves would have a greater impact. One can perceive Boehm’s unique ecumenical and pietistic convictions rise to the surface: “To what end, beloved brothers, would we take such a human course? Our whole purpose should be to go and preach Christ among the natives as the *author* of blessedness! He is indeed powerful to ignite and strengthen faith in them. Does it matter if there had never even been a Luther or if he were to remain wholly unknown among the natives?” When it came to what mattered—the order of salvation—the little good Luther’s name might accomplish would be outweighed by the potential damage to the whole fragile state of affairs.¹⁷

Every effort should be made to bring order out of the shambles caused by their catechism. In their future letters to the SPCK he advised against verbose explanations of the matter; instead, they should in general and friendly ways conform themselves to the society's recommendations. Then, slowly, the whole affair would be forgotten. To convince the missionaries of the society's good intentions, he said that its members had such high esteem for the Tranquebar mission "that they would have no qualms sending their own missionaries to you in order to watch first your whole conduct, methods, and teaching-style among the natives, before they themselves took on such a work."¹⁸

Boehm bemoaned the sectarian damage that could be done to the outreach to India should this dispute not be quickly resolved. Without prudence such squabbles could ultimately produce an unfortunate situation in which separate Lutheran, Calvinist, and Anglican mission efforts would compete with each another. At the same time, Boehm also did not want his non-sectarian spirit to be misunderstood: "In this whole matter, dear brothers, it is in no way my opinion that you should go over to another party and, for instance, introduce the liturgy or confession of another Church. Indeed, I would be truly opposed to such a case, whereby bad would become worse; I would rather let everything fall apart and sink as consent to such a dangerous mishmash."¹⁹

He urged the missionaries to walk "a middle way" when teaching natives the way of salvation, by avoiding the human, partisan names that had done so much damage in Europe. Admittedly, acknowledged Boehm, Lutheran doctrine, especially as set forth by Spener, was as pure as any Protestant Church; nonetheless, Boehm suggested identifying it as Christian, not Lutheran.²⁰ After some specific suggestions about the Apostles' Creed, baptism, and Holy Communion,²¹ Boehm informed the missionaries that the society was going to publish his translations of some of their recent letters. He hoped that those reports would bring a new awakening for the mission. His final words were diplomatic, to say the least: "May the Lord grant us the necessary prudence and wisdom in all our ways; have no doubt that well-intentioned Englishmen will continue to remain faithful to the mission. Towards this end, take care that you do not speak too highly of the work, but let readers form their own opinions from your candid reports of the growth, hindrances, and other evidences of the footsteps of divine providence."²²

Out of his concern that the missionaries come to terms with the seriousness of the issue, Boehm asked Halle to send the missionaries

some “further advice...to carry on the work with proper theological prudence.”²³ Ultimately the appropriate changes were made; with the approval of Halle, the Anglican second commandment against graven images was added as an augmentation to the first commandment in the next edition of the catechism. The missionaries sent this response to their benefactors in England: “As to what relates to Party-Names, or Distinctions, the divine Wisdom, which is without Partiality, has taught us to abhor them. Our Scholars [students] know not so much as the bare Name of Luther or Calvin.”²⁴

Orthodox Lutheran versus Pietist Lutheran

On the continent in Europe there arose another conflict over the Tranquebar mission, related to its Pietist theology and chosen methodologies. The debate began in earnest with the return from the mission field of J. G. Bövingh, a Dane who had spent about two years in Tranquebar. He had traveled to India with Gründler, the man who on their arrival in 1709 quickly took Plütschau’s place as second-in-command and Ziegenbalg’s closest associate. Already on board ship, the differences between Gründler’s Pietist Lutheranism and Bövingh’s Orthodox Lutheranism had flared into dissension.²⁵ On arrival in Tranquebar, Bövingh’s suspicion of Pietism isolated him from the other missionaries; Ziegenbalg wrote that Bövingh had “a contentious spirit and distrustful mind.”²⁶

After two tension-filled years, Bövingh, unable to live with the pietistic theology (and theologians) at Tranquebar, returned to take a pastoral position in Germany. After his arrival an anonymous person published Bövingh’s travel diary taken during his trip to India, which contained strong reproaches against the missionaries and the Tranquebar mission. Bövingh expressed regret at the publishing of the diary, yet two years later he allowed a corrected edition of the journal to appear, this time under his own name. To him the journal contained the “naked truth.”²⁷ The journal drew a strong reaction from Halle. Joachim Lange directed a sharp reply at Bövingh, who then responded to Lange’s attack by publishing a defense in V. E. Löscher’s “Unschuldige Nachrichten” of 1716.²⁸ Löscher, the most outspoken Orthodox opponent of Pietism, had published a report on the East India Mission in his “Unschuldige Nachrichten” of 1708, in which he praised the mission itself, but questioned the calling and orthodoxy of the missionaries from Halle.²⁹ The criticisms of Löscher and the publication of Bövingh’s journals resulted in doubt being cast in many people’s minds on the propriety of the mission.

It is difficult to overestimate the enmity between Orthodox and Pietist Lutheranism. Gensichen suggests that Bövingh was a man who, whatever his theological convictions, clearly did not measure up to the requirements of missionary work, and was sponsored intentionally by orthodox circles who hoped that he would upset the mission from the inside and discredit Ziegenbalg. To Gensichen, Bövingh was an instrument in the hands of ecclesiastical powers.³⁰ The attacks of the orthodox party focused on two areas. First, they challenged the confessional and theological integrity of the missionaries, and Ziegenbalg in particular, accusing them of pietistic heterodoxy and millenarianism.³¹ Unquestionably the first missionaries drew primary theological inspiration from Halle; however, if the conflict with Archbishop Tenison over their catechism is any indication, the missionaries took pains to keep the mission on a Lutheran plane and to answer orthodox critics in Europe.³²

The second direction of orthodox attacks was one which occurred repeatedly in the history of the Tranquebar mission and in the whole of mission history. Bövingh said that the mission reached only the “dregs” of society and that the church consisted only of the poorest of the poor, people who could be won only through material incentives. In the eyes of these orthodox critics, the gospel did not fundamentally alter the caste system; the mission could only reach those who had been expelled from heathen society. This assessment exemplifies the insidious nature of western paternalism—these missionary efforts are not successful if they only reach the “dregs”—and would reappear throughout the history of the Tranquebar mission.³³

Even when Bövingh slipped from prominence, the conflict in Europe did not subside. Christopher Wendt, secretary of the Mission College in Copenhagen—the mission’s official governing body established by the king of Denmark “with a full and unlimited Power to transact, manage, and determine all such things as relate to the Mission”³⁴—began to criticize the methods of the missionaries. Wendt, who had been influenced by Bövingh, wanted a more apostolic and peripatetic mission, with more direct evangelistic outreach into the regions around Tranquebar. He accused Ziegenbalg of depending too much on his status as a royal missionary, being too impetuous in his disagreements, and spending money too freely.³⁵ Ziegenbalg was hurt by Wendt’s attack and penned a response in which he retorted that he had never diverted from his primary calling as a missionary—“to serve one’s neighbour both in body and in soul, and to bring him to God.”³⁶ This new attack from the Mission College was

a deep blow to Ziegenbalg. Before his death in 1719 he wrote: "Several letters which we received in the years 1717 and 1718 from Europe, contributed not a little to so depress my spirits that I have not been able to carry out my duties with the former joy."³⁷

Conclusions

Despite the conflicts described here—and others set down elsewhere—it would be a mistake to ignore the remarkable mutuality involved in the Tranquebar mission. Even the participants, whether in the SPCK, Halle, or Copenhagen, knew they were part of something unique, even historic. Francke himself could say to the SPCK in a letter that Boehm translated and brought to the English public in 1713: "Posterity shall learn...how one Nation can help the other in the common Cause of Propagating the Christian Religion, finding that the German Nation assisted the Danes, as the English do both."³⁸ But as with any venture of this type that had no precedents or parallels, the journey was thorny. It is noteworthy that many of the difficulties that plague mission efforts to the present day—relations and disagreements with home missionary boards, conflicts among missionaries on the field, respect for native peoples and their beliefs and customs, the inviolability of caste, and others—were foreshadowed in the early years of the Tranquebar mission.

In attempting to measure the long-term impact of these conflicts, it must be pointed out that the attacks and defenses that raged within academic and administrative circles in Europe predominately did not reach the ears of supporters in Germany or England. A. H. Francke in Halle and Boehm in London exercised rigid censorship in what went public. From the beginning Halle had regularly published reports about the mission,³⁹ but A. H. Francke—and especially his son G. A. Francke after him—would leave all unpleasant things out of the publications, in order to prevent the work from being harmed and because benevolences might be cut off through negative publicity.⁴⁰ This censorship has been harshly condemned by scholars. Fengar sees in the suppression of anything negative "a sort of clandestine caution," particularly obvious in the fact that nothing of the Bövingh quarrel appeared in the Halle reports.⁴¹ Norgaard says that, since the fathers in Halle (and London) determined that in almost every controversy silence, or censorship, was the best way to ride out the storm, the mission reports from Halle are almost useless as accurate historical sources.⁴²

But one wonders if modern mission historians have given enough

weight to the delicate and unique nature of this enterprise. It must be remembered that, even though both missionaries and their advisers in Europe made many mistakes and exhibited frustrating weaknesses and foibles, this undertaking was a pioneering effort. The missionaries had few models they could draw upon in establishing the mission, nor did the leadership in Copenhagen, Halle, and London have many patterns in guiding the mission. Not only was this the first on-going Protestant missionary effort, but it was also the first time Christian leaders of three nations and two denominations had attempted a cooperative enterprise of this extent. The fragility of the situation is made clear in a letter from one of the leaders at Halle to the missionaries in 1719: "One has to make every effort to treat the English nation with respect and to behave towards them moderately and wisely, that they may not find the least reason to go back on their affection and good will. However, on the other hand, you should also take care not to do something trying to please everyone which would bring vile gossip in Denmark and in the Lutheran Church."⁴³

As long as the collaboration took place on a material plane conflicts could be minimalized; but when theological or doctrinal questions were raised problems were unavoidable. Hardliners were ubiquitous; whether in Germany, Denmark, or England the mission never lacked for critics. Boehm was all too familiar with these tensions and wanted for the sake of the mission to avoid theological disagreement as much as possible. As has been seen, his was one of the genuine ecumenical spirits of this time.

Epilogue: Lasting Effects

In spite of the stringent censorship exercised with both the Halle reports and Boehm's *Propagation of the Gospel in the East*, it would not do those publications justice to leave unsaid the impact they had in the lives of some notable Christian leaders. When John Wesley was a boy his mother Susannah read one of the first editions of *Propagation of the Gospel in the East*, including a preliminary discourse on the character of a missionary by Boehm. After reading the book, which had been sent to her home by the SPCK, she told her husband:

I was, I think, never more affected with anything... For several days I could think or speak of little else. At last it came into my mind... I might do somewhat more than I do. I thought I might pray more for them [the missionaries], and might speak to those with whom I converse with more

warmth of affection. I resolved to begin with my own children, in which I observe the following method: I take such a proportion of time as I can spare every night to discourse with each child apart.⁴⁴

Thursday was John's night, Saturday Charles's. While at Oxford twenty years later John still remembered those conversations with his mother: "If you can spare me only that little part of Thursday evening which you formerly bestowed upon me in another matter, I doubt not but it would be as useful now for correcting my heart as it was then for forming my judgement."⁴⁵ A nineteenth-century Methodist missionary to India remarked that to Susanna's reading of *Propagation of the Gospel in the East* "was probably owing the early and continued piety and zeal of her sons."⁴⁶

William Carey was aware of the Tranquebar mission,⁴⁷ but the most important direct influence of the missionary reports from India was on Zinzendorf, who first heard them in his grandmother's home. In 1753 he told a group of Moravians in England: "I know the day, the hour, the spot in Hennersdorf; it was in the Great Room; the year was 1708 or 1709; I heard items read out of the paper about the East Indies, before regular reports were issued; and there and then the first missionary impulse arose in my soul."⁴⁸ In the face of modern criticism of the censorship in the Halle mission reports, it is not insignificant to hear Zinzendorf's words: "If there had been no Indian Mission Reports, we would not have gone to convert."⁴⁹

Even today we see the lasting effects of the Tranquebar mission. Toward the end of 2004, a deadly tsunami wreaked death and destruction in Southeast Asia, including the southeastern coast of India. More than 6,000 people were killed in the region around Tranquebar; 600 died in Tranquebar alone, more than half of them children.⁵⁰ The tsunami hit during Sunday worship at New Jerusalem Lutheran Church, the church established by Ziegenbalg and the first missionaries. Pastor Gunalan Packiaraj reports that the congregation fled to the roof of the historic church for refuge. So demanding was survival in the days following, that it was almost a month before Pastor Packiaraj was able to hold funerals for the dead. Less than four weeks after the tsunami, the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of India opened the Tsunami Response and Rehabilitation Center in Tranquebar. It was headquartered in the Ziegenbalg Spiritual Center across the street from New Jerusalem Church.

Tranquebar was already home to a Christian elementary school for Tamil children; now it also houses one of twenty orphanages the Tamil Church established following the tsunami. About ninety girls between the ages of five and fifteen live in the Tranquebar orphanage. In each girl's file, her photo is stapled to a picture of her home, or what is left of it, sometimes just the ground where it once stood.

Ziegenbalg died at age thirty-six after only a decade or so of ministry, and yet today, almost 300 years later, the church he planted is still in mission, a school and orphanage are reaching children, and a center for spiritual healing and renewal bears his name.

Endnotes

1. On the Tranquebar mission, see J. F. Fengar, *History of the Tranquebar Mission*, trans. E. Francke, 2nd edition (Madras: M. E. Press, 1906 [1843]); W. Germann, *Ziegenbalg und Plütschau* (Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1868); E. Arno Lehmann, *It Began at Tranquebar*, trans. M. J. Lutz (Madras: Christian Literature Society, 1956 [1955]); idem., ed., *Alte Briefe aus Indien* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, [1957]); Stephen Neill, *A History of Christianity in India, 1707-1858* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), ii.28-58; D. Rajaiah Paul, *The Cross over India* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952); Julius Richter, *A History of Missions in India*, trans. S.H. Moore (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1908), 96-127.

2. Lehmann, *It Began at Tranquebar*, 15-16, says that when Carey is called the "father of Protestant Missions," as some historians have done, Ziegenbalg is ignored and a century of ecumenical cooperation forgotten.

3. E.g. Erich Beyreuther, *August Hermann Francke und die Anfänge der ökumenischen Bewegung* (Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich, 1957), 183-95, 234-47.

4. On Boehm, see Arno Sames, *Anton Wilhelm Böhme (1673-1722). Studien zum ökumenischen Denken und Handeln eines halleischen Pietisten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990); Daniel L. Brunner, *Halle Pietists in England: Anthony William Boehm and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993); idem., "Boehm, Anthony William," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), vi.421-22.

5. J. F. Foster, "The Ecumenical Significance of A. W. Boehm, 'The Propagation of the Gospel in the East,'" *Oecumenica: Jahrbuch für ökumenische Forschung* 1968, 117-32.

6. SPCK *Minutes*, 7 Sept. & 23 Nov. 1710 (SPCK Archives, London, v.126, 144).

7. Boehm to Francke, London, 19 Sept. 1710, In *Anton Wilhelm Böhmens...Erbauliche Briefe* (Altona/Flensburg, 1737), 166.

8. Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyterian* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1956), 154ff.

9. Special Committee Minutes (hereafter, SCM), 16 Dec. 1713 (SPCK Archives, ME/m/3).

10. Newman to Chamberlayne, Whitehall, 19 Dec. 1713 (SPCK Archives, Society's Letters, CS2/3, f.84).

11. Ibid.

12. Chamberlayne to Archbishop Tenison, Petty France Westminster, 21 Dec. 1713 (Lambeth Palace Library, London, MSS 953:102). It is unclear whether or not Tenison

was ultimately satisfied that the Lutheran nature of the mission had been minimized sufficiently. See SCM, 26 Dec. 1713 (ME/m/3); White Kennett to Chamberlayne, 17 Aug. 1714, and Archbishop of Canterbury to Chamberlayne, 19 Aug. 1714 (copy) (SPCK Archives, Letters from India, ME/CR1).

13. SCM, 22 & 24 Dec. 1713 (ME/m/3).

14. Boehm to Z[iegenbalg] and G[ründler], L[ondon], 8 Jan. 1714, In *Erbauliche Briefe*, 288-309.

15. *Ibid.*, 289-90.

16. *Ibid.*, 290-92.

17. *Ibid.*, 292-95.

18. *Ibid.*, 299.

19. *Ibid.*, 300.

20. *Ibid.*, 299-301.

21. *Ibid.*, 301-05.

22. *Ibid.*, 308.

23. Boehm to G. H. Neubauer, London, 22 Jan. 1714 (Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Sachsen-Anhalt in Halle/Saale, Abt. Archiv der Franckeschen Stiftungen, C 229:29).

24. Ziegenbalg and Gründler to SPCK, Tranquebar, 27 Sept. 1714, In *Propagation of the Gospel in the East, Part III*, [ed. and trans. by A. W. Boehm] (London, 1718), 115f.

25. H. W. Gensichen, "Der Fall Bövingh," *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* (1980): 106-12.

26. Ziegenbalg letter of 11 Oct. 1709, In Lehmann, *It Began at Tranquebar*, 78.

27. Gensichen, "Bövingh," 106-08.

28. *Ibid.*, 107. "Unschuldige Nachrichten," loosely translated as "Unbiased Reports," was the first German theological journal and the best reflection of the thinking of Lutheran Orthodoxy in the first half of the eighteenth century.

29. Fenger, *History of the Tranquebar Mission*, 116.

30. Gensichen, "Bövingh," 109f.

31. Fenger, *History of the Tranquebar Mission*, 119.

32. Even Bishop Stephen Neill, an Anglican, points to the Lutheran character of the mission and especially of Ziegenbalg himself (Neill, *History of Christianity in India*, ii.35).

33. Gensichen, "Bövingh," 110.

34. "An Abstract of the King's Instructions to the College, or Incorporated Society," in *A Brief Account of the Measures taken in Denmark, for the Conversion of the Heathen in the East-Indies*, [ed. A. W. Boehm] (London, 1715), 13.

35. Lehmann, *It Began at Tranquebar*, 86; Neill, *History of Christianity in India*, ii.38-39.

36. Quoted in Neill, *History of Christianity in India*, ii.39.

37. Quoted in Lehmann, *It Began at Tranquebar*, 82.

38. Francke to Newman, Halle, 26 Feb. 1713, in *Propagation of the Gospel in the East*, 61.

39. *Der Königlichen Dänischen Missionarien aus Ost-Indien eingesandte ausführliche Berichte*, 9 vols. (Halle, 1710-1772).

40. Lehmann, *It Began at Tranquebar*, 62.

41. Fenger, *History of the Tranquebar Mission*, 194.

42. A. Norgaard, "Missionar Benjamin Schultze als Leiter der Tranquebarmission (1720-26)," *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 33 (1977): 201.

43. C. B. Michaelis to [Ziegenbalg and Gründler], [Halle], 27 Nov. 1719, quoted in: W. Germann, *Johann Philip Fabricius* (Erlangen, 1865), 131.

44. Susanna Wesley to Samuel Wesley, [Epworth], 6 Feb. 1712, in *The Journal of John Wesley*, 8 vols., ed. Nehemiah Curnock (London: R. Culley, 1909-16), iii.33. Foster, "Ecumenical Significance of Boehm," 121f, is persuaded that Boehm's preliminary discourse on the character of a missionary was what most influenced Susannah.

45. John Wesley to his mother, Lincoln College, 28 Feb. 1732, In *The Letters of John Wesley*, ed. John Telford (London: Epworth Press, 1931), i.119f.

46. James Lynch, 1817, quoted in: Foster, "Ecumenical Significance of Boehm," 117.

47. William Carey, *An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens* (Leicester, 1792), 36.

48. Quoted in Arthur J. Lewis, *Zinzendorf, the Ecumenical Pioneer* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), 24f.

49. Quoted in Lehmann, *It Began in Tranquebar*, 104.

50. On the story that follows, see David L. Miller, "Beyond Tsunami," *The Lutheran* 18, no. 3 (March 2005): 12-16; ELCA Communications, "Walking Letter to India: Tranquebar/Tarangambadi" website, <http://imageevent.com/elcahunger/tsunami/tranquebar>, accessed April 4, 2005.