

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Edinburgh Revisited:

Edinburgh 1910 to Melbourne 1980

T. E. YATES

It was G. K. Chesterton who wrote of a night of travel to Birmingham by way of Beachy Head: to approach Melbourne 1980 from Edinburgh 1910 may seem an equally circuitous route to some. Nevertheless, the latest issues of the *International Review of Missions*¹ have shown how conscious writers like Emilio Castro are of the genealogical line which stretches from Edinburgh to New Delhi, when the International Missionary Council (IMC) merged with the World Council of Churches (despite the protests earlier by Max Warren and others²) and gave rise to the Council for World Mission and Evangelism (CWME), described by W. R. Hogg as the 'IMC reborn'.³ This arm of the WCC, in its self-understanding, sees itself as particularly the inheritor of Edinburgh's concern for world-wide evangelism. Successive conferences of CWME at Mexico City (1963) and Bangkok (1973) were intended to maintain this thrust, expressed for John Mott's contemporaries in the watchword 'The evangelization of the world in this generation'. The title adopted for Melbourne 1980, 'Your Kingdom Come', can be taken to express the same purpose. In so far as it may be open to other interpretations, it is worth recalling again K. S. Latourette's comment on Edinburgh and what flowed from it: 'It cannot be said too often or too emphatically that the ecumenical movement arose from the missionary movement and continues to have at its heart world-wide evangelism.'⁴ CWME is particularly charged with responsibility to see that the commitment to evangelism, which Warren and others feared would be quenched by the absorption of the IMC into the potentially stifling structures of the WCC, continues in 'the spirit of Edinburgh'.

What follows is an attempt to recapture the 'spirit of Edinburgh' by way of two main constituents of the Edinburgh tradition: first, by reference to a theme running through the nine published volumes of the reports of the commissions, still a fascinating quarry for any concerned with the situation of the church in our own day, with many sidelights on such issues as theological training (V,240-5), women in ministry (V,148-51), revival (I), recreation for Christian workers (III, 323) and how to combine faith and realism when facing a budget deficit as a missionary society (VI,211). Secondly, I shall attempt to get behind the published reports to the 'spirit of Edinburgh' as expressed by missionaries in the field, whose returns to questionnaires, still unpublished, provided the essential background to a

conference which, without them, could not have reflected so deeply on the universal task of the church.

The spirit of Edinburgh: mission as strategy

CWME 1980 would be likely to be embarrassed by the range and extent of a triumphalist strain in the Edinburgh report, although when we look at the returns from missionaries for Commission IV on 'The Missionary Message', we shall find that a rather different spirit prevails. The emphasis on a world-wide strategy, to be pursued in quasi-military terms, can be illustrated by the frequent use of the term 'aggressive' in the reports. On one occasion only is this western emphasis redressed:

The West has so exalted and given supreme emphasis to the aggressive and positive types of character that these have become highly enthroned among our cardinal virtues, so that we look with suspicion and contempt upon that ideal of the other hemisphere which does not reveal these. We speak of the mild Hindu and regard him as hardly worthy of our respect. We forget that the passive virtues, which have shone with such exclusive lustre in India, are as truly a part of our life as taught and exemplified by Christ, as are the assertive, aggressive virtues which have been so emphasized by us.⁵

With this notable exception, the reports and speeches use the term 'aggressive' everywhere in a commendatory sense, to express the world-wide advance which was needed. This is especially the case in Commission I, 'Carrying the Gospel to the non-Christian World', chaired by Mott himself, but not exclusively so. The survey of fields was judged to give a 'reliable basis for a comprehensive and aggressive policy' with the 'best disposition of the forces outlined'.⁶ The church should 'resolutely attack' the 'great citadels of the non-Christian world' and its 'hitherto impregnable forces'⁷ in its prosecution of its task in unoccupied or neglected fields. The church needed to build up its own spiritual life in order 'to be an aggressive force'.⁸ Field after field was said to be in need of 'aggressive work'. Islam, a major pre-occupation at Edinburgh, required 'the peaceful message of the Christian gospel' but through 'aggressive strategy [which] has ever been the most successful'.⁹ The 'battle' was on for the Far East in this connection (G. Warneck)¹⁰ and aggressive advance was needed in Thailand (then Siam) and Laos.¹¹ In the Near-East, reinforcements were needed 'to mount an aggressive and not merely a defensive missionary campaign',¹² not merely 'guerrilla warfare' but a 'unified spiritual campaign'.¹³ In India, among *pariahs*, the Bishop of Madras made the same kind of comment in a Hindu context: with sufficient missionary forces to mount a 'prompt, aggressive and adequate campaign', thirty million such people could be brought into the Christian church over the next fifty years.¹⁴ One SPG missionary and college principal remarked that, if a policy of 'Christian atmosphere' was to be contrasted with one of 'aggressive Christian evangelism',

he knew which he preferred. 'I do not myself believe in the policy of Christian atmosphere. What we must have, if anything at all, is aggressive evangelistic work.'¹⁵ Missionary bodies were urged to 'organize the church of Christ into the aggressive army of the Lord.'¹⁶

Two things, at least, need to be said to criticism of this approach. First, the New Testament itself has its military metaphors. Melbourne 1980, with its emphasis on the kingdom, may remember our Lord's words about the strong man armed, who must be bound if he is to be dispossessed (Luke 11:21-2). St Paul saw himself engaged in a war, in which he did not fight as one who was a shadow boxer (I Cor. 9:6) but brought into captivity everything which was an obstacle to the knowledge of God, with weapons of war able to 'destroy strongholds' (I Cor. 10:4, RSV). Ephesians and the Pastorals call on the Christian to fight the fight of faith (Eph. 6; I Tim. 6:12), and church history has demonstrated the hold of the language of struggle on the Christian mind, with the baptized as soldiers in Christ's army ('manfully to fight under his banner', BCP) and, more recently, with a Salvation Army and a Church Army in which to enrol.

Aggression is not a word with which we are at ease today, however. Unlike the Edinburgh delegates, we are post-Freudians and inheritors of two world wars. We prefer thoughts of peaceful penetration, and seek to express evangelism in these terms: 'the stress falls less on outward activity and more on inward quality, a sensitive responsiveness to the Sender, a readiness to move or to wait, to speak or to be still. The call to mission becomes ever less of a warrant for aggressive activity, let alone for pentagon-like strategy of world domination.'¹⁷ Nevertheless, understanding evangelism and the coming of the kingdom as warfare may remain an inescapable metaphor so long as sin, evil and the worldly powers are resistant to the claims of Christ. Neither must we allow the use of a particular kind of metaphorical language to blind us to the evidence it gives of commitment to making Christ known, which is the true spirit of Edinburgh 1910.¹⁸

Secondly, when one turns to the responses sent in by the missionaries working in the field, there is a less hostile or pugnacious attitude revealed, for example, to the other religions. The policy of 'attack' is explicitly disowned. It may even be that, at least in the case of Commission I, the language of world-wide assault owed more to the home-based strategists—whom one writer has recently called the 'ordained generals', though in this case they were often laymen¹⁹—over against the more moderating views of the missionaries in the field, who were aware that any wholesale 'attack' on other religious traditions was a very poor way of advancing Christ's claims among their adherents.

Pluralism: Edinburgh and Melbourne

As we turn from this world-conquering mood which was a part of the

Edinburgh spirit, what guidance, if any, has Edinburgh to give on what Emilio Castro calls 'the reality of a pluralistic world situation'²⁰ in which the delegation at Melbourne will meet 'an entirely different world from that of 1910—a world of pluralism and ideological confrontation'²¹ Here certain source-documents exist which are of considerable value in any approach to men of alternative religious traditions. E. J. Sharpe, who has written on one of the Edinburgh respondents, J. N. Farquhar, has drawn attention to the fact that the manuscript material behind Edinburgh remains 'virtually untouched'²². This is certainly unfortunate, as it is a rich source. D. S. Cairns' own copies of the responses from missionaries in the field, used by him in writing the report of Commission IV, 'The Missionary Message in Relation to Non-Christian Religions', are available at Christ's College Library in Aberdeen (as Sharpe noted), although since his research was conducted the volume on Islam, thought by him to be missing, has come to light.²³ If, speaking very broadly, Jerusalem 1928 erred too greatly in the direction of an unqualified 'Yes' to the other religious traditions, and paved the way for the syncretism of the 1930s, while Hendrik Kraemer's great work for Tambaram 1938 appeared to many to say a resounding 'No', then Edinburgh 1910 as represented by these responses contained an admirable blend of Yes and No, written as they were by men of great experience in the field and long acquaintance with, for example, Islam and Hinduism. The respondents were asked various questions: notable among these were the attitude which they thought the preacher should adopt; what supposed points of contact existed with the religions concerned; what constituted the greatest points of appeal in the Christian gospel.²⁴ In what follows, we shall confine the study for the most part to the responses from those working either in an Islamic or Hindu context. Confucianism, the other great tradition represented, is no longer a live option since the advent of Communism in China, and animism is less pressing for today's pluralist setting. Melbourne 1980 can be expected to give little attention to either.

The appeal of Jesus Christ

First, there is a continued reiteration of the appeal of Jesus himself to the unbeliever. It is the portrait of Jesus in the gospels which attracts, linked in the Indian returns very strongly with the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount and the living out of this teaching in the events of the passion, as in the prayer 'Father, forgive them'. So C. F. Andrews, perhaps the most widely known missionary in India, wrote that the 'pure ideal picture of Jesus Christ in the Gospels is to the educated Hindu . . . the greatest of all attractions to the faith.'²⁵ A. G. Hogg, very different in his expression of the Christian faith from Andrews at many points, is at one with him in this assessment: 'By far the strongest power of appeal is that which resides in the

personality and life of Jesus.²⁶ Whereas a 'body of divinity' does not attract the Hindu mind, 'Christ himself is becoming an increasing attraction and a growing power', wrote T. E. Slater.²⁷ This missionary assessment is given added weight by the testimony of various Hindu converts: Canon Nihal Singh wrote that 'The unsullied life of our Lord, and his self-denial and the conquest of *self* on the cross are the elements which appeal most . . . Matthew 5 and the teaching of our Lord made an especial appeal to me when I was a Hindu.'²⁸ R. C. Sircar also spoke of the drawing power of the Sermon on the Mount; he adds the interesting additional feature that he was drawn *both* by the tolerance of his Hinduism *and* by the exclusiveness of Christianity, but it was the reading of the Sermon on the Mount which led to his receiving Christ.²⁹ So, the love, patience, gentleness and meekness of Christ have the greatest appeal, with the Sermon on the Mount and especially the Beatitudes (W. E. S. Holland).³⁰ Altogether, it is not Christianity but Christ which appeals to the Indian.³¹

The same note is present in the returns from Islam, though it is less prominent. S. G. Wilson, then principal of a theological college in Persia and with thirty years' experience in the field, wrote: 'The greatest power of appeal [is] . . . the character of Jesus Christ, his gentleness, his humility, purity, love and self-sacrifice, and with this the precepts of brotherly love.'³²

The doctrine of the Trinity

It is interesting to find that, long before the writing of Karl Barth or Leonard Hodgson had reasserted the central importance of the doctrine of the Trinity for Christian proclamation; before, too, the debates as to whether the World Council of Churches itself was to be Trinitarian or merely Christological in its confession; the responses show missionaries of the stature of Temple Gairdner and S. M. Zwemer making eloquent pleas for the reinstatement of an understanding of the Trinity which would make it religiously central. The same emphasis is present both from workers in the Islamic and the Hindu fields, although the former felt it more acutely. For W. H. Campbell, working in South India, the Trinitarian emphasis was 'essential' to counteract Indian monism and its failure. To him, the Trinity is 'a necessity for faith' against such a background.³³ Similarly, in North India in the Hindu 'capital' of Benares, Edwin Greaves had come to regard the Trinity as 'vital', 'philosophically absolutely necessary', and for life 'full of warmth and power'.³⁴ It was this warmth and religious vitality in the doctrine which Temple Gairdner wanted to recapture in the context of Islam, and his reflections found their way into Cairns' digest for the Commission. For Gairdner, the Trinity 'sums up' the Christian gospel, but it needs to be preached with spiritual and ethical, rather than simply metaphysical form. Islam 'forces the Christian church to find the Trinity in our heart; and

it forces us to find the Trinity in the heart of God. . . . The Christian who preaches the Trinity must know the secret of the trinitarian life.' This emphasis on a trinitarian Christianity, which expresses itself in prayer, devotion and worship, can be found by modern students suggestively delineated in the moving conclusion to Leonard Hodgson's *Doctrine of the Trinity*,³⁵ which sets out to do what Gairdner is suggesting here. Like Gairdner, the equally respected missionary to Islam, S. M. Zwemer, found in the Trinity and the atonement 'the heart of Christianity', a matter of which he was 'more than ever assured'.³⁶

The approach to other religions

Here, inevitably, there is some variety of emphasis, both over the returns as a whole and within the body of material given to either tradition. First, from Islam, various missionaries stress that care should be taken not to attack Islam.³⁷ Somewhat in contrast to the Hindu returns, however, the emphasis of the most experienced missionaries is negative towards Islam, despite their pleas for sympathy and understanding. One missionary admits to a greater sense of theocentricity in his practice of Christianity through his exposure to the stress on theocentricity in Islam,³⁸ but more typical is Temple Gairdner's complaint of the rarity of a spiritual, as distinct from a formal, outlook among Muslims. He has found it, 'but how rare!'³⁹ He cannot accept talk of Islam as a *preparatio evangelica*. Instead, it is self-confessedly a religion which regards itself as superseding Christianity towards its destruction. Gairdner, who was an essentially sensitive and profound student of Islam, respected as such by Muslims in Egypt, was joined in this negative assessment by two well-known missionaries in Northern Nigeria, T. E. Alvarez and Dr W. R. Miller. They complain of lack of conscience in Muslims. Any points of contact are very superficial. W. A. Shedd, an able American missionary who worked in Persia, also saw the danger of superficial resemblances, but perhaps he more than any expresses the characteristic attitude of both 'Yes' and 'No' which came from Edinburgh. 'So far as old faiths are true they should of course be confirmed; so far as they are defective' it is necessary to 'remove the erroneous . . . to secure a hearing for the gospel. This involves more stress on differences than on agreements.'⁴⁰

The Indian returns, mainly from workers in Hindu surroundings, show a wide variety of views. Certainly here there were more respondents who belonged to the 'fulfilment' school, of whom J. N. Farquhar was the most notable. Equally, there were some critics of this approach, outstanding among them, both for the rigour of his mind and the interest of his own theological odyssey, the Scottish missionary and theologian A. G. Hogg. For the purposes of clarity we may

divide these responses into three categories: 1) those where the Yes prevails; 2) those where the Yes and No are held in balance; and 3) those where the No prevails over the Yes.

1) Francis Kingsbury, a convert from Hinduism from Madurai, wrote with echoes of Paul's speech at Lystra (Acts 14:15-18) that the missionary should be 'glad to find that God has not left himself without witness in India.' We should be prepared to admit that 'there have been many sages and saints among the Hindus, men who have known God and have lived with Him.' For Kingsbury, Jesus is 'not destroyer but fulfiller', although he concedes that there are 'teachings and practices which should be severely and fearlessly condemned.'⁴¹ This strongly positive reaction is present in others. N. C. Mukerjee notes the contrasts between the two religions but holds that they have a secondary, if a legitimate, place to points of agreement.

2) Perhaps we should not be surprised to find two Anglican bishops as proponents of a *via media* theologically! Both the Anglican bishop of Madras (Henry Whitehead) and the bishop of Calcutta (R. S. Copleston)⁴² put an equal emphasis on the Yes and the No towards the Hindu tradition. The missionary must seek out points of contact while yet putting emphasis on points of divergence (Madras). The other religions are '*helps* so far as they tend to reveal or heal the corruption; *hindrances* so far as they are a screen, more or less consciously held up, between the human conscience and the demands of the Truth.' 'What is good in the non-Christian religion is often set up as a "screen": the better it is, the more fit it is to be alleged as a reason why a hearing should not be given to the *more imperative but similar* demand which Christianity makes.'⁴³ Other non-episcopal figures take a similarly balanced view. 'Many of the great truths of Christianity have their complement in Hinduism. But the truths of Hinduism are exaggerated and distorted out of recognition.' The need is to 'set Hindu fragments in the "new light" of Christianity' and to bring 'half-neglected truths into prominence or aspects of truths into new perspective.' (L. B. Chamberlain)⁴⁴ Again, 'We ought to strive to show how Christianity fulfils the highest aspirations of their hearts and completes the truths which are found in Hinduism, but Hinduism is a corruption of God's truth . . . distorted and discoloured through corroding and disintegrating influences . . .'⁴⁵

3) A sharper note of dissent and emphasis on the No came from A. G. Hogg. Hogg had had an interesting theological and spiritual pilgrimage. This found its way, but without his name attached, into Cairns' digest for Commission IV. It is Hogg who is described as a 'teacher in a large college',⁴⁶ who had arrived in India with a vague theism, prepared to surrender 'alleged facts of the New Testament narratives—even the resurrection itself' provided that the 'general impression' of 'Jesus' personality was not affected.' He wrote: 'I had not long been in India when a radical change began to be effected in the

tendency of my thinking.' Surrounded by Hindu students and literature, he became convinced that two things were fundamental to Christianity: God as active will, self-expressed in history and supremely in Jesus Christ; and the need 'to break, root and branch' with 'the conception of human merit', over against a Hindu doctrine of *karma*, which was essentially worked out in terms of desert. With this theological pilgrimage as his background, Hogg sharply repudiated 'fulfilment' themes: 'Christian doctrines are not the fulfilment of Hindu doctrines': 'outside the region of vague abstraction what does it [fulfilment] mean?' Hindu satisfaction 'certainly proves that Christian beliefs fulfil the yearning of the Hindu consciousness thrown out of equilibrium by Christian influence, but not that Christianity is a fulfilment to . . . the typical undisturbed Hindu consciousness.' 'Christianity is the solution of a religious problem which the typical Hindu does not feel but which, under favourable conditions, he can be made to feel.' 'If this be the real relation of Christianity to Hinduism, to call it one of fulfilment may be . . . permissible but the description obscures the fact that it fulfils by, at least partially, destroying.'⁴⁷ Others, apart from Hogg, were critical of fulfilment ideas, but he is the most rigorous critic. A missionary called Gulliford wrote: 'We must not be content with trying to show that Christ fulfils Hinduism and Islam as he fulfilled Judaism',⁴⁸ a task with Pannikar and others have assayed to do since then in such works as *The Unknown Christ of Hinduism* (Darton, Longman and Todd: London 1964). Another missionary, J. P. Jones, while noting that both religions have a stress on divine incarnation which is unique to themselves, continued: 'This consonance passes into dissonance.'⁴⁹ It becomes plain that Hendrik Kraemer's massive critique of fulfilment ideas in his *Christian Message in a Non-Christian World* (Edinburgh House Press: London 1938) had a history of missionary disquiet behind it from a much earlier generation of thinkers.

Conclusions

What, if any, conclusions can be drawn for the delegates to Melbourne from this attempt to recapture, albeit in a compressed and inadequate form, the spirit of Edinburgh 1910? Denton Lotz, in a recent article in the *International Review of Missions* on the famous watchword, the topic of his doctoral research, has remarked that 'Your Kingdom Come' is a prayer and not a battle slogan.⁵⁰ Whether or not Melbourne expresses itself in the language of struggle and the metaphors of the battlefield, we should surely pray that it will manifest the same deep commitment to the task of world-wide proclamation of the gospel that these figures of speech witnessed to at Edinburgh. Secondly, in so far as the missionaries' returns comprised the essential ingredients of the spirit of Edinburgh, they would suggest: first, that among all the many discussions about the means of bring-

ing in the kingdom, the unique attraction of the Jesus Christ of the Gospels should not be forgotten. In this connection, it may be worth the CWME assessing *how much of its budget for world mission and evangelism should go towards the simple but fundamental matter of making the portrait offered in the Gospels available to men of all races in their own languages.* The attraction which Jesus had for Hindus and Muslims at the turn of the century has been amply witnessed to in our own day by these and other seekers after truth. Next, the returns have shown the need for Christian doctrinal formulation, as in the doctrine of the Trinity, as part of the *missionary* obligation, where doctrine and its religious expression must not be lost sight of. A sharper focus and expression will result when Christian doctrine, held in the person of the missionary, is in immediate relation with non-Christian systems and persons, and there will be a fresh stimulus to work out its importance for Christian life and practice as was the case for Temple Gairdner and S. M. Zwemer. Finally, as Melbourne confronts the pluralism of our world, there is a need to contain and reflect upon the sheer variety of Christian responses to other religions and ideologies. This variety was present at Edinburgh and has become more sophisticated and diverse since. Edinburgh's emphasis, the combination of the Yes and the No, of genuine sympathy and yet rigorous criticism, applied to the Christian tradition as well as to that of others, is greatly needed. So is the diversity of reaction between traditions, and the attempt to distinguish seriously in each separate case which of the Yes and the No should preponderate and why. It seems to the writer that there is room still for a 'middle order' theology, which neither dismisses the reality to which alternative traditions point nor too facily overlooks distortions in favour of a superficial acceptance. For such an approach, Edinburgh provides material of lasting value.

DR T. E. YATES is Rector of Darley Dale in Derbyshire. He was previously Warden of Cranmer Hall, Durham.

NOTES

- 1 *IRM*, vol. LXVII, no. 267, July 1978, pp 249-54; vol. LXVIII, no. 270, April 1979, pp 97-101.
- 2 M. A. C. Warren, *Crowded Canvas: Some Experiences of a Lifetime* (Hodder & Stoughton : London 1974), pp 157 f; cf. 'The Fusion of IMC and WCC at New Delhi: Retrospective Thoughts after a Decade and a Half', *Occasional Bulletin of Missionary Research*, vol. 3, no. 3, July 1979, pp 104-8.
- 3 W. G. Hogg, 'Conferences, World Missionary' in *Concise Dictionary of World Mission*, ed. S. C. Neill, G. H. Anderson, J. Goodwin (Lutterworth Press : London 1970) p 138.
- 4 S. C. Neill & R. Rouse (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517-1948*, (SPCK : London 1954) p 362.
- 5 World Missionary Conference 1910, *Reports I-X* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier : Edinburgh) III, p 260 (hereafter E,I etc.).

CHURCHMAN

- 6 E, I, p 2.
- 7 E, I, p 296.
- 8 E, I, p 369.
- 9 E, I, p 21.
- 10 E, I, p 435.
- 11 E, I, p 365.
- 12 E, I, p 186.
- 13 E, I, p 190.
- 14 E, I, p 148.
- 15 E, III, p 417.
- 16 E, VI, p 169.
- 17 S. Barrington-Ward in *CMS Newsletter*, no. 412, September 1977.
- 18 John Mott was chairman of Commission I. His love of military metaphors has been noticed by recent writers. For example, at Student Volunteer Movement meetings in 1898, when his closing speech was 'full of the metaphors of the battlefield.' Clifton Phillips in J. K. Fairbank (ed.), *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America* (Harvard University Press : Cambridge, Mass. 1974) p 102; cf. also for similar examples and comment on them pp 101, 111, 114, 354.
- 19 Op. cit., p 288. Shirley Garrett is the writer here in the symposium.
- 20 *IRM*, July 1978, p 250.
- 21 *IRM*, April 1979, p 98.
- 22 E. J. Sharpe, *Not to Destroy but to Fulfil* (Gleerup : Lund 1965) p 276.
- 23 Op. cit., p 364. I should express here my thanks to Dr Wood (librarian of Christ's College) and Professor Andrew Walls for their help in making this source available to me.
- 24 E, IV, p 2.
- 25 Aberdeen Returns for Edinburgh Commission IV (D. S. Cairns' copies, available at Christ's College, Aberdeen). There is one volume of responses headed Islam; and three volumes of responses from missionaries in India. Hereafter these are cited as (e.g.) A, India I, etc.
- 26 A, India I, no. 176, p 53.
- 27 A, India III, no. 229, p 5.
- 28 A, India III, no. 211, p 10.
- 29 A, India III, no. 234, p 42; cf. S. K. Rudra similarly no. 261, p 4.
- 30 A, India II, no. 177, p 4.
- 31 A, India III, no. 251, p 7.
- 32 A, Islam, no. 342, p 275. Cf. J. C. Young of the Keith Falconer Mission at Aden: 'The sinlessness of Jesus I would assuredly put first, then his tender, loving sympathy for sinners.' no. 282, p 296 i.e. 'first' in appeal to Muslims.
- 33 A, India I, no. 133, p 17.
- 34 A, India I, no. 166, p 13.
- 35 E, IV, pp 153 f.; cf. p 135. See L. Hodgson, *Doctrine of the Trinity* (Nisbet : London 1943), pp 176-94.
- 36 A, Islam, no. 283, p 314.
- 37 A, Islam, no. 258, p 5 (Herman Barnum); cf. no. 259, p 10 (James Cantine).
- 38 A, Islam, no. 237, pp 21 (van Ess).
- 39 A, Islam, no. 263, p 24; no. 300, pp 101, 107.
- 40 A, Islam, no. 272, pp 157 f.
- 41 A, India II, no. 187, p 4.
- 42 Whitehead was the brother of A. N. Whitehead, the philosopher and mathematician, and was Bishop of Madras 1899-1922. Copleston had been translated from Colombo in 1902 and was Bishop of Calcutta 1902-1913. M. E. Gibbs, *The Anglican Church in India 1600-1970* (ISPCK : New Delhi 1972) pp 309 n, 411 f.
- 43 A, India I, no. 235, pp 5-6; II, no. 209, p 11, (my italics).
- 44 A, India I, no. 134, pp 11-12.
- 45 A, India I, no. 130, pp 14-15.

- 46 E, IV, p 207. A, India II, no. 176, pp 59-60 describes his change of view in full. Cf. J. L. Cox, *The Missionary Thought of A. G. Hogg*, University of Aberdeen, Ph D, 1977, p 28, note 7 et al.
- 47 A, India II, no. 176, p 14.
- 48 A, India II, no. 168 a, p 7.
- 49 A, India II, no. 184, p 14.
- 50 *IRM*, 'The Watchword for World Evangelization', April 1979, pp 177-89.

Opinion

Since *Churchman* claims to be a magazine of 'reference information', I wonder if you would allow me to correct a remark of Colin Buchanan's (vol. 94:1, p 42) to the effect that the 'Association method' of theological college government was 'pioneered by Dr Jim Packer' at Tyndale Hall. This is not strictly accurate.

Following the abortive attempt to merge Tyndale and Clifton in 1969, a working party was set up to deal with the Tyndale situation. Dr Packer provided its first meeting on 24 October 1969 with a Memorandum for debate which contained no reference to Association government. Later that day the basic Association scheme was privately concocted by Mr Peter Lefroy-Owen and myself and 'sold' to Dr Packer that night (not without difficulty) by Mr Lefroy-Owen. Minute 30 of the working party confirms that the proposal was formally proposed by Mr Lefroy-Owen on the following day and, in due course, it became the constitutional foundation on which Tyndale and, later, both Trinity and St John's, Nottingham, were built.

I have no wish to diminish Dr Packer's glory but we two lesser mortals were, in fact, the joint-architects of the scheme. At least allow us our tiny niche in history!

Ealing Vicarage, London W5

MICHAEL SAWARD

The Dynamics of Religion

David Holloway's review of Bruce Reed's book *The Dynamics of Religion* in your third issue of 1979 raises a fundamental question: How far is a great deal of activity in a local church a sign of spiritual life? Unfortunately he avoids the question instead of facing it.

Many Christian ministers have known people who are very willing to share in the work of the church and put an enormous amount of time and energy into Christian activities. At first they give the impression of a deep dedication to the service of Jesus Christ, but, as one gets to know them better, one realizes that behind this willingness is a longing, sometimes a desperate longing, to feel fully accepted as part of the church fellowship.

In the section to which David Holloway refers, Bruce Reed argues that this pattern of behaviour is found not only in individuals but in