

What is the Justification For a Chair of Missions in This Situation?

*J. Leslie Dunstan
Andover-Newton Theological School
Newton Centre, Massachusetts*

Six years ago when this Association met, one of our members presented a paper on “Missions in the Curriculum.” Near the end of that paper were these words:

We in the field of missions are lost sheep, scattered among the folds of history, theology, comparative religions, and education, wandering from the theological field to the practical field and back again. We are so busy looking at the world revolution and the fresh strategies of the mission fields that we have failed to analyze the changes required in our own teaching. We proclaim in our lectures and sermons that the world mission is the central task of the church, yet we have all too often allowed it to become peripheral in our curriculum.

Today, we return to somewhat the same theme, only now we hedge it about with interpretive limitations. We are to assume that the words “missions” and “missionary” are undergoing a process of de-emphasis, that is, that they have become tainted words, unfit for use in the carefully exact circles of theological professors. And we are to ask whether, in view of this discrediting of our traditional language, and by implication all activities, agencies, authorities, and assignments associated with these terms, there is any further place for a chair of missions in our seminaries. That way of stating the matter really results in a slaughtering of the lost sheep of the earlier paper and either their consumption by the hungry bears of history, theology and practice, or their burial by dry-eyed deans secretly glad to do

the obsequies for wandering animals which had threatened to contaminate the pure heritage of the theological flock.

We shall assume that the statement about the current de-emphasis of the words “missions” and “missionary” is substantially correct. Nothing would be gained by doubting the statement, for all that would ensue would be the marshaling of evidence both for and against the contention and the attempt to arrive at a conclusion by weighing the evidence. Inevitably, the opposing parties would remain convinced of their own positions. Therefore, we shall not raise the issue. But we do need to ask the reason for the de-emphasizing in order to judge whether that reason has any bearing upon our subject. It may be, to cite one possibility that our two words have fallen out of use simply through the passage of time. Words do that sometimes. The thirty-third verse of the seventh chapter of the First Book of the Kings in the King James Version describes the wheels of a chariot; in doing so, the passage uses the words “naves” and “felloes.” I judge that those words have become so completely de-emphasized in our time that one would need to search a bit to find a person who knows their meaning. At any rate, the Revised Standard Version does not use them. Yet, wheels still have hubs and rims. Now if something like that is happening to our two words we can proceed to deal with our theme completely untroubled by the setting in which we are asked to consider it. Or it may be, to cite another possibility that our two words have acquired some unpleasant connotations and meanings, and that therefore the de-emphasis which is taking place is only a kind of unacknowledged effort to give the words a rest until they shall have re-established themselves in the good graces of our common discussion. Again, if that is what is happening we can deal with our theme without considering its setting, since the setting has no real or permanent bearing upon the work to be done by a professor of missions.

Or it may be that the de-emphasis upon the two words indicates that the enterprise and the persons to which the words referred are gradually disappearing; that with the changes that have taken place missions as we have known them are coming to an end and missionaries are becoming fewer and fewer in number. If these things are taking place, our words are falling into disuse rather than undergoing a de-emphasis. Yet, even if this were the case, the disuse would be only in the immediate practicalities. The words would still be needed for use in the study of that era of church history in which they have had meaning. The church has conducted missions, and missionaries have been sent out. Our students should know something of the heritage that is theirs if for no other reason than to make reference to it from time to time. Thus, there ought to be professors in our seminaries responsible for acquainting students with that

particular part of the church's past. Even though the words are going out of use, we could, in this way, justify the existence of a chair of missions. The incumbent would occupy himself teaching in his special field, researching the vast mass of material left by missionaries, and putting his findings in some kind of usable order. And he would have just as much right on a seminary faculty as a professor of early church history.

But, perchance, none of these suggestions is the case. There is the possibility that the current de-emphasis upon the words "missions" and "missionary" is a sign of a deep-seated, and, in part at least, unacknowledged condition in the life of the Christian church. Surely the rather widespread discussion that has been going on about those words and the warmth that is generated by those who insist upon their continued use or plead for their deletion from our vocabulary indicates that far more is involved than an intermural quarrel over language. We treated the claim that our two words have acquired some unfortunate implications rather cavalierly a minute ago, and dismissed the condition as a temporary affair, which the passage of time will cure. Suppose, however, that the trouble, which has befallen our words, comes from the manner in which the missionary enterprise has been carried on and the principles upon which it has been based. Some have said that during the nineteenth century, missions, quite unconsciously perhaps, got themselves involved far too deeply with the imperialistic undertakings of the western powers and thus acquired through association some unpleasant imputations. Suppose further that the beliefs and practices of the missionary enterprise in that era were the inevitable and quite proper expressions of its essential nature. If these suppositions were the case, then the background against which we are asked to consider our theme may be indicative of the very heart of the matter.

We ought to remind ourselves that we have not reached a clear and defensible justification for a chair of missions. We remain, generally speaking, the lost sheep of six years ago. Some of us by sheer dint of enthusiasm and persuasiveness have gained a relatively firm hold upon a spot in the theological terrain. Yet, the fate of some of our illustrious predecessors ought to tell us that our positions are precarious at best. Consider the record, which Professor O. G. Myklebust has set down for us in such inclusive detail in his two-volume *Study of Missions in Theological Education*.

The missions chair, which was established at New College, Edinburgh, in the nineteenth century, was really the result of the enthusiasm aroused in the Free Church of Scotland by the work Alexander Duff had done in India. No one, apparently, thought through the reason

for the chair and Duff was not able to define the field with which he would deal. That chair survived only one successor to Duff, its original occupant. On the European continent Warneck worked to make the subject of missions academically respectable and thus to give it standing in the theological curriculum. He believed there were some firm principles upon which missions rested and he thought that if those principles were elucidated and the records of the missionary enterprise organized around them there would be a body of material to be mastered by theological students. Warneck was not interested in setting boundaries around an area over which the professor of missions might rule in lonely dignity, for he said that an incumbent in a chair of missions should work within the established disciplines. But he was interested in establishing the right of the missions professor to exist on grounds acceptable to the scholarly world. And there are chairs of missions on the continent today, which have their rationale in the proposals Warneck made. You will observe, however, that if we take seriously the present-day questioning of the word “missions” and see in that questioning a symptom of some difficulty in the enterprise itself, the justification which Warneck provided for a chair of missions is seriously undermined.

In our own country, the story is a mixed one. We have had chairs of missions established because of an emotional interest in missions or the person of a missionary; chairs established to give pastors-to-be an enthusiasm for the missionary cause and the knowledge of how best to bring their congregations to a more generous support of the enterprise; chairs established to enlist and train students for the missionary profession; and chairs established simply to acquaint students with the history of the missionary activity of the church. We have been thoroughly American in our experimenting and our practicality. And the reasons we have given for the establishment of such chairs have been as varied as the creative minds, which proposed them. But we have not come to any agreement as to an appropriate justification for those chairs.

Against this background, we suggest that the way to a more solid foundation for our work lies ready at hand; and I propose a brief excursus into some simple theology in order to clear the ground for that foundation. At the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches, [the late] Dr. Paul Devanandan quoted Dr. Hoekendijk thusly: “A church which knows that it is a function of the apostolate, and that the reason for its existence is therefore the proclamation of the kingdom to the world does not ‘pursue’ mission. On the contrary such a church becomes the mission.” That quotation was taken, as you will recognize, from a paper prepared for the Willingen meeting of the International Missionary Council. Dr.

Devanandan paraphrased this quotation by saying, “the church is God’s mission.” That statement can serve us here. The one thing it does is to put the church fully and completely in the context of God’s work in man’s behalf. We need not trace the steps by which the church has been led to assent to such a statement. During the past half century, as human affairs have undergone a radical revolution, the church has been forced back upon itself to understand what it is and what its role is. Out of that process of self-knowing there has come the awareness that the church is the very mission of God among men; that there is nothing more and nothing less than this which can or should be said. This does not imply that God works only through the church. God is Lord of all men, making the creation serve Him, lifting up those who are caught in lowly places and bringing down the mighty. All human history testifies to the power of God and glorifies the hidden mystery of His being. But the church in a unique and special way is the agent of God’s outreach.

Thus in its very being the church is God’s mission. God brought the church into existence through Jesus Christ; God has sustained the church through all the changing affairs of history by His power; God has directed the church through the wise and unfailing leadership of the Holy Spirit; God has brought about the results that have followed from the work the church has done; and God ever holds before the church the promise of that kingdom of which it is the fore-court. From beginning to end, the church is the creation of God for the intention, which He has for men. The church is the mission of God.

We have made this statement as unequivocal as possible in order to set out in all its starkness that which is true. If we ever seriously intend to banish the word “mission” from our language we shall have to reckon with that which the church is and we shall have to put some other word or phrase having the same meaning in its place. We might use the word “sent,” so that the church would be “those whom God sends.” That would be most clumsy and not readily usable. But whatever word we use it will of necessity have to convey the correct description of what the church is.

On the other hand, however, to Protestants the church is a human institution. Men agree together to form it; men write the rules under which it will exist; men plan its programs and conduct its affairs. The interests of men, their desires and their yearnings, the emotions and the feelings of their inner selves, their knowledge and their wisdom, and the circumstances of their days are all involved in the make-up and the activity of the church. Looked at from the outside by those who know nothing about it, the church appears much the same as other organizations men

have created for their own ends. The buildings men erect to house their churches, the rituals by which they express themselves, and the particular activities in which they engage may differ from comparable elements in other organizations in which men participate. But in the fact that the church is of men, it participates completely in the human world. We must assert this just as emphatically and just as explicitly as we did the divinity of the church.

Yet, this double nature of the church is precisely what must be, for such is of the essence of our faith. Jesus Christ was both Son of God and Son of Man. And the church is both of God and of man. The very nature of the church appears when within it God brings the world to Himself and openly establishes His Lordship over it. God through Christ lays claim to men and by their response makes them His people. On the one hand, the church makes clear its divine origin as it depends in its life upon the Holy Spirit within it; and on the other hand, the church holds firmly to the world by bringing the world into all its affairs. The church carries out God's demand for righteousness and truth and complete responsibility, but does so in and through the circumstances in which it is involved.

The history of the church shows only too clearly how difficult, if not impossible, it is for man to fulfill the task God has given him in the church. Man fails by putting greater stress on one aspect of the church than the other, doing so in any of a number of ways. He may pay primary attention to the divine presence in the church and then either withdraw from the world completely or separate his connection with the world from his relationship to God. Or alternately, he may pay primary attention to the world, and then either sanctify his worldly career, believing that God's blessing rests upon it, or separate his life in the church from his life in the world and keep the two quite unrelated. Yet, even though man is always in danger of erring in the working out of the nature of the church, he never loses touch with that nature as long as he maintains his connection with the church.

Now you will observe that God's mission is carried on by the church to the extent to which it is true to itself. For the church is the place where the rule of God and the world meet, or, the church is the place where the outreach of God to man comes in contact with the world; or, the church is the place where God makes explicit that which He is doing for all mankind and invites man to accept His rule. We shall use the word "boundary" for that which takes place in the church, for that has come to be a well-known term. The boundary of God's mission is the church.

But precisely, where is that boundary? To that question, there is no clear answer. But in general there are three possibilities.

First, there is the line between the church and the world. On one side of the line are those people who are members of the church through some willed action of their own and on the other side are the people who are not members. The boundary may not always be as distinct as some would like it to be, nor even as some are sure, it is. There are church members who belong to the world and men in the world who well may be true church members; and no one can be sure of the true state of affairs. Yet, even so there is a meeting between the church and the world. The church makes an impact upon the world and the world must take account of the existence of the church. The boundary of God's mission is the border of the church.

Second, there is the boundary line that is within the church. Men enter the church as they accept God's lordship over their lives. They enter the church as they are, men formed and molded by the world, giving their allegiance to the powers of the world. In their commitment to God, they repudiate that within them that is of the world. That is, they repudiate that within them, which they consciously recognize as being a denial of God's authority. But men never do, because they never can, put their whole lives under God. Always within the church, there is an order, either liturgical or sacramental or ethical or experiential, which is the form of God's rule. And men live within that order. That order is the boundary line between that in church people which remains under worldly control and that in the church through which God's saving mission among the people. He has chosen is carried forward.

Then third, there is the individual in the church. He is of the world; he is within the church. He brings into the church the world that is himself and he becomes the subject of the ministrations of the church and the transmission of God's leading through the church. He is the place where God's mission and the world meet. And he is moved, within himself, from one side of the boundary of God's mission to the other; he is changed from being one to whom the mission is addressed to one who is himself a missionary. God's mission runs right through the life of a person.

We cannot take the time to analyze the way in which the boundary, lying within the individual as it does, comes to be within the church and between the church and the world. Such an analysis would show how the life of one individual is related to the lives of others in the church and how there develops a oneness of understanding and spirit within the church.

The church, because of the relationships of which it is composed, comes to be more than the sum total of the lives that are within it. Thus, the church produces within itself a boundary line that is common to its members, and at the same time, the church establishes a boundary between itself and the world.

Moreover, as we noted earlier, it is through Jesus Christ that the church comes to be. He is the one who is at the heart of the church. He establishes relationships with individuals and thus becomes the source of the complex of relationships that is the church. The church is more than the oneness of a human fellowship and the consensus which human agreements of mind and will create. The living Christ is in the church. Christ works through the total body of the church. This is the reason we have said that there is a boundary within the church and one between the church and the world.

Primarily and basically, however, the boundary is within the individual. As Protestants we know this and insist upon it, although we ought to remark, as a kind of parenthesis, that we are being forced to do some rather careful thinking about the other boundaries of which we have spoken. We have not yet come to terms with the authority of the church, which in reality is the authority of Christ through the church. When we do, we shall discover that the other boundaries are of far more significance and are far more clear than we now know. For the present, however, we attend to the fact that the boundary of God's mission passes right through individual life.

We may illustrate. William Carey was a man of his own time. During a period of his life, the boundary line for him involved the established order of the church and God's dealing with him through that order. Also involved were his contacts with people who had broken with the church as it was then in England. Carey took his world into his awareness of God dealing with him, and through that relationship he was led into a different structure of life than he had been in before. Subsequently, Carey became absorbed in the larger world that had opened through the agencies of explorers and traders, and he confronted that world as he learned about it from his reading. Then he carried that world into the presence of God. God's mission in him thus began to involve that larger world. Carey's decisions and actions were based on his knowledge and the practicalities of his day; they were the means by which he expressed the authority of God for him, both as he understood that authority and as he understood the world. He brought together within himself the boundary between God's working through Christ and the world of men. People looking at Carey

could and did criticize him, and we in our day pondering the record of his life see many aspects of it that were erroneous and mistaken, with signs of sheer unsaved humanness. Such objective judgment, however, does not in any way effect the fact that Carey carried within himself the frontier of God's mission to mankind.

God's mission goes forward in precisely that way. Certainly, God works through Jesus Christ; He is and will ever remain the divine in the midst of men. But Christ enters into relationship with man; He uncovers to man the truth of his own self; He asks man for dominion over his life; and when man submits to Christ's demand Christ becomes his authority. Then the relationship continues, Christ reaching deeper and deeper into man's life, shining the light of His truth and righteousness on the varied qualities of that life, bidding man let Him extend His rule, and man accepting that rule, even though protesting all the while and often taking back control over himself for a time through his own will. Man's life is always tied to the world of men. His ties are formed through knowledge, interest, attitudes, purposes, and actions. The claims the world has upon him, the extent of those claims and the weight those claims exert depend in part upon himself and his own nature. And as his own self changes so do the claims of the world. Life is within man, formed through decisions and choices and actions. God grants man new life when man worships and serves Him. The mission of God in the world passes through the personal life of each individual. Man must be himself, as God, through Christ, makes him to be.

Now with that, naive and most inexpert discussion we proceed to suggest an answer to the question set for us. The key to that answer lies in the mission of God. That mission, as it goes forward, moves through the lives of individuals. This means that all Christian people are bearers of the mission, or that they are missionaries, to use the traditional term. In every Christian, God brings the world under His authority, and through every Christian He moves out into the world with His authority and makes that authority clear in living witness. This is the reason for the growing realization that laymen have a most significant role to play in the work of the church. However, our particular interest here lies at another point.

In our theological schools are those who from among church people feel they are to bear a unique responsibility for God's mission. They are, if you like, missionaries among missionaries. They bear within themselves responsibility for the boundary line within themselves, and in addition, responsibility for the boundary as it exists within the church and between the church and the world. As they are able to work out in their

own lives a broader and deeper understanding of God's mission, that is, as that mission becomes increasingly effective in them, they will be better able to carry out the work to which they have given themselves. To use traditional language, ministers are responsible for the Word of God; they are ministers of Word and Sacrament, charged to keep the church true to its heritage and its commitment. The professor of missions, then, must deal with students as they face and work out the mission for them. The professor must engage with the students as they explore the boundary line for themselves. The professor must lead the students as they discover ever-wider reaches of the world within which the boundary line is set.

The professor of missions has the mission as his primary responsibility. And the mission is a living enterprise carried on by God within men. That enterprise is always mediated through men, which means that the professor is always a mediator. He does not so much transmit knowledge, although through the work he does students will acquire a good deal of factual material of which they were not earlier aware, but he does bring students to the place where they must actually confront the reality of the divine mission taking place in them. He cannot make the students act on that mission, but he can proceed in such fashion that their eyes may be open to it. The professor of missions has his task defined by the mission.

But do not the professors in other fields of study carry the same responsibility? The professor of Bible or of Church History or of Theology may, and certainly should, so manage the educational process that students will be led to share vitally in the subject matter. The documentary hypothesis should be more than a theory and Amos more than a name in a long list of prophets; Augustine should be more than a theologian of renown and Luther more than a monk who pinned ninety-five theses on a chapel door; and the books of Schleiermacher, Regal, Forsythe, and Barth should be more than sources of trouble at examination time. The whole curriculum of a seminary should come alive so that students not only master its contents but also feel within themselves the thrill of sharing life with leaders of God's people through the ages. Yet, even when that occurs and the lives of students are molded and changed thereby the mission of God is not primarily involved either for student or for teacher. The mission of God may well be taking place, but it will not be under careful scrutiny.

Again, is there not a similarity between the work of the professor of social ethics, or Christian ethics, whatever his title may be, and that of the professor of missions? The professor of ethics is concerned with that aspect of Christian life in which the authority of God over the life of man

is turned into the practical realities of behavior. This would appear to be life at the boundary, and thus would be precisely the place to which the missions professor must give his attention. But ethics deals at the boundary with the faith a man already holds. There is, of course, and always is bound to be an interaction between the measure of a man's faith and his actions, for faith is formed and molded in action. Yet, even so, in ethics the primary concern is with man's action. His faith is assumed. But in mission, faith itself is the subject of concern, the illumination God gives a man's response to that illumination. The distinction here is one, which James dealt with in his letter. Yet even though faith and its expression appear as two sides of the same coin, there is a difference between them, and one may look at one side of the coin at a time. A life of faith in Jesus Christ is the same everywhere; the only question involved in it is the extent of the faith, or the degree to which faith in Jesus Christ has overcome faith in other powers: that is the question of the boundary line. Forms of living, however, are different in different societies, and while they must express faith, they must be related to their particular societies as well as to faith. And the professor of ethics treats of man's actions as expressions of faith.

This leads to the question of how the limits within which the professor of missions works are to be defined. In the past, those limits have been set by the enterprise in which the churches of the western world sent emissaries of the Christian Gospel to lands outside the west. The words "Christendom" and "heathendom" are indicative of the understanding on which the missions were conducted, and thus of the limits within which the work of the professor of missions was seen to be. All this is changed, however. And in any case, as we indicated earlier, such a definition of the work of the missions professor was bound to prove defective since it was built on conditions that through the very nature of God's work were bound to change. The professor of missions cannot operate within limits set by geography or history. His work is concerned with the boundary line of God's mission, primarily as that line exists in the lives of seminary students, and then as it exists within the church and between the church and the world. At the present time, there is much confusion in this matter. Professors of missions continue to be thought of as related to the overseas work of the church. It was reported that the mission board executives of one denomination held a meeting with the professors of missions in the seminaries of that denomination in order to bring the professors up to date on the mission program and the promotional plans designed to finance it. If the professor of missions is responsible for God's mission as it is being worked out he must take under his purview the meeting of faiths, the boundary between the faith God gives and the faith or faiths by

which men in the world live. Within this general area the professor may set some arbitrary limits for himself, although he will find it increasingly difficult to do so, for as the professor works with the students as they meet the boundary line in their own lives he is bound to be drawn into a consideration of the various contemporary faiths of men as those faiths become live possibilities for the students.

There will be four divisions in the work the professor of missions will do. We speak of divisions only to describe the material the professor will use and the directions of interest he will have. All his work will focus on the mission of God within the life of the student; thus, all his work will be addressed to a particular point. Yet, it may lead to further clarity if we mention certain distinctions that can be drawn.

First, the professor will help the students appreciate and live through the boundary line, as it has existed among Christian people in the past. History is much more than a record of earlier days; it is more than a story of activity to be studied and criticized. It is the reality within which the student must take his place. It is God's mission, both as God has carried it out and as He carries it out now. Tradition is not written doctrine; it is the living Christ in human affairs and the student must find his way into that. God's mission in him ought to come, in part at least, through the ever-continuing work of God. In dealing with students at this place, the professor will use the history of the boundary line on which men have lived. This section of the professor's work we may call "the mission in its own setting."

Second, the professor will direct the students to meet the boundary line within the church itself. The world is in the church. We see it clearly now in the divisions in the church and in the psychological, sociological, and racial characteristics with which those divisions are marked. And as we see these divisions, we realize that we have been led to see them through the mission in which God is engaged in our lives and churches. God would lead His people now into a deeper oneness with Christ and with each other. God's mission would now overcome the barriers between men that nature and history have set up. Within the church, the world as it is with all its complexities and brokenness must be brought under God's rule. And this must take place within the lives of students as they are led to enter ever more fully into God's continuing activity. This section of the professor's subject we may call "the church and the mission."

Third, the professor will lead the students into the meeting between their own faith and the other faiths by which men live. Students should

know and feel within themselves the power of idolatrous faith. They may know that power when they are helped to see it, for it is not something outside them. They are not wholly alien to other faiths. To the extent, then, that they are made consciously aware of the various forms idolatry takes and discover within themselves the power of God overcoming idolatry they will know of the mission which God carries forward now and the mission which belongs to the church. The section we may call “the mission and the faiths of men.”

Fourth, will be that of the practical problems and methods involved in the implementation of mission. This may or may not be considered a section separate from the other three sections. Very likely, in the educational process, this section will be within the others since the boundary of God’s mission is always expressed in some form or other. Yet there remains the possibility, since the mission is of faith that this section will provide the occasions for confronting students with the meaning faith must have in living. In this, the professor will use his discretion and proceed as the development of his primary purpose dictates.

If this is the justification for the professor of missions and this the pattern within which he does his work, is he not forever doomed to academic mediocrity? Since his main concern is with the faith of his students, will he not be forced to disregard the rigorous standards of high scholarship? Such need not be the case. God is all truth, and in His mission to and through man God imposes upon him in all he does the test of absolute truth. Man’s own life and the boundary line within him must be judged in truth. All pretense, prejudice, and false images must be overcome, until the very wholeness of truth becomes the decisive power in life. Every bit of data, every record of history, every fact of contemporary affairs in the church and outside it must be treated with the utmost regard for truth. That this is difficult goes without saying, for all of us are on both sides of God’s mission the side of the human world as well as on the side of His people. We are and we see from lives set in the world. But this is precisely the reason why the professor of missions must submit all he does and says to the most exacting scrutiny of the truth. He cannot be less strict in his scholarship than his fellow professors, and should, in the nature of the case, be more strict than they.

Then, what about the responsibility of the professor for the preparation of those who present themselves for missionary service, to use our traditional terminology. Here the question of words properly arises. As we said a bit ago, all Christian people are missionaries, for all deal in their lives with the border between God’s rule and the rule of the

world. And all ministers trained in our seminaries must know that they are missionaries at work among missionaries, that they with their people confront the world and bring that world under the Lordship of Christ. But there may be, and there ought to be in our seminaries men who believe they are called to enter the world of another culture and language than their own to bring that world under Christ. There is every reason why such men should appear, since God ever provides servants for His church. Such men will need to meet the discipline provided for all students by the professor of missions. Further than this, in general, preparation for the specific service they are called to render will have to be done apart from the main body of the students, perhaps in an institution designed for the purpose. The church may have to find a new name for such men, although the names that have been proposed thus far seem strangely inadequate. But whatever name is devised, it will have to indicate that they are engaged in God's mission at a particular spot.

Such is the justification for a chair of Christian missions. Or we might call it, the chair of the Christian mission. That is, the chair of those who are "sent by God." There is no possibility that a chair defined in this way will ever be outmoded. The work the professor does will doubtless change in form and content through the years, but God will continue His saving work among men to the end of time. As long as we conduct theological education within the general structure, which now exists, there will need to be a professor of the Christian mission. This does not, of course, mean that the title will remain unchanged; that is a secondary matter of no particular importance. Then, if, under the leading of God a completely different and now quite undreamed of plan for the training of church leaders should come to be, somewhere in that plan will need to be one who is responsible for leading students deeper and more widely into the mission of God.



First Fruits
THE ACADEMIC OPEN PRESS OF ASBURY SEMINARY