

RADHAKRISHNAN, A.G. HOGG, AND HINDU-CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS

Joshua Kalapati

It is ironic that Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, who studied for twelve years (1896-1908) uninterruptedly in Christian institutions, went on to become one of the most strident critics of Christianity. No less strange is the fact that, having been exposed to three Christian reformed traditions - Lutheran, Dutch and Scottish - successively and with increasing intensity, Radhakrishnan became one of the great apologists and reformers for Hinduism in the twentieth century.

In this paper we shall first of all consider Radhakrishnan's life in general at Madras Christian College, secondly evaluate reasons for his becoming an apologist for his faith, and finally see the exchanges between Radhakrishnan and his teacher A.G. Hogg, which is a vivid introduction to the Hindu-Christian apologetics. We shall conclude by assessing what this interaction means for inter-religious understanding.

Role of the Madras Christian College

If at all there is one institution which contributed most towards making Radhakrishnan into what he later became, it is the Madras Christian College. Radhakrishnan's career was largely shaped and his destiny scripted in those four years (1904-1908) when he studied for his B.A. and M.A., taking courses in the Department of Philosophy (then known as the Department of Mental and Moral Sciences) at Madras Christian College.¹ The two scholarships it offered;² the highly enriched academic discipline and atmosphere that prevailed; the stimulus, both positive and negative; the Christian Missionaries (notably Hogg) inside as well as outside the classroom; and the Hindu-Christian exchanges that were published in the *Madras Christian College Magazine* were all responsible for shaping the life and thought of Radhakrishnan.

Before we examine how Radhakrishnan emerged as an

apologist at Madras Christian College and to what extent Hogg influenced him, it is relevant to consider briefly the educational policies of the Scottish Mission, which founded the Institution in 1835. This would help us gain a glimpse into the policies and priorities of the Christian Missionaries in India and see how they were responsible for arousing a religious debate (and thereby a critical spirit towards religion and society), which largely contributed towards the emergence of the Indian renaissance to which Radhakrishnan made such a seminal contribution.

EDUCATIONAL AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The Reverend John Anderson (1805-1855), a Scottish Missionary, landed in George Town, Madras, in 1837 to take over the two-year-old school with the following instructions from the General Assembly Committee for Foreign Missions:

1. To train the youth of Madras in sound, comprehensive Biblical knowledge;
2. To raise up thoroughly trained and pious teachers and preachers, who would evangelise the masses of the country; and
3. To target especially the higher classes of the Hindu society.

Targeting the higher classes – rather castes – was a distinctive feature of the Scottish Mission in India since the time of Alexander Duff, who started the first Scottish school in Calcutta in 1830. Duff believed that if the high castes in the Hindu society were trained in the Bible and Western knowledge through the medium of English, they would be converted to Christian faith and these converts in turn would do the same to those below them, a strategy which came to be known as Duff's "Downward Filtration Theory." But the very fact that Radhakrishnan, hailing from a high caste, was not only not converted to Christian faith, but went on to become a critic of Christianity, illustrates the abject failure of the Downward Filtration Theory.

Not all the missionaries of the Christian College were, however, imbued with the same evangelistic zeal of John Anderson. William Miller (1838-1923), who succeeded Anderson and took over the school in 1862 (upgraded into a college in 1867) reoriented the educational policy of the Institution. Unlike Anderson, Miller believed that education should make a "leavening impact." The task of an

educationist is “ploughing and sowing,” while the responsibility of harvesting falls to those engaged in preaching. Education for Miller cannot be evangelism per se but rather a preparation for it, *Praeparatio Evangelica*. He was opposed to using education as “bait for conversion.” Conversion of individuals in Christian institutions, Miller believed, should not be primary but subsidiary.⁶

Thus Anderson and Miller represent two divergent streams of missionary teachers at Madras Christian College - the former believing that education must serve Christian faith and mission, while the latter viewing education as a preparation for receiving the ultimate truth. Radhakrishnan’s teachers too represented these two streams. It needs to be mentioned that Miller’s liberal stance as an educationist proved a greater success and shaped the Madras Christian College into a premier educational institution in India.

One chief reason for the enormous fame and success of the Madras Christian College was its corporate and ecumenical structure. It was a stroke of genius that William Miller invited the fellow Protestant missions in Madras to join him in the academic and administrative functioning of the institution. Consequently since 1877, the year in which Madras Christian College as a corporate entity came into existence, several churches have become participating members in the functioning and administration of the College.⁷

By the time Radhakrishnan entered the College at the end of the year 1904, it already enjoyed a very high academic reputation for the highly qualified faculty representing various Protestant missions in India. Of course the Scottish Mission was the most prominent of these.

RADHAKRISHNAN AS AN APOLOGIST

There are strong, irrefutable reasons for describing Radhakrishnan as an apologist. In the first place it is relevant to define the discipline called “apologetics” and the characteristic features which mark an apologist.

Apologetics is lucidly defined as “a study of theology...which defends faith against attacks.”⁸ *The Encyclopaedia of Religions* brings out the nature of Apologetics thus: “Any religion, monotheistic or otherwise, might adopt an apologetic posture in circumstances in which it perceives the need to defend itself against mis-understanding, criticism, discrimination or oppression.”⁹

The above definitions amply qualify Radhakrishnan as an

apologist. Much of what he wrote had a two-fold aim: To interpret ancient Indian philosophy, religion and culture in a modern idiom and, secondly, to defend the Hindu faith against attacks and criticisms especially from the Christian critics.

Radhakrishnan is an apologist because he not only defined Hinduism, but defended it stoutly. This role of an apologist was thrust upon him by the Christian scholars, as Radhakrishnan himself observed, “the challenge of Christian critics impelled me to make a study of Hinduism and find out what is living and what is dead in it.”¹⁰

That many of Radhakrishnan’s writings glow with apologetic convictions is an inescapable conclusion. This is because his defence of Hinduism necessitated his answering the criticisms of the Christian scholars advanced against his own religious convictions and commitment. We can cite four concrete examples in support:

(1) The earliest evidence is his Master’s dissertation, titled, “The Ethics of the Vedanta and Its Metaphysical Presuppositions” (submitted in 1908). This was written chiefly in response to the missionary criticisms that Hinduism in general, and Vedanta in particular, precludes the possibility of ethics and social responsibility. We shall see in a later section how it was that the rigorous philosophical scrutiny of Hinduism by Professor A.G. Hogg, his teacher in his B.A and M.A. classes, largely kindled and provoked the attention of the young Radhakrishnan. In this small work of ninety-three pages, Radhakrishnan clarifies that Samkara’s Vedanta does not mean passionless life but one in which passion is transcended. Besides, he does not confine himself to the system of Vedanta alone, but goes on a counter offensive against Christianity. He boldly rejects the uniqueness of Jesus Christ by giving a Vedantic and universalistic hermeneutic of Christ’s mission, death, and resurrection - a hermeneutic he employs throughout his writings. That in this dissertation Radhakrishnan not only clarifies and defends the Hindu system of ethics, but goes on a counter offensive against Christian faith, clearly reflects his dual role as an apologist for his faith, viz. to define it and defend it.

(2) Another early work of Radhakrishnan, *The Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore* (1918) was written chiefly in response to the interpretations of Rev. Saunders, Rev. Urquhart and other Christian missionaries, that Tagore’s ideas were essentially Christian and that Tagore’s God was the God of Christianity. Radhakrishnan dismisses this line of interpretation to say, “The critics who make Rabindranath Tagore a borrower from Christianity betray an

astonishing lack of ‘historical conscience’ - a charge generally urged against Indians. The Absolute of Philosophy and the God of religion have both a place in the Vedanta system.”¹¹ Thus, Radhakrishnan attempts to demonstrate that Tagore is not a Christian or a Christianity-influenced poet but a quintessential Hindu Vedantist. Both the idea and the idiom are clearly those of an apologist.

(3) Likewise Radhakrishnan's next major work, *The Reign of Religion in the Contemporary Philosophy* (1919), was written to demonstrate that the Western philosophers such as Leibnitz, William James, Bertrand Russell and Rudolf Eucken allowed their philosophic pursuits to be influenced by their religious backgrounds (meaning Christianity), and therefore their conclusions were not entirely philosophical. Thus with one stroke, Radhakrishnan targets both western philosophy and Christian religion.

(4) Radhakrishnan's book, *Eastern Religions And Western Thought* (1939), is based on his lectures delivered during 1936-1938 in Oxford and other places in the U.K. This book must be understood against the then-prevalent intellectual opinion of Western scholars that the philosophical and religious ideas of India had their origin outside India. It was also the time that the Aryan invasion theory was gaining ground. It was against this background that Radhakrishnan tries to prove to the world that the lofty and ennobling philosophies in India were the creations of their own and in fact these gradually spread to the other parts of the world and affected other religions including Christianity. Indeed, the chapter “Mysticism and Ethics in Hindu Thought” is written specifically with the same apologetic intent to counter the argument of Albert Schweitzer that Hindu thought is generally World and Life Negating and Christian thought, World and Life Affirming. The apologist in this chapter so stands out that T.P.Urumpackal comments that although this chapter is titled, “Mysticism and Ethics in Hindu Thought,” it is more a condemnation of Christianity than an exposition of Hindu thought.¹²

This general trend of expounding Hindu ideals and values on one hand and meeting the criticisms from the West on the other, can easily be discerned in almost all of Radhakrishnan's writings. It is for this reason that Radhakrishnan has been acknowledged as an apologist by a host of scholars - Ninian Smart describes him as “a great Hindu apologist”¹³ and Henrik Kraemer hails him as “an enormously erudite apologist of Indian Spirituality.”¹⁴ Likewise Robert Minor observes, “...beginning with his [Radhakrishnan's] Master's thesis, *The Ethics of Vedanta and Its Metaphysical Presuppositions*, were a series of publications with an explicit

apologetic motive in mind.”¹⁵ Robert Braid understands Radhakrishnan to be moderately apologetic when he says, “...but often his works intersperse statements of a normative and apologetic nature along with statements which are more characteristically descriptive.”¹⁶

However, we shall be doing a great injustice to the intellectual calibre and contribution of Radhakrishnan if we treat him just as an apologist and no more. Apologetic intent is a prominent feature underlying his thought, but certainly he is not confined to it. His contributions are primarily philosophical, but not apologetic.

Radhakrishnan employs apologetics as a chief methodology in his approach to the Person of Christ and Christianity. Some see this methodology being stretched to the extreme. Stephen Neill remarks that Radhakrishnan’s determination is such that “Christianity must not be allowed to score a single point.”¹⁷ When Joachim Wach complains “there is a notable trace of bitterness in a great number of references to Christianity in Radhakrishnan’s writings,” Radhakrishnan humbly replies, “If he finds it so, there must be a basis for his statement and I am sincerely sorry for it.”¹⁸ Thus Radhakrishnan never disowns the fact that he is taking up the role of an apologist.

Now why was he bitter, if at all? What is the origin for his apologetic thinking? Where exactly were the seeds sown? The answer undoubtedly is the arena of the Madras Christian College. Two major factors that initiated Radhakrishnan into apologetics are (1) The prevailing climate of the Hindu - Christian encounters as reflected in the *Madras Christian College Magazine* and (2) The challenges of his Christian teachers, notably Alfred Hogg. As the scope of this paper is limited, we shall confine ourselves only to the interaction between Hogg and Radhakrishnan.

HOGG’S INFLUENCE ON RADHAKRISHNAN

Radhakrishnan himself recalls the names of the teachers at Madras Christian College during his times. These were European members such as Miller, Skinner, Meston, Corley, Russell, Hogg, Pittendrigh, Ross, Mackenzie, Moffat, and Henderson. Among the Indian members of staff were Rangayya Chetti, Lakshminarasu, Chinnathambi Pillai, Kandaswamy Chetty, and Joseph Muliyl. Radhakrishnan then makes a most generous remark about them: “It is difficult to imagine a better team of European and Indian members of staff.”¹⁹

Of all the teachers, four of them - Miller, Skinner, Meston, and Hogg - left an indelible impression on Radhakrishnan in their own ways. It was both positive and negative. Whichever way they did, the teachers of Radhakrishnan played a vital role in shaping his thought and career.²⁰ We shall, however, confine ourselves to the influence of Hogg on Radhakrishnan.

Any study of Radhakrishnan's religious thought vis-à-vis Christianity would be incomplete if it did not take into account the role of A.G. Hogg (1875 - 1954) in influencing Radhakrishnan. Radhakrishnan himself chose to single out Hogg among all his teachers and praised him as "my distinguished teacher,"²¹ "one of the greatest Christian thinkers we had in India,"²² and "a very distinguished theologian."²³

Hogg used to tell his students that he was a citizen of the world - born in Scotland, brought up in Egypt, educated in Germany and now serving in India.²⁴ He studied philosophy under Andrew Seth Pringle-Pattison between 1893 and 1897. He concluded his studies at Halle University where he studied under the Ritschlian, Arthur Titius. It was Ritschlian theology which captured the imagination of young Hogg. He learned from Ritschl that the centre of revelation is not the doctrinal formulations but the historical person of Jesus Christ. He thus understood that Christian faith and sentiment is in contrast with the dogmatic and doctrinal tradition.

Ritschl's influence on Hogg may be summarised under four points:²⁵ (1) Hogg derived his fundamental distinction between faith and faith (faith and belief) from the Ritschlian judgement of value; (2) Doctrine is subordinate to faith, and at the same time faith cannot be understood or expressed apart from doctrine; (3) Faith is essentially an inward, personal experience of God; and (4) The historical Jesus is the only lasting source and object for individual faith.

Radhakrishnan would strongly endorse the basic ideas of Hogg - viz. faith is superior to doctrine, that faith is an inward experience - but he rejects outright the idea that the historical Jesus is the only source and object of faith. For Radhakrishnan, like the liberal scholars of the west, the "Christ of faith" is more essential than the "Jesus of history." He writes, "Christ is not to be equated with the historic Jesus. Christ is the spirit of the Supreme, the Eternal Word. The manifestation of this Word in history is not limited to Jesus. Salvation is mediated through the Eternal Christ, the Word of God, which is not to be confused with historical Jesus."²⁶ Nevertheless Hogg must have impressed on Radhakrishnan the Ritschlian idea

that faith is not a dogmatic formulation but a personal experience.

The most fundamental influence of Hogg, although a negative one, on Radhakrishnan was his methodology for doing comparative religion, which has an interesting background in the *Madras Christian College Magazine*. Since its inception in 1883, the magazine had been a platform for several scholarly exchanges that took place between the Christian Missionaries and the learned Hindus, who were mostly students of the College, past and present.²⁷ These scholarly exchanges reached a crescendo with a classic encounter between Subrahmanya Sastri and Hogg, an encounter personally witnessed by Radhakrishnan during the year 1904 - 1905. We look into this encounter, although briefly, in order to understand the most important formative influence on Radhakrishnan's apologetic thinking.

In an article, "Hindu Philosophy,"²⁸ Sastri maintains that the doctrines of karma and transmigration of souls are the highest sanctions of Hindu morality and as such are the cardinal principles of Hindu philosophy. Sastri surveys the essence of the systems of Indian Philosophy, juxtaposing them with the Western Philosophical systems. He concludes that the Vedanta system afforded the most stable foundation for ethics, because its cardinal principle, "Tat Tvam Asi" provides the true knowledge that all persons are one reality in Brahman, and therefore it urges one and all to rise above all desires and wants. This ideal that all human beings are ultimately one is higher than the concept of universal brotherhood. Most of Sastri's views are not only in defence of Hindu ethics but were clearly advanced against Christianity.

In his initial response, Hogg (who just joined the College in 1903), while commending the critical spirit of Subrahmanya Sastri, nevertheless chides his over eagerness "to accentuate superficial parallelisms and ignore the fundamental contrasts" between the Indian and the Western Philosophical systems. He later on gives a detailed reply to Sastri's charges in his famous article, "Karma and Redemption" which was serialised in five parts in 1904 - 1905.²⁹

Hogg begins this article with his now famous distinction between faith and belief - faith being immediate and existential, while belief being the intellectual expression of faith. In summary he claims that the contrasts between Christianity and higher Hinduism lie chiefly in the area of belief, not faith. He argues that the Hindu idea of Karma and the Christian doctrine of redemption differ in that the former is predominantly judicial, while the latter is moral. Hogg points out that the God who is love and who personally intervenes in hu

man affairs is conceivable in Christianity alone. Nevertheless, Hogg makes a passionate plea for an effective intellectual interaction between Christian and Hindu thinkers. He also suggests that the points of divergence, as against Sastri's method of agreement, would take thinkers closer to truth. In this endeavour the Christian must cast off his alien mould and reconstruct and reshape his thought in order to be more acceptable to the Hindu, while at the same time making the historical person of Jesus Christ and his gospel the very centre of his thought.

This is the time and the clime into which Radhakrishnan entered his B.A. classes at Madras Christian College. He took no time to grasp the nuances of the religious debate that had been going on for two decades in the portals of the college. He became familiar with the criticisms of the Christian missionaries, both inside the classroom and outside, that the Hindu system is essentially pantheistic and as such lacks a system of ethics. It was Hogg more than any other teacher of his who churned his religious consciousness. As Eric J. Sharpe opined, "It may well have been Hogg's book, *Karma and Redemption* (1904 - 1905 in article form), in which the ethical basis of the Vedanta was subjected to criticism which prompted Radhakrishnan to write his first work of Hindu apologetics, *Ethics of Vedanta* (1908)".³⁰

That Radhakrishnan took the side of the Hindu scholars against his Christian teachers is quite obvious. Of the three articles he published in the *Madras Christian Magazine*, the first one, "Indian Philosophy: The Vedas and the Six Systems" (1908) is an extraordinarily strong defence of Indian Philosophy, while the last one, "Hindu Thought and Christian Doctrine" (1924) is one of his most acerbic critiques of Christianity. These two bring out most clearly the dimensions of his apologetic writings, viz. he clarifies, expounds, and defends his faith, at the same time he would not hesitate to counter attack, if challenged. Two dimensions reflect as much his unshakeable faith in Hinduism as his intellectual and moral courage.

Hogg's method, which J.L. Cox calls "the Method of Selective Contrasts,"³¹ could well be the touchstone for inter-religious dialogue and understanding. According to this method, as enunciated by Hogg, all attempts to find general agreements between Christianity and Hinduism will be largely ineffective. The Christian thinker, whether missionary, theologian or evangelist, must instead selectively draw certain fundamental contrasts between the beliefs of Christianity and Hinduism, and then subject both of these to most rigorous

philosophical analysis. In this process he would inevitably disturb the “Hindu equilibrium” and make him feel if there is something in his religion most dissatisfying and which can be met with satisfaction only in Christianity.

Although Hogg introduces this “method of contrast” in his series of articles titled, “Karma and Redemption” published during the year 1904 - 1905, the year Radhakrishnan entered the College, he develops it more fully in subsequent years. In 1907, Hogg writing in the *Harvest Field*, gives a lucid exposition of this method: “If Christianity could be presented not as a mere mass of alien beliefs but as a system of faith and life whose differences from Hinduism summed themselves up in the pre-eminent contrast of principle, Indian minds would be stirred to a new attention. They would in the long run - this we, as Christians, must believe - accept our principle.”³²

Thus Hogg, as “one pre-eminent contrast of principle,” earlier chose “Karma and Redemption” for his analysis. Hogg’s real intention was not only to show the inadequacies of the karma theory, but to disturb the Hindu consciousness so that it would be compelled to believe the Christian conception of “redemption” as morally satisfying. This challenge was thrust on him by Sastri, who argued, as we saw earlier, that Hinduism is both religiously and morally satisfying and superior to Christianity.

In this classic encounter between Sastri and Hogg, Radhakrishnan chose to follow the former. As against Hogg and his “method of contrast” Radhakrishnan espoused with great assiduity and success the comparative method, because it would satisfy and be in consonance with his Advaitic consciousness and understanding. He argues throughout his writings that all world religions have a great deal in common and their differences should be pushed to the rear in order that the religions are brought closer to each other. While Hogg considers the comparisons between Eastern and Western thoughts on one hand, and between Hinduism and Christianity on the other as no more than “superficial,” Radhakrishnan treats them as fundamental and essential.

Radhakrishnan’s future role as a Hindu apologist was also forced largely by Hogg’s classroom lectures and writings. Hogg’s critique of the Hindu doctrines in general and Karma theory in particular was a challenge to the young Radhakrishnan. Hogg levelled the following criticisms against the Karma theory:³³ (1) There is no scientific evidence for the theory i.e., no person can ever remember his previous embodiments, and even if he were to narrate these, the

same cannot be tested; (2) Karma theory cannot even be verified in the realm of nature. That there is a necessary connection between actions and fruits, which Karma maintains, cannot be true on par with any law of nature, which posits that “like causes produce like effects”; (3) The Law of Karma robs history of meaning, for a real history is not a mere causal sequence of events, but genuine development. A believer in Karma is not in a position to change his destiny or that of others in the society, for his actions are all pre-ordained in a previous life. Therefore “Real history disappears and all that is left is the chance pattern resulting from the interweaving of countless separate destinies”;³⁴ (4) Lastly, karma theory is not morally satisfying.

Radhakrishnan specifically responds to Hogg’s critique of the theory of karma beginning in his Master’s thesis, arguing that karma theory does not preclude free will and that human reason is so supreme that it can choose to change man’s destiny in any way it likes. This was his earliest attempt to defend the karma theory. It was only much later in his *An Idealist View of Life* that Radhakrishnan details a fuller account of the compatibility between karma and freedom, giving his famous example of the game of cards.³⁵

Thus began Radhakrishnan’s long journey on the road of apologetics. His M.A dissertation was the first work written in defence of his faith. However, its content was so raw and reactionary that Radhakrishnan dismisses it as a “juvenile and a rhetorical production and I am ashamed that I ever wrote it.”³⁶ Nevertheless this little essay perfectly reflects Radhakrishnan’s religious conviction and his determination to take up the role of a Hindu apologist. No less does it reflect the broadmindedness of Hogg, who as a supervisor of the work commended it thus: “The thesis which he prepared in the second year of his study for this degree shows a remarkable understanding of the main aspects of the philosophical problem, a capacity for handling easily, a complex argument besides more than the average mastery of good English.”³⁷

The bond between Hogg and Radhakrishnan became so strong because, as a recipient of the Aberdeen Studentship, Radhakrishnan was required to study, as per conditions of the Award, “under the advice of Professor Hogg and satisfy the Senates that he was making satisfactory progress.”³⁸ Through his teaching and vigorous philosophical acumen, Hogg left an indelible impression on young Radhakrishnan. At the same time, Radhakrishnan became a favourite student of Hogg. As Hogg watched the brilliant mind of

Radhakrishnan, he remarked, “You have splendidly redeemed the honour of your motherland and if I have the gift of prophesy, I am sure you will one day lead the destiny of your dear country.”³⁹

Radhakrishnan too held Hogg in high esteem and that he accorded a high academic pedestal to Hogg is clear from the fact that he made him the Sectional President (1937) and the General President (1940) of the Indian Philosophical Congress, which he founded.

CONCLUSION

In the light of Hogg-Radhakrishnan relationship, we may draw the following conclusions concerning inter-religious dialogue and understanding:

1. Apologetics – i.e., intellectual defence of a religious faith – could be an important methodology to bring faiths together. However, it must be carried out with a genuine knowledge of, and sensitivity to, the faith of the other and pursued with a total sympathy and understanding, lest it might degenerate into a polemic.
2. Method of comparison – i.e., drawing upon the similarities between the faiths – could well be superficial parallelisms. This at best can bring faiths closer to each other, but not them closer to truth. A method of selective contrasts if pursued honestly can confirm which of the beliefs could be intellectually convincing and morally satisfying.
3. Faith is more important than belief, as the latter is only an intellectual formation of the former, which is existential and experiential. However, faith cannot be blind, but intellectually coherent and morally satisfying.

*Madras Christian College
Tambaram, Chennai, India*

Notes

¹ The interesting details concerning Radhakrishnan’s life at Madras Christian College are already well known. A comprehensive survey could be found in the forthcoming book by Joshua Kalapati, *S. Radhakrishnan and Christianity: An Introduction to Hindu-Christian Apologetics* to be published by ISPCK, New Delhi.

² The Extra-Collegiate Scholarship enabled him to do B.A. course

and the Aberdeen Studentship helped him to undertake M.A. course work, details given in Madras Christian College Calendars (1906) 67 and (1908) 95.

³ Quoted in A.B. Campbell, "Madras Mission of the Free Church of Scotland," *Report of the South India Missionary Conference*, (Madras, 1858) 37.

⁴ See D.F. Wright et al (ed.) *Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology* (Edinburgh, 1993) 259.

⁵ See William Miller, "The Place of Education as a Missionary Agency," in *Report of the General Missionary Conference* (London, 1873) 107-108.

⁶ For a comprehensive statement on Miller's educational policy, see T. Ambrose Jeyasekaran, *Educational Policies of Protestant Christian Missions in South India till the end of the Nineteenth Century* (Delhi: AIACHE, 1991).

⁷ For more details, see William Miller, *The Madras Christian College: A short account of its history and influence*; also K. Joshua, "The Early Educational Mission of the Scottish Missionaries in Madras Presidency: Its Social Implications, in *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology*, vol. 16, no. 2 (Autumn 1998) 140-55.

⁸ John Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1966) 35.

⁹ See Mircea Eliade (ed.) *The Encyclopaedia of Religions*, vol. I, Section on Apologetics (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.) 349.

¹⁰ "My Search for Truth," Radhakrishnan's Autobiographical Essay, *Religion in Transition*, Ed. Vergillius Ferm (London: George Allen & Unwin Co., 1937) 19.

¹¹ See his *Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore* (London: Macmillan & Co., 1918) 1-7.

¹² *Organised Religion according to Dr.S.Radhakrishnan* (Rome: Roma University Georgsana Editrice, 1972) 211.

¹³ Ninian Smart, "S.Radhakrishnan," *The Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, Ed. Paul Edwards, vols. 7 and 8 (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1967) 62.

¹⁴ *Religion and Christian Faith* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956) 135.

¹⁵ "S. Radhakrishnan and Hinduism defined and defended," *Religion in Modern India*, Ed. Robert Braid, revised 2nd ed. (New Delhi: Manohar, 1989) 423.

¹⁶ *Category Formation and the History of Religions* (Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1971).

¹⁷*Crises of Belief* (London: Hodder & Stroughton, 1984) 106.

¹⁸See his "Reply to Critics," *Philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan*, ed. P.A. Schilpp (New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1952) 807.

¹⁹See Radhakrishnan's inaugural address delivered at the 125th year celebrations of the Madras Christian College on 10 March 1962; Principal's report in *The Madras Christian College Magazine* Vol. XXXI, (1962) 71-72; and Radhakrishnan, *Occasional Speeches and Writings* (July 1959 - May 1962) 193-99.

²⁰Details given in Joshua Kalapati, op cit.

²¹Radhakrishnan, "My Search for Truth," op cit., 9.

²²See his "Reply to Critics," op cit., 806.

²³"The Fulfilment of Man," *President Radhakrishnan's Speeches and Writings* (May 1962 - May 1965) 65.

²⁴See *Madras Christian College Magazine* (Hogg Memorial Volume) 1955 for several interesting articles on Hogg's personality. This includes a condolence message from his student Radhakrishnan, who was then the Vice-President of India.

²⁵For comprehensive details on Hogg's contribution to missionary theology, see James L. Cox, *The Development of A.G. Hogg's Theology in Relation to Non-Christian Faith: Its Significance for the Tambaram Meeting of the International Missionary Council, 1938*, Unpublished Ph.D., Thesis submitted to the University of Aberdeen, 1977; for Ritschlian influence on Hogg, see pp. 40-43. The first scholar to give wide publicity to Hogg's life and thought was Eric J. Sharpe, through his *Theology of A.G. Hogg* (Madras: C.L.S., 1971), but a more comprehensive account of Hogg's biography and theology is included in his recent work, *Alfred George Hogg* (Madras: C.L.S., 1999).

²⁶*Recovery of Faith* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1956) 147.

²⁷Details given in Joshua Kalapati, op cit.

²⁸*Madras Christian College Magazine*, Vol. XXII (1904 - 1905) 68-83.

²⁹For Hogg's initial response see his "Mr. Subrahmanya Sastri on Hindu Philosophy," *Madras Christian College Magazine*, Vol. XXII (1904 - 1905) 121-28. Hogg's elaborate response was given in his "Karma and Redemption," serialized in five parts in the same volume. See Part I (pp. 281-92), Part II (pp. 359-73), Part III (pp. 393-409), Part IV (pp. 449-69), Part V (pp. 505 - 522).

³⁰See John Hinnels and Eric J. Sharpe (eds.) *Hinduism* (Newcastle Upon Tyne: 1972) 101.

³¹See James L. Cox, op cit., p. 44f.

³²"All things to all men," *Harvest Field*, 18 (4), (1907) 36.

³³ See Hogg, *Karma and Redemption* (Madras : C.L.S., 1909) 42-47.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 45-46.

³⁵ “Life is like a game of bridge. The cards in the game are given to us. We do not select them. They are traced to past karma but we are free to make any call we think fit and lead any suit...” (*An Idealist View of Life*, p.221).

³⁶ “My Search for Truth,” op cit, p.19.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 40.

³⁸ See *Madras Christian College Calendar* (1908) 95.

³⁹ Hogg’s remark of 1908(?) was cited in Saminatha Subramaniam (ed.) *Hon’ble Dr. S. Radhakrishnan Commemoration Volume*, (prepared on his 78th birthday) (1966).