

The Problem of Transcendence and Immanence in Asian Contextual Theology¹

Simon Chan

Observers of the Asian theological scene have noted the main theological concern to be the twin issues of religiosity and poverty.² They constitute, respectively, the Asian version of the perennial theological problematic of divine transcendence and immanence.³ The current tendency among many "mainline" Asian theologians is to focus on the immanent pole, that is, the socio-political reality in Asia (of which poverty and oppression are prominent features) rather than strictly on the transcendent pole, namely, the great Asian religions. Even where both of these poles are taken seriously, the tendency is still to interpret Asian religiosity in immanent terms, that is, in terms of what God is doing within the socio-political contexts of Asia. Asian theologians could hardly be accused of not taking history seriously. But *that* is the problem: they have taken history *too* seriously, so much so that human history becomes the *only* avenue through which the God's presence is revealed. Consequently, there is no distinction between the working of God in the world and in the church. All history is redemptive history in the sense that both Christians and enlightened people of other faiths are involved in achieving the common goal of socio-political and economic redemption.

In this essay I will first look at the historical situation in Asia that gave rise to an undue emphasis on immanent theology. Three types of immanent theologies will be briefly discussed, against which I would like to argue why the transcendent dimension should not be ignored. Secondly, I would like to examine the works of two Asian Christians, Vishal Mangalwadi of India and Wang Ming Dao of China, who in the midst of *doing* (rather than merely reflecting upon) theology reveal in different ways how the problem of immanence and transcendence could be successfully integrated.

To understand why many Asian theologians have been tempted to "de-supernaturalise" the gospel, we need to realise that many were operating in

a milieu which was heavily influenced by Western models of modernisation and development. China in the 1920s was vigorously promoting the slogan "Science will save the nation" (科学救国). Needless to say, many Christian thinkers had to come up with a response that would make Christianity look compatible with modern science. Similarly, M. M. Thomas⁴ developed his theology at a time when many Asian nations were going through a lot of changes as they emerged from their colonial past, grappled with modernity, and sought to forge their own national identities. Great optimism was expressed over the vast possibilities modernisation would bring to Asia. Thomas saw modernisation as the harbinger of the gospel in Asia. This is because he saw modernisation as breaking the cyclical mentality of traditional societies and creating a linear or historical consciousness and an eschatological vision. With this consciousness, people are able to see themselves as shapers of their own historical destiny. The sense of personhood is awakened as people see themselves as agents of change rather than as part of a cosmic cycle over which they have no control. This sense of personhood prepares people for the gospel because the gospel, too, presupposes the ability to make personal decision and take responsibility. Thomas' analysis makes a lot of sense when one considers the fact that Christianity has made most headway in societies where modernisation and industrialisation have taken place. Singapore is a good case in point. The rapid growth of the church coincided with the period of rapid industrialisation beginning in the early 60s. Prior to that church growth had been very slow.

But for Thomas, the aim of the gospel is not so much to create a distinct people called the church; rather, he sees the gospel in terms of its ability to transform human society and build human communities. Salvation is essentially humanisation. Thomas' understanding of salvation is in part motivated by the fact that Christians form a very small minority in India. It would therefore be more strategic to engage the other religions on the basis of the common concern for humanisation of society rather than on theological grounds. Engaging the other religions in terms of their "religiosity", he feared, would lead to syncretism. But the main reason, I suspect, is the reluctance to confront the real differences between Christianity and Hinduism. Thomas would, therefore, advocate preaching "the unbounded Christ" rather than Christianity because the former would enable him to focus on broad principles on which both Christians and Hindus could agree.⁵ In short, the social contexts largely explain this tendency in mainline Protestantism in Asia to see Christianity in terms of certain historical processes.

Christianity as the *Within* of History

Let us look at three theological motifs in Asia which underwent the same historicising process. The first is the concept of the **cosmic Christ** which is popular with Indian theologians, such as Stanley Samartha⁶ and Raimundo Pannikar.⁷ It is based on two main passages of the Scripture, namely, Eph. 1:9-10 and Col. 1:15-20. These passages show that Christ is Lord over all creation. This means that all people are in some way under Christ's sovereignty. Since Christ is present in all creation, including the various Asian religions, all people of faith are thought to be "in Christ" even if they are not aware of it. The cosmic Christ is the basis for belief that wherever there are stirrings of the human spirit for freedom, justice, human dignity and truth, God's Spirit is at work among them. Raimundo Pannikar in *The Unknown Christ of Hinduism* sees Christianity and Hinduism as united ultimately in their common affirmation of a mystery that undergirds all of life. What Christians call the Christ, the Hindus identify as Isvara, the one who mediates the divine absolute, Brahman, to the world. Isvara is the manifestation of Brahman, just as Christ is the revelation of God.

The second motif is the theology of **God's suffering** found mainly among theologians coming from the Buddhist context, such as the Japanese Kazoh Kitamori⁸ and Kosuke Koyama⁹ and the Taiwanese theologian C. S. Song.¹⁰ Central to Buddhist teaching is the concept of suffering as embodied in Buddha's Four Noble Truths. One can see how in such a context theologians too will have to come to terms with the suffering motif. In Kitamori, the essential nature of God is "love rooted in the pain of God". The focus is not on God's suffering *for* humanity but *with* humanity. Kitamori draws his analogy from Japanese tragedy where a father gives up his own son for the sake of others.¹¹ God knows what it is to feel our pain because he feels the pain of his Son's suffering. Jesus embodies the "pain-love" of God in his earthly life and therefore is able to identify himself wholly with human suffering.

My third example is taken from the various liberation theologies operating in contexts characterised by dehumanisation, deep poverty and oppressive political and social systems. They go under many names. In India it is called Dalit theology, in Korea Minjung and in the Philippines simply liberation theology. What they all hold in common is the belief that God is the **God of the poor**. The gospel is the gospel for the poor; that is to say, the gospel as taught among the poor must set the standard for the preaching

of the gospel elsewhere. The gospel offers to people “full humanity” or personal dignity in Christ in the face of dehumanising systems and practices (such as the caste system of India); it overthrows the oppressive structures of society and brings about radical social change.

What these three examples have in common is that the gospel is equated with some historical ideal. In the cosmic Christ, the ideal is expressed in terms of striving for truth and human dignity; in the pain of God, it is the identification with fellow-human sufferers; in the God of the poor, it is freedom in socio-political life. While we do not deny that the coming of Christ into human history does have far-reaching implications for our historical existence, the gospel of Christ is *more than* all of these things. The gospel is not just about changing our historical existence; it has to do ultimately with the “*beyond* history”, as the Greek Orthodox theologian John Zizioulas puts it.¹² It is this “beyond history” which many Asian theologians have not fully reckoned with.

Christianity as the *Beyond* of History

To recognise that Christianity is also about the beyond of history is simply to acknowledge a basic given in the Christian faith: this is the way the Christian faith *is*. No matter how Christianity is interpreted in any context, there is an irreducible transcendent reality in the Christian faith. This assertion is borne out by direct observation. When the church is left very much to its own without too much outside interference, over time it tends to take on a form that is broadly orthodox—whatever its ideology may have been at the beginning. I have observed this phenomenon in Burma which from the late 50s to relatively recent times was almost totally cut off from the outside world. Prior to the policy of isolation, the Burmese church was, like many other Asian churches, much dependent on the Western “mother” church both financially and theologically. When a theological accreditation team (of which I was a member) visited the country in the late 80s after more than seven years, we noticed that every seminary had a set of Paul Tillich’s *Systematic Theology* sitting proudly on their library shelves—collecting dust! During the years of enforced isolation, the Burmese church had to turn to more basic spiritual resources. The result is that the church has moved to a position that could best be described as embodying a conservative type of Christianity. The same could be said of the church in China. Left to themselves, the Christians simply propagated a very conservative and charismatic Christianity.¹³

The kind of Christianity observed in Burma and China could perhaps be best described as “primitive” Christianity, with a strong supernaturalistic dimension. It is conservative, but not like the conservative Christianity from the West which is very much tainted by the ideological struggles between fundamentalism and liberalism. The Western type of conservatism when transplanted in Asia tends to carry over its ideological hang-ups. It tends to conceive of the gospel strictly as a transcendent reality, totally concerned with our “spiritual” life and afterlife and having little or nothing to do with our social, political and economic life.

The state of Nagaland in north-east India is a good case in point of this type of Christianity. Although it is 90% Christian, it is one of the most corrupt states in India. The politicians and civil servants who enrich themselves by corrupt means are likely to be regular churchgoers or even deacons. They donate considerable amounts of money to the church (but retain considerably more for themselves). Some of them live in staggering opulence, while the majority of their brothers and sisters in Christ eke out a miserable existence. The Christian politician apparently sees no contradiction between his confession of Jesus as Saviour and Lord in church and the shady deals he conducts at work. The gospel does not seem to have had any influence beyond the four walls of the church. There is not only endemic corruption, but the predominantly Christian states in the north-east continue to be plagued by inter-tribal conflicts. The Nagas and the Kukis (a tribe from the Christian state of Manipur) have been at war for several years over land titles. About three years ago, in one of our regular visits to Nagaland, I came across a report in the local papers about the killing of a Kuki pastor and his entire family by a group of Nagas, who apparently were also fellow-Baptists. Yet, the Naga churches are by and large some of the most vibrant missionary churches I have seen. They send missionaries into some of the most difficult and forbidden areas of the region like Tibet, Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan. Sadly, the Naga church is split by the same ideological divide that splits the Western churches. We have on the one hand the pastors who preach the gospel of individual salvation without its social implications and, on the other, those trained in the mainline seminaries who preach liberation and humanisation without a life-changing gospel.

Vishal Mangalwadi: Integrating Social Reform and Charismatic Ministry

Let us look at two Asian Christian leaders who, in my view, have successfully brought together both the *beyond* and the *within* of history

together. Vishal Mangalwadi is an Indian Christian and founder-director of the Association for Comprehensive Rural Assistance (ACRA), an organisation dedicated to helping the poor villagers who are often the victims of exploitation and injustice perpetrated by their high-caste landlords with the connivance of a corrupt bureaucracy. Mangalwadi discovered early in his work among the poor that the problem of poverty is not a matter of backwardness in technology; it was part of a system of ordering society based on religious sanctions going back thousands of years. When the rich and high-caste believe that it is their right to be rich and powerful and the poor and oppressed also believe that it is their lot to live in poverty and servitude because the all-pervading law of karma so dictates, the only way to change this unjust structure is by changing the basic outlook of people. Mangalwadi sees three possible options. First, one could minimise the injustices inherent in the caste system by enacting laws, but this will not fundamentally change the structure of a caste-based society. Or, one could try to change people at the top, that is, by removing those who are responsible for the injustices. Again, this will not do in India where the perpetrators of oppression of the lower castes number in the hundreds of thousands. The only option, then is the third:

[It] is to change the oppressed. One can refuse to accept the basic unjust structure of society and reform the system by changing the oppressed, e.g. if the untouchables cannot change the high-caste oppressors, their only option is to change themselves. This change has to be at two levels. First, they have to be set free from mental or ideological slavery. They have to cease to believe that they are born untouchables because of the *karma* (actions) of their past lives and that blessings of their lives depend on their fulfilling the duties of their present low status. They are held in slavery by faith in a falsehood. The truth alone can set them free from this mentality of slavery. Second, they have to opt out of the socio-religious systems, i.e. cease to be Hindus, in order to cease to be untouchables. They have to accept a new world view which has a high view of man and equality of man as basic doctrines and at the same time they have to join a community which practises these truths.¹⁴

This third option calls for the use of all the spiritual resources that Christianity offers. Mangalwadi acknowledges that only with supernatural resources can one challenge the very core of the caste system. And so Mangalwadi engages in evangelism.

Oppressive systems survive by propagating falsehood. Evangelism liberates by spreading truth, i.e. by undercutting the intellectual foundations of an exploitative system and by creating an alternative social structure which seeks to live out the truth (p. 37).

Evangelism centres in the Good News of Jesus as Saviour *and* Lord. It is when we recognise the lordship of Christ that we begin to see the wider implications of the good news. The proclamation that “Jesus is Lord” eventually undermines all human governments with totalitarian claims (p. 39), including the totalitarian sanctions of the caste system. Mangalwadi, however, is not just concerned with the “social dimension of evangelism”. He believes that evangelism is a full package which includes the need for personal repentance and faith. Mangalwadi recognises the importance of *personal* evangelism especially in a context that all too easily sacrifices the individuals for “the good of the larger society”. He believes that preaching personal salvation and prophetic condemnation of social injustice must go hand in hand. Preaching “salvation without proclaiming repentance and justice, reduces the Church to a rudderless boat floating at the mercy of social currents”. At the same time,

when we cease to be a voice of justice, we also become ineffective as channels of salvation: When we are not breaking the yoke of oppression, we have no ‘good news for the poor’ either. The poor masses consider us irrelevant and our critics legitimately dismiss us as giving ‘opium’, and not spreading the Good News (p. 83).

Mangalwadi also believes in and practices prayer and exorcism. In exorcising demons from people, he was also awakening people to the reality of the demonic in other realms, especially the social and political realms. We cannot begin to deal effectively with deep, structural evils in society until we recognise the reality of the demonic underlying these structures. We will begin to see that these are not just maladjustments in social life, but entrenched radical evil. We cannot effectively deal with such evils without the power that comes from the Holy Spirit. Baptism in the Spirit gives power to witness to the Truth—the truth that sets people free (p. 85). But it is not enough to speak a prophetic word of judgement:

A prophetic judgment on oppression, cruelty and exploitation in our society can have no meaning if it is not backed by our own life of service and the care of the powerless lambs. But our service also has

little effectiveness if it is not seen against the background of our overall Christlike compassion for man (p. 89).

This need to show compassion in a concrete way leads Mangalwadi to take seriously the place of miracles and healings as part and parcel of a holistic ministry of compassion coupled with prophetic judgement. Above all, it is through prayer that such a ministry is possible (pp. 93-94).

Mangalwadi's approach to ministry among the poor and oppressed leads to a couple of important observations. First, it shows the need to be deeply involved with and among the people we serve. Without deep involvement with people we will not have a holistic vision of their real needs. Out of that vision we will be able to see the larger implications of the gospel beyond just the saving of individual souls. Second, the greatness of the human need, the abjectness of the human condition, drives us to rely on supernatural resources. We begin to realise that the task is just too great to be dealt with by the normal methods of social alleviation and education, or simply by making prophetic pronouncements. A radical conversion is needed if change is to take place. The power of God must be relied upon rather than human wisdom. It was just such a vision of human need that led Mangalwadi to integrate social reform with evangelism and charismatic ministry empowered by the Spirit of God.

Mangalwadi's work reminds me of my own experience a few years ago with a group of Filipino ladies who were deeply engaged in helping the very poor, drug addicts and handicapped in the central part of the Philippines. They brought me to a place where they took retreats and studied the Bible under a spiritual director. One of them told me, "We could only do what we are doing because we come to this place regularly. It's prayer that keeps us going."

Wang Ming Dao: Creating a Contrast Community

Mangalwadi is a theologian in his own right who reflected deeply on the context in which he serves. My second example is a Chinese preacher who, though not a theologian, is nevertheless deeply conscious of the vast implications of the gospel. And within the peculiar historical situation that he found himself, he sought to create what Hauerwas calls a "community of character" that would indirectly pose a challenge to the absolutist claims of a totalitarian regime. Wang Ming Dao (1900-1988), the name he took after his conversion, means understanding the truth. Wang did not write theology, but in his many sermons there is a consistent implicit theology.

Wang lived in a period of Chinese history when China was going through vast changes socially and politically. The impact of Western science and technology on China beginning with the May Fourth Movement in 1919 led to radical rethinking and self-questioning among the Chinese intellectuals. Why had China been lagging so far behind? Such soul-searching led to the question of the role that religions had played in Chinese society. Inevitably Christianity came up for questioning. The Western educated elite saw Christianity as a superstition and a hindrance to progress. Many Chinese Christian apologists rose up to defend the faith. But Wang was, seemingly unconcerned about these developments. This has led some scholars of this period to regard him as an escapist who was concerned only with spiritual matters.¹⁵ But this is really to misunderstand Wang. Part of the problem is that Wang has been evaluated by a particular theory of social engagement, a theory Stanley Hauerwas calls the "Constantinian model" where the only recognisable form of social engagement is that of direct involvement in the socio-political sphere. Wang's approach is far more subtle, less direct, but no less threatening to the false ideologies of his day.

Wang was primarily concerned about the church and what it ought to be. He directed his messages to and at the church, but always with an eye on the way the church would affect the world. Thus, unlike John Sung and Watchman Nee, two other influential Chinese preachers of this period, whose messages were mostly concerned with personal relationship with God, Wang's messages could best be called "theological ethics". Even in his earlier sermons, when conflict with the Three Self Patriotic Movement was not on the horizon, Wang was consciously seeking to mould the church into a "contrast community". In "Dangers of the Present-Day Church" he warns of the enemies inside the church, namely, the worship of wealth, conformity to the world, and toleration of sin. His idea of holiness was not formed by the typical Holiness list of do's and don'ts: smoking, drinking, the cinema, etc. Rather, he castigated social evils that had crept into the church:

The strongest evidence of this 'Mammon Worship' is the prevalent attitude of attaching weight to wealth and of despising poverty. Vast amounts of money are in the hands of wealthy men. To get money, by following human methods, involves going to these wealthy man [sic] 'cap in hand' and playing the sycophant. Wealthy people are invited to occupy the best seats in the church building and to fill the important offices in the church. Board members, Board chairmen, Committee

members, Committee chairmen, Elders, Deacons, Presidents, Honorary pastors—these seats are largely occupied by people with money.... So long as you have money you can occupy the best seats in the church building.... Even when it is known that the wealth of these people has [sic] amassed by dealing in opium and trading in tobacco, or by using an official position to squeeze money out of people....¹⁶

Again, when Wang spoke out against conformity to the world, he referred to such practices in the church like using “the name of some important person such as the head of a government, a manager, or a chairman of some kind, to be a notice board for the church” or of welcoming people to the pulpit on the basis of their academic qualifications without considering their spiritual qualifications.¹⁷

His call to the church became even clearer between 1949 and 1955, the year when he was imprisoned. In sermon after sermon he spoke out boldly against compromise and for the need to be faithful and obedient to God. In “Nitty Gritty Faithfulness” based on Luke 16:10a, he warned of the danger of making small compromises which in the long term undermined one’s integrity and made one completely powerless. This is obviously a reference to the leaders of the Three Self Patriotic Movement (TSPM).

Suppose a piece of white paper is laid before us and most people declare, ‘It is black,’ but I insist that it is white. That will surely disturb those others and invite their ill feelings. Some friends might advise, ‘Don’t make an issue of it. What does it matter if everyone is saying that the paper is black; go ahead and agree with them and keep peace.... Why not peacefully coexist with others and gain greater opportunities to serve them and witness for the Lord?... But if you persist in saying that the piece of paper is white, you will not only irritate others, you will disrupt all harmony with them and lose the chance to help them....’ This kind of argument or logic may sound quite reasonable and attractive, but if you analyse it carefully you will know it is based on a principle which looks right but is completely wrong.¹⁸

Wang recognised that these seemingly inconsequential actions are deadening because they are actions arising from fear.

Today, because you are afraid to offend another person over such a seemingly small matter, and agree to lie, someday many people may

say that a certain innocent person is evil—and will you have the courage to say that he is innocent when you know that he truly is?¹⁹

Wang knew what was really at stake. The line must be clearly drawn between truth and falsehood, between the church and the world. The choice between God and the world always comes as an either/or: “Anyone who works for God should make an irrevocable decision whether he intends to please God or to please men. There is only one choice—a person cannot have it both ways.”²⁰ Only by remaining a contrast community can the church be true to her Lord in the midst of incessant assaults from a godless ideology. It is no wonder that when the communists took over China in 1949, they saw Wang as their greatest threat. They knew that as long as the likes of Wang existed, communism will not have absolute sovereignty over the people. The TSPM accused him of spreading “imperialist poisonous thought”, of being “individualistic” and “unclear”. But what Wang really did was simply to insist that there must be a division between the godly and the ungodly, between believers and unbelievers. Wang’s stance implicitly rejects the totalitarian claims of the state. By affirming absolute loyalty only to Christ, as seen in another sermon “Obey God or Men?”²¹ Wang in effect relativises all human authorities—and *that* the communist could not tolerate.

The Centrality of the Church

Both Mangalwadi and Wang developed different ways of relating the gospel to their respective contexts. Their different responses could be attributed to their very different circumstances and backgrounds. Mangalwadi, working in a country with a democratic tradition, could make use of the processes of direct engagement. This involves sometimes confronting the powers that be and calling them to account. Wang, on the other hand, operates in a context without such a tradition. His critique of society is always indirect, that is, by making a direct appeal to the church to be a different community, he was implicitly showing up the false claims and pretensions of the Chinese Communist Party and also the moral failure of the TSPM. Mangalwadi harnesses theological arguments for the need to integrate evangelism and social reform. Wang, on the other hand, shows the need for the church to be different by directly “indwelling” the gospel story. That is to say, the gospel story sets the normative pattern for our own life story. If our own life story is to be true, it must ‘reenact’ the gospel story. And so Christ’s victory through suffering becomes the key to our own triumph:

Peter saw his Lord *triumph through suffering*. Then he clearly understood that his own failure was because he was afraid to suffer. His experience made him fully comprehend that the only way to overcome the enemy's threat and attacks was to "arm himself with the spirit of suffering."²²

Our success must be like the success of Jesus: "It is not the success of accomplishing great and splendid enterprises, but of glorifying God on earth and accomplishing what God has committed to us."²³ Similarly, the story of Peter before the Sanhedrin became the basis for non-conformity: "We ought to obey God rather than men" when men's laws contradict the law of God.²⁴ Wang applied the story of Peter's denial to his own case when, under intense interrogation, he was forced to confess his "mistakes". Upon his release he saw himself as Judas, but later, as Peter who denied his Lord, not from wilfulness but from weakness. This story helped him in his own restoration. He immediately went back to his captors to retract his confession, drawing from this bold act a life sentence. Wang spent the next 25 years in prison. He was released in 1980 and died eight years later.

What is common to both Mangalwadi and Wang is the central place they give to the church. This is crucial if we are to bring the poles of transcendence and immanence together. Both saw the church as a counter-culture. But Mangalwadi is more explicit. He describes the church as a "power structure" that provides the antidote to structural evil.²⁵ We can only address structural evil with a counter-structure. The church is that counter-structure that Christ built against which the gates of Hades will not prevail (Matt. 16:18). Mangalwadi chides those modern theologians who "dismiss the very concept of the church as irrelevant to the struggle against injustice and the struggle for the weak" (p. 101). For him, evangelism and church planting must go together. The church is "an inseparable part of the Good News" (p. 107). His concern for the church reminds us of what D.T. Niles, the Sri Lankan ecumenical theologian once said, "The answer to the problems of the world is the answer that Jesus Christ provided, which is the Church."²⁶

Wang did not reflect on the nature of the church as such, but by "indwelling" the Gospel he was seeking to create just such a counter-structure. In a number of his sermons prior to his imprisonment in 1955 Wang referred to the conflict between the apostles and the Jewish religious leaders. For Wang, this same conflict was now being reenacted in China between the true church and the church that had sold itself to the

communists (the TSPM). Like the apostles the true church must be prepared to suffer for Jesus. It must be prepared to disobey a false command in order to obey Christ's command to preach the gospel.²⁷

Conclusion

It is ironic that those who are so concerned about making Christ immanent in Asia have ended up making the church powerless and irrelevant. If Christians and non-Christians have Christ at the same centre, then there is no need for a separate church. It is not surprising that advocates of the "cosmic Christ" are often hazy about the mission of the church: what do we actually preach to non-Christians if Christ is, in some mysterious fashion, already among them? But if the boundaries of the church are clearly defined, then we can be clear about our message: it is the gospel, given by Christ to his church, that lays claim on both individuals and society, calling them to conversion to a new life and a new society of love, peace and justice. But the church must first show that such a society is possible by its own way of life as a counter-culture. I have given two examples to show that it is just such a gospel and such a church that is the hope of Christianity in Asia.

My examples are not the "standard fare" that one would get from a book on Asian theology, but I believe that if Asian theology is to address real issues in Asia, it has to go beyond talk about what Asian theologians are saying. We need to look at what the Asian churchmen and women and laypersons are *doing*. Then we need to ask ourselves: What is God saying to us through their deeds?

¹ This essay is a slightly revised version of a lecture delivered at Bethel Seminary in San Diego, California earlier this year.

² See William A. Dyrness, *Learning About Theology From the Third World* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 1990), p. 151; Aloysius Pieres, *An Asian Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1988), p. 69.

³ See, for example, the way in which the transcendence-immanence problematic is used as the interpretative category for understanding 20th Century theology in Stanley J. Grenz and Roger E. Olson, *20th Century Theology: God and the World in a Transitional Age* (Downers Grove, Il.: IVP, 1992).

⁴ *The Christian Response to the Asian Revolution* (Lucknow: Lucknow Publishing House, 1967).

⁵ *The Christian Response to the Asian Revolution*, p. 95.

-
- ⁶ "The Unbound Christ: Toward a Christology in India Today," *What Asian Christians are Thinking*, ed. Douglas Elwood (Manila: New Day Publishers, 1976), pp. 221-239.
- ⁷ *The Unknown Christ of Hinduism*, rev. (Maryknoll, N. Y.: Orbis, 1981).
- ⁸ *Theology of the Pain of God* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965).
- ⁹ *No Handle on the Cross: An Asian Meditation on the Crucified Mind* (London: SCM Press, 1976)
- ¹⁰ *The Compassionate God: An Exercise in the Theology of Transposition* (London: SCM Press, 1982).
- ¹¹ *Theology of the Pain of God*, p. 135.
- ¹² *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir Seminary Press, 1985), esp. chap. 3.
- ¹³ Cf. the stories collected by Jonathan Chao in *Wise as Serpents Harmless as Doves: Christians in China Tell Their Stories* (Pasadena, Ca.: William Carey Library, 1988).
- ¹⁴ *Truth and Social Reform* (London: Spire Books, 1989), pp. 36-37.
- ¹⁵ See, e.g., Lam Wing-Hung, *Chinese Theology in Construction* (Pasadena, CA: William Carey Library, 1983), pp. 22-23, 75-76.
- ¹⁶ Wang Ming Dao, "Dangers in the Present-Day Church" in *Spiritual Food* (Southampton, Hants: Mayflower Christian Books, 1983), p. 39.
- ¹⁷ *Spiritual Food*, p. 42.
- ¹⁸ *A Call to the Church*, trans. Theodore Choy, ed. Leona F. Choy (Fort Washington, Penn.: Christian Literature Crusade, 1983), p. 18.
- ¹⁹ *Call to the Church*, p.20.
- ²⁰ "A Message Without Discount," in *Call to the Church*, pp. 68-69
- ²¹ *Call to the Church*, pp. 23-28.
- ²² "Preparation for Suffering," in *Call to the Church*, p. 30.
- ²³ "Success and Embroidered Pillows" in *Call to the Church*, pp. 53-54.
- ²⁴ "Obey God or Men?" in *A Call to the Church*.
- ²⁵ *Truth and Social Reform*, p. 95.
- ²⁶ *The Message and Its Messengers* (Nashville, New York: Abingdon, 1966), p. 50.
- ²⁷ "Strange Men and Amazing Miracles" in *A Call to the Church*, p. 104.