

was in choosing Calcutta as the sphere of his operations instead of some rural district, as Dr. Inglis proposed; and second, the statement that Duff *at once* revolutionized missionary methods in India is entirely unfounded. It was forty-five years before it was approved by any great body of missionaries, and Duff never wished, and never did materially alter or affect the methods of former missions.

Nothing could be more erroneous and mischievous than the misrepresentations on this point. One writer, to whose statements great prominence has been given, has the boldness to say that "mission schools and colleges have been diverting from evangelistic work the energies and talents of at least *three-fourths* of the ablest men sent out by all the Protestant Missionary Societies." Leaving out that invidious and unmeasurable quantity, by which the writer guards himself, but which only reveals the fact that some of the ablest men do choose this method of evangelizing India, what do we find to be the real state of the case? I have before me two estimates from the statistics of missions in that country made by two independent authorities. The one says: "According to the *Asylum Press Almanac* there are 264 European and American missionaries in southern India. Of these exactly forty devote the main portion of their time and strength to 'mission high schools and colleges.'" That is only fifteen per cent., or less than one in seven, in the most educational region of India.

The other says: "Taking the latest reports of sixteen missions in different parts of the country, including the Panjab and Madras, Calcutta and Bombay, we went through the names of all foreign missionaries and found that between a seventh and an eighth of the total number is devoted to educational work—in many cases very partially, in others more fully." Both these witnesses give the estimate for the great educational centres, including the capital cities of the principal provinces. If they had taken the whole of India there would have been found *one in ten of the foreign missionaries*, and if we include the native ministers and evangelists there would not be one in twenty or thirty engaged in this higher education, and of both classes it may be said that, of those engaged in teaching, many give only a part of their time to mere teaching; much of it is devoted to directly evangelistic work. Dr. Duff never meant his system to form more than a fractional part of the missionary work of the church even in India. As for the rapid revolution, no system of missionary effort has ever been more stoutly opposed both at home and in India. It was not until the year 1879, forty-five years after its introduction, that it received in Bangalore anything like an unanimous approval from any missionary conference. But there and then a resolution was passed, proposed by the most ardent evangelistic missionaries in southern India, expressing the most unqualified approbation of the