Ching Feng [New Series, Volume 8, Number 1-2, 2007]

Ching Feng

A Journal on Christianity and Chinese Religion and Culture

Originally published under the title *Quarterly Notes* since 1957, *Ching Feng* is one of the major publications of the Christian Study Centre on Chinese Religion and Culture, by which it seeks to promote critical and constructive studies of all aspects of Chinese Christianity, Chinese religion and culture, and interreligious dialogue between Christianity and other religious traditions in Asia.

Ching Feng

A Journal on Christianity and Chinese Religion and Culture

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 8, NUMBERS 1–2, 2007

Special Issue for the Bicentennial of Robert Morrison's Arrival in China

Editors' Introduction 3

The Right Reverend Dr. George Smith, Anglican Bishop of Victoria (1849–1865): His Advice to the Church Missionary Society and His Missionary Travels on the Chinese Mainland 5
GILLIAN BICKLEY

Robert Morrison and the Old Protestant Cemetery in Macao 31
LOUIS HA

A Parting Memorial: Morrison and Missionary Motivation: His Sabbatical Sermons, 1823–1826 45
CHRISTOPHER D. HANCOCK

Christian Mission and Higher Education: A Case for the Study of World Christianity Today 73
PETER TZE MING NG

In the Eye of a Tornado: Lessons to Be Learned from Critiques of Christian Missionaries 91
LAUREN F. PFISTER

Preaching the Social Gospel: Protestants and Economic Modernization in Republican China, 1927–1931 117
THOMAS H. REILLY

The Importance of Shandong: A Missiological Evaluation of a *Place* 131
SCOTT W. SUNQUIST

Protestant "Missionary Cases" (*jiao'an*) in Shandong Province, 1860–1900 153
R. G. TIEDEMANN

The Chinese Nation-state, Missionary Medicine and Chinese Women 197
M. CRISTINA ZACCARINI

Dealing the Culture Card against Episcopal Women's Ministry in Asia 215
ELIZABETH KOEPPING

Special Issue for the Bicentennial of
Robert Morrison's Arrival in China

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 3–4

Editors' Introduction

Rev. Dr. Robert Morrison (1782–1834) of the London Missionary Society probably remains the best known as well as the most controversial missionary to China. To commemorate the bicentennial of his arrival—and so also that of Protestant Christianity—in China, a number of academic institutions and church bodies in Hong Kong jointly organized a series of events in 2007, namely two public lectures, an academic conference and an exhibition of historical pictures. The organizers include the Hong Kong Council of the Church of Christ in China, the Chinese Christian Literature Council, the Christian Cultural Society, the Centre for the Study of Religion and Chinese Society of Chung Chi College, the Centre for Christian Studies of the Department of Cultural and Religious Studies at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, the Modern History Research Centre of the Department of History at Hong Kong Baptist University, the Christianity and Chinese Culture Research Centre of the Alliance Bible Seminary, the Christian Study Centre on Chinese Religion and Culture, and the Society for the Study of History of Christianity in China.

The two public lectures were held at Church of Christ in China's Mongkok Church, on April 25. The first one, titled "We are Writing History," was given by Prof. Lin Zhiping 林治平 of Christian Cosmic Light Holistic Care Organization, who is a professor emeritus at Chung Yuan Christian University, Taiwan. The second lecture, titled "Rev. Robert Morrison's Work in China and His Influence," was given by Prof. Lee Kam Keung (Li Jinqiang 李金強) of the Department of History at Hong Kong Baptist University. Rev. Dr. Lee Chee Kong (Li Zhigang 李志剛), the chairman of the Christian Cultural Society, gave responses to both lectures.

The international conference that followed, titled "The Meeting of East–West Culture: Conference in Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of Rev. Robert Morrison's Arrival in China cum the 5th Confer-

ence on the History of Christianity in Modern China," was held on April 26–28 at Chung Chi College of The Chinese University of Hong Kong (April 26–27) and Hong Kong Baptist University (April 28). About 70 scholars from mainland China, Taiwan, Singapore, the United States, the United Kingdom and Hong Kong attended the conference and presented their papers on Christianity in China in the 19th and 20th centuries, with special reference to the work and legacy of Robert Morrison as well as other missionaries to China.

The exhibition of "Historical Pictures in Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of Rev. Robert Morrison's Arrival in China" was held at Hong Kong Baptist University on April 23–30, with the sponsorship of Christian Cosmic Light Holistic Care Organization, the Chinese Coordination Centre of World Evangelism, and the Archives of the History of Christianity in China at the library of Hong Kong Baptist University. A collection of 800 historical pictures related to the history of Protestant Christianity in China were exhibited.

Some of the conference papers written in Chinese have been selected to be published by the Chinese Christian Literature Council, in early 2008. Ten of the papers that were written in English and presented at the conference, on the other hand, are published in this special issue of *Ching Feng*.[†] Both the Chinese and English papers presented at the conference cover a rather wide range of topics, and the authors are also from a rather diversified background, reflecting the mushrooming of the related fields of study internationally and the need for mutual understanding as well as cooperation between scholars of the fields from China and the West.

It is the honour and pleasure of the Christian Study Centre on Chinese Religion and Culture to have co-organized the bicentennial commemoration of Morrison's arrival in China, to publish this collection of quality papers in this journal, and thus to contribute to the advancement of the studies of Christianity in China.

Lai Pan-chiu
Ying Fuk-tsang

[†] In addition to these papers, the present volume includes a refereed article on "Episcopal Women's Ministry in Asia."

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 5–30

The Right Reverend Dr. George Smith, Anglican Bishop of Victoria (1849–1865)

His Advice to the Church Missionary Society and His Missionary Travels on the Chinese Mainland

GILLIAN BICKLEY

I have spoken twice before at earlier conferences in this series, on the subject of the Right Reverend Dr. George Smith (1815–71), first Anglican Bishop of Victoria, Hong Kong (1849–65). The first time I spoke (at the Second Symposium on the History of Christianity in Modern China, in January 2001), I described his life, his dedication to missionary work in China and the sacrifice of his health, leading to a relatively early death, at the age of 55. I also described his work as Bishop of Victoria, including his and his wife's pioneering efforts in Hong Kong education. (Between them, they established three schools. One of these was the first government day school for Chinese girls in Hong Kong, and, in Rev. W. Lobscheid's words, its establishment proved without doubt "the possibility of female education in China."[1]) St. Paul's College is the modern embodiment of St. Paul's Missionary College, of which the Bishop was the first Warden, ex-officio. And the Diocesan Native Female Training School has mutated into two estab-

---

Gillian BICKLEY is honorary research fellow at the Centre of Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong.

[1] Rev. W. Lobscheid, *A Few Notices on the Extent of Chinese Education, and the Government Schools of Hongkong* (Hong Kong: China Mail Office, 1859), 31.

lishments: the Diocesan Girls' School and the Diocesan Boys' School.[2] The second time I spoke (at the Third International Conference on the History of Christianity in Modern China, in May 2003), I described his efforts—combined with those of others—in raising funds to establish the See of Victoria, based in Hong Kong.[3] I used primary source materials to show that, at the time of this fund-raising, he had already served as a missionary in China and returned to the United Kingdom because of ill-health. As a result of his experience and also his personality, he now had considerable credibility with the Church Missionary Society (CMS) and a high profile in Government circles in the United Kingdom. These factors, combined with his enthusiasm for the spread of the Gospel in China, led to an adequately successful result. Without the impetus that George Smith contributed, the See of Victoria would not have been established when it was—and in fact, in my view, it was established prematurely—before there was adequate financial and moral support for the See in Hong Kong itself.

George Smith was indeed a Pioneer of the Christian Church in Modern China. He provided a foundation for the work of others, along with a structure within which they could operate. These are good rea-

---

[2] Gillian Bickley, "George Smith (1815–1871), Pioneer of the Church Missionary Society in China and First Bishop of Victoria" (henceforth referred to as "George Smith"), paper presented at the Second Symposium on the History of Christianity in Modern China (co-organized by the Department of History, Hong Kong Baptist University and Alliance Bible Seminary, and sponsored by the Hong Kong Baptist Church), Hong Kong Baptist University, 5–6 January 2001. For Word file, see Gillian Bickley, [SmithCorresp2:HistSem4]. For the official conference hand-out, see Gillian Bickley, magazine box no. 16, private archive. This paper has very full bibliographical references, which are not repeated in the present paper. [If you would like a copy of any of Dr. Gillian Bickley's unpublished works mentioned in this and the following notes, please email her (gbickley@hkbu.edu.hk) to let her know. She may be uploading this material to a website and can give you the reference then. Or she may be able to send you a soft copy in some other way.—Ed.]

See also, Gillian Bickley, "The Right Reverend George Smith, Bishop of Victoria, Chairman 1852–1864," in *The Development of Education in Hong Kong, 1848–1897: As Revealed through the Early Education Reports of the Hong Kong Government, 1848–1896*, ed. Gillian Bickley (Hong Kong: Proverse Hong Kong, 2002), 24–31.

[3] Gillian Bickley, "The Establishment of the Colonial Bishops Fund and Its Impact on the Establishment of a Bishop's See of Victoria, Hong Kong, China, and Saint Paul's Missionary College, Hong Kong, in Association with the See" (hereforth referred to as "The Establishment of the Colonial Bishops Fund"), paper presented at the Third International Conference on the History of Christianity in Modern China (jointly organized by Hong Kong Baptist University and Alliance Bible Seminary), 16–17 May 2003. For Word file, see Gillian Bickley, [Proverse_GB_Work_Completed\HKU_Hist_Sem_23_3_06\CLBPPAP.DOC]. For associated print-outs and correspondence, see Gillian Bickley, private archive. This paper, also, has very full bibliographical references, which are not repeated in the present paper.

sons to give him prominence in our study of this broad topic of the Contemporary History of Christianity in China. There are other reasons too, including but not limited to the following: his publications on China, his interest in the Taiping Rebellion and his hope that it could be a very significant means for bringing the Gospel to China, the role he played in the translation of the Bible into Chinese and in discussions of the "term question," and—perhaps most important—his interest in, advocacy of, and efforts towards training and establishing a Chinese ministry to the Chinese as the most effective means for spreading the Gospel.

At this conference, my contribution of historical data, again derived from primary source materials, relates to two topics: the advice George Smith gave (in 1844–49) to the CMS about its future operations in China; and his own missionary travels on the Chinese Mainland. My purpose in this paper is very simple, with no hidden agenda whatsoever. It is written from the perspective of a scholar of nineteenth-century historical sources, who is interested particularly in people and in an accurate understanding of their actions, motivations and achievements. My hope is to arouse interest in the life and work of George Smith in the context of his contributions to the establishment and development of the Christian Church in China and to solicit partners in continuing a study of his missionary travels in particular. Following from my own experience in researching this and related topics and also arising from some decisions about publication which I am currently facing, I also raise questions about the appropriate approach to the study of the History of Christianity in China and the appropriate use of the greatly enhanced opportunities for publishing our work which are now quite readily available.

Smith did comment on Robert Morrison, the missionary pioneer whose life and work this meeting is celebrating, and his comments, based on extensive reading performed during Rev. Smith's early illness as a missionary in China,[4] are a brief but interesting indication of the

---

[4] George Smith, MS Report on Hong Kong, dated Victoria, Hong Kong, 7 January 1845, addressed to Rev. H. Venn, Master's Lodge, Queen's College, Cambridge, United Kingdom. Received in England, 26(?) April 1845, in Church Missionary Society Archives, Birmingham University Library, C CH/O 79/[4B], transcribed by Gillian Bickley. See Gillian Bickley, [CMS79No1], Word file. Henceforth referred to as "George Smith's First Report."

See the following comment on how this report was written: "I had strict injunctions . . . to take in hand no reading or study, except for recreation and of a light kind—I thought the best way was to read and acquire information about China and the Chinese—and the result is the enclosed Report" (ibid).

consensus view, over 160 years ago, of Morrison's work. In Rev. George Smith's first Report to the CMS,[5] which (as he himself explains) is in effect a report on extensive book research and not on field research, Smith begins by comparing "the present position of Missionaries with the former mode of conducting Missionary proceedings for the conversion of the Chinese," very clearly identifying the dividing point between the "former" and present situations as "the late treaty between China and Britain."[6] Before the treaty, missionaries attempted "nothing of a direct Missionary nature," "on the soil of China." "Even the honoured name of Morrison," he says, "was during the latter years of his life associated with the secular business of the East India Company; and it was only by stealth and secrecy that the most indirect efforts were made for the spread of Christianity." Although Morrison and two other missionaries who succeeded him (Smith does not name these) gained personal influence, he suggested that "it is a problem which still remains to be solved, whether they have the power of transferring that influence which they have deservedly gained, to those on whom in the ordinary course of nature will hereafter devolve their work of faith and labour of love." In other words, it was not clear that the good reputation which Morrison and the two others had earned among the Chinese would be commuted to an equally good opinion of their successors, the present and future Protestant missionaries to China.

George Smith himself arrived in China, borne on the wave of enthusiasm which the new opportunities created by the British treaty with China had opened up. He was one of the two first missionaries of the CMS to the newly-opened ports of China, and he arrived in Hong Kong on 25 September 1844. His particular mission was to give advice to the Society as to its future operations in China and then, pending confirmation from the Society, to remain in China, pursuing his own advice.

---

[5] "George Smith's First Report."

[6] The treaty by which, on 26 June 1843, Hong Kong was ceded to Britain in perpetuity.

THE ADVICE REV. GEORGE SMITH GAVE (1844–49) TO THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY AND ABOUT ITS FUTURE OPERATIONS IN CHINA, BASED ON HIS "EXPLORATORY VISIT" IN 1844–46

In very practical terms, the CMS needed to know if it should have a mission to China. (This it had already decided by the time Rev. Smith set sail.) Could it fund this mission? (This was an ongoing concern and commitment.) Where should it base its missionary operations, what should the nature of those operations be, and whom should it employ to carry out its missionary operations?

During his travels and residence in China, including Hong Kong, George Smith compiled reports which he mailed back to the CMS in London and he also wrote regular letters to the CMS administration. I have read through these documents, transcribing many of them, and the following is a summary of his main points. *In general, his comments show a very practical approach, aimed at making the most converts out of the fewest missionaries and at preserving the health and lives of those missionaries who could be recruited.*

Smith regarded a location as suitable if the people were likely to be receptive to the Gospel. Were they hostile or friendly to foreigners? Could they read their own language (and were they thus approachable through missionary publications in Chinese)? Were they settled, family people, with whom a long-term relationship could be established? Was the population of such people large? Was their local dialect uniform (so that missionaries need learn only one language to communicate with them)?

As for the environment, was it healthy for western missionaries? Was the place expensive? Were there no more than a few mercantile foreigners (whom Smith generally regarded as a hindrance to missionary work)? Was it a place where a missionary would feel happy and thus be productive in his work? Were there or were there not many missionaries there already? If, as in Hong Kong, there were relatively many, proportionate to the numbers of Chinese (as compared with the situation on the Mainland of China itself), he would recommend that new missionaries should be sent elsewhere.

Smith also comments on his own changed perception of the major factor indicating likely success in missionary work. First, he writes, he had used the yardstick of financial donations. Soon, he learnt that the

available number of "qualified labourers" was the most important factor. *Without suitable missionaries, there could be no mission.*[7]

As for the nature of missionary operations, he firmly believed that providing direct access to the Gospel should have priority, both by itinerant preachers using the Chinese language and by translations of the Bible into Chinese.

As to location, the specific advice George Smith gave, taking into account the considerations he had determined were important (as summarized above), was that the CMS should *not* base its operations in Hong Kong.[8] He recommended that the CMS, instead, should focus on the northern cities of China.[9]

The results of this advice are most interesting. First, the CMS took the advice and thus, when George Smith was appointed missionary Bishop of Victoria, he already knew that he could expect to receive no help from the CMS in his own missionary work. (His acceptance of the bishopric in such circumstances is all the more laudable.) Second, since his advice to the CMS was included in his book, published in England in 1847, *A Narrative of an Exploratory Visit to Each of the Consular Cities of China, and to the Islands of Hong Kong and Chusan*, it was available for all to read. Ironically, by the time the CMS was ready to take a more active role in China, the American Episcopal Mission, under Bishop William J. Boone, had already taken advantage of the advice, which the CMS had commissioned for itself, and had established itself in the place(s) which Rev. George Smith had recommended to the CMS, thus making them less available to the Society.[10] As a result, it was not until October 1853 that Bishop Smith was able to hold his primary visitation at Shanghai. The American Episcopal Church had at first objected to the English Bishop of Victoria exercising his jurisdiction in that part of China; but after some correspondence and negotiation it was agreed that each bishop should superintend the clergy and congregations of his own Church.[11] In spite of this relatively early

---

[7] The above paragraphs are based on Gillian Bickley, "George Smith," 7–8.

[8] Ibid., 9.

[9] Ibid., 10.

[10] This is my understanding of what Dr. Mei-mei Lin told me, in conversation, during the second Symposium on the History of Christianity in Modern China, in 2001, based on her PhD research. However, if I remember correctly from my reading, Mei-mei Lin, "The Episcopalian Missionaries in China, 1835–1900" (PhD thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 1994), does not mention this point. Thank you to Dr. Timothy Wong Man Kong for providing this mislaid reference.

[11] "Bishop George Smith's Visitations" (a typescript list made by a previous researcher, and citing as general authority for the facts presented, "Diocesan Register 1, pp.

compromise, however, there were continuing strained relations between the two societies and their personnel, flowing from this early misunderstanding.

George Smith was deeply concerned that the Christian gospel should be brought to China. The ill-health he suffered during his first visit to China had permanent effects, and meant that he could not, himself, live the life of a full-time missionary in China. However, the terms of his appointment as Bishop of Victoria (terms, which he himself most likely influenced, as I have already mentioned, and as I have argued elsewhere),[12] made it quite explicit that the purpose of the See was to contribute to missionary work on the Chinese Mainland, as well as in Hong Kong, more than to play a pastoral role, serving Anglican expatriates living in Hong Kong and in designated parts of the Mainland. "An important part of his duty should consist in preparing a body of Students, native and European, to be trained for Missionary employment in China,"[13] the Colonial Bishoprics Committee wrote in their Fourth Report, dated August 1848. The arguments they give to justify their position are very similar to some of those advanced by George Smith, when he wrote home to the CMS from China, during his exploratory tour.[14]

But, as I have mentioned already, the See was inadequately funded. And, as I have also argued elsewhere, there was a deliberate ambiguity in expressions of the nature and purposes of the See and similarly in the expression of the duties of the Bishop, with the aim of securing the widest possible political and financial support.[15]

But some of the results of this were unfortunate. Among contemporaries in Hong Kong, there was a misunderstanding of the large extent to which Bishop Smith was expected to devote himself to missionary work and this misunderstanding continued to be a problem for later bishops. There has also been, among the few historians who have given

---

26–40"), Diocesan Records, Hong Kong Public Records Office, HKMS 94, D & S no. 1/2, fols. 9–10 (fol. 9).

The source cited by the previous researcher is, the "Register of Diocese of Victoria, 1849–1871," Diocesan Records, Hong Kong Public Records Office, HKMS 95, D & S no. 1/23, fols. 22–40 (mostly in Bishop Smith's own manuscript). The present writer has used the information in these two sources, together with other information, to compile a chronology of Bishop Smith's visitations to the Mainland.

[12] Gillian Bickley, "The Establishment of the Colonial Bishops Fund," 9.

[13] Quoted in ibid., 14.

[14] See ibid, 13–14.

[15] Gillian Bickley, "Mission China!", unpublished book length typescript.

him a glance, a refusal, as it seems to me, to accept the extent of George Smith's continuing concern with the mission to China.

Fortunately, George Smith himself documented his activities; and his evidence has survived both in unpublished and published forms.

I respectfully suggest that the importance of George Smith's contribution to the mission to China, combined with a persistent misunderstanding—sometimes, perhaps, a deliberate refusal—to accept the scale and dedication of his missionary work, makes this an important and fruitful area for detailed primary research, which would make an important contribution to our knowledge of the History of Christianity in Modern China.

THE NINETEENTH-CENTURY NEED FOR CHINESE MISSIONARIES TO PREACH THE CHRISTIAN GOSPEL; AND NOW, FOR CHINESE RESEARCHERS TO WORK IN CHINA TO RESEARCH THE LOCATIONS WHERE GEORGE SMITH VISITED, FIRST AS MISSIONARIES AND THEN AS BISHOP

At the beginning of his episcopate, Bishop Smith wrote of the need to employ Chinese missionaries. In the "Prospectus of Missionary Plans for the Benefit of the Chinese, by the Right Reverend George Smith, D. D., Bishop of Victoria," which appeared in *Oxford University, City and County Herald*[16] on 16 June 1849,[17] he writes of the training of

---

[16] See "Prospectus of Missionary Plans for the Benefit of the Chinese, by the Right Revd George Smith, D. D., Bishop of Victoria," *Oxford University, City and County Herald* [OUCCH], 16 June 1849, 1.

[17] Ibid., 1

Two transcriptions of this have been performed by the present writer: first, a straight transcription; then a version, transcribed, using as a basis the printed version, found at CO/129/31/286r.–287v.

The conclusion suggested by the comparison, provided by the second transcription, is that the CO/129/31 version existed prior to the version published in the *Oxford University, City and County Herald*; and that it was cut, for use as an advertisement. It was also clearly adapted to the particular readership of the Oxford publication, by the addition of the name of an Oxford firm, for the receipt of donations. We may therefore conclude that the London version was written by 16 June, when the Oxford version appeared.

In an initial private communication, the Centre for Oxfordshire Studies wrote, "The OUCCH of 23 June 1849 mentions advertisements in the last two issues, but we only found the 16 June advert." In a later private communication, the Centre for Oxford-

Chinese Evangelists as a highly important goal, giving the following reasons:

> The peculiarities of the language, the complex variety of its written symbols, the number of its spoken dialects, and the great difficulty of a foreign student attaining the delicate intonations essential to a perfect pronunciation, all point out the great importance of a *Native Agency*, as the grand desideratum and hope for Christian Missions in that country.

He also spoke publicly of the need for Chinese missionaries to serve in the mission to China. On 17 September [1849], he spoke at a public meeting at Manchester. In his address, explaining the future work of his "Missionary College" (St. Paul's), Smith spoke of the importance for the Chinese Mainland of "native Christian missionaries," giving the additional reason that these would not be limited by the geographical boundary restrictions then currently imposed on non-Chinese.[18]

As for the means of creating a body of native missionaries, Bishop Smith had described boarding schools as the most likely means for achieving this, as early as the letters he had written home from his journeys of exploration, in 1846. As he put on record in his *Prospectus*, "During the Author's journeyings and residence in the northern ports, it appeared to him expedient to form a Missionary Seminary, where a few native pupils of promising piety and ability might be collected together in one place, from the several Stations on the coast of China, and at the same time be detached from the unfavourable influences of kindred and home."

There is no doubt at all that the creation of a group of Chinese missionaries and/or Chinese clergy was one of the most important goals that George Smith set himself when he accepted his nomination as Bishop of Victoria.

But, during his time in Hong Kong, the Bishop's hope of achieving this goal was constantly frustrated. The Chinese boys and young men who attended St. Paul's Missionary College preferred to become merchants and join the professions, rather than undertake the arduous and

---

shire Studies wrote, "We have checked again the issue of OUCCH for 9 June 1849 and there is no mention of the Bishop of Victoria's missionary plans. However, as the advertisement appears in the issues, for both the 16th and 23rd, it would seem reasonable to assume that the statement refers to the current and previous issues."

[18] Gillian Bickley, "George Smith," 11.

financially unrewarding mission to China.[19] Although feeling personal attachment to the Bishop (as George Smith was deeply touched to discover during his final leave-taking, to return to the United Kingdom for good), not one young man came forward for the work. The Bishop's hopes for a Chinese clergy were also frustrated by the expectations and demands of his British fellow clergymen, who frequently opposed his proposals that certain Chinese Christians in the community were suitable and ready to be ordained.

But, at the end of his episcopate, George Smith was made extremely happy by very positive developments. In 1863, he ordained two Chinese men as deacons, one—Dzaw Tsang Lae—at Holy Trinity Church, Shanghai;[20] and one—Lo Sam Yuen—in Hong Kong.

These were significant steps. And George Smith did his best to provide for the continuing support of these men, after his return to the United Kingdom. For example, the Hong Kong deacon, Lo Sam Yuen, was ordained on 21 December 1863. On Christmas Day the same year, Smith preached a sermon to the English congregation in the Cathedral to raise funds for the CMS, and particularly to support the new Chinese pastor."[21] As for the other deacon, based on the Mainland, unfortunately this gain was, literally, short lived. Dzaw Tsang Lae died not long after his ordination.

As you will recognize, my own reason for choosing my topic for this conference echoes one of George Smith's own reasons for advocating a Chinese ministry for China. I hope to inspire other scholars, who may have greater access to the Mainland—as well, perhaps, as greater time to give to the topic—to take further what I have already been able to do.

It would certainly be difficult (although very interesting, and actually I would like to do it!) for me to seek out the places that George Smith visited in China, particularly the very remote places. (With my husband, Verner Bickley, I have already made a preliminary single visit to Putuoshan, which George Smith visited on more than one occasion; we took the opportunity of an organized tour arranged by the Royal Asiatic Society Hong Kong Branch some years ago.) For me to

---

[19] Rev. Carl T. Smith, *Chinese Christians: Elites, Middlemen, and the Church in Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1985).

[20] Diocesan Records, Hong Kong Public Records Office, HKMS 94, D & S no. 1/2, fol. 8. (Fol. 8 is a typescript list made by a previous researcher, but not citing authorities for the facts presented.)

[21] Gillian Bickley, "George Smith," 15.

make a consistent survey, with adequate personal communication and exploration of documents, would be extraordinarily difficult, and most likely impossible, at this stage of my career, particularly given the need I would have to acquire the services of research assistants and local guides. Even apart from considerations of cost, time and access, and the need for a common language to communicate with local residents as well as with those who may be guardians of archival and printed sources, there are additionally still concerns in the Chinese Government about visits from foreigners, as there were—but even more so, then—in Bishop Smith's time.

I came across very recent evidence of this while preparing this paper. On Tuesday, 23 January 2007, the *South China Morning Post* published a short Reuters article:

> SURVEYING, MAPPING BY FOREIGNERS RESTRICTED
>
> New rules have been issued restricting foreigners' surveying and mapping activities on the mainland, with state media reports citing national security concerns. Xinhua quoted the Ministry of Land and Resources' regulation as saying foreigners were forbidden from conducting land surveys, aerial photography, mapping of administrative borders and drawing navigational maps. The regulation stipulates foreigners need to obtain central government approval before carrying out such work and let local government supervise them.[22]

The research work I have in mind could certainly easily be misunderstood as coming into those categories, about which, according to the Reuters report, concern is expressed.

It would certainly be more possible for Chinese scholars, particularly (it seems to me) those based on the Mainland of China, to seek to establish the locations where Bishop Smith visited, to travel there, and explore what remnants there may be of his presence and activities, when there. These may be physical. (Do buildings or communities survive?) Or they may be mental. (Are there any records in memories which have been handed down?) And even if there are no traces of his passing, there is still relevant and useful information to be learnt from the aspect of the place and the history of its own development.

The work would not be plain sailing, even for a Mainland-based Chinese scholar. Bishop Smith does not record place names in Chinese characters, for example, and a knowledge of geography, combined with

---

[22] *South China Morning Post*, 23 January 2007, A5.

a sense of history, would be needed in order even to begin to seek to identify the localities and places where he travelled, some of them remote and sparsely populated. Familiarity with other archival and published sources, including contemporary maps, would be of help. But, as a start, if a willing scholar came forward, I could certainly draw up a list of the English names and descriptions of the places, which Bishop Smith visited, based on the materials I have gathered and transcribed.

NEED FOR CHINESE RESEARCHERS TO WORK IN CHINA TO SEARCH FOR ANY DOCUMENTS OR PRINTED MATERIAL THROWING LIGHT ON HIS WORK

Similarly, it would be very worthwhile to conduct a careful search in China for documents as well as printed material which might throw light on George Smith's work. These would include his own publications, publications by his contemporaries in the China Mission and any commentary by people whom he met. The missionary archives, which are already more or less accessible, and are certainly quite well known, do provide much information. But there may be—no, must be, surely—other sources, beyond these, including those created outside missionary circles themselves, in the wider community. Again, a Chinese scholar, living on the Mainland, would have certain advantages that a person like myself does not have. Of course, much material is available outside China, and this still needs a great deal of work. But location research as well as local documentary and print research could also yield results. If the attempt is not made, we will never know what there might be to find.

BUT WHY ARE WE INTERESTED IN THIS TYPE OF DETAIL? INDEED, WHY DO WE STUDY THE LIVES OF MISSIONARIES IN CHINA AT ALL?

There are several answers to these two questions. (And I should perhaps make it clear that the following discussion is mainly theoretical, and that it makes no reference to any studies or discussions other than those explicitly mentioned.) There are of course pragmatic reasons to

give in answer to them. Assisted by meetings such as this, the History of Christianity in Modern China is a growing area of study. Worldwide, there are many who are eager to find virgin subjects for their research and future academic careers. Some find it interesting to work in secondary sources to build up a database, which they and others may later analyse. There are also more personal reasons. Some may see that the general subject of the History of Christianity in Modern China is relevant to their understanding of their own lives and those of their families, communities and countries; and their eagerness to contribute to the scholarship of this subject may be enhanced by these personal reasons.

Other scholars may be committed Christians, eager for the continuing spread of the Christian gospel. These scholars may be particularly interested to understand how the Gospel first reached China, how it was received and how it fared over the years. They may see practical applications. On the one hand, there may be useful lessons to be learned as to what policies to pursue in the contemporary world and in the future. There may be lessons about the types of actions, activities and attitudes which are advisable or inadvisable. On the other hand, they may be conscious of criticisms and hostile comments made both in the past and the present and they may be eager to explore the truth or otherwise of such criticisms and accusations. They may understand that a dispassionate and conscientious study could give a basis for two groups of response to such negative remarks: one, acceptance of their truth and the other, the conclusion that they are in error. Such scholars may appreciate that the ability to give such an authoritative response is a good weapon to have ready, in case of attack arising for whatever cause and from whatever direction. It is of the nature of things that such a response can not be researched effectively *after* such an attack is made, for the response time would be so long that it could have no useful effect in any controversy or discussion. Research needs to be conducted for its own sake. Later it may have practical applications in the contemporary world.

Related to this, however, there may be a particular concern, for those who support Christianity. That is, that their own research, study and writing may, by bringing to light information long buried, lead to criticisms of Christianity, Christian leaders and Christians, which would not have arisen if they themselves, through their careful research, had not provided the ammunition.

The opposite may, of course, equally occur. I myself was partly prompted to consider the life of George Smith in depth because of criticisms of him which I found in George B. Endacott and Dorothy E. She's book, *The Diocese of Victoria, Hong Kong: A Hundred Years of*

Church History, 1849–1949. In this particular case, I personally formed the view that the criticisms were based on inadequate source material as well as on inappropriate conclusions from the source material actually available. It seemed to me that these criticisms might have been driven by some personal feeling on the part of at least one of the writers, who may possibly have been misled by bitter grievances still to be found expressed in archived letters. But a careful analysis of the trail of evidence suggests that these grievances were erroneous, grounded on ignorance of the facts and a related misunderstanding of that part of the reality which the original writers really did know.

As I continue my work on Bishop Smith, however, I am, from time to time, concerned about whether what I have learnt would, if published, lead to results negative to the Church, or any part of Christian work, in any way. Sometimes also, I am concerned as to whether what I have learnt about Bishop Smith's actions and words—though generally exemplary or understandable from my own point of view—will damage his posthumous reputation, rather than restore the good name he had among many in his life. One example arises from the interesting story of his baptism of his second son, which I have already been able to recount.

Like many missionaries of the time, Smith was intensely interested in the Taiping Rebellion. In late May 1853, excited by what he took to be a providential opportunity for confirming what he believed to be the Christian tendency of the leaders of the rebellion, he left his wife, who was eight months pregnant with their second child, for Shanghai. He arranged with her to follow him as soon as possible, along with their two-year old son and the expected baby, later born on 18 June, telling his wife not to have the baby baptized until she joined him, when the child could be baptized by himself, the child's father.[23] But, as Mrs. Smith travelled to join him, with the new baby, there was a terrible storm at sea. Fearing that they would be drowned and the baby die unbaptised, Mrs. Smith baptised the baby herself. Fortunately, they did not drown and they reached Shanghai safely. There, for the expressed purpose of confirming the faith of the church in Shanghai, Bishop Smith baptized the baby again. When I told this story to a former member of the clergy at St. John's Cathedral, Hong Kong, he was critical of the bishop. "I don't like him," he said. "That was blasphemous. A person can be baptized only once." If I had not passed on what I had

---

[23] Gillian Bickley, "George Smith," 13.

learnt, I would not have given reason for this person to criticize Bishop Smith.

It is the case, of course, that we never know what other people's views will be. New points of view are developing all the time and some of the angles, certainly, will distort what we consider the truth of the histories, which we have researched and constructed, doubtless sometimes using the material we have compiled and brought to light.

But how are we to react to this future possibility? Certainly, to ignore history is not an option, for if we do so, we will have no answer at all to what others may find to say.

Nor is it an option, it seems to me, to suppress those parts of the record, which we ourselves consider damaging or capable of malicious use. One reason is that our own viewpoint could be wrong. Another reason is that there is more likelihood of misrepresentation, if any parts of the whole picture remain obscure. And another reason is that, if others, hostile to Christianity, realize that something has been suppressed, they will interpret this in the worst possible way.

Should we then, perhaps, adopt an opposite tack, instead? Should we embellish and improve on the facts as we find them? Again, this is not an option. Again, our own viewpoint may be wrong. Unintentionally, we may do more harm than good. We may make the picture worse rather than better. Again, others may discover what we have done and use it to attack Christianity.

Leaving aside the question of the primary research work, conducted to create and make available as complete and accurate a usable database as possible, how should we write the narrative which emerges from these facts? Who are our readers? What do we want them to learn? What are they interested in learning?

At my first Divinity class at the grammar school I attended as a girl, the teacher impressed on us that this was a special subject, different from all others, because the subject was God and religion. She asked us therefore to emulate the monks of medieval times, and illustrate all our homework; for example with coloured or pictorial capital letters, as a signal of the special nature of this study. Is the study of the history of religion, including the history of Christianity, whether in Modern China or elsewhere, fundamentally different from the study of the history of anything else? Should we also embroider—metaphorically speaking—our writing, which is based on our studies of the History of Christianity in Modern China? And if so, what should be the nature of the embroidery? Should we, for example, write for an audience of Christian readers, doing so in such a way as to reinforce the views of a

particular group of Christians, or, perhaps, to reinforce the faithful commitment of all?

I would be interested to know what explicit answers others may have. Our *implicit* answers will be evident to those who know our subjects as well as we do ourselves. And I must say that I myself have sometimes found unjustified bias in historical writing by those who are committed to a particular church; who have—deliberately or unconsciously—written about the history of Christian missions from a partisan point of view, tending also to accept without question contemporary views based on sectarian attitudes which they themselves share. (In the nineteenth century, views could be expressed very strongly; and it may not be surprising if we modern readers are misled as to their truth.)

My own view, respectfully put forward, is quite clear. As far as we possibly can, I think we should avoid partisanship in our historical studies and writings, being particularly alert to the possibility of this error if we know we have strong sectarian views. For example, if we belong to a church which does not have bishops, we should not be influenced in such a way as to criticize bishops for existing at all, nor for exercising the functions which their own church had appointed them to exercise.

Similarly, it seems to me, we should be alert, also, to bias in what others have to say, particularly perhaps in archival materials. Of their nature, many of these have been seen only by one or two, or at most a few, contemporaries of their writers. Often, the facts and opinions they preserve have not, therefore, been validated by the spotlight of publication and public response.

There is an interesting paradox. Those who are most motivated to study the history of Christianity must include some who are very concerned that that history should present Christianity in a particular way; negative, positive; reinforcing certain Christian practices, or indicating a case against other ways of being a Christian.

My own reasons for my work on Bishop Smith have been that, as a member of the Christian church, who lives in China, I find the topic relevant to my interests and the context in which I live. But I should also say that I came to a study of Bishop Smith through my earlier study of Frederick Stewart, Founder of Hong Kong Government Education, who was selected for his Hong Kong appointment by Bishop Smith. In fact, I first studied Bishop Smith in order to understand Frederick Stewart. I needed to understand Bishop Smith and consider what his reasons for appointing Stewart might have been, in order to understand Stewart more. My primary concern, therefore, was to learn what

was relevant to my work as a teacher, rather than as a Christian, living here, in Hong Kong.

I think all of us here must know that, in the present state of the History of Christianity in China, much fundamental work needs to be done, including (in my view) extremely detailed studies, such as the identification of the places which Bishop Smith visited during his missionary visits to the Chinese Mainland and study of what he did while there. The more complete a picture is, the more accurate it can be; and, for reasons suggested above, accuracy is not only a historical virtue but a necessary concern for those who write, at least equally, as committed Christians.

But accuracy is not only a question of assembling all the facts we possibly can. We also need to learn how to view the picture into which these facts compose themselves.

Meetings such as this are, of course, one way in which to learn from additional ways of interpreting our findings, as well as to understand the possibility of additional conclusions. But, as well as this, we need to apply the techniques of literary criticism. We need to immerse ourselves in our subject matter, to think as our archival informants thought, while absolutely preserving the integrity of our own perspectives. For example, we need to be well educated in contemporary conventions. What did people mean when they used a particular word? Which phrases were mere formalities at that time, and which words indicate, instead, deeply felt emotion? As for particular individuals, we can build up an impression of their own habits of expression and feeling, and form a view as to what they habitually meant when they used particular terms.

To the extent that we have a common culture with our informants, we will be better able to understand them. In the case of Bishop Smith, I personally do have experience of a culture similar to his. As a young person, I studied with a group of evangelical Christians, who came from a similar background to Bishop Smith; who used the same phrases, and quoted the same texts that Bishop Smith quotes. Based on my adult appreciation of the sincerity of these people, whom I actually knew over many years, and my knowledge of how they sacrificed their personal lives to their Christian vocation, I have been able to perceive—I believe accurately—a similar sincerity and sacrifice in Bishop Smith himself.

But I have also done a lot of detailed work, transcribing (as I have already said) pages of George Smith's handwriting. I have also compared and contrasted the published versions of some of what he wrote—sometimes edited by others—with what he originally wrote,

thus gaining an understanding, not only of what George Smith really wanted to say, but of the context in which he wrote. My own experience is that by establishing facts and placing them, first in categories, then in chronological order within those categories, and then relating these different chronologies to each other, problems can be solved, misunderstandings can be removed, and important insights can be gained.

I feel confident that a study of the places in China where George Smith visited, with the dates of these visits and lists of the people he met at these times, together with information about where he stayed, what he ate, and what his activities were, would not only be interesting in itself, but lead to interesting insights. It would also indicate other lines of fruitful enquiry.

WRITING UP OUR CONCLUSIONS

But study is not enough. We need to communicate what we have studied. And here we come to another set of problems.

One problem is almost solved. The time it takes to disseminate our results and the expense of publication have both been reduced considerably, if we opt to choose certain new publication routes. There is the internet, personal websites and e-books. But the sweeping away of these concerns has brought to the foreground and magnified another problem, that of writing for a particular audience in such a way as to make our intended meaning clear. Our work can now reach a far greater audience than the restricted 200, 500 or 1,000 print-runs which are rather typical of academic books or journal articles. But this ease of reach means that it is at least very difficult, and perhaps impossible, to write appropriately enough for all our readers. If we write in a popular way, so as to reach the general reader, some academic readers may not appreciate our intention and may criticize our work as inappropriate from their academic point of view. And general readers, reading works written in the academic manner, will have other objections of their own. As for devout general readers, they may be indignant at academic treatments of religious or missionary subjects, because they consider that it is not appropriate to approach these subjects from an academic point of view, but only from the perspectives of faith. The responses in 2006, to the present Pope, Benedict's, quotation of a historical source

and to a cartoon published initially in Europe are relevant to this discussion.

I do not know what we should do. Should we publish our results on the internet, believing that we should share, as widely as possible, what we have learnt, hoping that only those who will use our work responsibly will have the interest to read it?

Or, should we confine ourselves to more conventional means of publication, believing that the difficulty of accessing specialized journals and the expense of academic books will restrict access only to those who will understand our intentions and approach, and read and use our work responsibly?

As for my own work on Bishop Smith, while I remain open to other views, I am presently satisfied that I have so far presented his life and work not only truthfully, but with at least broad accuracy. (No one is immune from making mistakes!) I am ready to write about him, at greater length than previously, either for a general audience or for a general Christian audience, or both. I am also ready to publish several finished studies which I have had on hand for some years. I would welcome your opinions as to what route I should take for doing so (print-based or internet based), and what mode of writing—scholarly or popular—is more suitable.

APPEAL FOR CO-WORKERS

Nevertheless, in this study of George Smith, the young missionary to China, and Bishop Smith, first Anglican Bishop of Victoria, large areas of work remain to be done, which—if done—would open up additional perspectives and insights. If anyone here would like to work with me in some of these areas, particularly on the subject of Smith's missionary journeys in China, I would be very pleased.

Let me conclude by giving a very brief taste of what these journeys involved . . .

George Smith's Missionary Travels as a CMS Missionary

As for Smith's missionary travels as a CMS missionary, I will repeat, very briefly, the summary I gave in my paper delivered at the second

conference in this present series. The young Reverend George Smith reached Hong Kong on 25 September 1844. During the next nineteen months and some days, he travelled extensively in China, spending periods of time at Canton, Macau, Ningpo, Chusan, Shanghai, Amoy and the Island of "Potoo," as well as in Hong Kong.[24]

George Smith's Missionary Travels as Missionary Bishop of Victoria

As for George Smith's Missionary Travels as Missionary Bishop of Victoria, these came about for two reasons. First, according to an Order in Council, George Smith had authority and jurisdiction over "all persons in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland being within the dominions of the Emperor of China or within any ship or vessel at a distance of not more than one hundred miles from the Coast of China."[25] All these persons were, "subject to the authority and jurisdiction of the See of Victoria and the Bishop thereof in the same manner as if they were resident within the . . . island of Hong Kong."[26]

Given this responsibility, it is clear that Bishop Smith needed to make Episcopal visits to the Chinese Mainland in order to discharge his duties. And during his term of office, George Smith made several Episcopal visits to the Mainland, during which he performed confirmations and ordinations and exercised other Episcopal functions. His travels were extensive and time-consuming. In 1858, for example, he visited Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, Shanghai; Macau; Canton; Shanghai, Ningpo, Seen-poh District, Ningpo, Shanghai, Hanchow, Shaouhing. There was a similar pattern in other years.[27]

But Bishop Smith took the opportunities that his Episcopal visits gave also to seek to strengthen and extend missionary work in those parts.[28] Accounts survive of his "side-trips" to remote parts, in pursuit of missionary objectives. One example is the five-day trip to the Seen-po district and beyond, for a further number of days, which he made in late 1858, in between attending to Episcopal duties in

---

[24] Gillian Bickley, "George Smith," 6.

[25] "Original Letters Patent Creating Bishopric of Victoria, 1849," TS Copy in Diocesan Records, Hong Kong Public Records Office, HKMS 94 D&S no. 1/2, fols. 4–6.

[26] Ibid.

[27] See Gillian Bickley, "George Smith," 11–12.

[28] Ibid., 11–12.

Ningpo.[29] And he has also left a record of the delight he took in his missionary expeditions. "Such [missionary] visits are a real refreshment to my body and mind," he wrote, "after the weariness and anxieties attendant on a residence in a colonial community, and in a trying climate like that of Hong Kong."[30]

But there were occasions when a visit was prompted by what George Smith saw as a missionary, not an Episcopal duty. Like many missionaries of the time, the Bishop was intensely interested in the Taiping Rebellion. In late May 1853 (as already mentioned), he left his wife, who was eight months pregnant with their second child, for Shanghai. (Not surprisingly, he did not find this an easy thing to do, as he wrote to Henry Venn, Honorary Secretary of the CMS in London.) Bishop Smith's objective was to make the most of what he excitedly took to be a providential opportunity for confirming what he saw as the Christian tendencies of the Taiping leaders,[31] with its promise, as he saw it, of a fruitful means of reaching thousands among the masses of China with the Christian message.

This was a hope which the Bishop kept alive. In the first half of 1862, he met rebel leaders, and his description of his meetings was published.[32]

We can find interesting support for this view of the Bishop's clear separation of his Episcopal and missionary duties in his financial accounts. He was very conscious of the fact that the moneys he had to spend derived from earmarked sources and he was scrupulously anx-

---

[29] As an example, I have provided an appendix below with a brief summary of George Smith's travels and activities during 1858.

[30] [George Smith], "Journal of a Visit to Ningpo and Hangchow, and the Adjacent Parts of Che Keang. By the Bishop of Victoria," *Church Missionary Society Intelligencer: A Monthly Journal of Missionary Information* 10 (May 1859): 97–112 (112, col. 2). [It would seem that this article is an edited version of the Journal which Bishop Smith had sent to Church Missionary Society Headquarters in London. In contrast with [George Smith], "Notes of a Visit to India, Ceylon, Singapore, and Java, by the Bishop of Victoria," published in the *Church Missionary Society Intelligencer* 7 (1856):121–32, the only parts contained in quotation marks are those which Bishop Smith himself quotes from other documents.]

[31] Gillian Bickley, "George Smith," 13.

[32] Ibid., 15. [George Smith], "China: The Taeping Rebels at Ningpo—Letter from the Bishop of Victoria" (From the *Record*), *Church Missionary Society Intelligencer* 13 (1 August 1862): [3 pp.]. [Under the heading, "Recent Intelligence," the 1 August 1862 Number of the *Church Missionary Society Intelligencer* includes an article from the *Record*, which, after a brief editorial introduction, gives four paragraphs, described as quoted from a letter, dated Shanghai, 2 May 1862, from "The Bishop of Victoria."]

ious not to spend Episcopal funds on missionary activities or vice versa.

Disappointingly for him, all George Smith's energetic efforts to create a body of Chinese clergy and missionaries, and to influence a major movement for conversion among the masses in China, won little success. It is not surprising that he does occasionally admit to discouragement and depression. Yet, he still kept in mind the stirring biblical texts which are still used to fish for new recruits to labour in the mission field.—Just input the quotation into Google to find evidence of this!—"Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest."[33]

Similarly, the Bishop found a way to console himself for his own lack of success. But I will end, not with an example of this self-consolation, but with a stirring passage which he wrote at the very beginning of his experience of China, before what some might consider his own failure joined that of Rev. Christian Frederick Swartz, whom he quotes. The sentiments which the young Reverend George Smith expresses here, he presents as inspired by a visit, from his sickbed, to what is now called the Old Protestant Cemetery in Macau, where Morrison and other missionaries are buried, along with military men.

> The present generation of Christians will soon have passed away. The heroes, who filled the world with monuments of their power and prowess, will soon be forgotten even in the praises of their fellow-men. But the Missionary work, often the source of humiliation and discouragement, will hereafter be invested in its native honour. And as the writer of these pages, just emerging from the sick-room, at Macao, stood over the tombs of a Morrison and a Dyer,[34] and contemplated the narrow habitations of the dead—he felt that there was a time fast approaching, when the martial tenants' fading laurels wreathed by fame around the brows of the martial tenants of the neighbouring graves, would leave no trace of beauty on the memory—while the names of the first Protestant evangelists of China, would ever here be remembered in the affections of their fellow-men, as among the most illustrious benefactors of the human race.[35]

---

[33] John 4:35.

[34] Samuel Dyer (20 January 1804 – 24 October 1843) was a British Protestant Christian missionary in the Congregationalist tradition, and is buried near Robert Morrison in the Old Protestant Cemetery at Macau.

[35] Rev. George Smith is referring to the Protestant Cemetery at Macau.

> The missionary work in China, not devoid of encouragements, has its peculiar complication of difficulties. May the Great Lord of the harvest, in answer to the prayer of His church, send hither a numerous band of labourers, men of earnest prayer, of strong faith, of self-denying zeal, "willing to spend, and to be spent" in this glorious service. Though for a time no fruits appear, patience must have its perfect work, and God must have the glory. Yea, we will faint not, but in the prospect of discouragements, adopt as the motto inscribed on our banner, the sentiments uttered sixty years ago by Swartz,[36] that devoted apostle of Southern India, whose memory has been embalmed in the grateful recollections of numerous native converts—and who now in the Christian village of Tinnevelly,[37] has found a monument nobler far than all the munificent wealth of native princes could rear to his name:—"I cheerfully believe that God will build the waste places of this country. But should it be done after we are laid in the grave, what harm? This country is covered with thorns; let us plough and sow good seed, and entreat the Lord to make it spring up. Our labour in the Lord, in his cause, and for his glory, will not be in vain."[38]

How happy George Smith would feel today if he could witness the extraordinary increase in the numbers of Chinese Christians and the leadership qualities displayed by their local clergy and priests!

I hope that what I have indicated in this paper (as well as in previous work) has aroused your interest in Bishop Smith, and particularly, I hope it has aroused an active interest in doing further research of your own, or working together with me, taking as a starting point the work I have already done, particularly in the area of his missionary visits to the Mainland of China. But there are many other interesting and fruitful areas to study.

- Bishop Smith's role in the debate about the appropriate Chinese name for "God."

---

[36] On Rev. Christian Frederick Swartz, you may like to visit http://www.openlibrary.org/details/memoirsswartz02swaruoft)

[37] There had been mass conversions there, which, later, Bishop Smith found insincere and perhaps hysterical.

[38] See Rev. George Smith, M. A., of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and late Missionary in China, *A Narrative of an Exploratory Visit to Each of the Consular Cities of China, and to the Islands of Hong Kong and Chusan, in Behalf of the Church Missionary Society, in the Years 1844, 1845, 1846* (London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1847), 529.

- His views about the use of local dialects, or otherwise, in translations of the Bible.
- His participation in missionary conferences.
- His interventions in favour of the appointment of Chinese deacons.
- The extent of his fund-raising on behalf of the mission to China and the uses to which the money he raised was put.
- His administrative role in support of local churches and local missionary work on the Chinese Mainland. (In those early days when even regular systems for the transfer of funds were not yet in place, he even had to act as banker for his brethren. And he often acted as intermediary and conciliator, as well as gate-keeper.)
- His meetings with the Taiping Leaders.
- His visit to carry out fact-finding on behalf of the London Mission for the Conversion of the Jews.
- His visits to Buddhist temples and his interactions with Buddhist priests.
- His attitude towards the Roman Catholic church.
- His bold stance in relation to the British Government and the Hong Kong British administration.
- His criticisms of some British expatriates, and his kindliness towards others.
- The unfavourable comparisons he drew between the support the French Government afforded the Roman Catholic Church in China and the lack of such support for Protestant clergy from the Government of Great Britain.
- His rather strict and austere preferences for both life and liturgy.
- His skill as a church diplomatist.
- The support he achieved from both the CMS and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG).
- His strong and affectionate relationship with Henry Venn.
- His continuing support for the mission to China even until his last day on this earth.

Bishop Smith landed in Hong Kong as Bishop at Easter 1849. Perhaps, round about Easter 2009, we could have another conference to

mark that event? If this could be possible, it might serve as a stimulus and a target for new initiatives in the study of the extent and nature of Bishop Smith's influence on the development of the Christian Church on the Mainland of China. And this in turn would enhance other studies in this area, for each has an impact on all.

APPENDIX: A BRIEF SUMMARY OF GEORGE SMITH'S TRAVELS AND ACTIVITIES DURING 1858[39]

[At Canton February 1858.]

[Embarked on H.M.S. "Fury" on 20 February 1858 on a visitation to Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo and Shanghae.]

[Left Shanghae 15 April in P and O steamer.]

[Arrived at Hong Kong 19 April 1858.]

[At Canton September 1858.]

[Visited Shanghae, Ningpo, Shauouking, Hangchow, etc. September to December 1858.]

NINGPO, HANGCHOW: 21 September–26 December 1858[40]

Shortly after returning to Hong Kong from a confirmation visit to Canton, he [Bishop Smith] embarked on P and O "Formosa" on 21 September 1858, for a five-week stay at Shanghae, landing at Woosung at sunset on 25 September [1858].[41]

---

[39] Square brackets around entries indicate that the source is [George Smith, Bishop of Victoria], "Register of Diocese of Victoria, 1849–1871," Diocesan Records, HKPRO, HKMS 95, D & S no. 1/23, fol. 34. Square brackets within entries indicate material supplied by the present writer.

The additional details about the Ningpo and Hangchow visits are based on [George Smith], "Journal of a Visit to Ningpo and Hangchow, and the Adjacent Parts of Che Keang. By the Bishop of Victoria," pt. 1, *Church Missionary Society Intelligencer* 10 (May 1859): 97–112; and ibid., pt. 2, *Church Missionary Society Intelligencer* 10 (June 1859): 122–30. (It would seem that these articles are edited versions of the Journal which Bishop Smith had sent to the Church Missionary Society Headquarters in London.)

[40] [George Smith], "Journal of a Visit to Ningpo and Hangchow," pt. 1, 97, col. 1.

[41] Ibid., pt. 1, 97, col. 2.

Journeys by native-boat.

On 4 November [1858] embarked for Ningpo "in a native boat, manned by Chinese sailors, and commanded by a Swede (kindly lent to me by a mercantile family)."[42]

From Ningpo, Smith and Gough took a five days' trip to the Seen-poh district. In a native boat, the "Lowda." On 15 November [1858], at 6 p.m., "We embarked in a native boat outside the north gate; and after sailing a few miles up the river, we turned aside into a lesser and more circuitous stream, in order to avoid the risk of an attack from the Canton pirate-boats in the main river."[43]

After further journeys into the interior, they returned to Ningpo by chair, arriving at the west gate, on 19 November [1858] at 8 p.m.[44]

On Sunday, 28 November 1858, "Preached on board H.M.S. 'Nimrod,' lying in the river, to the officers and crew, and a few of the English residents who came to the service from the shore."[45]

【Reached Hong Kong 26 December 1858.】

---

[42] Ibid., pt. 1, 103, col. 2.
[43] Ibid., pt. 1, 107, col. 2 – 108, col. 1.
[44] Ibid., pt. 1, 111., col. 2.
[45] Ibid., pt. 1, 111., col. 2.

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 31–43

Robert Morrison and the Old Protestant Cemetery in Macao

LOUIS HA

In 2007, various Chinese Christian communities celebrate the 200th anniversary of the arrival of Robert Morrison (1782–1834)[1] in China as the first Protestant missionary to mainland China, by organizing conferences and other activities. However, 73 years ago in 1934, a group of Chinese Christian missionaries chose to set up a plaque on the wall behind Morrison's grave in Macao to commemorate the 100th year of his death and praise his work. People celebrating or commemorating Morrison, both now and then, have shown deep admiration for this missionary, who was well known for his translation and publication of a Chinese version of the Bible, as well as for his dictionary of the Chinese language, in the early 19th century.

Morrison tried to stay in Canton for as long as possible and initiated projects in Malacca to support his work. But during the 27 years of his

---

Louis HA (XIA Qilong 夏其龍) is research assistant professor in the Centre for Catholic Studies, Department of Cultural and Religious Studies at The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

[1] Robert Morrison was ordained in 1807 and was immediately sent by the London Missionary Society to Canton. In 1809 he became translator to the East India Company. He founded the Anglo-Chinese College in Malacca with his colleague William Milne, which moved to Hong Kong in 1843, and translated the New Testament into Chinese (1813). Their translation of the entire Bible appeared in 1821. Among Morrison's other works are a *Grammar of the Chinese Language* (1815) and a *Dictionary of the Chinese Language, in Three Parts* (1815–23).

missionary life, his residence was in Macao and his body was brought back to Macao for burial after his death in Canton. His remains rest in the Old Protestant Cemetery next to the Camoes Garden with his family. The tombs numbering 142, 141 and 143 are those of his first wife Mary (d. 1821), himself (d. 1834) and his son John Robert (d. 1843) respectively. To tell the story of why and in what background he caused this cemetery to be set up is the intention of this article.

The small cemetery, consisting of 166 tombs, was originally owned by the East India Company. Officially, the cemetery was for its employees and their dependants.[2] It was set up in 1821 with the first interment of Mary Morrison (1791–1821). And it was closed after only 36 years. Sir Lindsay Ride (1898–1977), the fifth vice-chancellor of the University of Hong Kong (1949–64), spent over 15 years in thoroughly studying the cemetery after his retirement. Bernard Mellor, registrar of the University from 1948 to 1974, edited and abridged Ride's manuscripts of 1,200 pages into a book, entitled *An East India Company Cemetery: Protestant Burials in Macao*.[3] This book is the main source of information concerning that cemetery for the present article.

THE QUESTION OF BURIAL

In the 19th century, it was not easy to find a proper burial place for foreigners who died in China. It might reflect the very low degree of welcome extended to foreigners by the Chinese at that time. Before the 19th century, however, there were at least three cemeteries specially set up for foreigners in Beijing. In 1611, the Wanli 萬曆 emperor of the Ming dynasty offered a burial place called Zhalan 柵欄 outside the western city gate for Matteo Ricci in recognition of his scientific and cultural contribution to China. In 1706, the Kangxi 康熙 emperor of the Qing dynasty donated a piece of land near Zhalan to the papal legate Maillard de Tournon (1668–1710), for the burial of a member of his team; thereafter the place became a cemetery for missionaries sent by Rome. In 1732, the French Jesuits, in the capacity of mathematicians of the French king, Louis XIV (1638–1715), worked in Beijing

---

[2] Lindsay and May Ride, *An East India Company Cemetery: Protestant Burials in Macao*, abr. and ed. B. Mellor (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1996), 62.

[3] Ibid.

and acquired land at Zhengfusi 正福寺 as a cemetery. Missionaries who had held posts in the Chinese imperial court and had died in China were buried by imperial edict with donation for funeral arrangement in these cemeteries.[4]

Although several abandoned communal burial grounds belonging to different dynasties were founded in both cities and villages in China, to bury people in a cemetery understood as a communal burial ground for people of different clans was never a dominant practice among Chinese.[5] To choose a place on a hillside with care for a suitable position and direction according to ancient belief was one of the most fundamental and legitimate observances for Han Chinese in burying the dead.[6] Lindsay Ride observed that

> Graves in China were mostly sited separately or in family groups, always on a hill, and either in family fields or in places chosen for the relicts by geomancers. Filial piety demanded that both choice of site and its upkeep should be a family responsibility. The European custom is to inter the dead in community ground particularly set aside, or in holy ground such as a church or a churchyard, and as its title of ownership is vested either in the community or in a church body, family responsibility is limited to the upkeep of the grave itself.[7]

Only after the Treaty Ports were opened since 1842 did the European concepts of burials begin to flourish in China.

FOREIGNERS AND THEIR BURIAL PLACES

In principle, in the first half of 19th century no foreigners were expected to be present on Chinese soil without a specific reason and per-

---

[4] Edward J. Malatesta, SJ and Gao Zhiyu, eds., *Departed, yet Present: Zhalan, the Oldest Christian Cemetery in Beijing* (Macao: Instituto Cultural de Macau; San Francisco: Ricci Institute, University of San Francisco, 1995), 23.

[5] Song Deyin 宋德胤, *Sangzang yiguan* 喪葬儀觀 (Beijing: Zhongguo qingnian chubanshe, 1991), Chap. 8, pp. 116–29 (on "burial ground").

[6] Juwen Zhang, *A Translation of the Ancient Chinese: the Book of Burial (Zang Shu) by Guo Pu (276–324)*, trans. with an introd. by Juwen Zhang (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 2004), 8.

[7] Lindsay and May Ride, *An East India Company Cemetery*, 59.

mission. The most welcomed foreigners were those who came to pay tribute as representatives of their own countries. The tolerated ones were merchants. They were allowed to stay in Canton only during the months of trade, usually from November to May. And female foreigners had to stay in Macao while their spouses were doing business in Canton.[8] Missionaries were explicitly prohibited by the Chinese authority to stay in China.

From time to time, even the Portuguese authority in Macao made things difficult for foreigners to stay in Macao. Some Catholic missionaries coming not directly from Lisbon to China had to disguise as sailors in order to embark for Macao. The unfriendly treatment was not only for low ranking clergy. Maillard De Tournon, the Papal legate to India and China, didn't follow the Portuguese prescription for missionaries to pass from Lisbon to Macao with permission of the Court.[9] Instead, he left Europe on a royal French vessel to India and arrived in Macao by way of the Philippine Islands in 1704. Because of this infringement of what the Portuguese regarded as the privilege of the Portuguese padroado, his papal credential was recognized neither by Macau civil authority nor by the ecclesiastical one.[10] The civil authority in Portugal quite often turned hostile to missionaries. In 1759, Portugal started to expel the Jesuits from all its territories. In Macao the expulsion happened in 1805.[11] The Jesuits were restored to their full legal status and came back to Macao only in 1814, several years after Morrison started his work in China and Macao.

Missionaries were not even welcomed by the business community, because they preached Christian moral teachings that would cause inconvenience to un-ethical trading specially of illegal opium. Coming to China, Morrison had to choose the passage via America because the East India Company refused to allow missionaries to sail either to India or China in any British vessel. He travelled to New York from London

---

[8] Jonathan Porter, *Macau, the Imaginary City: Culture and Society, 1557 to Present* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1996), 89.

[9] Anders Ljungstedt, *An Historical Sketch of the Portuguese Settlements in China; and of the Roman Catholic Church and Mission in China* (Hong Kong: Viking Hong Kong Publications, 1992).

[10] Michael T. Ott, "Charles-Thomas Maillard De Tournon," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, ed. Charles G. Herbermann, Vol. 15 (London: Caxton Pub. Co.; New York: R. Appleton Co., 1912), http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/15001a.htm.

[11] Wang Zhichun 王之春, *Qingchao rouyuan ji* 清朝柔遠記, ed. Zhao Chunchen (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1989), 152, in Tan Shulin 譚樹林, *Ma Lixun yu Zhong–xi wenhua jiaoliu* 馬禮遜與中西文化交流 (Hangzhou: Zhongguo meishu xueyuan chubanshe, 2004), Chap. 1, pp. 26–28.

first and then journeyed round Cape Horn and across the Pacific and the Indian Oceans to Canton.[12] When Morrison accepted the offer by the East India Company to be a Chinese interpreter, one of his excuses was that his presence in the company might change the "aversion" of the Company's directorship towards missionaries.[13]

The unfriendly attitude of the Chinese towards foreigners did not provide enough choice for foreigners to dispose of the remains of their dead. At the same time, the "aversion" of the business community towards missionaries did not facilitate the establishment of a cemetery specially for Christians. The busy trade activities in Canton at the time kept several thousand foreigners each year working constantly on board trading ships. When these people died around the Pearl River Delta, their bodies were disposed of either by being launched into the sea or being buried on uninhabited islands around the Bocca Tigris.[14] The practice of burying their dead on the hillsides near the anchorage at Whampoa continued even after the opening of cemeteries in Macao. The reason then was partly economic and partly political. Lindsay Ride points out that "river transport for a coffin was not always permitted or available: when it was, the distance made it costly. Land at Whampoa was more easily procured than in Macao, and prices were lower and less liable to fluctuate."[15]

So, when James Morrison, the first-born baby of the Morrison family, died in 1811, he was buried on the hillside outside of the city walls. In such cases, burial on a hillside was accepted as a fact of life,[16] be-

---

[12] Marshall Broomhall, *Robert Morrison: A Master-builder* (London: Church Missionary Society, 1924), 33–40.

[13] In 1809, when the news of his appointment to the British Factory reached England, it was rumoured that he had deserted the cause for which he had gone forth. Morrison wrote back: "It might also tend to do away any aversion of the Directors of the East India Company to missionaries, when they found that they were ready to serve the interests of the Company" (Broomhall, ibid., 62).

[14] Burial at Whampoa was a luxury compared with "being launched headlong into the abyss of the ocean" (Lindsay and May Ride, *An East India Company Cemetery*, 59).

[15] Lindsay and May Ride, ibid., 60.

[16] James Morrison (d. 1811), "Their first-born, a son, died on the 5th March 1811 when less than a day old. Roman Catholic cemeteries were of course closed to Protestants and as there were no other enclosed burial grounds in the town, Protestants had to follow the Chinese style and bury their dead on the open hill sides outside of the town. Morrison chose the top of the hill called Meesenbury and there dug his son's grave in spite of strong opposition from the Chinese, and there the babe James was buried" (Lindsay Ride, *Robert Morrison: The Scholar and the Man* [Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1957], 11).

cause the burial place inside the city was reserved only for the Catholics.

THE EAST INDIA COMPANY AND THE CEMETERY

Ten years later, when Mary, the wife of Robert Morrison and the mother of James, was dying, she expressed her wish to be buried with her son. And Robert promised to fulfil her wish. Mary soon died in 1821 at the age of 30, carrying her still-born baby. But her last wish could not be carried out, because local Chinese residents, out of respect for the dead or simply being superstitious, opposed the opening up of James' grave for the burial of Mary.[17] Robert Morrison was forced to face the fact that he could not find a burial place either outside or inside the city. Theoretically, the other choices were to launch her body into the sea or to have it cremated. These options never came up as acceptable choices. Finally, the fact that Morrison had been working for the East India Company for over ten years made it possible for him to opt for a more respectful solution—the Company could buy a piece of land for that purpose.

The British East India Company was a company based in England for the purpose of trading in India and East Indies. The company started to share the spice trade which was until the 17th century a monopoly of Spain and Portugal. Later, it traded also in cotton, silk and saltpetre. After the decline of cotton-goods in the mid-18th century, the company traded in tea. In the times of Morrison, the company financed the importing of tea mainly by exporting 1,400 tons of illegal opium to China annually.

Several years before the death of Mary Morrison, the company tried to acquire a piece of land from the Macao government for a Protestant burial ground without success. It is not clear whether this attempt had any connection with Morrison. In 1815 the company negotiated with one Baron for the purchase of land. Again, it was unsuccessful. In fact, neither a foreigner nor a foreign organization might own land in a Por-

---

[17] "To disturb a grave—unless the coffin had first been exposed by the elements—constituted a crime for which the punishment in the Chinese penal code was a hundred stroked and banishment for life; for uncovering a corpse, the penalty was death by strangulation. The presence of a body in the plot discouraged the coolies from disturbing the grave" (Lindsay and May Ride, *An East India Company Cemetery*, 61).

tuguese colony according to Portuguese law. However, the company argued that Macao did not enjoy a colony status.

Meanwhile, the movement of setting up garden cemeteries became a trend in Europe. One of the aims of this movement was to distance their dead from the Church and from the churchyard.[18] At the south-east of Paris, Pêre Lachaise Cemetery was opened in 1804. It became a very successful land speculation after it attracted burials of famous people there.[19] Following this example, a Manchester cemetery company was set up in 1820.[20] The board of directors of the East India Company might have been aware of this trend in Europe and decided to set up a cemetery in Macao too.

When Mary Morrison died in 1821, the urgency of Morrison's difficult situation for a burial place renewed the company's move to pur-

---

[18] James Stevens Curls, "A Short History of the Cemetery Movement in Europe," in Sandra Berresford, *Italian Memorial Sculpture, 1820–1940: A Legacy of Love* (London: Frances Lincoln, 2004), 10–11.

[19] Ibid., 21.

[20] Early successful cemetery companies (1820–34) are as follows:

Date	Town	Company
1820	Manchester	Rusholme Road Proprietary Cem. Co.*
1823	Liverpool	Proprietors of the Low Hill Gen. Cem.*
1824	Norwich	Rosary Burial Ground Trust*
1825	Liverpool	St. James Cem. Co.
1825	Newcastle	Westgate Hill Cem. Co.*
1828	Great Yarmouth	Gen. Cem. Co.*
1830	London	Gen. Cem. Co.
1830	Portsmouth	Portsea Island Cem. Co.*
1832	Birmingham	Gen. Cem. Co.*
1833	Leeds	Proprietors of the Leeds Gen. Cem. Co.*
1834	Sheffield	Gen. Cem. Co.*
1834	York	Cem. Co.
1834	Newcastle	Gen. Cem. Co.*

* denotes a Nonconformist cemetery company (Julie Rugg, "The Emergence of Cemetery Companies in Britain, 1820–53" [unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sterling, 1992]).

Rusholme Road Propriety Cem. Co., the first cemetery company in Britain, was established in Manchester in 1820 and consequently set an example for the establishment of other cemetery companies in the early nineteenth century (Julie Rugg, "The Origins and Progress of Cemetery Establishment in Britain," in *The Changing Face of Death: Historical Accounts of Death and Disposal*, ed. P. C. Jupp and G. Howarth [Basingstoke: MacMillan, 2000], 109).

chase the land from the Baron, who was just in urgent need of ready cash. So the transaction took place quick enough to let Mary Morrison be interred in the newly purchased land.[21] To buy a piece of land by such a big company was not a major decision. However, it was clear that Morrison had won the sympathy from various authorities to expedite the complicated process. It reflects also that Morrison's work had won himself high esteem by all. Alongside his profession as an interpreter for the East India Company for twelve years, he performed his missionary work by translating the Bible into Chinese and by publishing and distributing Christian tracts to people in China.

THE CATHOLIC REFUSAL

Morrison mentioned explicitly that the Catholic Church refused the burial of his wife in its cemetery.[22] There were several reasons why the Roman Catholics could not offer a burial place for Mary Morrison. Firstly, it was a theological one. The Catholic burial place was situated beside the Church of Mother of God near St. Paul's College. It was not a cemetery but a churchyard. Conceptually, the churchyard was an extension of the church. The people buried there were the ones who were in communion with the Church, the good standing members of the Catholic Church. Catholics who had committed public sins were not allowed burial there, because they were denied entrance to the church when they were living. Obviously, the Morrison family by professing Protestantism was not in communion with the Catholic Church and perhaps Morrison also would have been unwilling to bury Mary in the churchyard of a church bearing the name of "the Mother of God" even if he had been offered the chance.

Secondly, the Catholic Church in Macao was too nervous to allow any irregularity by relaxing the burial rules or lifting the restriction during Morrison's times. The Catholic Church was then often in bad relation with China and with Portugal. The Chinese Rites Controversy at the end of the 16th century resulted in the prohibition of Catholicism in China by the Chinese emperor. And Maillard De Tournon, the Papal

---

[21] Lindsay and May Ride, *An East India Company Cemetery*, 61–62.

[22] Elisabeth Morrison, *Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison* (London: Longman, Orme, Brown, and Longmans, 1839), 2:102.

legate, died in Macao in 1710 during his house-imprisonment imposed by the Macao government under the pressure of the Chinese government. The situation of the Catholics in China and Macao was so bad that there was an imperial edit penalizing people who converted to Catholicism and prohibiting the printing of Christian literature in China.[23] In such a tense situation, it was too difficult for the Catholic Church to bend the burial regulation to let Mary Morrison be buried in the Catholic churchyard. It would make the Catholic Church responsible for the missionary work done by Morrison, which was not legal according to the Chinese government.

The Catholic Church was often not on good terms with the Portuguese authority, too. After the Spanish crown inherited the Portuguese crown by succession in 1580, the Catholic Church found herself often sided with the Spanish crown. This aroused hostility from the Portuguese. Benefiting from the discovery of gold and precious stones in Brazil in the 18th century, the Portuguese monarchy acquired an authority that was almost absolute. And with the help of his minister Marquês de Pombal, the king expelled in 1759 the Jesuits from all the Portuguese dominions. The Catholic Church in Macao was involved in this catastrophic decision too. In such a situation, the local Catholic Church could not afford to side with Morrison's cause, because, if she had done so, she might have complicated her own relations with the Portuguese government.

Thirdly, the Catholic–Protestant conflict was serious in Macao. Morrison himself noted, "The Romish missionaries will be our bitterest foes, if the Lord do not in a particular manner work upon their hearts . . . and if the Romish missionaries be our foes they will be foes that are far superior: aged, venerable and learned men."[24] Morrison regarded the refusal of the Macao government to give permission for residence to his companion William Milne (1785–1822) as a consequence of the jealousy of Catholic bishops and priests, who explicitly forbade any Chinese to assist Morrison in his studies.[25] Furthermore,

---

[23] In the 17th-century Jesuits believed that the answer was positive that it could be tolerated within certain limits; the Dominicans and Franciscans took the opposite view and carried the issue to Rome. The Roman Church authority condemned the rites in 1645. And after considering the arguments of the Jesuits, it lifted the ban in 1656. Finally in 1715, the Pope formally banned the rites again. Another Pope in 1742 reaffirmed the prohibition and forbade further debate (Ott, "Charles-Thomas Maillard De Tournon").

[24] Broomhall, *Robert Morrison: A Master-builder*, 31.

[25] Elisabeth Morrison, *Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison*, 2:288.

Morrison accused the Catholic Bishop of being indirectly responsible for the burning of about one hundred copies of St. Luke's Gospel, together with some tracts and catechism.[26] In view of the tense relations between them, it was obvious that the Catholic Church would not do the favour to let Mary Morrison be buried in a Catholic churchyard.

THE CEMETERY AND MORRISON

The Old Protestant Cemetery was set up in 1821. During the functioning years of the cemetery, the burial number remained in single digit each year except in 1844 and 1857, when there were 14 burials.[27] The reason for this sudden increase of burials is unknown, but very probably it was connected with the first and second Opium Wars. According to the inscriptions on the tombs, three quarters of them belonged to males and the age of people buried there was between 30 and 50.[28] This indicates that the East India Company had rather young males as their employees. Most of these people were on their gravestones identified as British and Americans who worked as captains, mariners, seamen, commanders and lieutenants.[29] There are only three missionaries buried there. Robert Morrison is the most remembered one. Obviously, not all members of Morrison's flock were employees of the Company and they were not necessarily allowed to be buried there, although people call the place the Old Protestant Cemetery. Morrison succeeded in obtaining a burial place for his wife and later for himself and his son, but his position in the company might not be influential enough to allow a public cemetery to be set up for Protestants in general.

After his death in 1834, his son John died in 1843 when he had just been appointed the colonial secretary of the newly set up Hong Kong colony. Situations in Macao changed quickly thereafter. Hong Kong soon took over the important trading position of Macao. Factors that impeded the burial of foreigners in Macao disappeared one after another. New cemeteries and burial places were set up outside the city

---

[26] Broomhall, *Robert Morrison: A Master-builder*, 52, 58, 79, 82.

[27] See Table I in the appendix.

[28] See Tables II and III in the appendix.

[29] See Tables IV and V in the appendix. Some of the information in these tables is the result of the research from other sources done by Sir Lindsay Ride.

after 1857. The Catholic cemetery which was set up in 1854 became secularized in 1912. The East India Company was dissolved in 1874. And the Chinese Rites controversy was over in the early 20th century. In 1939 Rome authorized Christians to take part in ceremonies honouring Confucius and to observe the ancestral rites. It seems that only the stones in the cemetery have continued to be more or less the same.

The remains of Robert Morrison are lying near his family members in the Old Protestant Cemetery, waiting for the second coming of Christ according to the Christian faith. In the meanwhile, his gravestone stands to confirm his earthly existence and to remind visitors of his mission and vision which demand much respect and admiration.

APPENDIX

TABLE I: The number of deaths according to year of death

1773	1	1830	1
1775	2	1831	1
1776	1	1832	1
1777	1	1833	3
1780	1	1834	3
1785	1	1835	5
1786	3	1836	9
1797	1	1837	5
1775	2	1838	6
		1839	6
1811	1		
1812	1	1840	2
1813	1	1841	6
1814	1	1842	7
1815	1	1843	8
1816	1	1844	14
1817	2	1845	4
1818	1	1846	1
		1847	2
1821	2	1848	1
1822	2	1849	5
1823	3		
1825	2	1850	4
1827	3	1851	2
1829	3	1852	4

1853	2	1859	2
1854	5		
1855	2	1870	1
1856	4	1889	1
1857	14		
1858	3	*year of death unknown*	7

TABLE II: The number of deaths according to age of death

under 1	11
under 10 but above 1	8
under 20 but above 10	6
under 30 but above 20	36
under 40 but above 30	34
under 50 but above 40	24
above 50	17

TABLE III: The number of deaths according to sex

female	39
male	137
unknown	2

TABLE IV: The number of deaths according to occupation

captain	23
officer/agent	7
diplomatic	2
scholar/writer/translator/artist/ musician	5
commander	7
lieutenant	1
mariner/seaman	12
merchant	7
missionary	3

TABLE V: The number of deaths according to nationality

American	53
American-German	1
American-British	1
British	103
British-Swiss	1
Swedish	3
Dutch	7
Danish	3

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 45–72

A Parting Memorial

Morrison and Missionary Motivation: His Sabbatical Sermons, 1823–1826

CHRISTOPHER D. HANCOCK

INTRODUCTION

Robert Morrison's *A Parting Memorial* was printed at Stationers' Hall Court, Ludgate Street, by Simpkin and Marshall shortly before he returned to China in May 1826. Unlike Eliza's two-volume *Memoirs*[1] of her husband's life and work, Morrison himself prepared *A Parting Memorial* for publication. There is a solemn deliberateness in his selection and editing of the twenty-six discourses, part sermons, essays and exhortations included here. The tone is set by the text from Isaiah which heads the work, "*Behold! these shall come from afar; And lo! These from the north and west; And from the land of* Sinim."[2] The China mission, to Morrison, fulfilled ancient prophecy. Penned at his

---

Christopher D. HANCOCK is the director of the Centre for the Study of Christianity in China, Oxford, United Kingdom.

[1] Eliza Morrison, *Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison, D.D.*, 2 vols., (London: Longman, 1839).

[2] Robert Morrison, D.D. F.R.S. M.R.A.S., President of the Anglo-Chinese College; Member of the Société Asiatique of Paris; Author of a Chinese Dictionary, Translator of the Sacred Scriptures &c., *A Parting Memorial* (London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1826), title-page.

London home (5, The Grove, Hackney), and dated January 5, 1826 (his forty-fourth birthday), the ascription states: "To Personal friends, throughout the United Kingdom, and to the friends of that cause to which he has devoted his life, the following Memorial is affectionately and respectfully inscribed by the author."[3] A self-conscious epitaph to his work in China, and a mature statement on Christian missionary life, *A Parting Memorial* contains much rich, surprisingly un-quarried, material for this paper on Morrison and that vital theme in modern mission studies, "Missionary Motivation." Conscious life was short, and there was much to do; Morrison is as direct, economical, and urgent in *A Parting Memorial* as at any stage in his life. Like every early missionary he lived "in the land of the shadow of death," and in Britain he spoke and wrote deliberately to secure a legacy; not for himself, but for his work in China.

A PARTING MEMORIAL

As the title-page indicates, *A Parting Memorial* contains "miscellaneous discourses, written and preached on board ship at sea, in the Indian ocean; at the Cape of Good Hope; and in England, with Remarks on Missions, &c." Here is Morrison's farewell sermon on John 14:1–3 (dated January 29, 1807), the discourse he delivered in Consequa's Warehouse on November 16 and 23, 1822, after the great fire of Canton, and his famous "Sermon to Sailors" finally preached at Whampoa on December 10, 1822. Here, too, are sermons on-board the *Waterloo* on the hundred day voyage from China, via Cape Town and St. Helena, until he "disembarked in a smuggler" at Start Point, off Salcombe, Devon, on March 20, 1824. The sermons add depth and detail to our understanding of Morrison generally, and fill out his (unusually, but not unsurprisingly) jovial travelogue; after one he complains in his diary, "To-day there has been a want of seriousness that disappointed me. If a ship's dog had been drowned, there could not have been less";[4] another (Discourse IX, dated February 12, 1824), entitled "Preparation to meet God," followed the drowning of seaman Benjamin Hill the day before. Ever the evangelist, Morrison was a better pastor and preacher

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] *Memoirs*, 2:246.

than he, or we, might think. The volume as a whole, and especially the sermons he preached in Britain, are humane, earthy, realistic and, of course, deeply biblical in their exposition and cast of mind.

A Parting Memorial also contains four weighty lectures Morrison gave in Britain, as the honorary mouth-piece of the Ultra-Gangetic mission: their titles convey their substance, viz. "*Hints on the means requisite to promote Christian knowledge throughout the world*"; "*A brief inquiry into what may reasonably be expected of* '*Messengers or Apostles of the Churche*s' *to the unevangelized nations*"; "*On the qualifications of Directors or Managing Committees of Missionary Societies*"; and "*A Parting Word to Protestant Missionaries*." Throughout, Morrison's style is pious, direct, generous and authoritative. *A Parting Memorial* titles him "Robert Morrison D.D. F.R.S. M.R.A.S., President of the Anglo-Chinese College; Member of the Société Asiatique of Paris; Author of a Chinese Dictionary, Translator of the Sacred Scriptures &c.": and he speaks as such. The farmer's son embodies our theme; his hard-won victories validating his generous, common-sense case for gritty, principled, Christian missionary endeavour.

A Parting Memorial also contains nineteen of the sabbatical sermons, part sermons, and an exhortation, that he delivered as he exhaustingly criss-crossed Britain between his arrival on March 20, 1824 and his departure with Eliza and the children finally on May 21, 1826. Living, he told a friend, "mostly in stage-coaches and inns"[5] for much of his first year back in Britain, Morrison journeyed from Devon to Aberdeen, London to Liverpool, Newcastle to Dublin, Paris to Paisley, addressing people from all walks of life, in over-full churches, mission society meetings, prayer groups and colleges. The (mostly) dated and located sabbatical sermons help us chart Morrison's journey, and his intellectual development. Preaching two and three times on a Sunday, his sermons reflect his missionary passion, his priorities, principles, and striking freedom from prejudice or priggishness. He could, and must, say in England what he could never say in China. The rationale for mission and a right perspective on missionary motivation are laid bare here with critical clarity and frank honesty. Antithetical to armchair experts, Morrison appealed for workers and supporters, making the case for mission itself time and again.

---

[5] Ibid., 2:280.

THE SABBATICAL SERMONS IN CONTEXT

Morrison's early weeks in England were frenetic. His first sermon, composed on board the *Waterloo*, entitled "*God the Supreme Ruler*," was delivered at Kingsbridge, Devon on March 21, 1824, the day after he landed. He preached the same sermon the following Sunday at Dr. Waugh's, Wells Street Chapel, London. In a long introduction (of the kind Morrison as preacher and editor prefaced a number of these sermons), we glimpse key themes in his sabbatical ministry. He began,

> In a land far off, the most populous nation in the world, on the eastern limits of Asia, from whence your preacher has returned for a short season, the name of Jesus is hated by the rulers, and by most of the people. A native of that land is, through dread of the oppressor, afraid to have about his person, or in his house, either book or any written paper which contains the name of Jesus, that blessed name, which is your only hope.
>
> Compared with such a state of things, how truly may the people of this country say, "to us the lines have fallen in pleasant places, and we have a goodly heritage." In Great Britain, princes, nobles, and legislators, join with the ministers of the Gospel, and beseech men to receive the Bible. (*How cheerful to me, after many years exile and solitude, is such an assembly as this!*) Who can estimate the value of the Sabbath, and the Bible, and the ordinance of God's house!—And is it possible that those nations which now hate the name of Jesus, and are slavishly attached to their idols, and their ancient sages, and their superstitions, and their vices, can ever be converted? Is it not a hopeless task to endeavour to reclaim them? We say, no! and the reason we assign is this—"The most High God ruleth in the kingdom of men." For the encouragement of my own mind, and for your fellow Christians, I have chosen the following words as my text, (Daniel iv. 32) "The most High ruleth in the kingdom of men."[6]

God's sovereign rule, in a traditional Scottish Presbyterian Calvinist sense, is the context for Morrison and his missionary peers of all human activity, including overseas mission. Missionary motivation was first a matter of theology: right understanding was the basis for right

---

[6] *A Parting Memorial*, 135.

action, and true, biblical missionary principles. From God's sovereignty he could, though, also deduce, "it is practicable to serve him wherever we are . . . nor is it often necessary to quit one's station in society, in order to serve the Lord."[7] For all his piety and passion, Morrison was still a family man, keen to see his children, Rebecca and John Robert, and his family, friends, childhood church, old haunts, and parents' graves in Northumberland. In this, too, God was, he believed, rightly honoured: as he said of China, it was "The place where Satan keeps his throne," but "the duties of the second table of the law, are still discerned with considerable precision."[8] Delayed in London over the duty payable on his 10,000 imported items for a library (still to be identified) in Britain, and beset by invitations to meet everyone from William IV (who approved "that gentleman's distinguished and useful labours"[9]), to Wilberforce and the Clapham Sect (who were sponsoring Yong Sam Tak when Morrison met him in 1805), to later Edward Irving, Dr. Adam Clarke, and (nearly) Sir Walter Scott, as well as to the Honourable Court of Directors of the East India Company, who hosted a dinner for Morrison (prompted by a letter from the Select Committee in Canton), Morrison finally spent April 18th to 23rd in his native Newcastle. He apologized to a friend: "It grieves me that the importunity of London has so long prevented my having a moment's leisure, to answer your kind letter."[10] When he arrived, he received a hero's welcome; as he wrote to Sir George Staunton, "My reception in this town is as kind as I could possibly wish. It is interesting to me to revisit the streets and fields where I lived as a poor bashful boy thirty years ago."[11] At his old church, High Bridge Chapel, "hundreds could not get admittance" to hear "the great and celebrated townsman, Dr. Morrison." He began his sermon:

> More than thirty years have elapsed, since, in this house of prayer, he who this night addresses you, attended as a child, the ministry of the Gospel; and then, by God's blessing, had his mind gradually imbued with the principles of our holy religion . . . The child of that period has been, in the course of Divine Providence, conducted to distant regions, to a people of a hard language and a strange speech; there to use means of conveying to the people the treasures of divine truth

---

[7] Ibid., 138.
[8] *Memoirs*, 2:236.
[9] Ibid., 2:256.
[10] Ibid., 2:259.
[11] Ibid., 2:260.

> and mercy, which have been entrusted to the churches by Almighty God, for the salvation of a lost world . . .[12]

From Newcastle Morrison travelled north to collect Rebecca and then on to Manchester to be reunited with his son, John Robert, who accompanied him back to London. He could not see everyone, writing sharply to a friend from Newcastle on April 23, 1824:

> I am labouring from morning to night, and from day to day, for my kindred, and for my children, and for the public; and sacrificing all personal considerations, and still I do not give satisfaction. My friends are most unmerciful, requiring of me more than I can do; and seemingly offended because I do not perform impossibilities. From London to Newcastle is, by the route I shall travel, here and back about six hundred miles, which I must perform with little intermission; and you, my dear M——, are displeased because I have not made it *eight* hundred! I have had no rest here, from five in the morning till eleven at night, and must set off tomorrow at five o'clock again. Do pity, instead of blaming.[13]

To another friend in Manchester he was equally direct:

> [I] will try to preach one sermon for you; *two*, I think out of the question. It does appear to me inconsiderate of my friends, to expect, after so many years' study of a barren Pagan language, that I should the moment I land, amid a thousand various avocations, which dissipate and weary the mind, forthwith ascend the pulpit, and preach charity sermons.[14]

Morrison had, in his own way, attained celebrity status, and suffered the loss of privacy and understanding as a consequence. Habituated to opposition in Canton, he now faced the tougher challenge of acclaim. Wrongly adjudged proud and self-confident, he was hungry for affirmation. He relished opportunities to talk about his work, but grieved his fellow-countrymen's shallow faith, culpable ignorance, willful myopia, and hardness of heart towards "the lost"; as he wrote to Staunton soon after landing,

---

[12] *A Parting Memorial*, 150.
[13] *Memoirs*, 2:262.
[14] Ibid., 2:261.

> I am trying to stir up a little more zeal respecting China—its moral and spiritual affairs amongst my friends, who are but little acquainted with the state of society in the Eastern hemisphere; but not with very great hopes of success. Who knows (they say) anything but China![15]

Highly-motivated for mission himself, he struggled to accept the low level of genuine interest, and sacrificial religion, he found in Britain. He had begun to express strong opinions before leaving China. In his final letter to the London Missionary Society (LMS) before sailing, he rejected the pious cant of "well-educated, well-connected, wealthy Christians and ministers, both young and middle-aged," who praised the "*dignity* of the Missionary" (as ambassador for the greatest monarch) whilst leaving mission work to "the poor and uneducated, to the extent they do, and so much to the disgrace of the Protestant churches."[16] As he stated, "The Missionary, whom many people praise and respect, is a sort of *ideal* character, and their lofty, magnificent, visionary notions still allow them to despise and neglect the *actual* Missionary."[17] With equal passion, but some reserve, he now begins his sermon, *The Missionary's Rehearsal*, in the Scotch Seceder's Chapel, Miles's Lane, London, on April 11, 1824,

> The personal and relative duties of Christians are from Sabbath to Sabbath, the theme of animating discourses from the pulpit; and the mercies of God our Saviour are daily exhibited to guilty men that they may be saved. I would this morning take a wider range, and digress a little to those duties which Christian churches owe to those still large portions of the great human family, which heretofore have remained unacquainted with revealed religion; and endeavour to ascertain our duty from a review of the past. The subject cannot be as interesting to each individual, as that which concerns his or her personal salvation; but yet, as it concerns the salvation of others, it should not be uninteresting to any Christian.[18]

He concluded: "The pioneer is forgotten. Missionaries who *first* enter pagan lands, are only pioneers. . . . I fear the patience of British Christians will be tried, if not exhausted, before the fruits of the Chinese

---

[15] Ibid., 2:259.
[16] Ibid., 2:221, 222.
[17] Ibid., 2:222.
[18] *A Parting Memorial*, 102.

Mission exhibit any striking appearance."[19] To Morrison, mission was a tough, universal Christian obligation. He had learned first hand, good intentions were nothing without durability and persistence. His sixteen years in China had proved he possessed both; as he stated in one sermon, "Having, by divine help, served a long campaign, bivouacked on the field of battle, I do not much dread the epithet coward, nor of 'carpet' Missionary, and similar accusations, from men who never quitted home service."[20] Purity of intention and the soundness of a missionary's motivation, as he had witnessed on a number of occasions recently in Malacca, were tested by the fires of loneliness, fear, disappointment, sickness, cultural confusion, collegial tension and local hostility. Mission involved an unromantic call to sacrifice and service. Apathetic Christians at home, he knew, made answering that call all the harder.

The sabbatical made as many demands on Morrison as his work in Canton. Apart from his travel, writing, and meetings with groups and individuals, preaching was a challenge; as he stated at the Bristol Missionary Society Anniversary service, on August 2, 1824:

> My Christian Friends, your preacher for this evening is not, in ordinary cases, fond of apologies, and should not now make any, did he not think that justice to you and to himself required it. It is generally known, by those who attend meetings like the present, that he has been long in a distant country, occupied chiefly in philological labours, and the exceptions are so few, he may say he never preached. That your edification may not be hindered by disappointment this evening, he states the fact. Beside, on this anniversary, the subject of missions has been thrice advocated, and the claims thereof so powerfully argued; and the difficulties thereof so well illustrated; and the final success thereof so scripturally exhibited, that nothing remains to be said. All that preachers on this occasion can now do is, but to reiterate truths similar to those which have already been addressed to you.[21]

Morrison's energy, faith, courage, and perseverance still inspired many; as a fan wrote, "Millions shall yet bless your memory, while they feast on the rich food which you were permitted to spread before them. I say not this to fan the spark of self-congratulation; but to excite

---

[19] Ibid., 111.
[20] Ibid., 306.
[21] Ibid., 183.

the purest gratitude to Him 'who counted you worthy, putting you into' this 'ministry.'"[22] Another, "I cannot but greatly rejoice to hear how the Lord has honoured you, as an instrument in his hands, and preserved your valuable life by sea and land, at home and abroad."[23] This was heady stuff. In distant Canton, Morrison had been mostly shielded from public praise and professional acclaim.

Morrison had left Britain an angular, anguished twenty-five year old, with little theology, a smattering of Chinese, and an untested call to overseas mission: he returned to Britain a weathered, forty-two year old widower, his purportedly impossible assignment by the LMS (to learn Chinese, and translate the Bible) accomplished, his credentials validated, and his self-confidence legitimate. As he summarized his sixteen years in China to himself, as he left Canton, "My public life in China has been a period of great industry—my domestic life has been a chequered scene of pleasure and of pain; but even the painful circumstances are very dear to my recollection."[24] Mindful of Macao and Mary, with Georgian understatement, he noted again in his diary, as the *Waterloo* crossed the Tropic of Cancer, "I have spent in China the most interesting period of my life."[25] The sabbatical gave him space to reflect on what he had learned that might help others pursue, or support, a missionary vocation. Motivation was a central issue.

Time prevents study of Morrison's fascinating trips to Paris, Ireland, and Scotland, or of his reception at the annual society meetings of the LMS, British and Foreign Bible Society (BFBS), Religious Tract Society, and Prayer Book and Homily Society; "for all of which," Eliza says, "he continued to be an efficient agent, until death terminated those labours of love."[26] At both the LMS and BFBS annual meetings in 1824 Morrison presented copies of the Old and New Testaments in Chinese "translated by himself and the late Dr. Milne," and a copy of the Chinese–English Dictionary. The response to his work was rapturous. Morrison's work had acquired iconic status. The seemingly impossible had been accomplished. All other missionary tasks now faced comparison with, or drew inspiration from, what Morrison had achieved. The LMS motion receiving the gift stated:

---

[22] *Memoirs*, 2:263.
[23] Ibid., 2:263, 264.
[24] Ibid., 2:236.
[25] Ibid., 2:246.
[26] Ibid., 2:265.

> That this meeting contemplates with sacred delight the completion of a Translation of the Holy Scriptures into the Chinese Language, by the Divine blessing on the unwearied labours of the esteemed Missionary of this Society, the Rev. Dr. Morrison, assisted by the late lamented Dr. Milne, &c.[27]

Never one to miss an opportunity to challenge the status quo, when invited later to join the Board of the LMS, Morrison characteristically replied:

> I beg you to return my thanks to the Gentlemen in the Direction for the honour designed me: which (although I am perfectly satisfied with being merely a Missionary, and have no ambition to direct the affairs of others) I do not decline; because I think it Scriptural, that messengers of the Church to pagan lands, should, when returned from their duties, and unimpeached, have *a right* to be heard as equals, in the Missionary councils of christians at home; and I hope this proceeding will lead to the adoption of a general principle in favour of Missionaries being eligible for the office of Directors: I think the good resulting to the christian cause, would be great.[28]

Likewise, when made a Fellow of the Royal Society in February 1825, he confided to a friend, "these, my Brother, are of little value in this life—how much less at the hour of death."[29] Far from blunting Morrison's edge, praise seems to have sharpened it: the sabbatical reveals him in new ways as a strong, critical, independent thinker, for whom practicalities were as important as principles. The shift in his thinking, evident in his last three years in Canton, towards the holistic, social activism of early nineteenth-century English evangelicalism, becomes a prominent feature of his sabbatical ministry. Echoing Wilberforce and the Clapham Sect, he stated: "Universal benevolence . . . is a scriptural idea, and to cherish such a sentiment a Christian duty."[30] Living in China, he had come to see "benevolence" as a distinctive and compelling Christian virtue.

The demands of the sabbatical finally exhausted Morrison, and in September 1825, he accepted Sir George Staunton's invitation to his newly-acquired estate, Leigh Park, in Hampshire, to recuperate: it was,

---

[27] Ibid., 2:266.
[28] Ibid., 2:307.
[29] Ibid., 2:304.
[30] Ibid., 2:276.

Eliza reckoned, his only break in Britain. A few weeks later, under circumstances still shrouded in mystery, Morrison remarried, his original plans to return to China by August 1825 overtaken by his wooing and wedding of the strong, thirty-year old spinster, Eliza Armstrong, from Liverpool, and his desire to see the "Language Institution" and China mission generally firmly established in Britain. But if Morrison enjoyed his sabbatical in England, his heart and mind were surely still in China.

MORRISON AND MISSIONARY MOTIVATION

The second half of this paper looks at major themes in Morrison's preaching and teaching on missionary motivation during his furlough. Central to his thinking was what had, and had not, provided sustained and sustainable impetus to the life and work of a missionary on the field. These were new questions at the beginning of the new missionary era. An exhortation appended to one of the sermons gives a useful summary of his thinking.

> — The cause of Christian missions is the cause of Christ.
>
> — He has commanded them to be undertaken.
>
> — The heathen nations are given to him as his inheritance.
>
> — When he sees their conversion, he sees of the travail of his soul, and is satisfied.
>
> — He has commanded ordinary means to be used:—*Go and teach all nations*.
>
> — The idea of *waiting* for miraculous interference has been acted on, but does not seem warranted. Chinese, supposed to be the most difficult language under heaven, has given way to the use of means.
>
> — Christian missions are Christ's cause, and love to him should constrain every Christian to aid in sending forth missionaries, and supporting them, till churches be formed amongst the heathen.[31]

---

[31] *A Parting Memorial*, 210.

As this suggests, Morrison's sabbatical sermons blend Reformed theology with a generous approach to creation, humanity, and miracle. Throughout, love for God and neighbour (not guilt, fear, or duty) are the supreme motivators for mission.

Morrison's preaching presents mission first as *an expression of God's sovereign rule*. This is evident in many sermons. We glimpsed it in his first sermon, "*God the Supreme Ruler*," on March 21 and 28, 1824. His text was Daniel 4:32. "*The most High ruleth in the kingdom of men*." From this he deduces God's omnipotent *ability* to reach all peoples ("Individuals constitute nations, and great affairs arise from small beginnings"[32]), and his sovereign *desire* to draw all people to himself ("The Lord God omnipotent reigneth; hath he said and will he not do it! What Christian dares contradict and blaspheme, by surmising there *are some* peoples and nations, and languages, who will not, and can never be made to serve him?"[33]). For, he urges, "The Lord has not deserted any nation."[34] What's more, true subjects of this sovereign will want to celebrate his rule: as Morrison stated, "If our hearts feel no interest in the prosperity and enlargement of the Messiah's kingdom, it is sufficient to excite a doubt whether we be, indeed, subjects of that kingdom."[35] To those who rejected the necessity or possibility of a human agent in mission, or, as elsewhere, claimed mission should be deferred until God granted "*miraculous powers* to men who shall be sent to heathen nations,"[36] Morrison replied, ". . . the Bible does not sanction this inference, nor the notion thus entertained"; for "Heaven is pleased to work by the instrumentality of men."[37] Likewise, "Those err egregiously who trust solely to human efforts, and (as some do) deride appeals to heaven for the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit; and those who affirm, that conversion being Heaven's work, the use of means is unnecessary, and may be neglected, do not less err from the truth."[38] Crucially, as we will see next, far from condemning the world, in the light of God's sovereign rule, to Morrison there is "amongst many of the heathen, a spirit of faith that the 'Heavens do rule,' and that man is accountable to superior powers."[39] Alive to both Christian nominalism

---

[32] Ibid., 139.
[33] Ibid., 142.
[34] Ibid., 145.
[35] Ibid., 142.
[36] Ibid., 382.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid., 145.
[39] Ibid., 146.

and Confucian integrity, he stresses, "there are many of the heathen more correct men than many people called Christians":[40] however ultimately, he believed, China's "atheistical" Confucian tradition produced a defective morality without a spirit to regulate and inspire human benevolence, and without a hope or fear of heaven.[41]

Classically, we see the outworking of Morrison's sense of God's Providence in his lengthy introduction to his sermon "The Knowledge of Christ supremely excellent," preached before the LMS in Surry Chapel, on May 11, 1825:

> Fathers and Brethren!
>
> So long ago as 1807, Jan. 31st, I embarked for a distant country, as a Messenger of the Churches, to convey to a people of a strange speech and a hard language, the Books of Divine Revelation. From that time to the present my attention has been almost entirely devoted to that language, and to accomplish the object for which I was sent; which object, with the aid of my beloved friend and colleague, the late excellent, laborious, and indefatigable Missionary Milne, was effected. But those labours were such as altogether tended to disqualify me to appear in the place which I now occupy; to address a British audience. I remember well that a return to this land was never anticipated by me. At 5 P.M. as the sun was declining in the west, on the 26th of February of the year I have named, when the ship in which I sailed took her final departure from the British shores, I find from my Journal that I thus wrote—
>
> "This is in all probability (but God alone knows) the closing prospect of a land I shall visit no more. O may the blessing of God rest upon it! The land that gave me birth; the land that till this hour has nourished me; the land of my fathers' sepulchres—a land I esteem most precious, because there, I trust, I was born again; and there the saints in numbers dwell. Happy land! May the light of the Gospel never be removed from thee. The prayers of a departing Missionary are ended. Amen and Amen."
>
> Afterwards, being removed to a far distant land, about 17,000 miles from Britain, when standing on the sea-shore, in the cool of the evening; or walking solitarily on the beech; often have I cast a wishful look across the ocean—but dared not cherish the hope of revisiting England. However, Providence has led me by a way that I knew not; and I am, by the will of others, places this day, in circumstances

---

[40] Ibid., 147.

[41] *Memoirs*, 2:272, 273.

> which I had not anticipated. I therefore crave your indulgence, whilst I deliver the following discourse; and I pray that the blessing of God may rest on my endeavours to state, and to enforce the TRUTH.[42]

Motivation for mission was, to Morrison, a joint act of God and man.

Secondly, Morrison presents mission as *grounded in God's work in the world*. As we have seen, Morrison is notably world-affirming, and disarmingly generous towards Chinese culture and Confucian philosophy. As he stated elsewhere:

> What, then, do the Chinese require from Europe?—Not the arts of reading and printing; not merely general education; not much that is harped on by some philanthropists—civilization; they require that only which St. Paul deemed supremely excellent, and which it is the sole object of the Missionary Society to communicate—they require *the knowledge of Christ* . . . With all their civilization, still, envy and malice, deceit and falsehood, to a boundless extent—with a selfish, ungenerous prudence, and a cold metaphysical inhumanity—are the prevalent characteristics of the people of China.[43]

This mind-set is evident in his sabbatical sermons and views on missionary motivation. His sermon "The Kindredship of the Nations," on Acts 17:26, "*God hath made of one blood all nations of men*," which we find he prepared in his father-in-law John Morton's house and delivered at Dr. Raffles' Chapel, Liverpool, in behalf of Moravian Missions, July 1824, on his way to Ireland, begins strikingly:

> Some of the principles contained in the divine revelation, are so different from the commonly received opinions of the world in its present state of apostacy from God, that they are generally overlooked and disregarded, either as preposterous, or as inapplicable to men of the existing generations. The pacific spirit of the Gospel, in opposition to wars—the meek and long-suffering virtues of our holy religion, in opposition to resentful duels, are examples of what I refer to; and the doctrine taught in my text, viz. the *kindredship* of all mankind, is amongst the number disregarded, although heaven-derived truths.[44]

---

[42] Ibid., 2:231, 232.

[43] Ibid., 2:272.

[44] *A Parting Memorial*, 169.

From this he urges "the important truth," "all nations are derived from the same first pair of human beings, and are therefore related to one another . . ."[45] He continues:

> Too long have false notions of individual superiority, of family greatness, and of the right of some nations to dominate over the rest; and notions of a mistaken patriotism led men to despise and disregard, if not to hate and injure his fellows, for all of whom we this day claim the rights of *consanguinity* and of *brotherhood*.[46]

One creator gives life to all, he argues, and before the call of Abraham "there was no distinction made in Heaven's dispensations amongst the nations of the earth."[47] So no race can proudly claim superiority over another. Travel reveals, "The hideous and distorted pictures formerly drawn of the rest of the nations, either by ignorance or artifice, as well as the representations of savage innocence, have, in all cases proved untrue, and human nature is found much the same in every land."[48] However, "The great point yet to be gained is, to induce the Christian Churches to use somewhat proportionate means to communicate spiritual means to the rest of their brethren of mankind."[49] For "[t]he cause of Christian missions is the cause of God,"[50] he urges, and the "religion of Jesus" does not commend the received notion of patriotism, but makes people "*citizens of the world*" with a heart to care for "all human beings whom their Creator has made of the same blood as themselves . . ."[51] Voicing the social perspective evident in his latter years in China, he contrasts the "great and shameful efforts of Christian states in Europe to fight," with the "languid, and feeble, and niggardly, and cowardly . . . efforts (of supposedly Christian peoples, except the Moravians) to do good to the rest of mankind."[52] But he then adds soberly, "I am persuaded, that few or none will advocate such a cause, or such a sentiment."[53] Here is a theme, though, that Morrison addressed throughout his sabbatical; his bold and provocative Christian interna-

---

[45] Ibid., 170.
[46] Ibid., 171.
[47] Ibid., 172.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid., 198.
[51] Ibid., 174.
[52] Ibid., 175.
[53] Ibid.

tionalism flying in the face of Britain's nascent colonialism. For Morrison, mission was motivated by the same spirit of global philanthropy which drove Wilberforce to address the curse of slavery. As Morrison stated in his essay *A brief inquiry into what may reasonably be expected of "Messengers or Apostles of the Churches," to the unevangelized nations*,[54]

> A Christian Missionary from England is not sent to India or any other part of the world to introduce English customs, but Christ's Gospel. He should not be shocked or irritated by the innocent usages of other nations, which happen to differ from his own. A Missionary's views of Providence, and the gracious care of God extended to all parts of his world, should elevate his mind above the Swiss disease of extravagant love of country. A notion which some people possess, that there is nothing good or comfortable out of England, that all God's works, every where, are inferior and to be despised, in comparison with what he hath done for England, may be called patriotism; but it is a notion that is unjust, and of an impious tendency, and is unworthy of a Christian Missionary. . . . He must carry the principle of unlimited toleration to the ends of the earth—that *man* is *not* accountable to man, but *is* accountable to GOD "*onely*" for his religious opinions.[55]

For all his generosity of spirit, though, Morrison was not gentle on idolatry or irreligion. His sermon, "The Nations shall renounce Lies and Vanities," delivered at Bristol Missionary Anniversary, on August 2, 1824, on Jeremiah 16:19, "*O Lord, my strength, and my fortress, and my refuge, in the day of affliction. The Gentiles shall come unto thee from the ends of the earth, and they shall say, 'Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit*,'" is a sustained call to mission in order that the revealed religion of Christ may release the world from false idols. As he declared:

> In China, there is not a street, nor a shop, nor a palace, nor a hovel, nor a college, nor a poor fisherman's boat, that has not an idol; a carved image of wood, or a porcelain goddess, or a molten divinity of clay, or a literary god of bronze, or a stone idol cut by the mason, or a rude unfashioned piece of rock.[56]

---

[54] See ibid., 379–98.

[55] Ibid., 386–87.

[56] Ibid., 185.

Chinese civilization had not put an end to idolatry nor inspired benevolence. As he states:

> Now the fact is, that in China, for example, there is quite as much mildness and civility in the intercourse of human beings, as in Europe, and sometimes more. And men's actions are as much regulated by law and etiquette, and so are as much polished, as in any nation they can be, till Christianity regenerates and purifies the heart, and fills it with love to God and man, and diffuses abroad amongst all ranks, something more human than human nature ever attains to, without Christianity.[57]

The church is, he concludes,

> not confined to any nation; but is *placed amongst the nations*, for the good of mankind irrespective of political or geographical distinctions; and that her efforts should embrace the whole world, without the narrowness of feudal bigotry, or pagan-derived notions of patriotism. God's world is the Christian's country; and he should feel none of those violent partialities for particular spots of his heavenly Father's territory.[58]

As we would expect, Morrison, the evangelical, sees missionary motivation as, thirdly, *a response to Christ's saving death*. The nations of the world, regardless of their culture or civilization, share in the universality of human sin, for which Christ died an atoning death on Calvary. In the spirit of the Evangelical Revival in Britain, Morrison's sermons are clear on the fact of sin and need for individual atonement and divine forgiveness. So, in his sermon in July 1824, in aid of Moravian Missions, he had stated, "the whole world of human beings is guilty before God,"[59] and those who have received Heaven's pardon "are bound, by the Saviour's command, to proclaim it to every human being to whom they can obtain access."[60] This is a Christian "duty," he urges: for "[t]he great object of Christian Missions, is to proclaim the mercy of God to guilty creatures—i.e. to preach Christ's Gospel, and with it, the whole of revealed religion:—it is to convey divine truth, as

---

[57] Ibid., 184.
[58] Ibid., 190.
[59] Ibid., 176.
[60] Ibid., 177.

revealed in the Sacred Scriptures, to the human mind,"[61] until such time as "in each country the inhabitants themselves shall be able to teach each other, and not require foreign supplies."[62] As he states,

> I am not endeavouring to inculcate any thing extravagant and outrageous; but a plain, palpable, common-sense Christian duty, manifestly deduced from all our Christian principles, and the generally acknowledged truths of our holy religion. I inculcate universal philanthropy, not existing as a merely visionary sentiment, but embodied in real acts of substantial good; and the good to which we now allude, as you Christians know, is above all price, for the redemption of the soul is infinitely precious.[63]

In this context it is interesting to find, in an undated sermon included in the sabbatical sermons, that Morrison rejects the idea that Christian missionary activity should be deemed "charity"; as he states,

> I am astounded to find Christians so often referring all their missionary efforts to charity, in the ordinary sense of the term. A missionary sermon, is a charity sermon. Now the churches cannot conceal it from us, that Heaven has made it their *solemn duty* to proclaim the Gospel to the ends of the earth . . . Charity indeed![64]

In the same vein, he amazingly takes his mentor Dr. Waugh publicly to task at the end of his sermon on March 28, 1824, for using the word "generosity" to motivate mission. He states, mindful of the riches of God in Christ,

> No, at risk of being called a caviller, I do object to the use of this word, because but little has been done by us, and that little is done for Jesus Christ. Is the propagation of the Gospel not his cause! Is not the support of Gospel ordinances in this land his cause! . . . That a reasonable portion of what God hath given us, be employed by us, in supporting and diffusing the blessed Gospel, is a solemn duty, which no Christian man or woman may innocently leave undone. It should not be called *charity* or *generosity*.[65]

---

[61] Ibid., 179.
[62] Ibid., 180.
[63] Ibid., 181.
[64] Ibid., 191.
[65] Ibid., 149, 150.

Morrison's own life and work were a willing response to God's generosity in Christ: this was the key to his own sacrificial life of service.

Closely allied with this, we find Morrison's sermons next presenting mission as *a natural expression of Christian obedience*. The command to "Go" rings through his words. We have glimpsed this already in his sermon at the Scotch Seceder's Chapel on April 11, 1824. In his sermon two weeks later at High Bridge Chapel, he speaks of "selfish" Christians, who have kept the good news for themselves, but states,

> I hope brighter days are near at hand, when the churches will exert themselves more in the great duty of disseminating the Gospel, than they have ever yet done. When Cain's sullen selfish speech—"Am I my brother's keeper?" shall be reversed, and Christians shall all acknowledge the solemn duty of caring for their brethren of mankind, irrespective of geographical limits; for God has made of "ONE *blood*," all nations of men—and all men are brethren; even Pagan Chinese maintain the principle, (whatever their practice may be,) that (*Tëen hëa wei yih këa*) "The whole world is but one family."[66]

His sermon of April 11th makes clear his sorrow when it has not been recognized that "every Christian Church . . . is a *Missionary Society*; a society established not only for its own edification, but for the enlargement of the Redeemer's Kingdom."[67] He admits huge pressures on missionaries ("The mental labours and anxieties of Milne were extreme," he says[68]), but mission is not an option; it is a duty in some form for every Christian. His sermon entitled "Regard to the Affairs of others," delivered at Hoxton Academy Chapel, on February 6, 1825, on the text Philippians 2:4. "*Look not every one on his own things, but everyone also on the things of others*," is as strong a statement as any of Morrison's commitment to "universal benevolence," which he calls "a rational, scriptural, christian idea."[69] Christians need, he argues, to be "incommoded" for the sake of others. He states, "If the people of Europe called Christians, had looked with a benevolent eye on the affairs of the sons of Africa, how could the abominable Slave-trade ever have been suffered to grow to that horridly cruel and malignant height

---

[66] Ibid., 152.
[67] Ibid., 119.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid., 219.

that it did?"[70] Jesus is the role model. The neighbour is nearby and far away. His sermon "Watchfulness during the Lord's Absence," delivered at the Reverend Joseph Fletcher's Chapel, Stepney, in October 1825, on Mark 13:35, "*Watch, therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house cometh*"; or, according to St. Matthew, "*what hour your Lord cometh*," sets Christian charity in the context of ultimate accountability and the need for urgent action. Likewise the undated sermon, Discourses XXI, entitled "The anticipated end of the world should induce a useful and pious life," on 2 Peter 3:11, "*Seeing then that these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversations and godliness; looking for, and hasting unto (expecting and earnestly desiring) the coming of the day of God*," locates Christian service against Christ's return.

> The habitual recognition of the great truth before us, should *prevent covetousness*, world-mindedness, the desire of riches; *niggardliness in the cause of God*; *discontent*, repining; over-valuing earthly things, or the breath of applause—it should prevent *remissness*, procrastination in pious works, the delay of repentance, and the deferring of reproof or exhortation to fellow sinners.[71]

If there is no fear, Morrison argues in another undated sermon, on Psalm 56:2, 3, "*O thou Most High—what time I am afraid I will trust in Thee*," entitled "Trust in the most high, the best defence against fear," human life is empty and futile. As he states, "Many of the well-educated and opulent drown all serious reflection in a whirlpool of giddy, unintermitted amusement, and frivolity; whilst men of business produce the same effect, by immersing themselves in worldly affairs, and schemes and speculations."[72] Better to put right fear in God.[73] His stress on a right use of time and life, as the context for thinking about mission, also comes through an evening lecture he gave at St. Thomas's Square, Hackney, on January 1, 1826. The talk was entitled "On Man's residence in the world"; his text, 1 Chronicles 19:15, "'*For we are strangers before thee, and sojourners, as were all our fathers: our days on earth are as a shadow, and there is none abiding*' (Heb. *expectation*.)." We have, he urges, quoting Boothroyd, "*No hope of abiding*." In the light of Christ's teaching and the shortness of life, we

---

[70] Ibid., 221.
[71] Ibid., 278.
[72] Ibid., 289.
[73] See ibid., 291ff.

should live obedient, dependent lives, shaped by God's will and purpose for mission.

> Some object to Christian Missions, on the fallacious supposition, that by enlightening other nations in the knowledge of the will of God, we shall make their condemnation the greater. But it is our *duty* to communicate to our fellow-residents in this transitory world, whatever we know of our Lord's will, and it is their duty to receive it . . . [lest] by keeping them in ignorance, as the supposition presumptuously and impiously supposes, we shall only by so doing, involve ourselves in the guilt of disobedience, disloyalty, and inhumanity; for our Lord's will is full of mercy and of kindness to all his creatures.[74]

And as he states later,

> Oh repine not at the afflictions which ye may be called to endure in this land, wherein ye are strangers and pilgrims. Be not impatient; be not like the Budhist of China, and the pleasure-sated, wearied, profligate of Europe, to call your existence a curse. Rather up and be active to do all the good possible here. Opportunities to do and to suffer for Jesus, will soon be over. Work therefore while it is day, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God, when ye shall attain to your eternal abode in heaven.[75]

Christian mission was, for Morrison, part of a Christian's service of God and neighbour.

Perhaps one of the most surprising and impressive themes in Morrison's sermons on mission is his stress on mission as *motivated by love*. In the part-sermon we have from his preaching at Mr. Stratten's Chapel on February 6, 1825, having considered missionary means, Morrison states: "The strongest motive I can suggest to you is, the love of Christ. Let that constrain you, and then your motives and practice will assuredly be exactly what they ought";[76] adding soberly,

> In the degree that we value Christian knowledge for ourselves, in the same degree shall we be anxious to communicate it to others. If we count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ, we shall consider the communication of that knowledge the greatest

---

[74] Ibid., 320, 321.
[75] Ibid., 329.
[76] Ibid., 123.

> good that we can possibly bestow on a fellow creature; and it is not only so, but it is likewise the most acceptable service that we can perform in the sight of God.[77]

The same theme appears at the same time in a sermon entitled "The Constraining power of the Saviour's Love," delivered at the Rev. Mr. Collison's Chapel, Walthamstow, on 2 Corinthians 5:13, 14, 15. Love, which he calls "the most powerful motive,"[78] not duty, zeal, a quest for power, or any other motive, should, he maintains, inspire all Christian relationships and actions, including mission. As he states graphically,

> A spirit of frigid philosophism, and visible disaffection to the Saviour, amounting sometimes to a palpable loathing, and dislike of the very mention of love to Christ, especially mark the formalist, the mere moralist, and the fallacious pretenders to a superior degree of rational Christianity.[79]

Without the love of Christ a person is, he says, "heretical and anti-christian," and forced, or fear-induced, conversions are very wrong. Morrison's lengthy missionary address at Rev. H. F. Burder's Chapel, St. Thomas's Square, Hackney, December 5, 1825, entitled "The Lord Christ's Command to Christianize all nations," on Matthew 28:18–20, "*And (Jesus) came unto them and said, Given unto me is all power in heaven, and earth; go ye therefore, and disciple all nations; baptizing them, and teaching them, to observe whatsoever I have commanded you*," likewise touches on love as motivating mission. Responding point by point to problems with, and objections to, British engagement with overseas mission, Morrison urges the need for an individual to respond to Christ, for Christ's example to be followed, for "darkness" everywhere to be exposed to the light of the Gospel, for overseas mission to be pursued despite the non-believers still in Britain, and for Churches to have mission at their core, and not just as a charitable extra. Love of God and neighbour "requires Missionary effort," he argues.[80] The best, most experienced, people, not the poor and illiterate, should be sent to new missions.

---

[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid., 208.
[79] Ibid., 207.
[80] Ibid., 309.

> Oh let fear and hope, gratitude and duty, and common-sense, all conspire to induce, in families and in churches, a ceaseless spirit of devotedness and personal sacrifice for the promotion of Zion's kingdom on earth, as it is in heaven . . . If there be any truth in the Bible, if our Christianity be not selfishness and hypocrisy, this devotedness were a chivalry at once rational and glorious. Away with those shameful complainings, which insinuate that too much is done for the King's cause. Away with those unbelieving anxieties, which belie the divine promises, and which virtually deny that those who honour God he will honour; and which assert that the seed of them who serve Him may be neglected by Providence.[81]

As the sabbatical sermons make clear, Morrison was far from being a cold, caustic character. His life and work in China had mellowed his tone and softened his edges.

Morrison also appeals to what we might call "the logic" of mission as *a deliberate sharing of Christian resources*. In another sermon at Mr. Stratten's Chapel, Morrison disagrees with an un-named Principal of a Scottish University, "that 'there is much still to be done at home; and whilst wants exist at home, it is Quixotic to send help abroad.'" "This tale is specious," Morrison declares, "and suits our selfishness."[82] On the contrary, he argues, though of course we are responsible for all we have, nevertheless out of the abundance of riches and Bibles in Britain, resources should be shared with others.

> Now, what does the Christian principle say—Shall I eat the whole of my scanty meal, and give my brother none? or shall I share it with him? I say, share it with him . . . Let it not be said of us—all seek their own edification only, not the enlargement of the Saviour's kingdom.[83]

Akin to this, the theme of living responsibly, to be able to live and give generously, is a recurrent motif in Morrison's sermons. Life-style matters. A sermon entitled "The cares of this life must not be excessive," delivered again at the Rev. H. F. Burder's Chapel, Thomas Square, Hackney, on August 18, 1825, on Luke 21:3, "*Take heed, lest your hearts be overcharged with the cares of this life*," insists the "cares of life" are universal, and should never be allowed to cause ingrati-

---

[81] Ibid., 311.
[82] Ibid., 124.
[83] Ibid.

tude for, or doubt in, God's gracious and promised provision. That said; Morrison was insistent throughout his sabbatical that the imposition of poverty on willing missionaries was neither loving nor appropriate. Rather, in this, as in mission strategy generally, sound, practical common-sense should guide implementation of biblical principles and practical distribution of resources. His essay *Hints on the means requisite to promote Christian knowledge throughout the world* (*APM* 356–66), sub-titled *On teaching all nations*, based on an exposition of Matthew 19:18–20, presses the case for thoughtful engagement with needs and strategies for missionary work. His essay begins,

> That it is the duty of the disciples of Jesus to teach the Christian religion to the whole world, is a principle that has been felt and acted on in the United Kingdom, within a few years past, more than at any former period. But that the duty is felt by the churches, to the degree which it ought, cannot yet be affirmed; nor has the *Christian* intellect of this land as yet engaged in the performance of the acknowledged duty, in a manner that is at all suitable to the disciples of that Master who claims are admitted to be divine.[84]

He urges the use of every means (especially printing, education and language learning), and the sharing of all resources, to advance the cause of Christian mission. Too narrow or restrictive a commitment to "preaching," he stresses, fails to grasp the complexity of overseas mission. Better preparation and support of missionaries will, he believes, increase the number and quality of those offering themselves for mission service.

Far from intending to create dependent national communities of Christians, Morrison holds to the LMS principle of seeking to inculcate national churches. Mission should, he urges in a number of sermons, be seen as *a means to build Christ's church*. His thinking here is of a piece with his theological position elsewhere; as he states, "The Church of Christ on earth has no exclusive home, but should *feel at home in any part of her Father's world*; and should *equalize* her care and anxieties for the good of the whole of mankind."[85] His sermon, "The Church Amiable," dated October 31, 1824, is a remarkably warm commendation of the community life of Christian people; his years of isolation in Canton and Macao had developed in him a rich appreciation for con-

---

[84] Ibid., 356.
[85] Ibid., 193.

gregational worship. To live for years among pagan temples inspires, he maintains, a greater love of God's house: as he points out, too,

> There is reason to apprehend, that even pious people do not usually value, as they deserve, the blessings derived to themselves and their children, from God's house of prayer, and Christian ordinances there dispensed; and this undervaluing of them arises, as is the case in other matters, from the abundance of the blessing.[86]

Likewise, in "Remarks on another occasion" appended to this sermon, he adds, "And there is one duty of which it becomes me to put you in mind, viz. that of assisting, as God shall give ability, to rear *tabernacles* dedicated to Jehovah, throughout the whole earth . . ."[87] Christian mission should "convey similar bliss to all mankind." As he urges, "There is no possible good work at all comparable to the originating, amongst any tribe of men, a Christian Church."[88] Though he often felt an outsider to Establishment Anglicanism, Morrison was never anything but a committed Churchman, and Christian mission arose out of this commitment to Christ's Church.

In the end, though, Morrison saw missionary motivation as *a matter of an individual's call and response to God*. It was, for him a "low," "personal" service: as he stated on one occasion, "No crusade is by me advocated; but, it is affirmed, every Christian ought to do his utmost to promulgate the Gospel."[89] Likewise in his *A brief inquiry into what may reasonably be expected of "Messengers or Apostles of the Churches," to the unevangelized nations*,[90] he recognizes different "gifts" and "offices" in the Church, as he had stressed many times when pressing for particular help in China. For Morrison is here, as in all things, a hard-headed realist, believing "theorists on the Missionary character, have worked it up to an utterly unattainable degree of ideal perfection,"[91] so that either people wait too long to offer themselves, or fail to send good people when they are available. Churches and mission societies should, he argues, work together with individuals to identify and fulfil their call from God.

---

[86] Ibid., 156.
[87] Ibid., 165f.
[88] Ibid., 166.
[89] Ibid., 193.
[90] See ibid., 379–98.
[91] Ibid., 384.

But much of his most powerful preaching is when he speaks from his own experience. His sermon at the Scotch Seceder's Chapel in April 1824, tells of how, "The first Protestant Chinese Missionary went quite alone,"[92] and how discouraging it was to be told in Britain to preach without people realising the "*labourious schooling* which a man must undergo before he can either teach or preach."[93] That said, he declares, "The Divine Providence has led him by a way he knew not, and in paths which could not be by us foreseen."[94] From his hard-won experience of learning Chinese he points out, "Missionary Societies do not, perhaps, lay stress enough on *furnishing the means* for a speedy and extensive acquisition of foreign languages by their Missionaries,"[95] and in his case he had had to find new means because in China because "we are . . . almost exclusively 'shut up'";[96] hence, the establishment of the Anglo-Chinese College, development of printing, and advocacy of the "Language Institution" in London. Mindful of his own finitude and fallibility, one of his last sermons in England, delivered at the Rev. J. Clayton, Junior's, Chapel, on February 26, 1826, entitled "The power of Christ resting on his people and servants, the only true cause of glorifying," and based on 2 Corinthians 12:9, "*Most gladly therefore will I rather* glory *in my* infirmities, *that the* power *of Christ may rest upon me*," stresses the sufficiency of Christ's grace for his life and work as a missionary. Rejecting perfectionism, he states,

> We sometimes have seen the necessary qualifications of Ministers and Missionaries drawn in such a high style of natural and intellectual, as well as moral and religious perfection, that I am sure no modest man could ever deem himself at all fitted for the service of his Lord . . .
>
> I infer, therefore, my brethren, that every one who professes a true *knowledge* of Christ's Gospel, unfeigned *love* to the Saviour, a sincere *desire to glorify Jehovah*, by receiving himself, and bearing to others the glorious Gospel of God, is justified in his endeavours to do so, and to hope that the Saviour's power will rest on him, whatever or however many soever his personal infirmities may be.
>
> In accordance with these principles, my brethren, your preacher

---

[92] Ibid., 109.
[93] Ibid., 118.
[94] Ibid., 105.
[95] Ibid., 110.
[96] Ibid., 115.

> ventured at first to undertake the work of an evangelist; on the same principles he has hitherto persevered in it, and those alone are the principles which still encourage him to go forward in the work. Pray for him that he may very gladly glory in infirmities, and may take pleasure in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, and in distresses for Christ's sake; and that the power of Christ, in all his journeyings, may overshadow him and perpetually *rest* upon him.
>
> Finally, brethren, farewell! Glory not in the supposed "*dignity* of human nature," but "glory in Christ."[97]

The sermon ends with the hymn:

> Let me hear my Saviour say,
> "Strength shall be equal to thy day,"
> Then I rejoice in deep distress,
> Leaning on all-sufficient Grace.
>
> I glory in infirmity,
> That Christ's own power may rest on me;
> When I am weak, then am I strong,
> Grace is my shield, and Christ my song.[98]

Morrison's personal embodiment of the principles for mission he articulated adds greatly to his reputation and authenticity. In the end, he understood that missionary motivation was a matter of will, as much as conscience and divine assistance. From his own experience, he knew that the work did not require perfection; it first required dedication.

CONCLUSION

Writing to Morrison on April 24, 1826, shortly before his departure, the Directors of the LMS addressed him in terms we now know he would have approved:

---

[97] Ibid., 353–55.
[98] Ibid., 355.

> May it appear, by the future dispensations of God, in the administration of his kingdom on earth, that he designed for you the exalted honour of being one of the earliest, most distinguished, and successful messengers of the genuine Gospel, to that vast portion of the human race . . . Be assured that, on our part, we feel the importance of that portion of the world, as a sphere for the exertions of our Society . . .[99]

On April 21, 1826, Morrison and his family travelled to Gravesend and boarded the *Orwell* for the last chapter of his life and work in China. The sabbatical ministry sealed Morrison's reputation in Britain. His tough, uncompromising views on missionary life, management and motivation, set a high bar for others to emulate or adjust thereafter.

---

[99] *Memoirs*, 2:313.

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 73–89

Christian Mission and Higher Education

A Case for the Study of World Christianity Today *

PETER TZE MING NG

A hundred years ago, John Campbell Gibson spoke at the Centenary Missionary Conference of 1907 at Shanghai. He referred to the forecast of William Milne (Robert Morrison's colleague) in his well known book, *Retrospect of the First Ten Years of the Protestant Mission to China* (1820). Judging by the progress made in the first decade of Morrison's work, Milne estimated that at the close of a century there would be one thousand Christians in China.[1] Gibson reported at the Centenary Conference that there were at least 180,000 Christians in China.[2] Gibson did not forecast what the second century would bring; if he had, he would certainly have underestimated the number as much as Milne had done a century ago.

Peter Tze Ming NG (WU Ziming 吳梓明) is professor in the Department of Cultural and Religious Studies at The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

* The present author would like to acknowledge the support of the Research Grants Council of Hong Kong, which provided an Earmarked Grant for the research project entitled "The Christian Dreams—Models of Christian Universities in East Asian Countries" (CUHK 4388/04H) in 2004–6. The present paper is part of the research output therefrom.

[1] It was reported in Edward Band, *Working His Purpose Out: The History of the English Presbyterian Mission, 1847–1947* (London: Presbyterian Church of England, 1972). See p. 326.

[2] See ibid., 326f.

The development of Christianity in China in the last fifty years has turned out to be a mystery and a "miracle" to many scholars. "Christianity Fever" was the term used by many scholars to describe the situation in China since the 1980s. According to the official statistics, there were ten million Protestants and four million Catholics in 1999, and in the year 2002 the Protestant population rose to 15 million.[3] Yet, we understand that these government figures, which include only officially registered believers, are normally regarded as very conservative. Though it is difficult to arrive at an exact figure, more significant is the fact that there were only 700,000 Protestants in China in 1949, shortly before China became a communist state. And in whatever ways we do the counting, we would find that the growth of Christian population in communist China is more than 60 times in 50 years. What happened in China in the past 50 years? To answer this question, we need to revisit the history of Christianity in China and try to make better sense of the development of Christianity before and after the establishment of the communist state in China in 1949. This paper is an attempt to do so. I shall attempt to reinterpret the history of Christian higher education in China in the light of our modern conception of World Christianity; namely to see how Christianity as a global religion has become localized in the Chinese contexts. The 200th anniversary of Robert Morrison's arrival in China is perhaps the best time for us to think again the Protestant mission history in China in the past two centuries and to explore what we can learn from the development of Christianity in modern China.

THE CHRISTIAN CASE IN CHINA REVISITED

While turning to the history of Christian mission in China with the lens of World Christianity today, I shall review the Christian mission in China by focusing on three topics: Christianity as a foreign religion, the quest for Chinese Christianity, and Christian higher education as a form of localized Christianity, hoping to demonstrate some points for our serious discussions.

---

[3] See, e.g., http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christianity_in_China (accessed 1 Feb. 2007).

1. Christianity as a Foreign Religion

As Christianity was preached to all parts of the world, it was claimed to be a world religion. The Christian movement was thus reckoned as a worldwide movement, namely, "for the evangelization of the whole world."[4] Yet, when it came to the Far East, it encountered totally different cultures and experienced cultural shocks. In her study of Christian colleges in China, Jessie Lutz described precisely such a situation, saying explicitly that the missionary educators were confronted by "the other-ness of Chinese culture and people" and were shocked to realize that "in China Western norms did not apply."[5] As a matter of fact, Christianity in China had long been seen by the Chinese people as a "foreign religion" so much so that it was described as "Western" Christianity, which "belonged to the West and was brought to China by the Westerners."[6] It was so recognized—precisely in our modern sense—as a "localized Christianity."[7] This also reminds us of another terminology invented by Roland Robertson in his theory of globalization, namely: "the particularization of universalism."[8] Hence, in describing the process of globalization of Christianity today, we cannot avoid identifying the particular, local contexts of Christianity in which it is represented, just as the Chinese have used the term "Western Christianity" to qualify one particular representation of Christianity brought from the West. This has truly been the experience of the Chinese, or more correctly the experience of Christianity in China. For many years, Christianity remained a foreign and heterodox religion in the minds of most Chinese people, and the saying "one more Christian, one less Chinese" verified that such understanding still prevailed. Worse still, lots of Chinese scholars were being criticized for a well-

---

[4] The missionary movement in the 19th and early 20th centuries was overwhelmed with the zeal to "evangelize the whole world in this generation." See, for instance, *Records of the General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China Held at Shanghai, May 10–12, 1877* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Missionary Press, 1878).

[5] Jessie Lutz, *China and the Christian Colleges, 1850–1950* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1971), 4–10.

[6] It should also be noted that "Western Christianity" may even better been seen as "Western Christianities," as there were indeed a multitude of representations of Christianity brought by the Western missionaries in China. See also my discussion in "The Necessity of the Particular in the Globalization of Christianity, the Case of China," *Studies in World Christianity* 12, no. 2 (2006): 164–82.

[7] See ibid.

[8] See Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Sacred Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage Publication, 1992), 64–81.

known book published by the China Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910, entitled *The Christian Occupation of China: A General Survey of the Numerical Strength and Geographical Illustration of the Christian Forces in China*.[9] This book was an attempt to gather all information, including statistical data about the total numbers of missionaries, mission stations, churches, schools, hospitals and believers; hence it is a very comprehensive report of the work of the missionaries in China. However, the title of the book reflected so clearly the great desires of the missionaries who wanted to conquer China with their missionary forces. The picture of a military campaign was so real that nationalistic Chinese had to stand up and condemn Christian missions as "the cultural arm of Western imperialism."[10] When discussing "The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Chinese Church" at the China National Council of Churches held in Shanghai in the early 1920s, T. C. Chao, a famous Chinese theologian echoed such a remark, saying: "The (Chinese) Church is weak because she is still foreign, both in thought and form, and is divided, by Western denominationalism."[11] Chao openly declared that the Western form of church life, especially "Western denominationalism," was a continuing embarrassment to the Chinese churches (simply because it was foreign and had not yet become indigenized). And he said firmly that there would not be any future for the Chinese Church unless she could do away with her image of "foreign religion" and wipe off her "Western denominationalism."[12]

When Christianity was brought to China, it was seen as foreign to Chinese culture and so was not recognized as "World Christianity"; it only qualified as "Western Christianity." That was how Chinese people knew about the Christian world movement and was also why Francis Wei, the first Chinese president of Central China University, deliberately distinguished "World Christianity" from "Western Christianity" when he gave his series of lectures as the first Henry Luce Visiting Professor of World Christianity in New York in 1945. Wei argued that

---

[9] See Milton T. Stauffer, ed., *The Christian Occupation of China: A General Survey of the Numerical Strength and Geographical Illustration of the Christian Forces in China* (Shanghai: China Continuation Committee, 1922).

[10] See ibid., xii. The accusation of "cultural arms" may be a bit too strong. The Christian mission was not a tool of imperialism; though unfortunately it had been tied to imperialism in China.

[11] See Zhao Zichen 趙紫宸 (T. C. Chao), "Zhongguo jiaohui de qiangdian yu ruodian" 中國教會的強點與弱點 [On the strengths and weaknesses of the Chinese Church], *Shengming yuekan* 生命月刊 3, no. 5 (January 1923): 1–8.

[12] See ibid.

"even when we are taking Christianity as a global (world) religion, the full expression of Christian faith needs to be in congruence with its specific contexts (which applies to Western as well as Chinese Christianities)."[13] On the other hand, Chinese Christians have already made it explicit that if Christianity wants to become "indigenous, Chinese Christianity," it has to take roots in China. A famous Chinese historian has said the following:

> The word "indigenous" (*pen-se*) essentially has the meaning of "home-grown," but since Christianity has been imported from the West, how is it possible to become a product of China? (He then tells the story of growing peanut in China and compared Christianity to the peanut.) The peanut, which we eat today, was at first called "eastern peanut" (because the seeds were originated from the West but sown and grown in the East). After only twenty years, there is no one around now who refers to it as "eastern peanut." In the same way Christianity will be sown and sprout on Chinese soil, and over time all of its Western features will be removed by natural selection. It will grow by absorbing the new nutrients provided by the Chinese soil and become a product "home-grown" in China that is (precisely what is meant by the word) "indigenized."[14]

This is indeed a very good analogy for our understanding of "indigenous Christianity." And we can now see more clearly why global Christianity has to be seen in its localized form. I shall come back to this issue of indigenous Christianity in the latter part of this paper. Meanwhile, we have noticed that it has taken over a century for our Christian Church to come to be aware of or to truly understand this truth. Now, we are in a much better position to understand that only when World Christianity—or the universal Christian faith—is distinguished from Western civilization, can we then talk adequately about Western and non-Western theologies/Christianities. And we would be struck to realize that it is of absolute necessity for scholars today to accept the mere fact that Western Christianity is just another form of localized Christianity.

---

[13] See *Wei Zhuomin jiaoyu wenhua zhongjiao lunwenji* 韋卓民博士教育文化宗教論文集 [Dr. Francis C. M. Wei's writings on education, culture, and religion] (Taipei: Huazhongdaxue Wei Zhuomin jinianguan, 1980), 132.

[14] See Wang Zhixin 王治心, "Benze jiaohui yu bense zhuzuo" 本色教會與本色著作 [The indigenous church and indigenous writings], *Wenshe yuekan* 文社月刊 1, no. 6 (March 1926): 21–34.

2. The Quest for Chinese Christianity

The development of Chinese Christianity could be traced back to the days of Karl Gutzlaff (1803–51), when he started the Chinese Union (Fuhanhui 福漢會) in 1844, which aimed at "evangelization of China by the Chinese."[15] The well-known principle of "Three-self," namely, "self-governing," "self-supporting" and "self-propagating," was commonly associated with Henry Venn (1796–1873), the honorary secretary of Church Missionary Society (1841–72), and Rufus Anderson (1796–1880), secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions since 1826 and corresponding secretary from 1832 to 1866. For both of them, the grand aim of missionary work was to build a genuinely native church in the mission fields. "The native church was . . . that it should potentially be a church of the country, a church that could become self-governing, self-supporting, self-extending."[16] However, though both spoke of the "Three-self" principles, they were, so to say, "mission administrators" only and the practice of "Three-self" had yet to be seen in specific mission fields.

Recently, scholars of Chinese Christianity such as George Hood[17] and David Cheung[18] have reported cases of "Three-self" churches in China. They both testify the fact that indigenous Chinese churches had already been formed around the time when Henry Venn and Rufus Anderson were formulating their "Three-self" principles. As Cheung reports, it was by the early spring of 1856 that the adult church mem-

---

[15] See e.g. Jessie Lutz and R. Ray Lutz. "Karl Gutzlaff's Approach to Indigenization: The Chinese Union," in *Christianity in China: From the Eighteenth Century to the Present*, ed. Daniel H. Bays (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996), 269–91.

[16] See e.g. Max Warren, *To Apply the Gospel: Selections from the Writings of Henry Venn* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1971), 26, 64ff.; and R. Pierce Beaver, ed., *To Advance the Gospel: Selections from the Writings of Rufus Anderson* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1967), 97.

[17] George Hood has been a missionary from Presbyterian Church of England. He went to Guangdong, China from 1945 to 1950 and later he served as East Asia Secretary for the Council for World Mission from 1972 to 1977 and he completed his doctoral research on Presbyterian Mission in South China at Birmingham University in 1985. See George A. Hood. *Mission Accomplished? The English Presbyterian Mission in Lingtung, South China* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1986).

[18] David Cheung (Chen Yiqiang 陳貽強) is a Philippine Chinese from Manila; he published his doctoral dissertation in 2004. It was a research he did at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London and Cheung was a student of Dr. Gary Tiedemann. In his book, Cheung reports the work of the missionaries in Amoy from the 1850s to the 1870s. See David Cheung, *Christianity in Modern China: The Making of the First Native Protestant Church* (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

bership at Sinkoe Chapel in Amoy had reached one hundred and ten; so the missionaries started in April the first instance of devolution in the church by the election of Chinese Christians as church elders and deacons. This signified a great move as it involved real power transfer and a real attainment of self-government in the Chinese Church.[19]

George Hood has also reported the case of the English Presbyterian Mission in Swatow which formed its self-governing presbytery in 1881 and ordained its first Chinese pastor in 1882.[20] It finally attained self-support status in 1907. Their leading missionary, John Campbell Gibson, was devoted to the cause and in 1907, at the Centenary Missionary Conference in Shanghai (where he was appointed the British Chair), he claimed that his English Presbyterians mission in Swatow had already achieved 80% self-supporting churches.[21] He even challenged the rest of the Church in China to achieve complete self-support within the next few years. These were successful cases of Chinese Christianity in the late 19th- and early 20th-century China.

John Gibson was the British Chair at the Centenary Missionary Conference in Shanghai in 1907, and he was also appointed as chair of the commission II on "The Church in the Mission Field" at the Edinburgh Missionary Conference in 1910. However, the situation changed at the Edinburgh Conference in 1910. The term "Native Church," which appeared in the agenda of the conference, was no longer used in Gibson's report. There Gibson explained:

> A phrase has crept into the agenda which is not used in the Report of the Commission, and for which the Commission is not responsible, I

---

[19] The devolution, as Cheung discovered, was neither due to the internal agitation on the part of the Chinese Christians, nor to the external anti-foreign pressures such as those of the 1920s in China. Indeed, it was the missionaries themselves who were committed to the first act of devolution as early as in 1856. There was a remarkable absence of home mission–native church friction, hence it demonstrated a peaceful and smooth process of devolution in China. See ibid., 13–14, 314.

[20] See Hood, *Mission Accomplished*, 138, 288.

[21] Gibson's missionary strategy was "to gather a small group of followers around him and rent space to hold religious services. As soon as the group grew to about 30 members, the foreign missionary would then began teaching them how to build a church organization of their own. The congregation would elect from among them a leader to conduct church affairs. After then, the missionary would go about other matters. As soon as two or three of these small churches were set up, they would then ordain a Chinese pastor for them." It was reported that there were 18 churches of this type in 1877 and the number grew to 137 by 1890. See J. C. Gibson, *Mission Problems and Mission Methods in South China* (London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1901); *Records of the General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1878, 1890).

> mean the phrase, "The Native Church." Now there is really in one sense no objection to that phrase, except that one might say that the Church of God is nowhere native to this earth, it is exotic everywhere. But the word "Native" to our shame—I speak of those of us who are Westerns—has been "soiled with all ignorable use" and we have thought it right to abstain from using the phrase, "The Native Church."[22]

His explanation seemed rather obscure and instead of using "native church" and "indigenous church," terms like "local church" and "church in the mission field" were adopted.[23]

Cheng Jingyi 誠靜怡 (known as C. Y. Cheng, 1881–1939) was one of the Chinese delegates who spoke at the Edinburgh Conference. He made a strong appeal for the development of indigenous churches in China. He hoped that "the China Mission" should soon become "the Chinese Church" and that "the Church in China" should soon become "the Church of China."[24] However, the missionaries at the conference did not hear what he said or they did not take his points. Much of the discussions in the conference were still on the issues of how to edify Christian believers and how to train native helpers, and of church disciplines such as mixed marriages between Christian and non-Christian families in Chinese churches. Some missionaries kept reporting that the Chinese converts could not meet the moral standards set by the missionaries so they could not be trusted. Hence, there was a consensus among the missionaries that the Chinese Church still needed the "correction, suggestion, illumination and guidance" of the Western missionaries and there would still be a long, long way to go for the development of indigenous church in China. One of the proposals made by the Edinburgh Conference was to cultivate better co-operation (unity) among all the Protestant denominations, hence the China Continuation Committee was set up to promote inter-denominational co-operation on the national level. However, the issue of the development of "native

---

[22] See the *Report of Commission II: The Church in the Mission Field* (Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1910), 340.

[23] It is surprising to find that Gibson changed his position in the 1910 conference. More study of his work is needed and I hope I could prepare another paper on him at the 2010 conference. For details, see ibid.

[24] See Cheng Ching-yi, "The Chinese Church in Relation to Its Immediate Task," *International Review of Missions* 1 (1912): 383–92. Cheng was later appointed to be a member of the Continuation Committee of the Edinburgh's International Missionary Council, which aimed to set up an organization emphasizing inter-denominational co-operation on the national level.

church" or "indigenous church" was evaded and there was no proposal whatsoever to bridge the gap between Chinese churches and foreign missionaries.[25]

Cheng was not frustrated at the result of the Edinburgh Conference. After his return to China, he started co-ordinating with Chinese Christians and planned for the formation of the National Christian Council (NCC) and the Church of China in China. In 1922, the NCC was formed and he was appointed as the first president of the NCC. Subsequently, the Church of Christ in China was in operation in 1927, which soon became the largest Protestant denomination in China, representing close to a quarter of China's Protestant churches.

Throughout the nineteenth century, the Protestant missionary movement in China was dominated by organized missionary societies, most of which (with the exception of the China Inland Mission) were agencies of mainline denominational churches in North America and Europe such as the Presbyterian, Anglican (Episcopalian), Congregational, Reformed, Lutheran, Methodist, and Baptist churches. But after 1900, there was a great increase in independent, local missionaries. Prof. Daniel Bays has cited from the report of the 1907 conference that the number of Protestant church members grew rapidly from 37,000 in 1889 to 178,000 in 1906 and he added a remark, saying: "the most important feature of this period was the growth of the spirit of independence in Chinese Protestant churches."[26] Bays then moved on to report the emergence of some of the independent Christian groups such as:

(a) The Chinese Christian Independent Church (Zhongguo Yesujiao zilihui 中國耶穌教自立會), formed by Yu Guozhen 俞國楨 in 1906;[27]

(b) The True Jesus Church (Zhen Yesu Jiaohui 眞耶穌教會), formed between 1917 and 1919;[28]

(c) The Jesus Family (Yesu jiating 耶穌家庭), formed by Jing Dianying

---

[25] See, e.g., *World Missionary Conference 1910, Report of Commission I* (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1910), 326.

[26] See Bays, *Christianity in China*, 307–16, esp. p. 308.

[27] Yu was formerly a Presbyterian pastor in Shanghai. The Chinese Christian Union was one of the all-Chinese, independent Christian groups in the early 20th century. It was out of this that a new federation of churches was formed, which was later known as the Chinese Christian Independent Church (Zhongguo Yesujiao zilihui).

[28] Dan Bays described it as Pentecostal, intense millennialism, highly exclusive and militantly anti-foreign. See Bays, *Christianity in China*, 311.

敬奠瀛 (1890–1953) in 1921 in the village of Mazhuang 馬莊, in Taian 泰安 county of Shandong 山東 Province;[29]

(d) The Assembly Hall (Juhuichu 聚會處 or Juhuisuo 聚會所) or "Little Flock" (Xiaoqun 小羣), formed in the mid-1920s under the leadership of Ni Tuosheng 倪柝聲 (Watchman Nee, 1903–72);

(e) The Spiritual Gifts Church (Ling'enhui 靈恩會), formed in the early 1930s after the revival movement in Shandong.[30]

Bays also drew our attention to some Chinese Protestant figures (revivalists) with a nationwide reputation, such as Ding Limei 丁立美 (1871–1936),[31] Wang Mingdao 王明道 (1900–1991),[32] Chen Chonggui 陳崇桂 (Marcus Cheng, 1884–1964), Song Shangjie 宋尚節 (John Song, 1901–44) and Ji Zhiwen 計志文 (Andrew Gih). They were powerful native preachers and evangelists and attracted many followers in China. Together with the Chinese churches mentioned above, their works had equally significant impact alongside with the work done by the Western missionaries in China. Western missionaries had been discussing for decades about the need for and possibility of the formation of Chinese churches or working towards the three-self goals, yet they were astonished to see that they could be realized, not by their missionary policies, but by means of these new forces and independent groups among the Chinese Christians.[33]

Our study of the history of Christianity had been focused too much on the missionary work in China, in such a way that Chinese Christians' efforts, especially their development of localized churches, have long been overlooked. There were at least three distinct groups of indigenous Christian movements in early-twentieth-century China. The first group was the work of Western missionaries such as the mainline denominational missionary societies and those treated by Cheung and Hood. The second group was the attempts to form indigenous churches

---

[29] One of my students has written a doctoral thesis on the Jesus Family. See Tao Feiya 陶飛亞, *Zhongguo de jidujiao wutuobang: Yesu jiating (1921–1952)* 中國的基督教烏托邦：耶穌家庭（1921–1952）[A Christian utopia in China: The Jesus Family (1921–1952)] (Hong Kong: Zhongwendaxue chubanshe, 2004).

[30] See Bays, *Christianity in China*, 310–13.

[31] Ting was famous as a YMCA evangelist in the 1910s.

[32] Wang was one of the best known evangelist in China and was put into prison by the government in the 1950s; he was not released until 1979.

[33] These local Christian movements became a significant sector of Chinese Christianity which survived and contributed much to the dynamism of Christianity in China even after the establishment of the communist state in 1949.

by Chinese Christians such as the Jesus Family led by Jing Dianying and the Assembly Hall and Little Flock led by Ni Tuosheng and others, as described by Bays. The third group was the Chinese Christians from the mainline churches who expressed a strong desire for the development of independent Chinese churches, such as those led by Cheng Jingyi at the NCC and the Church of Christ in China.[34] However, the development of indigenous Chinese churches was not as smooth as one might think. Hood has reported that the situation in China, especially during the 1920s, was not so favourable. The anti-Christian and anti-missionary movements had made the missionaries more cautious in keeping their properties and in transferring power and responsibilities to the Chinese Christians. Perhaps there were other reasons. The missionaries were so over concerned with how many converts they could make that they could not afford time for training local pastors or church leaders to take over the administration of the church. Or the missionaries still did not have enough confidence to transfer their power and responsibilities to Chinese leaders; hence they became a great hindrance to the development of indigenous churches in China.[35] Despite the efforts made by Chinese Christians in promoting indigenous Christianity in China, the conditions for the development of three-self churches was

---

[34] It should be noted that the missionaries had long been reckoning the "unequal treaties" as guarantee and protections for all missionary activities in China. It would be extremely difficult for the missionaries to understand the feelings of the Chinese Christians who demanded a truly Chinese church independent of foreign control. When the Chinese were asking for it, the missionaries were afraid that the Chinese were seizing power, hence they could not give up their powers.

[35] For instance, Gutzlaff once developed the fastest method to gain Chinese converts, by hiring Chinese evangelists to preach the simple gospel to their own people. But, later the method was found merely romantic and wishful thinking as the Chinese evangelists so hired were not doing the proper jobs as expected. Their travel accounts were not so reliable as Gutzlaff thought. The missionaries were so to say cheated by their Chinese helpers and plus the distorted interpretation of Christianity by the Taiping Rebellion (1850–64), the missionaries had lost their confidence in passing on all duties to the Chinese, even to their church members. So later, even when they were helping the Chinese Christians to develop self-supporting churches, they were still not willing to surrender all of their control over the church matters. Another fatal fact was that the missionaries had been expanding their mission work to include educational and social services such as schools, hospitals and literary presses, in such a way that the mission field would in no way be self-supporting by native Christians, but rather be perpetuating their dependence upon foreign support. See e.g. the discussions by David Cheung, *Christianity in Modern China*, and also Jessie Lutz, "Missionary Attitude toward Indigenization Within an Overall Context," in *Jidujiao yu Zhongguo bensehua: Guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 基督教與中國本色化：國際學術研討會論文集, ed. Peter Chi-ping Lin (Taipei: Yuzhouguang chubanshe, 1990), 356–81; and T. C. Chao, "Christian Faith in China's Struggle," in *Christian Voices in China*, ed. Chester S. Miao (New York: Friendship Press, 1948), 28.

even worse, not least because other factors like the breaking out of the Sino–Japanese War in the 1930s, World War II in the 1940s, and the Civil War in China immediately after the World War. Then came the communist rule of China since 1949 and the subsequent Korean War in the early 1950s. There was not much space for the Church in the mission field to develop proper indigenous Christianity. Hence, Hood says:

> However completely the Church in Lingdong might have achieved self-government, self-support and self-propagation, and however willingly the missionaries present in 1950 might have been to continue working with their Chinese colleagues under the authority of the Chinese Church, it seems today that without experiencing the complex break with the Mission which was made in 1951, the (Chinese) Church would not have been liberated from the past to achieve a new understanding and experience of its selfhood.[36]

The history of China has shown us that such a break was needed in order that Chinese Christianity could really stand on its own. Anyway, the experience of Chinese Christianity, especially in its development in the last fifty years, witnesses to us that such a break was painful but essential for the realization of indigenous Christianity in China. This is still relevant to those who are concerned with contemporary Christian mission.

When China was re-opened to the outside world, Bishop K. H. Ting led the China Christian Council, which he created in 1980, to its renewal of fellowship with Christian churches overseas. He began contacts with Bishop Gilbert Baker of the Hong Kong Anglican Diocese, the Right Honourable Robert Runcie, the then Archbishop of Canterbury in England in 1981. He paid visits in the following years to various countries including the United Kingdom (1982), Switzerland (1983), Australia (1984), Japan (1984), India (1985), Canada (1985), and Hungary (1986).[37] In re-establishing international fellowship with overseas Christian churches, Bishop Ting gained back their recognition and respect for the legitimate status of the Three Self Patriotic Protestant Churches and the China Christian Council. The worldwide Christian community began to re-evaluate and recognize the work of the

---

[36] See Hood, *Mission Accomplished*, 307.

[37] See reports from Ding Guangxun 丁光訓 (K. H. Ting), *Dangdai Zhongguo jidujiao fayanren Ding Guangxun wenji* 當代中國基督教發言人丁光訓文集 [The spokesman of contemporary Chinese Christianity: collection of Bishop K. H. Ting's essays] (Hong Kong: Wenyi chubanshe, 1999).

Three Self Movement in China in the past thirty years. As a result, the Three Self Movement is respected as an essential part of Christian movement of China, which is significant for the historical development of indigenous Christianity in China.

3. *Christian Higher Education as a Form of Localized Christianity*

I may now turn to the field of Christian higher education, which would illustrate precisely how the process of localization took place in one of the Christian enterprises in China. When the missionaries came to China, they built mission schools to edify Christian believers and train native helpers. From the perspective of "World Christianity," Western Christian education, which is vested with full consciousness of being global and universal, has to adapt to Chinese local contexts and take into serious consideration the relevance of the Chinese language and cultures, so much so that, as a result, it would develop a new form of Christian education with local, Chinese characteristics.

There are many examples in the history of Christian higher education in China which can be used as illustrations. For instance, there is the issue concerning the medium of instruction. When the early missionaries became involved in Christian education, they paid much attention to the medium of teaching. Should they use the international language which were in common usage among the missionaries themselves (i.e., global English), or should they use the current language used by the local people (i.e., local Chinese)? The discussion on this issue was quite vociferous. At the first General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries in China held in Shanghai in 1877, there was much discussion on this topic.[38] At that time the most important reason for using English as the medium of instruction was that the early missionaries thought that Christianity was part of Western culture, and they looked upon Chinese culture as heretical. Therefore the missionaries were not in favour of the Christians learning Chinese in order that they might not be influenced by a heretical culture. However, some missionaries at that time opposed to the use of English as the medium for teaching. They thought that using the local language would help the Chinese people to accept Christianity more easily. Although they knew

---

[38] Cf. *Records of the General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China Held in Shanghai, May 10–23, 1877* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1878).

that the use of English would attract more students to the mission schools, their purpose in attending those schools was to learn English rather than to gain knowledge about Christianity. Perhaps from the World Christianity perspective the missionaries could come to realize what had become increasingly apparent, that is, "the global must become local." The missionaries who had advocated the use of English as the medium of instruction represented those who placed more emphasis on the global aspect of Christianity, whereas those who now advocated the use of Chinese represented the stance of the "local." More important, however, was an emphasis on the proper interplay between the two, whether one opts for the "global" language or the "local" language. The second General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries in China was held in Shanghai in 1890.[39] After a serious discussion of the matter over the two conferences, there were a growing number of missionaries who were of the opinion that Chinese should be adopted as the proper medium of instruction.[40] In other words, a global Christian education should aim at training personnel who are well acquainted with the local language and with the grasp of Chinese literature and classics, so that they could have more influence on the Chinese society. The missionaries who advocated the use of Chinese as the medium of instruction clearly understood how important it was that "the global must become local" in missionary education. Finally, due to the interplay between the global and the local demands, the missionaries resolved to strike the balance and create a bilingual way of teaching in their Christian colleges.

The second area concerns the subjects taught in Christian higher education. Although the subjects of most Church colleges were divided into three parts: religious education (including both the curricular and extra-curricular activities), Chinese classics and Western scientific knowledge, religious education definitely held the primacy of importance in the curriculum. Religion was a required course and if a student failed to pass this subject, he/she would not be promoted.[41] Besides, students were required to attend the daily worship and the worship service on Sunday. Most schools also held evangelistic meetings once or twice a year, which the students were required to attend. However, the missionaries gradually realized that the colleges could not just offer

---

[39] Cf. *Records of the General Conference of the Protestant Missionaries of China Held in Shanghai, May 7–20, 1890* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Press, 1890).

[40] Cf. Calvin Mateer, "How May Educational Work be Made to Advance the Cause of Christianity in China," in ibid., 456–67.

[41] Cf. Lutz, *China and the Christian Colleges*, 71–72.

Western sciences and religious education. They must pay more attention to Chinese language, culture and national studies in their curriculum.[42] In the field of religion, courses on other religious traditions should be offered, such as the Religious Thought of Confucius, Buddha, Taoism and Zhuangzi. There would also be some comparative studies of these systems of thought via-à-vis Christianity. For instance, since the 1920s, Yenching University offered such elective courses as "Religious Ideas in Ancient Chinese Poetry," "Indian Philosophy," "Modern Religious Thought," "Buddhism," "Taoism," "Islam" and "Confucianism."[43] Actually comparative religion courses were on offer in American colleges only since the 1960s, but due to the demands from China's special contexts, such courses were already developed in Christian universities in China as early as in the 1920s.[44] Moreover, from the 1920s onwards, Christian universities in China began to offer professional courses and programmes other than theology or religious education. Examples of these are University of Nanking's agriculture and forestry programme, Lingnan University's agricultural programme, Soochow University's programme of law, Yenching University's journalism and sociology programmes, and Central China University's library science courses.[45] Again, looking at it from the World Christianity perspective, we may say that even though Christian universities in China adopted the Western style of education as representing the global/international aspect of Christian higher education in China, they still had to encounter challenges from the local contexts and undergo a process of glocalization when being challenged by the special needs of the Chinese society. Hence, "the global must become localized." Indeed, the "local contexts" become the qualifier of global Christianity. This is at least what we can learn from the missionary experiences in China. Christian universities in China gradually implemented a more pluralistic approach to curriculum development rather than being con-

---

[42] For further discussion, see Tao Feiya and Wu Ziming (Peter Tze Ming Ng), *Jidujiao daxue yu guoxue yanjiu* 基督教大學與國學研究 (Fuzhou: Fujian jiaoyu chubanshe, 1998).

[43] Cf. the Yenching University materials in the archives of Peking University, e.g., *Yenching University Bulletin—Colleges of Arts and Letters, Announcement of Courses, 1929–1930* (Yj29022). For a discussion of the topic, the reader is referred to "Cong zongjiao jiaoyu dao zongjiao yanjiu: Yanjingdaxue zongjiao jiaoyu de kaocha" 從宗教教育到宗教研究：燕京大學宗教教育的考察, in Wu Ziming [Peter Tze Ming Ng], *Jiduzong jiao yu Zhongguo daxue jiaoyu* 基督宗教與中國大學教育 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehuikexue chubanshe, 2003), 56–81.

[44] Ibid.

[45] See also the discussion by Jessie Lutz, *China and the Christian Colleges*.

fined to the provision of theology and Christian religious education. This transformation was no doubt due to the active interplay between globalization and localization in China.

Indeed, there is still much to be found in the experiences of Christianity in China. To give another example, I may cite the Yale-China Association. It was formed in 1901 by the students and faculty of Yale University, in response to the Boxers' Uprisings in China. It was part of the Student Volunteering Movement in America, which aimed at the evangelization of the whole world in this generation, hence the realization of Christianity as a world religion. However, when it came to China, there was an active interplay between the global and the local and the subsequent changes of its name demonstrate vividly such an interplay. The original name of the society was "Yale Foreign Missionary Society in China," which expresses its intention to be part of the Christian world missionary movement. But as it came to China, its name was later changed to "Yale Mission in China." The name was shortened but the nature of doing "mission" work remained unchanged. As the society became more and more concerned with education and medical services rather than merely evangelization in China, there was a decision in 1914 to take away the word "mission" in its name, hence "Yale-in-China" was used to replace "Yale Mission in China." Later, as the relationship between Yale and China became closer, the name was changed to "Yale-China" and the middle word "in" was dropped; the society became known as "Yale-China Association." This is an interesting development to be noted.[46] Also, its Chinese names reflect how the society has become a more sinicized organization in China, as "Yale-in-China" was known in Chinese as "Yali xuehui" 雅禮學會 and the Chinese name of the "Yale-China Association" is "Yali Zhongguo xiehui" 雅禮中國協會.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The study of missionary experiences is indeed a good learning experience for our historians today. Especially if we revisit the history of Chinese Christianity and the development of Christian mission in

[46] For more details, see Reuben Holden, *Yale in China: The Mainland, 1901–1951* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale in China Association, 1964), 77–79.

China from the World Christianity perspective, we will find that the concept of glocalization is indeed a helpful tool for the study of both the local and global aspects involved, as well as the concepts of "globalization" and "localization," and "the interplay between the global and the local" for our study of Christian mission in China. From the study above, it becomes clear that the phrase "Christianity in local contexts" implies precisely that we have to take "local contexts" as the qualifier of World Christianity. We need also to recognize the significance and the uniqueness of local experience for our understanding of World Christianity today. By applying the concept of glocalization to our research in Christian mission in China, we have also raised it to a new academic field of study. More significantly, we are opening up a vast area of historical experiences in Chinese Christianity, which could answer some concrete questions brought up by our present day academic circles regarding the future trend of globalization.

On the other hand, there has been much discussion on the concept of "World Christianity" and "Teaching Christianity in a Global Context" today, but we must say that significant lessons can also be drawn from our missionary experiences in the past centuries. We can indeed discover a lot more truths from our study of the Christian world movement in the past centuries. And the case of China only serves as an illustration and similar truths can also be found in other countries.[47]

Once again, this confirms the words of Prof. Andrew Walls, who says:

> The missionary movement was a great learning experience for Western Christianity. For those engaged in it, it was a process of discovery . . . It is no accident that one outcome of the process was a challenge to many of the assumptions . . . about the values of Western society, and, eventually, about the adequacy of Western theology. Part of the story of the missionary movement as learning experience is the creation of an instrument for Western self-criticism.[48]

---

[47] See e.g. my discussion in "Teaching Christianity in a Global Context in China," *Quest* 4, no. 1 (November 2005): 111–29.

[48] See Andrew F. Walls, *The Cross-cultural Process in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission and Appropriation of Faith* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2002), 258.

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 91–116

In the Eye of a Tornado

Lessons to Be Learned from Critiques of Christian Missionaries

LAUREN F. PFISTER

CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES UNDER SEVERE SCRUTINY

While reflections on the 200th anniversary of Morrison's arrival in southeastern China should rightly reconsider the historical and cultural significance of that singular event, I would like to consider a selection from a wider range of missionaries—both European and North American Protestant and Catholic missionaries in China during both the 19th and 20th centuries—in the light of three critical interpretive perspectives. While it is right to underscore some of the immense intellectual, spiritual and inter-cultural contributions that a good many of these religious figures made during the past 200 years, I sense that there are some important and revealing lessons for us to learn when missionaries' lives and works are weighed also in the light of Chinese Marxist criticisms, Orientalist evaluations, and post-colonial reflections.[1]

Lauren F. PFISTER is professor in the Department of Religion and Philosophy at Hong Kong Baptist University.

[1] Here I prefer to keep the hyphen in the term "post-colonial," reflecting the more narrow and historically appropriate meaning of this term rather than its "postcolonial"

To choose this particular approach is often difficult for the researcher, as it certainly has been for me, because it requires at times a will to listen accompanied by no small amount of patience and courage to ask tough questions. It is like standing in the eye of a tornado, watching from within that eerily calm haven the terrifying effects of the whirling winds which are tearing other things apart before one's very eyes. Nevertheless, this interpretive challenge is taken up in order to follow initially harsh and sometimes seemingly unfair arguments to their conclusions, leading to a new understanding (or at least a broader grasp) of what these critical arguments intend to claim as well as what they might reveal or leave unaddressed. This has not been an easy hermeneutic or dialogic task for me personally, and so I must appeal to colleagues from the very beginning for your patience and constructive criticisms.[2] As a result, in pursuing this route of discussion I believe it hermeneutically proper to indicate from the very beginning that I have found good reasons not to accept these critical perspectives as the only valid ways to assess missionary activities and their literary output.[3]

---

extension into many other contexts that were not actually colonized or even semi-colonized. Reflections on the significance of this shift in meaning have been discussed by Bill Ashcroft, who edited a "post-colonial studies reader" in 2003 and was the first to make me sensitive to that difference. See his "On the Hyphen in 'Post-Colonial,'" *New Literature Review* 32 (1996): 23–31.

[2] The ill-at-easeness I have felt came in part because I was not originally trained as a historian, though I have taken historical cases seriously in all of my philosophical and religious research, and because of the rigorous hermeneutic training I received from a Protestant seminary (Denver Seminary, established by the Conservative Baptist denomination) in the USA in the 1970s. Also, I needed to learn more about Marxism of various sorts, particularly once I came into the Chinese world to teach, to learn much more from Chinese sources about various aspects of Maoist doctrines and subsequent developments. Most of my learning in this realm has not come from contemporary political studies, but from studies in the history of Chinese philosophy and, even more specifically, translation work involving Feng Youlan's 馮友蘭 mature analysis of Mao's role in the contemporary developments of Chinese philosophy in the seventh and last volume of Feng's *Zhongguo zhexueshi xinpian* 中國哲學史新篇 (*New Edition of a History of Chinese Philosophy*), published independently in Hong Kong in 1992 as *Zhongguo xiandai zhexueshi* 中國現代哲學史 (*A History of Contemporary Chinese Philosophy*). In this process I have benefited from discussions and correspondence with a number of Chinese philosophers and intellectuals over the past twenty years, a good number of European sinologists, and a few special graduate students whom I have had the privilege to engage on a deeper level. Some of their names and works will be referred to in subsequent footnotes.

[3] In the conclusion to my two volume study of James Legge (Li Yage 理雅各, 1815–97), I have addressed explicitly the Orientalist critique. In this I share with Norman Girardot the use of a new term, "Sinological Orientalism," in talking about Legge's own way of addressing issues that have been highlighted by critical Orientalist scholarship. Because Legge lived in Hong Kong during its colonial period, and offered his own critical Christian views of classical Ruist ("Confucian") and Daoist teachings, there

Nevertheless, over the years of my own efforts in research into cross-cultural religious and philosophical dimensions in the works of "missionary-scholars,"[4] I have become sensitized to insights and challenges drawn from these interpretive perspectives—some are undeniably negative and critical, while others are ultimately positive because of what is revealed in the process of research and reflection as unanticipated by such forms of critical hermeneutics (reflecting their inherent "hermeneutics of suspicion"). As a consequence, I find they have helped me "see" what may be camouflaged, hidden, or left unaddressed in studies relying on other interpretive standpoints. For this purpose, I would like to share some of these matters and offer them for colleagues' consideration.

CHINESE MARXIST CRITICISMS

Obviously, sources for Chinese Marxist criticisms of Christian foreign missionary activities and Chinese Christian persons and institutions are numerous, multiform, and ideologically motivated. They were preceded by traditional forms of criticisms,[5] but sharpened by Marxist historical materialism and its principled rejection of religious life as anything authentic or constructive. A representative figure in the recent

---

are patterns of thought in certain of his works that also reflect various levels of colonial influences as well as anticipate Chinese Marxist critiques of these same traditions. See my *Striving for "The Whole Duty of Man": James Legge and the Scottish Protestant Encounter with China* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2004), 2:221–43.

[4] Those persons I would count as "missionary-scholars" are Chinese missionaries who applied systematic methods to understand Chinese texts and persons, and so were able to produce important interpretive materials that often became foundational for sinological studies in both European and North American university settings. The key foreign missionaries whom I have studied over a period of about two decades from this angle have all been Protestants, and include James Legge, John Chalmers (Zhan Yuehan 湛約翰, 1825–99), Ernst Faber (Hua Zhian 花之安, 1839–99), and Richard Wilhelm (Wei Lixian 尉禮賢 [the family name changed to 衛 after 1924], 1873–1930).

[5] Such as Chinese scholars' criticisms of Catholic doctrines, as found in the published polemical writings of Chinese Catholic intellectuals such as Xu Guangqi 徐光啟, Li Zhizao 李之藻 and Yang Tingyun 楊廷筠, as well as in the caricatures promoted in popular literature and inflammatory rhetoric displayed in derogatory placards spread throughout various regions of the late Qing empire, documented in Paul A. Cohen's relatively early work entitled *Christianity and Christianity: The Missionary Movement and the Growth of Chinese Anti-foreignism, 1860–1870* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963).

Chinese Marxist critique of Christian missionaries, whose works have had an undeniably important impact on this dimension of the study of Christianity in late 20th- and early 21st-century Chinese intellectual circles, is Gu Changsheng 顧長聲. A historian by training and Seventh Day Adventist in background,[6] Gu became known initially for his critical assessments of Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox and Protestant missionaries through two major Chinese works[7]—*Missionaries and Modern China* (*Chuanjiaoshi yu jindai Zhongguo* 傳教士與近代中國) and *From Robert Morrison to Leighton Stuart: Critical Biographies of Protestant Missionaries Who Came to China* (*Cong Ma Lixun dao Situ Leideng: lai Hua xinjiao chuanjiaoshi pingzhuan* 從馬禮遜到斯徒雷登——來華新教傳教士評傳).[8] Gu's works contain a relatively more informed basis for historical judgments, applying Marxist and other ideological critiques to these materials, but also adjusting in various degrees over time toward a culturally sensitive reading of texts after he had access to even more original sources and opportunities to dialogue with other non-Chinese scholars.[9] Other revealing perspec-

---

[6] I want to thank Prof. Philip Wickeri for informing me about Gu's religious background. Though some may find it strange that those with a particular monotheistic religious background could also employ Marxist critiques in their assessment of 19th-century Protestant Christian missionaries, this kind of self-critique of one's own or similar religious traditions by indigenous scholars is not only done in China, but also in other traditions where colonialism and/or imperialism have been at work (such as in the cases of those who espouse liberation theology). Though there are far more "traditional" forms of principled Marxist criticisms based on straightforward atheistic critiques of the "distorted and reversed worldview" inherent in any religious consciousness, I know of no other Chinese scholar influenced by Marxist ideology for so many years who has also produced monograph length studies of Christian missionaries in China. The further fact that each version of Gu's monograph has been published many times within mainland China makes his work also a representative piece, representative because it was accepted in each version by political censors at various times and has been read by many Chinese intellectuals.

[7] More cautiously, one should say that Gu's writings provide very little information about the Russian Eastern Orthodox missionaries, because there were relatively few materials to reflect upon. The details in most of his studies reflect an abiding interest in Protestant missionaries and their societies from Europe and North America, while there are also a good number of brief references to various earlier Roman Catholic (and especially Jesuit) missionaries in China during the mid and late Ming dynasty. Though he does mention a number of Catholic orders and some of their key institutional involvements in the Qing and post-Imperial periods, his emphatic focus of study has been the Protestant missionaries and their traditions.

[8] *Chuanjiaoshi yu jindai Zhongguo* 傳教士與近代中國, 1st ed. (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1981); *Cong Ma Lixun dao Situ Leideng: lai Hua xinjiao chuanjiaoshi pingzhuan* 從馬禮遜到斯徒雷登——來華新教傳教士評傳 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1985).

[9] The first volume mentioned above has now appeared in three different editions (1981, 1991 and 2004), and has progressively involved revisions that require more careful

tives can also be gleaned from the study of other documents, political and literary, but I will take up the work of Gu Changsheng as sufficiently representative for this realm of critical assessments of Christian missionaries.[10]

In a synoptic statement added to the third edition of his *Missionaries and Modern China* (2004), revealing a more balanced assessment of Christian missionary activities from the late 16th century to the mid-20th century, Gu Changsheng first lists six wide ranging cultural contributions, followed by six thoughtfully stated negative judgments, several of which include quotations from biblical sources to justify his assessments also on the grounds of what are understood to be parts of a value system reflecting a Christian worldview.[11] To these he adds a Chinese translation of a statement published by the National Committee of American Protestant Churches dated August 31, 1951, which includes a similar list of positive and negative assessments of American

---

comparative study than I have been able to complete so far. The most obvious changes are the addition of two chapters in the second edition (chapters 16 and 17) dealing with the translation and distribution of the Chinese Bible (pp. 431–49) and the role of missionaries in modern Sino–Western cultural exchanges (pp. 450–60). How much of the main text previous to the addition of these chapters was changed in both the second and third editions should be studied, but it is not obvious that very much has changed, in spite of the claims made by the author in the additional preface accompanying the second edition. In the third edition published in Shanghai in 2004, an additional subsection is added to the 17th chapter, constituting a critical response to the section regarding Protestant activities in the Qing dynasty in *The Cambridge History of Late Qing China* in five pages. Much more significantly, Gu added to this third edition a brief but very significant 18th chapter, entitled "Chuanjiaoshi dui Zhongguo de gongxian yu cunzai de wenti" 傳教士對中國的貢獻與存在的問題 (What missionaries contributed to China and remaining problems) (pp. 430–35). It is this final addition which will be a source of numerous reflections in the balance of this paper.

[10] From political sides, there have been a good number of works considering the political repercussions of the early Rites Controversy among Catholic missionaries (focusing at times on the interactions between the papal authorities and the Ming and Qing imperial courts) as well as the unequal treaty period (focusing on the "religious cases" [*jiaoan* 教案] and various wars that took place (with the Opium Wars of 1839–42 and 1858–60 and the Boxer Rebellion of 1900–1901 taking precedence due to the massive scale of their destructive impact). More recent studies about the legal conditions of religious citizens in the People's Republic of China have been documented with great detail and insight by the recently deceased Donald E. MacInnis (1920–2005). From the angle of Chinese literature touching biblical themes, the recent collection of essays by Marián Gálik illustrates how this can be a very revealing area of study. See his *Influence, Translation and Parallels: Selected Studies on the Bible in China* (Sankt Augustin: Monumenta Serica Institute, 2004). Footnotes in this volume identify not only many Chinese sources, but also other similarly minded sinologists whose works have significant interpretive influences.

[11] This and the following descriptions refer to the 18th chapter of Gu's *Chuanjiaoshi yu jindai Zhongguo*, 3rd ed. (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 2004), 430–35.

Protestant Christian missionary activities and institutions in China.[12] Significantly, these involve seven positive and seventeen negative "instructive lessons" (*jiaoxun* 教訓) to be drawn from the general experience of American missionaries in China over an unspecified period of time. A final paragraph reflects briefly on the departure of foreign missionaries from Mainland China between 1948 to 1951, and the subsequent stabilization and growth of Chinese Christian church communities in the later 20th and early 21st century.[13]

Foreign Christian Missionaries and Their Questionable Political Involvement

Certainly one of the major criticisms of Chinese Marxist critiques of Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries has been their collusion with European and North American governments during and after their stay in Chinese contexts as missionaries. Among Gu Changsheng's six criticisms of Christian missionary activities, four of them relate to different aspects of Christian missionaries working in conjunction with foreign political powers.[14] This political connection is sometimes

---

[12] Unfortunately, Gu provides no footnote to indicate the archival or published source for this document, or any further assessment of the authors or background of this summary statement.

[13] In regard to the extent of the growth of Christian communities, Gu indicates that between 1950 and 2004 they increased tenfold in numbers, from just over three million to a total of 30 million. There is no documentation he offers for these numbers, though it would be considered a conservative estimate by other scholars. This issue is a matter of great contention among all sources, because of the diversity of accounts of those who make guesses about the number of non-authorized or semi-authorized Christian communities in other parts of China. For example, David Barrett and his collaborators assert in their *World Christian Encyclopedia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) that the numbers they estimate (including categories of sectarian groups not normally associated with any orthodox strand of Christianity in general) stand at above 85 million.

[14] These involve his first three and the fifth points. The first indicates strategies seeking to obtain power through association with governing authorities or by means of military action against those Chinese or Manchurian governing authorities; the second refers to the use of force and even "tit-for-tat" measures that encouraged some Chinese Christians (especially during the Boxer Uprising) to become involved in violence against perceived non-Christian Chinese "enemies"; the third involves a certain group of missionaries who served as informants and military advisors for their own countries' military leaders and governments, and so taking part in the colonial intention to "split China up" among various foreign powers; the fifth point opposes the imperialist intentions of some missionaries who took no regard for the separation of church and state, which Gu takes to be a fundamental biblical principle. These com-

overlooked or even praised as appropriate by foreign writers when dealing with these missionaries' lives, but from a critical perspective adopted by Marxist Chinese scholars, this choice of mixing Christian missionary work with specific foreign national interests has always led to deep suspicions about the real motivations behind various missionary institutions and enterprises. In the following I will make a few representative points on this score in an outline form.

Issue: Government collusion and political critiques of religious missionaries.

1. Roman Catholic missionaries associated with the Vatican as a political and religious entity, a constant source of critique and trauma for those missionaries and their converts, especially after 1949. French government support for Catholic missionaries was also a well-understood feature of the unequal treaty period, and complicated matters for those missionaries especially during times of unrest (such as the Boxer Rebellion).
2. Protestant missionaries not always free from political involvement. It is clear that those who learned Chinese well were regularly sought out for helping their governments as political officials. Many of their children married into families with consular figures, many of whom were themselves also Protestant Christians.[15] But the most blatant examples are those such as
   - Karl Gützlaff (Carl Gutzlaff), who worked with the British military and served as a military governor in an island off of Shanghai, setting up his own spy network (as described in detail by Arthur Waley[16])

---

ments are found in Gu Changsheng, *Chuanjiaoshi yu jindai Zhongguo* (3rd ed.), 431–32.

[15] This was especially true of the children and other relatives of the earliest missionaries, starting in the 1840s and extending till at least the period following the "second" Opium War of 1860. Documentation of this trend can be followed in the British context, which certainly had the most extensive colonial government bureaucracy in the world within the 19th century, in P. D. Coates' encyclopedic work, *The China Consuls: British Consular Officers, 1843–1943* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1988).

[16] See Arthur Waley, *The Opium War through Chinese Eyes* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1958). This work is unusual for Waley, because he normally remained attached to translating ancient Chinese poetry along with a few pre-Imperial Ruist ("Confucian") and Daoist scriptures. Apparently the matter became so significant to him that he could not resist writing about it. Significantly, I know of at least one reprinting by Stanford University Press that appeared in 1968, and so it seems the volume touched

- Those associated with missionaries and serving as translators and treaty negotiators in the early years, such as John Robert Morrison (son of Robert Morrison)[17] in relation to the 1842 Treaty of Nanjing, and Horatio Nelson Lay (son-in-law of James Legge), who was heavily involved in the Tianjin Treaty of 1860.[18]
- Peter Parker and Leighton Stuart, after leaving their posts as missionaries, becoming (US) consulate figures with Christian interests.

These facts require of those of us who study Christian missionaries a more serious reconsideration of the relationship between foreign missionaries and their government officials and the implications that these carried for indigenous Christian communities in late Imperial China. Admittedly, what this Marxist position may simply overlook are those few missionaries who chose to leave their ecclesiastical posts and work instead for institutions either supported by the Qing government or as part of the Ming and Qing political institutions themselves—something which would be almost completely unanticipated by this kind of Marxist criticism. Nevertheless, even in spite of the unusual careers of certain persons—such as the former American missionary W. A. P. Martin (Ding Weiliang 丁韙良), who later became the Director of the Imperial Translation School (Tongwen guan 同文館);[19] the significant number of Jesuits who served in the Astronomy Bureau of the Ming and Qing imperial courts[20] (especially Johann Adam Schall von Bell [Tang Ruowang 湯若望, 1591–1666] and Ferdinand Verbiest [Nan Huairen 南懷仁,

---

a theme that ultimately received significant attention within Anglophone audiences.

[17] This fact I learned through reading an essay about John Robert Morrison prepared by Barton Starr, which I believe has been published in the most recently published version of the *Dictionary of National Biography* in the United Kingdom.

[18] For other details about Lay's part in this treaty action, see Pfister, *Striving for "The Whole Duty of Man"*, 2:70, 304 (endnote 211).

[19] For an account of Martin's career, see Ralph Covell, "Life and Thought of W. A. P. Martin: Agent and Interpreter of Sino-American Contact in the Nineteenth Century and Early Twentieth Century" (PhD diss., University of Denver, 1975; Ann Arbor: UMI, 1997).

[20] A summary of Jesuit roles in these imperial courts and their broader contribution to aspects of astronomical, geographical, and arithmetic knowledge at that time is described and evaluated by Benjamin A. Elman in two of his most recent books: *On Their Own Terms: Science in China, 1550–1900* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), esp. Chap. 2 (pp. 61–221), and *A Cultural History of Modern Science in China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006), esp. Chap. 1 (pp. 15–35).

1623–88]), as well as the British Baptist missionary Timothy Richard (Li Timotai 李提摩太), who was the first Protestant missionary to be invited to take up a post as a political counselor to the Guangxu 光緒 emperor[21]—it must be admitted that these persons were clearly in the minority of all those who took up foreign missionary careers within Ming and Qing political contexts.

Between Emperors, Mao, and God

Questions that arise here come from not only the Marxist exposé of political interests among missionaries, but also the theological problem associated with "giving to Caesar what is Caesar's and giving to God what is God's."[22] The "unequal treaty" conditions set during the Opium War period and lasting well into the third decade of the 20th century undoubtedly raised problems of credibility even as it opened doors for interaction. Here the question of missionary relationships with governments and especially with mercantile interests (such as the British imperial opium trade), and the question whether there should be missionary critique of these influences, are revealing problems of the cultural inconsistency of representation between different elements of foreign countries—some missionaries and other merchants. Differences in roles *did* matter, but in the context of Qing Chinese political life these were often misunderstood.

---

[21] The invitation Richard received from the erstwhile Prime Minister of the late Qing Empire and radical Ruist reformer, Kang Youwei 康有為 (1858–1927), ended up never being fulfilled. As he describes in his autobiography, *Forty-five Years in China: Reminiscences* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes, 1916), the week that Richard was supposed to report for duty in the fall of 1898, a military coup organized by portions of the Qing army supported by the Empress Dowager ousted Kang and his followers.

[22] As noted in note 14 above, Gu Changsheng assumes that the separation of church and state is a basic Christian assumption, but this is not the case, especially in European contexts where the Roman Catholic church or certain other church denominations are considered to be "national churches." In this light it is important to notice the degree of leeway which this Caesar–God formula permits, and so it explains why there were very different attitudes about the relationship between state and church institutions across the history of Christianity in numerous cultural and historical settings, whether in Mediterranean or European settings, Asian settings (as documented by Samuel Hugh Moffett in his two-volume study of *A History of Christianity in Asia*), or in the American or African continents. More significantly, he justifies his first and second criticisms of Christian missionaries by referring to Zechariah 4:6 and Matthew 10:14 respectively, suggesting that Christian representatives on missions should not use force to present their messages to others, and that if they are not received, they should leave the area on their own accord.

Maoist Marxism and Indigenous Chinese Missionaries

Another very different perspective dealing with a later period suggests that we can link up the ethical values of a liberating justice which informed and motivated the critical hermeneutics promoted by Chinese (and other forms of) Marxism with similar social and spiritual values promoted in biblically-oriented worldviews held by indigenous Chinese Christian leaders, missionaries, and ordinary church members. My own reflections on this matter consolidated into an account of one reason why Protestant forms of Christianity began to grow *during* the "Great Cultural Revolution," and not merely after those "ten years of calamity" occurred.[23] A summary of the argument goes as follows: the accomplishment of Maoist Marxism under Mao Zedong 毛澤東 included the fact that, due to the ubiquitous presence and ideological pressure applied to learning his little Redbook, the vast majority of Chinese persons and Chinese citizens from all levels of society (including those minorities that had become sinified) had ingrained within their thoughts and desires the universal values of justice, equality, and a secular form of liberation. When the Chinese Maoist revolution proved to be a failure in not reaching its communist ideal (in spite of ideologically loaded claims to the contrary at the time), and ultimately turning upon itself destructively, as had happened in all previous European revolutions,[24] there was a new and pervasive thirst among many Chinese persons for fulfillments of these new culturally instilled desires and values. This is no simple impulse and response model of explaining religious and cultural change, but has involved an ongoing dialectic

---

[23] This has been explored in greater detail in my essay, "Brothers in the Spirit," written for the Festschrift honoring Prof. Wolfgang Kubin of Bonn University in celebrating his 60th birthday, which took place in December 2005. As far as I know, the Festschrift has not yet been published.

[24] Here I am relying on the analysis of the European revolutions explored by Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy and helpfully summarized by George Allen Morgan. Consult Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, *Out of Revolution: Autobiography of Western Man* (New York: W. Morrow & Co., 1938; repr., Providence, R.I.: Berg, 1993), with an introductory essay written by the elderly emeritus professor from Harvard, Harold Berman. A subsequent account in German, revised for an European audience, was published in the early 1950s under the title *Die europäischen Revolutionen und der Charakter der Nationen*. Morgan's synopsis of these and other relevant works touching on Rosenstock-Huessy's analyses of these revolutions is presented in his volume, *Speech and Society: The Christian Linguistic Social Philosophy of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1987), especially the 15th chapter on "world revolutions" (pp. 52–66).

of intellectual and spiritual conditions within post–Cultural Revolution Chinese societies that has passed through at least two generations of reconsideration, but has not yet fully resolved the internal contradictions of values within this unfulfilled "secularized salvation."[25] One of the key responses in recent decades has been a renewed interest in an authentic spiritual salvation identified with the biblical message of Christ's love and mercy, touching personal dimensions of the need for repentance and renewal as well as social dimensions which balance justice and mercy. If this account bears scrutiny, it suggests another insight that can be gleaned from Chinese Marxist accounts of Christian missions. What it indicates is a transformation of earlier Marxist critiques into a more constructive reconsideration of the role of Christian missions in the modernization of China. This should include a broader cultural shift involving Christian religious renewal in the face of failed Chinese Marxist policies, one that has influenced a relatively larger group of Chinese persons, especially among intellectuals, but also within the vast hinterland.

Significantly, this kind of interpretive transition within Chinese Christian circles, which links up Marxist ideological failures with post-Mao era religious developments, is not in any way considered in Gu Changsheng's final reflections in the third edition of his *Missionaries and Modern China*. Instead, he lauds the self-establishment of Chinese Christians, but simply leaves the obvious fact of their immensely rapid growth rate essentially uninterpreted, even on well-known Marxist grounds of "religion serving as the heart of a heartless world." I propose that this dialectical interpretation of a inherent cultural distortion created by sustained revolutionary destructiveness and its religious response, grounded in the continued search for answers to a new set of universal values instilled in the general inter-subjective awareness of late 20th-century Chinese citizens, deserves very serious consideration. What is so significant about this interpretive approach is that it is based on a serious consideration of Marxist influences and their inherent revolutionary contradictions, and so reveals a dimension of study that

---

[25] This understanding of Marxist ideology as a dialectically shaped obverse reflection of Christian values was recognized already by European intellectuals in the 20th century, and has been summarized in a particular way in order to reflect on modern Chinese experiences of these intellectual and spiritual revolutions in Wolfgang Kubin's article, "'The Sickness God'—The Sickness Man: The Problem of Imperfection in China and in the West," in *Bible in Modern China: The Literary and Intellectual Impact*, ed. Irene Eber, Sze-kar Wan, Knut Walf, and Roman Malek, 409–28 (Nettetal: Steyler, 1999).

may prove very fruitful in cross-disciplinary studies and reflections in future years.

ORIENTAL CRITICISMS AND THE RECOGNITION OF SINOLOGICAL ORIENTATION

The fourth criticism Gu Changsheng levies against Christian missionaries in China touches a number of aspects that would be associated with some Orientalist criticisms of their work. Though a few of them became recognized sinologists, there were "many" who took up an attitude of cultural superiority, viewing Chinese persons as "half civilized heathen," while taking themselves to be "saviors" and "teachers" to the Chinese people. In this context they tended to carry on their missionary duties under the racist assumptions of "the white man's burden," and so reinforced among some Chinese persons a lack of self-esteem and a fetishism toward foreign things.[26] This claim reflects the statement made by American evaluators that "too many missionaries knew far too little about Chinese language, customs, culture and philosophy."[27] Exactly how many there were may be an important historical question, but the moral value motivating this assessment would suggest that only if there were none would it have been acceptable. In this there is an undeniably valid point, however it can be clarified in the details of historical statistics or the principles of Christian missionary policies.

Orientalism and Missionary-scholars

Those special class of missionaries Gu Changsheng does not challenge in any direct manner—the sinological missionary-scholars[28]—

---

[26] This summary is following the claims laid out in the fourth criticism Gu Changsheng raises against Christian missionaries in his *Chuanjiaoshi yu jindai Zhongguo* (3rd ed.), 432.

[27] Retranslating the fourth "negative lesson" enumerated in the 1951 document prepared by representatives of the National Christian Council of American Protestant Churches. See Gu Changsheng, ibid., 434.

[28] In this regard, Gu was aware of the university professorships taken up by James Legge at Oxford in 1876 and by Samuel Wells Williams (Wei Sanwei 衛三畏, 1812–84) at Yale in 1877 (see Gu Changsheng, ibid, 418). Nevertheless, he was apparently

are those who receive rather severe blasts from Orientalist critics. So, though we might honor James Legge (1815–97),[29] Séraphin Couvreur (Gu Saifen 顧賽芬, 1835–1919),[30] and Richard Wilhelm (Wei Lixian 尉禮賢 [name changed to 衛禮賢 after 1924], 1873–1930)[31] as among the greatest of these missionary-scholars turned sinologists and sinologues, Orientalist critics argue that they were nonetheless complicated within the paradigms of knowledge and power structures that imperialistic governments created for their own advances into China during the 19th and 20th centuries. These three monumental translators and interpreters of ancient Chinese canonical literature, being missionaries from Congregational, Jesuit, and Lutheran backgrounds, created

---

completely unaware of the similarly important translation and scholarly work pursued by Couvreur and Wilhelm, neither of whom are mentioned in his major work, even though both of them spent many years in China. Wilhelm lived in the German and later Japanese colony of Qingdao 青島 from 1899 to 1920, while Couvreur lived in Hebei 河北 province from 1870 until his death in 1919.

[29] Legge was the translator and interpreter of the notable series entitled *The Chinese Classics* (1st ed., 1861–72; 2nd partially rev. ed., 1893–95) and six volumes entitled *The Sacred Books of China* (1879–91), so that they encompassed all the key texts of the Ruist ("Confucian") Canon: the Four Books and the Five Scriptures in addition to the *Daodejing*, the *Zhuangzi*, and some smaller and later Daoist religious "tractates."

[30] Couvreur produced French and Latin renderings of almost all the same Ruist scriptures that Legge had produced in English versions except for the *Book of Changes* or *Yijing* 易經, but also produced in 1916 a version of one of the other scriptures related to ancient Chinese rites and customs which Legge had not included in his collection, i.e., the *Yili* 儀禮, which he entitled *Cérémonial*. In regard to translation of ancient canonical literature, Couvreur has taken his place along with Legge as the two most prolific translators of this sort outside of China.

[31] Though not as systematic and devoted to ancient canonical literature as either Legge or Couvreur, Wilhelm produced texts that have remained the standard German versions of ancient Chinese canonical literature in Ruist and Daoist contexts. Though he did not produce as many of these texts as Legge and Couvreur did, Wilhelm did provide annotations and updated polylingual bibliographies for most of his renderings, something which Legge had also produced in abundance, but which Couvreur never provided. In regard to ancient literature, Wilhelm produced and published versions of the *Analects* (*Konfucius Gespräche*, 1910), the *Mencius* (1914), and unusual versions of both the *Book of Changes* (*I Ging: Buch der Wandlungen*, 1924) and a selective and reorganized version of classical accounts of Chinese rites (*Li Gi: Das Buch der Sitte des älteren und jüngeren Dai*, 1930) from among the Ruist scriptures; regarding Daoist scriptures, he also produced versions of both the *Daodejing* (1911) and most of the *Zhuangzi* (1912, but missing the last seven chapters of the standard text). Beyond these, Wilhelm produced an immense corpus of non-canonical renderings from wide ranges of literature in ancient, medieval, and some relatively modern works. Unquestionably his most popular rendering has been that of his restructured version of the *Book of Changes*, which has been translated into at least nine other languages and published in fifteen different countries.

the largest sources of classical Chinese literature in English, French, and German respectively.[32]

Basic to the Orientalist critique of any literature produced by intellectuals of other cultures, including these missionary-scholars, is that they misrepresent the text and the culture which they portray through their writings and translations. Though the very matter of "representing" was an epistemological problem that Edward Said himself took to be an insurmountable problem (and so his account of Orientalism has been criticized as being methodologically suspect[33]), nevertheless, there is a serious question about whether or not there was any reason to doubt his claims in relationship to these major Chinese missionary-scholars mentioned above.

Did Legge, Couvreur, and Wilhelm willfully distort the ancient Chinese scriptures in their renderings? Or placed in even a broader perspective, did they intentionally or even unintentionally—because of their own cultural and religious biases as well as their own methodologically determined avoidance—refuse to understand and engage with Chinese indigenous scholarship related to these canonical texts? While we should always assume that any attempt at understanding a foreign culture is hermeneutically difficult and requires an overcoming of many previously unknown factors and easily misunderstood values and events, it should be emphatically stated that these problems are increased immensely when the foreign culture is also an ancient one, portrayed in an ancient script and language that may not be currently understood by the majority of indigenous people among whom a Christian missionary lives.[34] Much to the surprise of Orientalist assumptions,

---

[32] Several qualifications of this general claim need to be added in order to make the statement more precise. Richard Wilhelm not only did renderings of ancient canonical texts, but also produced German translations of more recent and even modern Chinese texts in different forms of literature, philosophy, and other areas. In addition, most scholars will know that both Legge and Couvreur presented not only translations of the ancient Chinese scriptures, but also a standardized Chinese version of these texts as well. In the case of Couvreur, he regularly added to the French rendering a parallel Latin rendering. In this sense their overall contributions are not limited merely to the textual and linguistic limits suggested in the more general statement made above.

[33] James Clifford is a noted critic of this epistemological problem in Edward Said's *Orientalism*, as found in his chapter "On Orientalism" in *The Predicament of Culture*, 255–76 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988), a fact highlighted by Zhang Kuan in his essay "The Predicament of Postcolonial Criticism in Contemporary China," in *Chinese Thought in a Global Context: A Dialogue between Chinese and Western Philosophical Approaches*, ed. Karl-Heinz Pohl, 58–70 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), esp. p. 64.

[34] In this vein I take seriously many of the points raised by Hans-Georg Gadamer when

it is clear that James Legge purposefully engaged and worked with the Chinese scholar Wang Tao 王韜 (1822–97) for a period of about ten years.[35] In Wilhelm's case, it is well known that he intermittently worked with Lao Naixuan 勞乃宣 (1843–1921) on the text of the *Book of Changes* during the period of Lao's post-revolutionary exile (as a

---

he describes the challenges of coming to understand the biblical texts, which involves not only the distance of an ancient text, but also the immense authority that this scripture holds for scholars within the field. As a consequence, there has normally been produced a wide range of commentarial traditions, the "effective history" of the canonical work itself, that needs to be considered by any sensitive scholar who would intend to understand the meaning of that scripture. This is a major point raised in his famous volume of philosophical hermeneutics, *Truth and Method.*

[35] To his credit, Gu Changsheng was aware of Legge's relationship to Wang Tao, and had some very general sense that this Chinese Christian scholar (and admittedly a very inconsistent Christian at that, especially during his later years when he returned to Shanghai) had been a source of help for Legge in handling "difficult passages" and preparing notes (*Chuanjiaoshi yu jindai Zhongguo* [3rd ed.], 420). Though Wang came into contact with Legge through unforeseen circumstances, Legge recognized the unusual opportunity to work with a young Chinese scholar, and so hired Wang to work with him, so that his Chinese scholarly friend ended up producing at least four different commentaries to various Ruist texts over the period of the nine years they worked together (from 1863 to 1872). Nevertheless, the nature of the influence of Wang on Legge's scholarship was more complicated than some have assumed, including Gu Changsheng. For example, though Paul A. Cohen was able to identify the places where Wang's works were cited by Legge in various notes within the later volumes of his *Chinese Classics*, he did not reveal that about half the time (depending on the text) Legge disagreed with Wang's assessment and explanation of various passages. Details about this more dynamic and interactive give-and-take are presented in my article, "The Response of Wang Tao and James Legge to the Modern Ruist Melancholy," *History and Culture*, no. 2 (Hong Kong: Department of History, Hong Kong Baptist University, 2001): 1–20. A Chinese version of this article appeared as "Wang Tao yu Li Yage dui xinrujia youhuan yishi de huiying" 王韜與理雅各對新儒家憂患意識的回應, in *Wang Tao yu xiandai shijie* 王韜與現代世界, ed. Lam Kai Yin and Wong Man Kong, 117–47 (Hong Kong: Xianggang jiaoyutushu gongsi, 2000).

Another factor that Gu Changsheng was unaware of in the case of Legge was that the four years that Hong Ren'gan 洪仁玕 (1822–64) spent in Hong Kong (1854–58) were under the tutelage not only of James Legge but also of his co-pastor and the first Chinese Protestant theologian, He Jinshan 何進善 (1817–71, also known in Cantonese spelling as Ho Tsun-sheen and later as Ho Fuk-tong [He Futang 何福堂]). In this sense, Legge was not only involved for about ten years with at least one Chinese scholar of traditional Ruist scriptures, but also helped to nurture the first major Chinese Protestant scholar before he went to Oxford. More about Ho Tsun-sheen can be found in my article, "A Transmitter but not a Creator: The Creative Transmission of Protestant Biblical Traditions by Ho Tsun-sheen (1817–1871)," in Eber et al., *Bible in Modern China*, 165–97. A Chinese version of this essay has also appeared more recently, "Shu er bu zuo: jindai Zhongguo diyi wei xinjiao shenxuejia He Jinshan (1817–1871)" 述而不作：近代中國第一位新教神學家何進善 (1817–1871), in *Shengjing yu jindai Zhongguo* 聖經與近代中國, trans. and ed. Tsoi Kam-to, 132–62 (Hong Kong: Hanyu shengjing xiehui, 2003). Fuller details about his life and works are also presented in selective passages of my larger work, *Striving for "The Whole Duty of Man".*

pro-Manchu oriented Chinese scholar in the German colony of Jiaozhou 膠州, where Wilhelm lived), amounting to a period of at least six or seven years (from 1912 to 1919). Recent research has revealed that Wilhelm also worked with several other Chinese teachers and informants, among them some other high ranking scholars.[36] The case of Couvreur is less certain, because he took no effort in any of his brief prefaces to each of his translations to refer to any of his Chinese teachers, co-workers, or even the works he employed in preparing his translations.[37] The fact that Couvreur lived and died in China, serving as a Catholic missionary priest and sinological translator in a town about 150 miles south of Beijing, suggests that there should be more to learn about his institutional connections, his contacts with Chinese Catholics and other scholars, and his habits of scholarship than are now currently available.

While all these factors appear to present an outright challenge to the Orientalist criticism that these missionary-scholars had no intention to engage contemporary Chinese scholars in the context of their own preparations, learning, and translation work, and did not seek to represent China in any authentic manner—especially in the cases of Legge and Wilhelm—it is hermeneutically appropriate to continue to keep these skeptical questions before us. In fact, both Legge and Wilhelm

---

[36] This research has been pursued by a group of six scholars (four German sinologists, one Chinese German scholar, and this author), with the intention of producing at least one new volume based on these new findings in the coming years, for the University of Washington Press. One of Wilhelm's first teachers during the first decade of the 20th century was a Chinese medical doctor, but later he had contact with a good number of notable Chinese scholars in the German colony. Later on, after the conclusion of World War I and the change in German government, Wilhelm took up a post as a cultural advisor to the new German ambassador to China, and was able to arrange to have an office in Beijing University as a researcher in the German faculty during the academic year of 1923–24. Due to all these factors, it is now undeniable that Wilhelm had significant contact with many contemporary Chinese scholars and also collaborated with several of them in working out some of his major translations.

[37] Up to this point I have had no opportunity to consult Jesuit colleagues who would possibly have access to archives and other data that would provide new insights into Couvreur's life, relationships, and study habits. David Honey identifies Couvreur as the first of three major 19th–20th-century Jesuit sinologists, pointing out that he received the Prix Julien for outstanding work in Chinese literature four times. (Legge had received this international prize in 1873, the first year it was offered, for his *Chinese Classics*.) In one other spot in Honey's wide-ranging account of the history of Chinese philology he adds evaluations drawn at least partially from another noted French sinologist, Paul Demiéville (1894–1979), that Couvreur's translations rarely departed from the interpretive positions of Zhu Xi 朱熹 (1130–1200) and never "essayed any original interpretation or personal criticism." Consult David B. Honey, *Incense at the Altar: Pioneering Sinologists and the Development of Classical Chinese Philology* (New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 2001), 41–42, 211.

had to struggle beyond a number of inherent cultural and religious biases which they initially brought with them to their different Chinese contexts, and both lived within colonial contexts which would raise other suspicions about their way of life and access to "authentic understanding" of Chinese persons and indigenous canonical scholarship. For these reasons it is worthwhile to explore these matters even further.

Problems in Characterizing Sinological Orientalism

When one looks more carefully at the careers, translations, and commentarial notes produced by Legge and Wilhelm, there are reasons to remain cautious about being too sanguine regarding their sinological achievements, especially during their earlier periods of missionary-scholarship. Hermeneutically speaking, both men had to overcome complex inter-cultural situations. This involved what some have recently described as a sinological form of Orientalist distortion, or more simply, "Sinological Orientalism." In the case of Legge, there was a manifest amelioration of his initially more harsh and critical Christian attitudes, expressed in the prolegomena to the first volume of his *Chinese Classics* published in 1861, attitudes that were explicitly rejected only later in the period after 1873.[38] Significantly, Wilhelm took up a more independent and non-confrontational approach within his missionary, educational and pastoral roles. Ultimately, he claimed to have not been involved with the conversion of any singular Chinese person, but certainly had been associating with various Chinese Christians and other missionaries throughout his time in China as both a missionary and a member of the German consulate in the early 1920s.[39] As a consequence, we should understand that Sinological Orientalism takes serious account of the limiting and distortive possibilities of alternative cultural and religious worldviews within these missionaries' lives as

---

[38] This I have documented in great detail and in partial contrast to the account presented by Norman J. Girardot in his major tome, *The Victorian Translation of China: James Legge's Oriental Pilgrimage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), in my article, "From Derision to Respect: The Hermeneutic Passage within James Legge's (1815–1897) Ameliorated Evaluation of Master Kong ('Confucius')," *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 26 (2002): 53–88.

[39] Wilhelm's own very unusual approach to missionary work has been characterized recently in another of my articles entitled "Protestant Ethics among Chinese Missionaries, Problems of Indigenization, and the Spirit of Academic Professionalization," *Journal of Classical Sociology* 2, no. 1 (March 2005): 93–114.

they interacted with Chinese persons, but also realizes that missionary-scholars could and did learn new ways to address, understand, and portray Chinese canonical texts that have proven to be far more constructive than Saidian forms of Orientalist criticisms would anticipate. In this light it is particularly important to highlight that Sinological Orientalism can account for both the initial negative and overly critical assessments most of these missionary-scholars harbored and, in addition, the fact that they were able to overcome these biases and distortions to reach a level of engaged and sympathetic understanding that was a tribute to their interrelationships with key Chinese teachers and collaborators. In this way, not only that a major lesson regarding the troubles of "coming to represent" can be gained from Orientalist criticisms, but a new appreciation for the actual interpretive achievements of major missionary-scholars can be underscored, reevaluated, and employed to challenge the more skeptical Orientalist epistemological assumptions.

Being Cautious about Claims of Ruist Secularism

Inherent in many of the Orientalist accounts as well as in relevant discussions among contemporary Chinese philosophers and other scholars is the assumption that the Ruist traditions, which were the dominant ideology for the last 700 years of the Imperial era in Chinese dynastic histories, were completely void of any religious character. Missionaries were divided, but it is notable that Legge and Couvreur both argued for a monotheistic presence within the ancient traditions. Legge focused on the presence of the terms Shangdi 上帝 and Di 帝, especially in the *Shijing* 詩經, but also in other literature;[40] Couvreur added within his longest introduction to any Chinese scripture a thorough description of Heaven ("*Le Ciel*") and the Supreme Lord ("*Le Chang Ti*") to his *Cheu King* (*Shijing* or the *Book of Odes*).[41] Ironi-

---

[40] Legge's initial discoveries came in 1852, and then he wrote consistently about these matters in various places, most prominently in his comparisons between Christian and Ruist religious traditions, in 1877 and 1880. A critical review and assessment of Legge's account of this Chinese monotheism has been made very recently by Wang Hui 王輝 in his PhD dissertation completed at Hong Kong Baptist University, which was given the title in an earlier version, "A Postcolonial Perspective on James Legge's Confucian Translation: Focusing on His Two Versions of the *Zhongyong*" (2006).

[41] Find these lengthy statements in Séraphin Couvreur, 詩經 *Cheu king: Texte chinois*

cally, this question itself has reemerged with a new vigor among various Chinese philosophers and scholars within and outside of China during the last twenty years.[42] As a consequence, there remains a very basic set of questions: Is Ruism religious or not? Is it a religion or not? Assumptions denying any religious dimension have often been churned out of a manifestly intense dialectical opposition to "Western" forms of "religion," and so have been countered even within sinological circles on the basis of other (not explicitly Christian) standards of cultural and religious assessment. This being the case, there are important reasons to reassess the assumed secular monolithic nature of Ruist traditions, and instead to replace these putative "secularist" perspectives with a more subtle and diversified account of multiform Ruist traditions that are more representative of their historical manifestations.

Need for a Self-reflective Turn among Chinese Scholars?

A final but important further reflection revolves around the historico-cultural assumptions and ideological camouflage that some contemporary Chinese scholars may hide within criticisms like those stated by Gu Changsheng at the beginning of this section. If as scholars we agree to employ a standard reflecting the value of basic human rights and the value of all Chinese persons—whether peasants or gentry in traditional society, and whether Communist cadre or Chinese minorities in contemporary China—it is also appropriate to ask more questions about the role of the traditional three teachings in how they performed on the same scale. In addition, what exactly counts as the honorable portions of "Chinese culture" which are to be upheld should be spelled out, since it is an undeniable fact that Chinese Marxist ideo-

---

avec une double traduction en français et en latin, une introduction et un vocabulaire, 4th ed. (Ho Kien Fou [Hejian Fu]: Imprimerie de la Mission Catholique, 1896), xxi–xxvii. Significantly, this is followed by comments related to the ceremonies to deceased parents.

[42] Witness to this development has occurred within China by the compilation of essays by Ren Jiyu 任繼愈 debating these themes in his *Rujiao wenti zhenglun ji* 儒教問題爭論集 (Beijing: Zongjiao wenhua chubanshe, 2000). In English there have been published in recent years several major works that assert positive accounts of Ruist ("Confucian") spirituality, though these accounts are not at all the same and not even necessarily compatible with each other. See Tu Wei-ming and Mary Evelyn Tucker, eds., *Confucian Spirituality*, Volumes 1 and 2 (New York: Crossroad, 2003–4) and the two volume work edited by Xinzhong Yao, *RoutledgeCurzon Encyclopedia of Confucianism* (London and New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003).

logues also made wide-ranging blasts against exploitative elements in traditional Chinese culture, at times being anticipated by the more informed and scholarly missionary-scholars many decades earlier. So, for example, the thoughtful, carefully articulated, and balanced assessments of Legge's renderings of ancient Chinese historical canonical literature (specifically, the *Shangshu* 尚書 and *Zuo Commentary* [*Zuo zhuan* 左傳] to the *Spring and Autumn Annals* [*Chunqiu* 春秋]) by the highly regarded historian, Liu Jiahe 劉家和, which take these cultural and historical factors into account, provide a more self-reflective hermeneutical method as well as a foundation for further studies balancing both critical and constructive sides to these evaluations.[43] From a broader perspective, these critical questions about the general nature and multiform way of the penetrating abuse of power within various power structures, taken up by critics of the non-hyphenated "postcolonial" line of critical hermeneutics (that is, involving historical and cultural situations even outside of explicit colonial settings), would putatively applaud this kind of self-reflective understanding on the part of contemporary Chinese scholars.[44] So, then, it is appropriate to move toward the last and final stage of our reflections, dealing with the more standardized "post-colonial" criticisms of Christian missionaries.

POST-COLONIAL REFLECTIONS

Within Chinese circles in the 1990s it was the discussion of Edward Said's *Orientalism* that provoked further reflections on the cultural phenomena associated with a post-colonial (or "postcolonial") con-

---

[43] Find these kind of assessments in four chapters devoted to evaluating James Legge's translations and interpretations in the middle of the recently published volume of significant essays by Prof. Liu: *Shixue, jingxue yu sixiang: zai shijieshi beijing xia duiyu Zhongguo gudai lishi wenhua de sikao* 史學、經學與思想：在世界史背景下對於中國古代歷史文化的思考 (Beijing: Beijing Shifandaxue chubanshe, 2005), 104–240.

[44] It should be noted that this also may not be the case. Some writers in the post-colonial vein would only speak about the flaws of non-Chinese foreigners, and would feel that applying the same standards to Chinese scholars or officials in any period would be inappropriate, because they are among those who have suffered under the oppressive conditions of the "postcolonial" powers. Nevertheless, when their own range of criticisms goes beyond historical and cultural bounds to embrace non-colonized settings, it seems all the more justified to ask them as well as Chinese scholars to take up this self-reflective step.

sciousness.[45] Though there might be some problems in arguing how the Qing empire in the 19th century was itself made into a "colony" in any normal sense of the term, it is the case that small portions of Chinese territory were taken at various times by foreign powers as their own colonial outposts. British, Portuguese and German colonies did exist in various parts of China—in Hong Kong and Weihaiwei 威海衛, in Macau, and in Qingdao 青島—not to mention the Japanese colonialization that took place in encroachments in Qingdao, Manchuria, Taiwan, and that ultimately led to China's involvement in World War II. In addition, the Marxist category of a "semi-colony," based primarily on mercantile involvement that involved "unequal treaties" and so unfair advantages, is also regularly cited as a justification for using this form of argumentation. So, on the basis of all these settings, and especially in the cases where Christian missionaries later took up residence within these colonial contexts, there are significant justifications for adopting a post-colonial reflection within contemporary Chinese settings.

Gu Changsheng addressed this kind of problem in his sixth criticism of Christian missionaries: they tended to dominate over their Chinese converts, not allowing them to take up their rights as leaders or responsible persons within Christian institutions.[46] Though this tends to reflect a "postcolonial" attitude more than an explicit "post-colonial" critique, we should consider some concrete cases where these charges appear to have some weight.

Examples of Colonial Privileges and Their Religious Implications in Hong Kong

For example, in the case of Hong Kong, there were distinct privileges granted to those involved with Anglican forms of Christian life, especially in the early colonial period. The Anglican Bishop was within the hierarchy of leaders who could take over the position of the colonial Governor in the case of any unexpected problems; in addition, special privileges related to education and the promotion of "Anglified" Chinese persons made their presence attractive to various Chinese

---

[45] The description of this development is presented by one of the key advocates of the value of post-colonial thinking in the People's Republic of China, Zhang Kuan. See his article (and note the dropping of the hyphen in "post-colonial"), "The Predicament of Postcolonial Criticism in Contemporary China" (see note 33 above).

[46] See Gu Changsheng, *Chuanjiaoshi yu jindai Zhongguo* (3rd ed.), 432–33.

converts during the colonial period.[47] In contrast, other Christian traditions, such as the Roman Catholics, who were focused on the role of the papal authority in Rome, had a very different orientation; though given freedom to practice their beliefs and establish their communities in the British colony, they were not given such privileges. This was even more the case for independent Protestants such as Baptists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, especially during the early years of the colony. For example, James Legge, a Congregationalist and senior missionary of the London Missionary Society in Hong Kong during the period from 1843 to 1867, was not able to bury or marry members of the congregation of Union Chapel until the 1860s, because these ceremonials had to be presided over by an Anglican clergyman.[48] Other factors that could be considered are the "brain drain" of bilingual Chinese citizens to England, their return as colonial subjects,[49] and questions regarding levels of corruption among higher officials, even including certain Christian figures, within these conditions. One of the very odd cases in this regard during the early decades of Hong Kong's history was the public indictment of a Prussian missionary and former "Inspector of Government Schools" in Hong Kong, Wilhelm Lobscheid, for becoming involved in a network where coolie labor was hired and then sent off in terrible conditions to various places in Australia and South America.[50]

---

[47] See for example the documentation provided by Gilliam Bickley in her paper, "The Establishment of the Colonial Bishops Fund and its Impact on the Establishment of a Bishop's See of Victoria, Hong Kong, China, and Saint Paul's Missionary College, Hong Kong, in Association with the See," in the collected papers of *The Third Symposium on the History of Christianity in Modern China: History of Christianity in Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Center for the Study of Modern History at Hong Kong Baptist University and the Research Center on Christianity and Chinese Culture at the Alliance Bible Seminary, 2003).

[48] The contrastive roles able to be adopted by "Dissenter" or "Nonconformist" Protestants within the English colonial setting are a major interpretive emphasis in my two volume work on James Legge. While instances of these matters occur throughout the work, there is a particular point of interest raised in the "Conclusion" under the theme of "Millennial Momentum: Nonconformist Influences in Heavenly and Earthly Kingdoms," (*Striving for "The Whole Duty of Man"*, 2:229–35).

[49] Including, for example, the son of the first Protestant Chinese theologian (Ho Tsun-sheen), who studied law in England, married an English woman, and then returned to become not only a major political figure within the colonial Governor's executive council, but also an important agent for educational developments for Chinese students. See Gerald H. Choa, *The Life and Times of Sir Kai Ho Kai: A Prominent Figure in Nineteenth-century Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1981 [2nd printing, 2000]).

[50] This was an issue which received much attention in the local Hong Kong papers, including the *China Mail*, where I recall reading about the issue. In the end, Lob-

Chinese Occidentalism?

Part of the impact of the discourse of colonial mentality, it is argued by post-colonialists, is that it tends to reflect itself in a subversive and submissive mentality among indigenous populations even after the return to Chinese sovereignty. Of some interest are the obvious misunderstandings that also are promoted by a post-colonial anger, and that end up replicating or even further complicating the maze of misrepresentations that can occur. For example, during the month before Hong Kong returned to Chinese sovereignty in June 1997, a movie on the Opium War was produced by Mainland Chinese cinematographers. Within that movie, they presented a scene where a Roman Catholic priest was found as the "Christian figure" on a Protestant British vessel involved in the first Opium War, something that would have been culturally and politically impossible at that time because of the Dissenter status of all Roman Catholics in Great Britain at that time. There was no understanding among Chinese cinematographers and their consultants, and possibly no will to understand, that the role of Protestant missionaries in these 19th-century contexts was quite different, since they were apparently unaware of the extremely tense and generally uncooperative interrelationship between Protestant and Catholic missionaries during the 19th century.[51] Official censors in the People's Republic of China were apparently not concerned about these factual matters, preferring instead to allow a particular form of an ideologically loaded Occidentalism to remain in place.

Alternative Interpretations: Moral Leadership within Troubled Contexts?

While there are lessons that can be learned from post-colonial criticisms of Christian missionaries in China, they cannot provide explanations for the development of authentic Chinese Christian communities even within these distorted contexts. Is there a need, then, to be able to

---

schied was given a light sentence because a criminal charge would have affected his ability to retire and receive a pension in Prussia. Exact details of sources for this information are not currently available to me.

[51] Another factor that I found intriguing was that the actual involvement of the son of a prominent Protestant missionary in the Treaty of Nanjing (in this case, John Robert Morrison, the son of Robert Morrison) was completely overlooked in the film, though a scene related to this treaty was briefly portrayed in the film as well.

discern differences between the transformative powers of genuinely compassionate and sympathetic missionary activities which do not follow the oppressive misuses of colonial power? Part of the reality not only of some foreign missionary activities and their related Christian institutions is that they refused to participate in the colonial privileging of religious institutions, suggesting that there were institutional contexts where Chinese Christians could grow into independent and self-sustaining Chinese communities that were not merely the result of colonial interests.

My own reflections on these matters have gained some support from an unusual source: recent studies related to "moral leadership." As Al Gini argues, moral leadership involves a "power and value laden relationship between leaders and followers/constituents who intend real change(s) that reflect their mutual purpose(s) and goal(s)." That there are inherent inequalities and questions of power within these relationships is manifest, but it is the will of moral leaders not to take advantage of these power structures, but to employ them for the general benefit of followers with whom they share explicit purposes and goals.[52] When this is added to the claims made by James MacGregor Burns that "transforming leadership" also leads to the empowerment of followers so that they can become moral leaders in their own right, there is suggested here a new and more constructive interpretive model for accounting for the intergenerational sustenance and growth of Chinese forms of Christianity both during and following the period of foreign Chinese missionary presence.[53] Another perspective involving another account of moral leadership that has received extensive attention in Christian seminary contexts in North America is the account of "servant leadership" promoted by Robert K. Greenleaf. Here the Chris-

---

[52] See this definition of leadership in Al Gini, "Moral Leadership: An Overview," *Journal of Business Ethics* 16 (1997): 323–30, here p. 324. In his article, Gini goes on to describe "five principles of power" which are not always insightful into these transformative contexts, and privileges "personal power" over any form of group power. From a Christian missionary point of view, there would seem to be a very explicit reason to support a vision of "community power and empowerment" experienced between committed Chinese Christian church members and foreign as well as local Christian missionary leaders.

[53] Consult James MacGregor Burns, *Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2003). It should be underscored that this explanation would help us understand not only the effective and transformative roles of foreign Christian missionaries, but also those who as Chinese converts became indigenous missionaries.

tian theological interest in the Incarnation and its implications is highlighted in Christian versions of this theory.[54]

In particular, it also suggests new interpretations as to why there have been constructive and positive roles taken up by Chinese Christians even when Chinese Christian communities have been situated within questionable colonial or post-colonial contexts, and can add further understanding as to why even those Chinese Christians within the current People's Republic of China can and have become some of the most positive contributors to the ongoing development of contemporary Chinese society. Notably, this counters some of the previously dominant interpretive models assumed under Marxist critiques of religious life that assumed that there could be nothing positive or healthy about any religious form of life. Weberian critiques of this Marxist assumption have proven to be particularly important in developing an alternative account of these matters, but the addition of these theoretical considerations from moral leadership theory has provided an even more explicit interpretive position that has not previously been considered in this context.

FINAL REFLECTIONS

The human dimensions of Catholic and Protestant missionaries in China may not always be so candidly described by those who honor Christian missionaries as heroes and culture-exchange agents. Nevertheless, there were some important complications and compromises at times indicating some dimensions of their lives were vulnerable to cultural biases, uncharitable Christian triumphalism, and at times even straightforward foreign political interests. Did these patterns dominate? Were they illegitimate in the light of missionary policies? Could other ways of organizing missionary institutions have avoided these matters? These questions are worth asking about the past, and continue to be relevant in the present day. What I have tried to present in the preceding discussions are matters of interpretive interest which indicate the

---

[54] Here I am referring to Robert K. Greeleaf, *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness* (New York: Paulist Press, 1977). A recent volume taking up this perspective from an explicit Christian orientation is C. Gene Wilkes' *Jesus on Leadership: Discovering the Secrets of Servant Leadership from the Life of Christ* (Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Pub. Inc., 1998).

lessons I myself have learned, and some of the more stimulating discoveries that have arisen because I sought to pursue these matters as far as I might be able to take them, whether on the basis of historical and textual data accessible to me, or because of new ideas that came to mind as a consequence of the interactions with advocates of these three forms of critical hermeneutics.

As a consequence, several new theoretical positions have been scoped out. I have come to what is as far as I know a new explanation about why there was such a rapid emergence of Protestant forms of Christianity in Mainland China during the Cultural Revolution period in the light of Chinese Marxist critiques, and have helped to shape and inform the nature of Sinological Orientalism on the basis of a critical reception of certain aspects of more general Orientalist assumptions. Finally, in the face of post-colonial assessments of missionary attitudes and institutions, I have sought to qualify some of these criticisms by asking questions about the nature of power structures within the missionary–convert relationship that can suggest other more constructive accounts of at least some of their developments. This has been done on the basis of applying the more recently articulated concept of "transforming leadership" promoted by James MacGregor Burns to the dynamics of missionary-and-convert concerns to become transformative culture agents within the contexts of Christian experience and the structures of the growing Chinese church. As colleagues will also see, I have tried to limit these claims according to my best understanding of the nature of these alternative and new accounts, but here I must leave these matters to rest for the time being and request your critical comments.

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 117–129

Preaching the Social Gospel

Protestants and Economic Modernization in Republican China, 1927–1931

THOMAS H. REILLY

In early Republican China, as a new industrial economy began to exert an impact on Chinese society, intellectuals and other social leaders came together to debate the morality and justice of this emerging economy. Protestant Christians—Western missionaries and Chinese converts—were active participants in these debates, and, in turn, sponsored their own discussions on the more specific relationship of Christianity and the economy. The resolutions that emerged from these debates gave birth to and nurtured social reform movements and provided the impetus for social reform legislation throughout the era of the republic. These debates, however, did not just lead to changes in Chinese society, they also led to changes in the Christian message. As a result of these conversations, the church began to preach a message of social salvation, and sought thereby to disassociate Christianity from the evils of industrial capitalism.

While these debates persisted throughout the whole of the republican era, there were two high tides in their urgency and intensity: the first tide began with the formation of the National Christian Council's Committee on Christianizing the Economy, which sponsored the first Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations in 1927, and culmi-

---

Thomas H. REILLY is associate professor of Asian studies at Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, USA.

nated in the 1931 Conference on the People's Livelihood. A second tide began in the mid-1930s, when a new direction was taken in these debates through the intellectual leadership of the YMCA.

A partnership developed between the National Christian Council (NCC), the body which first appointed the Committee on Christianizing the Economy, and the YMCA, in thinking about the relationship of religion and the economy. In the early stages of this partnership, the National Council was the leading member of this partnership, and missionaries often took the leading roles, yet both organizations were equally committed to the reconstruction of the economy. By the early 1930s, the flames of reforming zeal had died down in the NCC, but by this same time, leaders within the YMCA, now mostly Chinese Christians, took up the cause of the restructuring project, seeking to re-ignite the smoldering embers of public opinion, particularly through their publishing work.

This paper concerns the first tide of these debates: the period of the leadership of the Committee on Christianizing the Economy, which organized the Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations in 1927 and then the Conference on the People's Livelihood, which followed in 1931. It is during this period that Protestants, mostly Western missionaries, through the agency of the Committee on Christianizing the Economy, began to challenge the direction of the industrial economy and to critique the character of the capitalist social order that was emerging in China. While the work of the committee extended beyond these conferences, including publishing a series of Chinese-language books on economic issues and also the newspaper entitled "Industrial Reconstruction," the focus of this paper will be limited to the work of these two conferences.

In its short history, the Committee on Christianizing the Economy went through various changes in name and title and a few significant changes in mandate: it first appeared as the Committee on Christian Standards for Industry; next, as the Social and Industrial Relations Committee; then, as the Committee on Christianizing the Economy; and, finally, as the Committee on Christianizing Economic Relations. Most, but not all, of these changes reflected changes in the Protestant church body which first created the committee, and of which it was a part: the NCC.[1]

---

[1] The first attempt at unifying the various Protestant mission churches into a larger unified church body came in 1913 with the formation of the China Continuation Committee. This body created the predecessor of the Committee on Christianizing the

The NCC was formed in 1922.[2] It gathered for its first annual meeting in June of 1923, and decided to establish four permanent standing committees which would fulfill the mission of the church body.[3] The editor of the NCC Bulletin explained that the four standing committees represented the four major tasks, or callings, of the council.[4] One of these four committees was the Social and Industrial Relations Committee, which inherited the work of an earlier group called the Committee on Christian Standards for Industry.[5] Concern for economic justice, then, was a priority of the NCC from its beginning.

The NCC invested the Social and Industrial Relations Committee with an agenda of labor reform, and three different reforms constituted the substance of that agenda: factories should not employ children under the age of 12; one day of seven should be a day of rest; and industry should make every effort to safeguard the health of workers. The editor of the NCC Bulletin in its first issue asks plaintively, "It is six months since that stand [for these three labor objectives] was taken by representatives of all the Protestant forces in China. What is the Church doing to promote it?" He adds, "The time need not be wasted here that has been so tragically lost in the West, in dallying with the question of whether the church is directly concerned in securing social justice. We understand better than preceding generations were able to, that the teachings of Jesus concern man in all his relationships, and take life whole."[6]

There is much that is going on in this complaint that is indicative of missionary thinking of the time. Most significantly, the Christians in-

---

Economy, the Committee on Christian Standards for Industry. In 1922, the China Continuation Committee was transformed into the National Christian Council (NCC), an organization which represented most of the major missions and mission churches in China.

[2] The Chinese journal of the China Continuation Committee, *Zhonghua gui zhu* 中華歸主, continued as the Chinese version of the *Bulletin of the National Christian Council*. Still another organization that needs to be distinguished from these is the 1922 National Christian Conference, which is the conference that established the National Council of Churches.

[3] *Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal* 54 (1923): 311.

[4] *Bulletin of the National Christian Council*, no. 3 (June 1923): 1.

[5] *Bulletin of the National Christian Council*, no. 1 (November 1922): 3. The work of the Social and Industrial Relations Committee was further divided into three separate commissions: Church and Social Problems (the problems of opium use, mainly); Church and Home; and then, the Commission on Church and Industry. The number of committees created during this period must have tried the patience of many a churchman.

[6] *Bulletin of the National Christian Council*, no. 1 (November 1922): 8.

volved in this endeavor were concerned for social justice, not just charity. An article in the second issue of the NCC Bulletin described the goal of such efforts as a "Christian social order."[7] This goal embodied the hope of many missionaries in the promise of the Social Gospel, a theological and social movement, especially popular in America during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Alarmed by the negative impact of an aggressive industrial capitalism on American society and frustrated by the failure of the individualistic and pietistic Protestant response to it, some Protestant leaders began preaching a new message of social salvation to their American churches. The most influential of the Social Gospel thinkers was a Baptist pastor, Walter Rauschenbusch, who preached this social message of Christianity in the slums of New York, amidst the collateral damage of the industrial age.[8] This social gospel that was preached in Hell's Kitchen in New York was now to be proclaimed on the factory floors of industrial Shanghai.

The message was one of "social salvation," that is personal salvation is only part of the message of Christianity; the whole message of the gospel is the gospel of the kingdom, which encompasses all aspects of human life, including social life. A tension among missionaries in China began to be expressed during the early decades of the 20th century between those who emphasized personal (or, individual) salvation and those who emphasized social salvation. The editor of the *Chinese Recorder* attacked this emerging polarization as inimical to true religion. In one editorial in March 1920, Rev. Frank Rawlinson opined: "The terms 'Christian service' and 'Social Service' or 'individual salvation' and 'social salvation' are often used as though they are mutually exclusive and antithetic. Far from there being a conflict between these two conceptions, they stand for two necessary and complimentary [*sic*] aspects of the Christian life." Rawlinson followed this editorial with another a few months later, which again emphasized the dual character of the Christian message, as he described the "social results"

---

[7] *Bulletin of the National Christian Council*, no. 2 (April 1923): 4.

[8] Walter Rauschenbusch was the author of many different works, but two were especially influential in the missionary community: *A Theology of the Social Gospel* (New York: MacMillan, 1917) and *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: MacMillan, 1912). The former was translated into Chinese, and it was published by the Committee on Christianizing the Economy. A biography of Rauschenbusch in Chinese was also published by the committee in 1928. A more recent biography of Rauschenbusch, in English, which describes his leadership in, and contribution to, the Social Gospel movement is Christopher Evans' *The Kingdom is Always but Coming: A Life of Walter Rauschenbusch* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004).

of "personal" evangelism. Still the polarization continued between those who emphasized one of these aspects over the other.[9]

This is not to say that missionaries had ignored social problems in the past. Rather, it is to say that the social gospel movement adopted a more radical posture towards society and its problems than had been taken by earlier generations of missionaries. Protestant missions had always been heavily involved in all kinds of charitable works, such as orphanages and hospitals. But these were bandaging the wounds of Chinese society. Missionaries had also railed against a few especially degrading social customs such as footbinding and concubinage, and did operate a full array of educational institutions. But this committee represented the first time that the church would address the social order itself, not just individual social customs. To be fair, though, the missionaries had not had the opportunity to do so earlier, especially since industry in China was only beginning to develop in the early part of the 20th century.

One might think at this point that the church was overestimating her influence in Chinese society. After all, the number of Christians in all of China at this time did not even reach 0.1% of the total population. That observation certainly seems valid, but only if we overlook the special place of Shanghai, since this city occupied a unique role in these debates. Shanghai came by its unique role as a result of the interplay of three distinctive attributes. First, Shanghai was truly a cosmopolitan city, as it was divided into three sections, ruled by three different nationalities: the International Settlement, ruled by the British, the French Concession, and the Chinese city. Thus, two-thirds of the city was ruled by foreigners, and assuming that these foreigners would at least have professed some form of Christian faith, there would be some kind of audience for such church proclamations. Secondly, most of China's modern manufacturing was located in Shanghai. One study prepared for the 1927 Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations showed that of 123 modern industrial cotton mills in China, fully 66 were located in Shanghai.[10] Thirdly, the city was also the center of the Christian Church. Many of the major religious publishers were located there, and it was also where many of the ecclesiastical and mission offices were established, including those of the NCC itself. In fact,

---

[9] *Chinese Recorder* 51 (1920): 152–53; 191–95; 744–45.

[10] E. M. Hinder, "Some Facts about the Present Industrial Situation in Shanghai," in *Report of the Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations* (Shanghai: National Council of Churches, 1927), 76.

the annual meetings of the council were regularly held in and around Shanghai, since most of the seventy-eighty members who made up the council at any one time lived in the city, or within a short train ride of the city. The church, therefore, had the position, means, opportunity—and the responsibility—to address these issues.

By 1926, the Committee was no longer called the Social and Industrial Relations Committee; it was now renamed the Committee on Christianizing the Economy.[11] At the same time as the committee underwent its name change, its members began planning for a national conference on the economy. In 1927, from August 18 to August 28, the Committee hosted the Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations. The NCC Bulletin predicted that this Conference would witness a "fundamental questioning of the social order."[12]

Did the conference live up to its stated goal? Conference participants seemed to have believed so. In one of the opening devotions, the speaker declared: "We are trying in this Conference to establish a new social and economic order and in this Jesus should be the center." While the conference was conducted in Chinese, the proceedings of the conference were published in both a Chinese version and an English version.[13] The main topics of the program were organized around three different "problems": industrial conditions and problems; rural economic problems; and Christianity and economic problems. Under the third topic, there was "an examination of present-day social thinking and the Christian ethic in regard to such questions as private property, inheritance, the wage system, competition and private income." The conference, further, "did not attempt to express a complete social theory or doctrinaire solutions, but its frank recognition of the evils of large property holding, and its advocacy of the limitations of large landholdings, its questioning of the sources and use of income and the division of profits, and its acceptance of the ideal, 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his need,' mark tendencies

---

[11] *Zhonghua gui zhu* [China for Christ Movement] 66 (November 1926): 119.

[12] *Bulletin of the National Christian Council*, no. 24 (June 1927): 9.

[13] The English translation does not always correspond to the Chinese translation. For example, in the English version, in a section entitled "Industrial Conditions and Problems," there is only a summary review of the labor situation in Canton; whereas in the Chinese version, there is a fairly detailed review of that same city's condition, especially when it comes to describing the extent of the Communist influence in the unions (see pp. 49ff. in the Chinese version). Later, in a section entitled "Questions for Discussion," the English version offers a much more descriptive account of the nature of the wage economy than does the Chinese version (p. 72 in the Chinese version; pp. 88–89 in the English version).

far-reaching in their results."[14] That questions regarding private property and private income (income derived from sources outside of a wage-earning occupation) were even considered showed that those in attendance were serious about their call for a reordering of the social order.

The theological rationale for this examination, however, was disappointingly weak. Even though the introduction to the program states that this conference was called "in the hope that there might be a consideration of Christian principles in their bearing on economic relations, and a clearer understanding of the task of the Christian church in this respect,"[15] the sad fact of the matter is that the participants in this conference did not do their theological homework. There were very few Christian principles enunciated, and little theological reflection in the report.[16] Yet such theological preparation was necessary in order to persuade the full cohort of Western missionaries and Chinese Christians to more robustly support this effort, so that they could see the goal of "Christianizing" the economy was not some distraction to their missionary proclamation, but was rather an integral part of the Christian message. This effort was especially important for the theological conservatives, for it is at this time that the battle between fundamentalists and modernists in the United States was intensifying, and the battle lines for that fight were being drawn on the mission field, as well. In fact, I would argue that the failure to provide the theological rationale for these resolutions ultimately doomed the missionary effort to reform the economy, and contributed further to the deepening split between

---

[14] *Report of the Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations*, 2.

[15] Ibid., 1.

[16] Most glaring is the omission in the report of any reference whatsoever to the social legislation of the Books of Moses or to the social justice pronouncements of the Old Testament prophets. There were no references, for example, to the book of Deuteronomy, which contains much social legislation that would have buttressed the calls for economic and social reform, even radical reform. In Deuteronomy 5, for example, there is the legislation dealing with debts, and the provision of the cancellation of debt at the end of seven years. Nor was there a reference to the book of Leviticus (chapter 25) which includes legislation about the Year of Jubilee, which mandated that land which was sold had to return to the original owner during the Year of Jubilee, an event which was celebrated every 50 years. In effect, land becomes inalienable, and this kind of statute would prevent the amassing of huge landholdings which the Conference especially targeted.

The participants probably expected that the devotional component would at least provide some of this. But, again, even here, there was little theological reflection. The potential in certain biblical ideas, such as the kingdom of God, was there, but it was a potential that went unrealized.

the modernist and the fundamentalist camps, and their Chinese followers.

Frank Rawlinson, the editor of the *Chinese Recorder*, delivered the opening address of the conference. He laid out the alternatives for the Chinese: "At present, there are four systems of thought concerned with the problems of the economic life in China, namely: The capitalistic, the communistic, the bolshevist, and last, but not least, the Christian." (The Chinese version has "socialist" for Rawlinson's term "bolshevist.")[17] There are other places in the report that also attempt to stake out a more neutral position for the church in its relation to the economy—for example, in another place, it was stated that Christianity could fit with any system, capitalist or socialist.[18]

The problem is that neither the missionary community nor the Chinese churches saw the church adopting this neutral position. Most American missionaries would have been wary of socialism, and tended to see capitalism as just good economic science. To be sure, certain sins needed to be compensated, certain weaknesses needed to be remedied. But in the minds of most, gradualist reform was the way forward—this in spite of the fact that such a path did not seem to be leading anywhere in China. The Chinese version of the proceedings made it clear that many outside the church did not see the institution as occupying any kind of neutral position; indeed the Chinese version described very forthrightly how the labor unions viewed the church as the tool of the Capitalists.[19] The challenge for the missionary community and the Chinese churches was to adopt a more critical posture towards the capitalist economy, for if that challenge were not met, this identification of Christianity and capitalism would threaten to seriously distort and compromise the Christian message.

Probably the most thoughtful discussion of the positive impact Christianity could have on the economic order was delivered by a Japanese Christian, Toyohiko Kagawa 賀川豊彦, in his address, "Economics and Christianity." He began his talk by referring to the New Testament passages of Acts 2 and 4, and commented that these passages suggest that "Christians were the original Communists. In the second and fourth chapters of Acts we can read of their community.

---

[17] *Report of the Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations*, 8.

[18] *Jiduhua jingjiguanxi quanguo dahui baogao* 基督化經濟關係全國大會報告 [Report of the Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations] (Shanghai: National Council of Churches, 1927), 95. The Chinese version of the report was more straightforward on this point.

[19] Ibid., 73.

But there are two kinds of communism. One is selfish, seeking to own and demand; the other is unselfish, desiring to give—and Christianity should foster the latter." Kagawa then led his listeners on a survey of Church history, but one which highlighted social movements, rather than creedal formulations. He emphasized the role of guilds in the Middle Ages and the faith of the Anabaptists of the 16th century, characterizing their economic order as "communism." He ended his address with an examination of the "glorious history" of Christian socialism in England.[20]

Though the main sessions of the conference lacked any substantial presentation of a theological rationale for developing the new economic order, the final day of the conference witnessed a flurry of activity that more closely realized the promise of the conference. The activity resulted in a document containing several resolutions which boldly challenged the existing economic order. A few of the more progressive resolutions included: the institution of a minimum wage, based on the cost of living, not purely on the law of supply and demand; a reduction in hours worked per day, with the eventual goal being an eight-hour working day; the establishing of one day of rest per week, with the rest day being a paid rest day; the abolition of child labor, and the prohibition of night work for women workers (many women worked night shifts in the textile mills).[21] None of these proposals could be termed radical; indeed, many were reformist in character, and were similar to the proposals that made up the original mandate handed down by the National Christian Conference of 1922.

More radical was the manifesto issued at the end of the conference, bearing the title, "Christianity and Economic Problems." This document featured five different resolutions. First was a resolution concerning private property and inheritance. There is a list of platitudes which follow, but the section ends with the exhortation, "the Conference urges Christians to study the present economic order, with a view toward the elimination of the evils of holding large amounts of private property." In a second resolution, the Conference adopted the principle "To Each According to his Need," especially with reference to the payment of wages. The failure of the present economic system, the report tells us, is that it bases wage rates on production, rather than on the need of the workers to provide for their families. The fourth resolution urged the church to critique the existing economic system, and to aim

---

[20] *Report of the Conference on Christianizing Economic Relations*, 38–40.

[21] Ibid., 116–17.

at establishing a system which better expressed the Christian spirit.[22] These resolutions had the potential, if implemented, to offer a more radical vision of how Christian Chinese, along with their fellow countrymen, could relate to the economy, dealing as they do with issues such as the wage system, large landholding, inheritance, and how profits were to be distributed.

Shortly after the conclusion of the conference, the committee was renamed once again. The committee's name changed to the Committee on Economic Relations, after the name of the 1927 Conference, instead of the more revolutionary and foundation-shaking title, Committee on Christianizing the Economy.[23] Not only that, but several months later, the committee membership was tamed as well, counting among its members none other than the Nationalist Government minister, H. H. Kung (Kong Xiangxi 孔祥熙)![24] Some big changes had overtaken the committee in its short existence, and there would be more, as a newly-established Nationalist government (Chiang Kai-shek's Northern Expedition turned against its erstwhile Communists allies in Shanghai of April of 1927, just four months before the first conference opened) was beginning to exercise its control over the nation, and over the more progressive elements in the Christian community.

In February of 1931, a second conference was convened by what was now called the Committee on Christianizing Economic Relations, and in this conference the changes wrought by the new political order were evident. The proceedings of the conference were published under the title, *Papers, Abstracts, and Extracts from Papers contributed as the basis of discussion to the Conference on The People's Livelihood.* The forward informs us that "The National Christian Council, acting through its Committee on Christianizing Economic Relations, called, in February 1931, a Conference upon the 'People's Livelihood.' This constituted the second gathering under these auspices to consider the responsibility of the Christian movement in China in relation to the economic life of the people, the first having convened in 1927."[25]

H. H. Kung, serving the Nationalist government in the capacity of Minister of Industries,[26] while holding membership on the committee

---

[22] Ibid., 121–24.

[23] *Bulletin of the National Christian Council*, no. 26 (November 1927): 12.

[24] *Bulletin of the National Christian Council*, no. 29 (July 1928): 13.

[25] *Papers, Abstracts and Extracts from Papers: Conference on the People's Livelihood* (Shanghai: National Christian Council, 1931), i.

[26] From 1933–38, Kong served as the head of the Central Bank and as the head of the Ministry of Finance. He was also a brother-in-law of Chiang Kai-shek, having

for the Christianizing of Economic Relations, acted as the honorary chairman of the conference, and so delivered the opening address. He began by noting how the conference was organized under Sun Yat-sen's "Principle of the People's Livelihood." In Kung's speech, he focused first on the problem of rural agriculture. The most pressing need in agriculture was not the large landholdings which the 1927 Conference was most concerned with, but, rather, the need to improve the yield of crops through the application of scientific agriculture. Similarly, the most urgent problem in industry was the low level of productive efficiency. Wages could only rise once efficiency was realized. And efficiency would only be realized by the application of improved scientific methods.[27] Any discussion of setting wages according to the cost of living is absent. His emphasis was on the production of wealth, not its redistribution.

Eleanor Hinder, a YWCA secretary and long-term member of the committee, filed her report next, describing the kind of progress that had been realized since the 1927 conference. She characterized the earlier conference as having centered on hopes—"hopes for legislation, hopes for the development of scientific welfare work, the promotion of co-operative societies, and of workers' education."[28] She was especially encouraged by the progress that had been made in the industrial sphere, with three national labor laws having been enacted during the intervening time.

There was certainly more scientific study available at this conference, supplying the evidence for needed change. Some at the 1927 Conference had lamented the lack of such studies, since one of the most significant and radical proposals called for a minimum wage which was to be based on the needs of families, rather than on the law of supply and demand for labor. A study authored by H. D. Lamson provided a series of tables analyzing the budgets of families in various cities and in the countryside. Lamson included ten different tables, each of them summarizing the results of several different studies. For example, his Table 5, *Industrial Workers' Families, Factory and Home: Percentages Expended*, includes the results of seven different studies of budgets of industrial workers' families from various Chinese cities. Lamson's own 1929 study of 121 industrial families in Shanghai shows that these families spent 56% of their income on food, and only 9% of

---

married Song Ailing 宋靄齡.

[27] *Conference on the People's Livelihood*, 2–3.

[28] Ibid., 4–5.

their income on rent. A different study of the families of Beijing craftsmen, conducted by the Social Research Institute of China Foundation, reported that their families were also spending 56% of their budget on food, while hosiery workers' families in Tianjin 天津 were setting aside similar amounts for food (the multiple appearances of this 56% figure does cast some suspicion on the accuracy of these studies).[29] Yet, even though the ostensible purpose of these studies was to recommend a minimum wage based on the cost of living, there was no discussion of this very principle in Lamson's report.

Probably the most eye-opening report of the conference was that on industrialization and labor in Hebei 河北 Province, with a special focus on industry in Tianjin. The study applied a Marxist type of analysis to the conditions of the laborers in that city, and yet for much of the document the author praises the policies of the ruling Nationalist party government! The author notes the progress being made. He remarks positively on the impact of government efforts at ameliorating the burden and misery of industrial work. He refers, for example, to the Industrial Disputes Law, the Trade Union Law and the Factory Law. He found that that the system of one day of rest per week was in effect in most of the modern factories and mills. Child labor, nevertheless, was more resistant to change in Tianjin than in other cities, as fully 21% of the factory work force was still made up of child labor.[30] The study points out that the national law made no provision for factory inspection, and this hindered the enforcement of these laws.

The problem of enforcement, however, was not totally the fault of the national government. Part of the problem with government enforcement was the factories which operated in the foreign settlements, especially in Shanghai, in the British-governed International Settlement and in the French Concession, outside the jurisdiction of the Chinese government. M. T. Tchou surveyed the factory legislation, highlighting many of the more significant provisions, and he also pointed to the problem of enforcement, especially in the foreign concessions.[31]

The conference proceedings ended with a list of solutions to the problems outlined in the previous chapters. These are all of a reformist character, accepting the system of industrial capitalism, and working within it. Missing in this list are hopes of a different kind of system taking hold, an alternative both to the coercive systems of Capitalism

---

[29] Ibid., 11–12.
[30] Ibid., 45–47.
[31] Ibid., 82.

(as it was practiced in China during this time) and Communism, an alternative which many missionaries and Chinese leaders believed was possible in 1927. Christians, Western and Chinese, did not really question the need for China to industrialize. Most Christians believed that China's economic needs were as much a matter of economic production as economic distribution. But many Western and Chinese Christians did hope for an alternative. What happened to the hopes and dreams of just four years earlier? Was it a more conservative Christian reaction against rising Communist agitation? Were Christians just reckoning with the new direction Chinese society had taken under the leadership of the Nationalist Party? Or was it the very practical policy of believers facing the challenge of the world-wide depression?

Thus ends the first period of this debate concerning religion and the economy. Western missionaries in the main seem to have given up on the search for an alternative to the two systems. Chinese church leaders, however, will prove to be more persistent in the search. In the next few years after the close of the 1931 conference, a new tide of Christian debates on the economy will appear, and in these debates, now under the auspices of the YMCA, Chinese Christians will assume the most prominent roles. The outcome of these debates will lead several Chinese Christians to embrace the most radical of economic alternatives.

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 131–152

The Importance of Shandong

A Missiological Evaluation of *Place*

SCOTT W. SUNQUIST

The Master said, "The study of
strange doctrines is injurious indeed!" [1]

INTRODUCTION

Robert Morrison never stepped a foot in Shandong 山東, but I would argue he should have. Robert Morrison tilled the soil of Chinese culture to plant the seed of Protestant, Bible-centered Christianity, and in later generations, the seed Morrison planted developed. The development of Christianity has been quite diverse in China, but of special significance are a few locations. Shanghai, Nanjing, Hong Kong, Beijing and, I would argue, the province of Shandong. Most are major cities, Shandong a more rural province.

Missionary intercourse with local cultures is part of the story of local societies and cultures. Perspective is everything. If we were looking

---

Scott W. SUNQUIST is the W. Don McClure Associate Professor of World Mission and Evangelism at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pennsylvania, USA.

[1] Confucius' *Analects*, II (Wei Zheng), 16, translated by James Legge.

at the missionary endeavors in China from Europe or North America, we would see interactions, glories or tragedies as expressions, or extensions of Western culture. Even if we have great empathy for the Chinese, we would still be expressing Western interpretations of the Chinese context and the Chinese psyche. In this essay we shift the historical perspective, not from Western missionaries to that of the Chinese, but to that of a province. What can we learn about cultural interactions and Christian missionary expression by focusing on a diachronic study of a province? Although we could choose any province or even a number of major cities for our study, I have chosen a province that has been remarkable in the history of China and in the history of Christianity. Whether we are studying climate, geography, cultural history, colonial history, indigenous church development, or Christian missionary activity, Shandong stands out as an interesting case study.

Our approach may seem a little unusual, but I would like to suggest that such a pattern may bear fruit in other areas of mission history as well as other studies of indigenous Christian development. First, we will take a brief look at the historical geography of the region. Climate and topography, as we will see, have had a decisive influence upon the history of Shandong. Secondly, we will look briefly at some of the cultural history of the province. Its proximity to the Northern Capital, Beijing, and its geography have had an influence upon this cultural history, but, as we will see there are other reasons that the province has had such a rich history. Thirdly, we will look at some of the historical Western figures who have worked in Shandong trying to answer some questions about how their Christian endeavors were channeled by their relationships with the environment and history of the region. Fourthly, we will look at a few indigenous Christian movements that developed in Shandong from 1900 to 1938, and even before. Again, we will ask some questions about the relationship of the history (cultural, geographical, political and religious) to the development of these indigenous churches. Finally we will draw some tentative conclusions about what we have learned by taking this angle or perspective to study Christian history.

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF SHANDONG

Geography does not completely determine history, but it is one of the major factors. In the case of Shandong, geography and climate together

is a major factor in the history of religion in Shandong. Shandong's geography has a few unusual features that have led to some extreme natural occurrences. We will look at its coastline, the Yellow River and its location. From these three we will see that important events follow such as the building of the Grand Canal, the flooding disasters and great droughts and famines. More than any other province, geography has both blessed and cursed Shandong. The mighty Yellow River, for example, is called both "China's Pride" and "China's Sorrow."

Shandong is a peninsula situated between the Northern Capital, Beijing, and the old Southern Capital, Nanjing. It contains uplands in the central west, ever so slightly raised plains and then most of the province is a massive peninsular flood plain. The coastline is the second longest in China and contains many natural harbors (but also many dangerous reefs). Being situated between the two ancient capitals Shandong is a crossroads for traveling both north and south, and east and west.[2] The Grand Canal, a project mostly done at the end of the Sui and the beginning of the Tang Dynasty,[3] is the longest and most important canal in the world, traveling through western Shandong. The Yellow River is the second longest river in China and is considered the Cradle of Chinese Civilization.[4] This mighty river descends much too slowly through Shandong, and it carries much too much of the loess soil from Shanxi 山西, and so it is constantly shifting direction as it annually carries over one billion tons of soil to and through Shandong; it is truly a yellow looking river. Because of this "crossroads" location, and due to particular climatic conditions, this province has been unusually enriched, but more often in the past two centuries, unusually impoverished. Because southern China is the more productive region for wheat and rice, it became necessary to transport those grains easier to the north and so the Grand Canal was built.

The Grand Canal was a massive human undertaking, but there is a second massive human undertaking in Shandong and that has been the thousand year attempt called "Controlling the Dragon."[5] Annual summer rains along with thawing snows in the mountains cause periodic

---

[2] Even today, Shandong has the most dense highway network, again explained by its location.

[3] As early as the fifth century BCE the Canal was started to bring grains north. The Canal was not completed until the Yuan Dynasty (1279–1368).

[4] Other river basins that have been "cradles of civilization" are the Indus, Nile and the twin rivers of the Tigris and Euphrates.

[5] Randall A. Dodgen, *Controlling the Dragon: Confucian Engineers and the Yellow River in Late Imperial China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001).

flooding. What makes it much worse for this lazy river is the constantly rising river bed, causing the river to "seek lower ground," and causing engineers to build containing dikes and levees. At great cost of both human labor and money, Confucian engineers worked for centuries to minimize flooding and control the mighty dragon. In spite of the grand bureaucracy of Qing China working to control the river, in the years following 1853 the mighty river finally turned north, to an earlier emptying place, into the Bohai Sea. For a brief period of 700 years the Yellow River had passed Shandong and emptied further south into the Yellow Sea.[6]

In the century between the First Opium War (1842) and the Japanese War of Aggression, there were four major tragedies related to the Yellow River. The first was the major course change that took place from 1853 to 1855. During this time millions of people were displaced. The second major disaster has been considered the worst natural disaster up to its time: the 1887 Yellow River Flood. Estimates of the number of people killed (mostly in Shandong) go from 800,000 to 2.5 million. Again, millions were dislocated and lost their homes. The third major disaster was even greater and that was the 1931 flood, whereby between 900,000 and 4 million people were killed.[7] This was the worst natural disaster of the twentieth century. The fourth disaster of the Yellow River was not a natural disaster. With the Japanese advancing by sea and then through Shandong in 1938, the Guomindang decided to secretly slow down or prevent their advance by destroying the major dikes and levees of the Yellow River and flooding major portions of Shandong. Citizens were not notified, so they slept quietly in their homes as the waters rushed through their villages. An estimated 900,000 people died. In each and every one of these disasters, massive movements of people were necessary. Death, migration, homelessness and despair reigned far too much in this one province from 1842 to 1942.

As significant as the floods have been for Shandong and the surrounding regions, droughts have been just as disastrous in Shandong, as well as elsewhere in China.[8] Shandong has not been the only province

---

[6] It is estimated that the Yellow River has breached levees over 1,500 hundred times and had major course changes eighteen times.

[7] Death estimates are very difficult to quantify because many people will die within the following six months to a year from cholera and typhoid outbreaks.

[8] Estimating deaths from drought is a risky business, but globally most people would agree that four of the worst six droughts and accompanying famines in the world occurred in China (the 1900 famine in India and 1930–31 famine in Russia would be the other major ones, each with over a million deaths).

hit by some of these droughts and famines, but because of the impact upon the Grand Canal and the river basin, the droughts have had wider repercussions than the loss of grain. We could speak of other famines in the past century or two, but the Great Famine of 1876–79, both because of its time (rise of Protestant missionaries) and its impact (some regions saw a reduction in 90% of the population), will be used as an illustration. The droughts in Shandong and nearby provinces generally occur when the monsoon rains in the south do not move. These clockwise spinning winds will pump water into southern China for months, bringing long term dry winds from the west (Gobi Desert) into northern China. When this happens, the ground gets parched like a rock and, when it happens for a few years in a row, as it did beginning in 1875, the reserve grains are quickly consumed. Eastern Shandong had also had dry years for two years preceding, so the famine hit them hardest and the earliest. The results were devastating and the letters and articles written by missionaries are, to this day, among the most heart-rending you will ever read. They talk about people dismantling their homes to sell wood for fuel. Parents would sell their children into servitude, or sell their daughters into prostitution. There were stories of people becoming cannibalistic, sometimes not waiting for babies or starving adults to die before they began preparations. Bark was stripped off of trees for food and many, in complete despair, used their last strength to leap off of building to their deaths. Suicide was common. Cholera and typhoid exploited the weakened condition of people in a five province area of Shandong, Hebei 河北, He'nan 河南, Shanxi and Shaanxi 陕西. The British legation estimated 7 million died in the first winter of the Great Famine, 1876–77. Estimates from the China Relief Fund, an international fund set up by missionaries, estimated 9.5 to 13 million died in the three year famine.[9] Those who could, fled to the cities of the south where there was still food. Farms and homes were abandoned in an effort to stay alive. The migrations became a new problem for the already overtaxed government. A trade imbalance, due to the enforced trade in opium, the economic drain of a thirteen year civil war (Taiping Rebellion from 1851 to 1864), and now famine and uncontrolled migration just about brought the Dynasty to ruin. Over 70% of China's budget was being spent on military, to keep down rebellions and triad gangs, and now to control masses of migrants. The government had neither the will nor the foresight to keep the water system (dikes, lev-

[9] At the same time, a similar, though slightly less tragic, famine was occurring in India. See David Arnold, *Famine: Social Crisis and Historical Change* (London: Blackwell, 1988).

ees and canals) in good working order, nor to keep large granary inventories. The climate made things terrible for China, but political decisions and British imperialism made this apocalyptic. It was into this situation that the first generation of Protestant missionaries flooded into China after the Second Opium War.

CULTURAL HISTORY OF SHANDONG

Chinese culture developed in the Yellow River basin, in part centered in Shandong. The earliest dynasties were all centered in the Yellow River basins moving out to the north and south from the River. In these earlier dynasties the Yellow River emptied to the north and so it traveled through much of what is presently Shandong.[10] It is here then, in present day Shandong, He'nan and Shanxi, that Chinese civilization and culture first formed. In fact, the Chinese culture that Western missionaries from the seventh century on would encounter was the culture being formed for a millennium or more in the Yellow River region.

This is not the time or place to give a lecture on Confucianism, but a few comments should be made, if for no other reason, to acknowledge some historic irony. Confucius (Kongzi 孔子, 551–479 BCE) was born during the later Spring and Autumn Period, in the city of Qufu 曲阜, which was in the fragile state or Dukedom of Lu 魯. For our interest, it is important to know that Confucius never claimed to be teaching anything new—only to remind people of truths they already knew, and to remind them that lessons of *Li* 理 or what is righteous are found in our past. In this sense, he was an arch-traditionalist who, according to tradition, spent three years mourning his mother's death, and who taught that honoring your father is to imitate him when he dies. The afterlife is of no consequence; doing what is right here, and learning that from the wisdom of the past, is what is important. Two generations later his greatest follower, Mencius or Mengzi 孟子 (372–289 BCE), was born just 30 miles south of Qufu in the impressive capital city of the Qi 齊 Kingdom, Linzi 臨淄. This was not a state, but a Kingdom, and Mencius carried on the teachings of what some have called early Neoconfucianism. His teachings were long monologs and dialogs, whereas

[10] The twelfth century was the first time that the silt built up so much that the river flowed to the south emptying in the Yellow Sea.

Confucius would give aphorisms and proverbs. There are differences in their teachings, but what is remarkable for twenty-first-century ears—Eastern or Western ears—is the constant concern to learn from the past, preserve the past and show reverence and honor to family (especially parents) and rulers. Children also are to be trained properly, raised not near a graveyard, nor near a market, but near to a school.[11] One element that is new in Mencius is his teaching about the "enemy" of the old established traditions. Mencius, unlike Confucius, makes room for revolutionary behavior against a ruler who has "lost the mandate of heaven." When violence and corruption persist, or when famine and floods abound, it is clear that the ruler has lost the mandate from heaven. In times of national disaster, kings and other rulers must make proper sacrifices to retain the mandate for their rule. In Confucianism, both women and children are to be cared for. This is acting justly or in harmony, according to *Li*.

There are many other cultural and historic events and people associated with Shandong, but I would like to mention just two more. Buddhism also is important to Shandong. In 412 CE the Chinese Buddhist monk Faxian 法顯 (Fa-Hien according to James Legge) returned from a twenty year trip to the West, traveling to India and Sri Lanka, and bringing with him Buddhist scriptures and circulating his famous *A Book of Buddhistic Kingdoms*.[12] When he returned, he first landed in Shandong, where he began his translating of one of the lives of the Buddha from Sanskrit into Chinese.[13] Thus, he is one of the greatest historical figures in the translation of South Asian Buddhism to Chinese Buddhism.

One final historical note is worth mentioning and this is an occurrence during our time period: the Boxer Rebellion.[14] The "Fists of Righteous Harmony" were aroused first in Shandong with the post–

---

[11] Taken from one of the most quoted phrases of Mencius: *Meng mu san qian* 孟母三遷; literal translation: "Mencius' mother, three moves." These are the three moves she made, ending up near to a school.

[12] The full title is *A Book of Buddhist Kingdoms, Being an Account of the Chinese Monk, Faxian, of His Travels in India and Ceylon*, translated by James Legge, 1886.

[13] It appears from his biography that he later did most of his translation in Nanjing, being prevented from returning to his home in Xi'an, to the west.

[14] An interesting study related to Chinese rebellions would be to compare and look for some direct relationships between the White Lotus rebellions at the end of the eighteenth century with the Nian (Nien) 捻 Rebellion (1851–68) and the Boxer Rebellion. All had strong religious components (Pure Land Buddhism and some Daoism), along with various concerns for national identity (opposing the Manchus, British, Germans, etc.). The Nian Rebellion, however, was clearly catalyzed into semi-organized "bands" by two major floods of the Yellow River, in 1851 and 1855.

Sino-Japanese War settlements whereby Germany gained control over the important port of Qingdao 青島. German Catholic missionaries were very strong in this region already, and Society of the Divine Word (SVD) brothers were working throughout Shandong. Although anti-foreignism was mounting throughout the country at the time, Shandong seemed to be the flashpoint. The SVD missionary, John Baptist Anzer (1851–1903), was more confrontational than most of his missionary brothers, trekking to the home of Confucius in Qufu, stating his purpose: "My one aim, and the end of all my struggles and tribulations, was to lift high the standard of Christ in Qufu, Confucius' birthplace."[15] Anzer's imperialistic approach had sudden and dramatic repercussions: on November 3, 1897, two SVD missionaries were killed in Shandong. At the time, Anzer was back in Berlin, possibly conferring with the Kaiser about extending German influence in China. This was the final impetus to the regional and then empire-wide movement against both foreigners (both business people and Christians) and Chinese who became Christians. The initial slogan was "Overthrow the Qing; Destroy the Foreigner," but later it was a call to resist "primary, secondary and tertiary hairy men" (foreign traders, Christians and Chinese Christians). Nationalism, Buddhism and indignation combined to create a national explosion against foreign communities. Most of those who were killed, however, were Chinese Roman Catholics.[16] The Boxer uprising began in Shandong.

MISSIONARY CHRISTIAN HISTORY

Roman Catholics up to 1800

Christian history in Shandong goes back to the early Jesuits who mostly passed through Shandong going from port cities in the south, to

---

[15] See, Gianni Criveller, PIME, "Freinademetz and Anzer: Two Missionaries, Two Styles," trans. Betty Ann Maheu, *Tripod*, no. 131 (2003): 7–15.

[16] Samuel H. Moffett, *A History of Christianity in Asia, Volume II: 1500–1900* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 2005), 486, where he gives statistics from K. S. Latourette of 1,912 Protestant Chinese killed but, 30,000 or more Roman Catholic Chinese. This fits well with the thesis that Anzer and others had provoked the Boxers, since there were far more Protestant missionaries working in China at the time. The Protestant community was a little more than one-third of the Roman Catholic Chinese community in 1897.

the Imperial center of the Middle Kingdom, Beijing. In the early 1600s some Jesuits did toil away for twelve years, but with no response, and they left.[17] Shandong was not the type of place for Jesuits who were committed to reaching the rulers, so that the masses would follow. Shandong was no longer the center of Chinese civilization as it was in the Spring and Autumn Period and the Period of Warring States. Shandong was poorer, with no major cities like Beijing, Nanjing or Wuhan 武漢. Next, in the early decades of the eighteenth century, the Franciscans came, and these friars, more suited to work among the poor and underside, had amazing ministry results.

> The friars indeed sometimes took on work in a particularly tough territory, sometimes even in places that the Jesuits had given up as hopeless. The latter, after twelve years' fruitless work in Shandong, abandoned the area, and the friars remained alone there in the 1650s. They worked for fifteen years almost in despair, then suddenly the tide turned and by 1670 they had 4,000 converts. Within a few more years they reported that for Christian fervor it was the best province in all China.[18]

For less than ten years, Dominicans labored in Shandong as well as in Shanxi. Then, after a period of absence, the Franciscans returned and labored under very difficult conditions, including the general exile of all missionaries from China (1665–71). Antonio de Santa María Caballero (1602–69) is one of the more interesting of the friars of this period, and he gives us a window into the approach which was required at the time. He describes the difficulty relating to any of the literati, and then he talks about the overwhelming majority of the people in Shandong:

> The second are the country people . . . From these our Christians are drawn. They appreciate the things of this world well enough and that which concerns life here on earth; but to comprehend the way of eternal life these people are so ignorant, awkward and dull that it requires the above-mentioned exertions to prepare them for holy baptism and even greater ones to maintain them in the truth.[19]

---

[17] For a summary of the early Roman Catholic work see: Nicholas Standaert, ed., *Handbook of Christianity in China, Volume One: 635–1800* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 328.

[18] J. S. Cummins, *A Question of Rites* (Aldershot, Hants: Scolar Press, 1993), 110.

[19] From R. Gary Tiedemann, "Christianity and Chinese 'Heterodox Sects': Mass Conversion and Syncretism in Shandong Province in the Early Eighteenth Century,"

Most of the Christians are "awkward," "ignorant," "country people." Roman Catholic work at this period was little concerned with training Chinese priests. Their concern was to baptize, catechize, and order Christian communities that would be under Spanish or French or Portuguese priests. Until Spanish funding could no longer provide support, the Franciscans continued their ministry in China up to the first years of the nineteenth century, about the time of the arrival of Robert Morrison.

Protestant Missionaries in Shandong

Shandong was only entered by Protestants after the Second Opium War, when foreigners were "officially" permitted to reside beyond the approved treaty ports.[20] These early missionaries were little different from missionaries from the same societies already working in South Asia and Africa. They were motivated by a desire to see Chinese come to faith in Christ, for churches of Chinese to be worshipping the Triune God, and for Chinese to eventually evangelize their own country. They believed in the importance of learning local languages and dialects and in translating the Bible into those local languages. The Bible was the primary source and subject. Supporting this work of conversion and church development were the twin tools of education and medical care. But medical care was more than just an evangelistic tool, it was also a very personal concern. In 1861, within just a few months of each other, the southern Baptists Rev. and Mrs. J. B. Hartwell, Presbyterians Rev. and Mrs. Samuel Gayley, Rev. and Mrs. J. A. Danforth and Rev. and Mrs. John L. Nevius arrived in the port city of Dengzhou 登州 (Tengchow). G. Thompson Brown puts things in perspective:

> In the mid-nineteenth century it [Shandong] was desperately poor, and far removed from the Western commercial penetration. Both the Gayley and Danforth families had suffered from the heat and humidity in Shanghai and it was thought the five-hundred mile move north would be good for them.[21]

Monumenta Serica 44 (1996): 340.

[20] Although the "Peace Treaty" opening the ports to foreign residence was signed in 1858 (Treaty of Tianjin), China refused to allow foreign embassies in Beijing and so fighting continued up to the capture, looting and destruction of the Emperor's "Summer Palace." Thus, 1860 or 1861 was the very earliest Protestant missionaries could "legally" reside in China outside of the Treaty ports.

[21] G. Thompson Brown, *Earthen Vessels and Transcendent Power: American Presby-*

Helen Nevius also became very sick on the ship and the south China weather was very hard on her, so the Neviuses almost moved permanently to Japan, but John Nevius' clear sense of call brought them back to China. They returned to the north where the climate might be more favorable for his wife. Climate moved them north. John Nevius himself never had health problems, something his wife attributed to his exercise and "Sabbath keeping."[22] I believe his imported fruit trees and seeds might also have helped.[23] A cholera outbreak greeted the earliest missionaries and this dominated their first few years of letter writing, that is, along with language learning. Nevius, driven by health issues to Shandong, developed an approach to missionary work which, though not completely novel, is world famous. His "Three-Self Principles," as they are commonly known, are really about the de-professionalization of the ministry.[24] In his famous article, published in 1886 in the *Chinese Recorder*, "Methods of Missionary Work," Nevius focuses upon the problems with the "old way" of doing missionary work and contrasts this with the "New Methods." The old way involved paying Christian agents, and thus taking converts out of their environment, and out of their place of greatest effectiveness. Nevius contrasts this with the need to leave people in the occupation and location where they were first found, and then to provide training in each local context. This also meant that the missionary work would not be as dependent upon foreign capital (paying Chinese to do the ministry), nor upon foreign leadership. Nevius lived this idea of entrusting the ministry to local people. He and his wife had a nice mission house which was both a launching pad for his two to three month trips, and a type of school for young girls. He traveled constantly around central and western Shandong from the home base (first in Dengzhou and later in Cheefoo [Yantai 煙台]). His approach was not the basic approach used in China by

---

terians in China, 1837–1952 (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1997), 54.

[22] Helen S. Coan Nevius, *The Life of John Livingston Nevius, for Forty Years a Missionary in China* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1895). Helen Nevius remarked on the move north, "It required but a few months to prove the comparative salubriousness of the climate" (ibid., 213).

[23] Part of Nevius' response to the Great Famine was to bring in a variety of fruit trees from the United States. It worked in providing an important source of nutrition. Even today, the Shandong government website acknowledges the importance of fruit in Shandong: "The apples produced in Yantai, pears from Laiyang, peaches of Feicheng, and Leling's golden-threaded jujubes are all famous specialties."

[24] From an article to be published in the *Nanjing Theological Review*, by Scott W. Sunquist, "Four Theorists, Three-Selfs, Two Countries, One Goal: Missionary Practice in China and Korea."

the larger denominational churches, but it was the pattern of the Shandong missionaries: Hunter Corbett, Calvin Mateer and others.

Supporting this approach was the establishment of schools for both boys and girls. Julia Mateer imitated Helen Nevius, by starting her own school, as weak as she was. Both Julia and Calvin had run their own schools in the States before leaving for Asia. They were energized by thinking of how to better communicate, educate and transform young lives. Julia could not have children, so her educational ministry, a ministry that did in fact transform hundreds of young, poor Chinese boys into Christian men, was her life. The Mateers, but mostly Julia, set the pattern for the famous network of Shandong schools: these schools were basic schools of literacy, Christian knowledge and modern sciences where all the teaching was done in Chinese.[25] This meant that the first standard books on geography, Western science and mathematics were the translations and writings of the Mateers. The goal for the first two decades was not to train scholars, but to train well-informed Christian young men. A nine-year basic education was what the parents would sign up for, for their children.

Calvin Wilson Mateer, and Julia, had arrived in 1863, just two years after the first Protestants in Shandong, and while Julia stayed at "home" in the Kwan Yin Temple, Calvin tried the Nevius approach of vast itineration for nine-and-a-half years (until 1873). The childless Julia, who was still a gifted mother and educator, quietly established a school in her home for orphaned and poorer boys. Eventually, Rev. Mateer gave up on exercising a gift he did not have, and he soon followed his wife and became a leader in education. However, their educational model supported the Nevius method providing basic education for boys and girls, as opposed to training an elite class of Westernized Christians. Mateer had traveled an estimated 15,000 miles by foot and donkey before he settled down to educational work. When he did settle down, he and Julia[26] wrote what became a standard book for learning

---

[25] "Mr. and Mrs. Mateer included in their curriculum of studies the Chinese trimetrical classics (which were explained as soon as committed), geography, mental and written arithmetic, natural philosophy, 'Peep of Day,' *Pilgrim's Progress*, *Evidences of Christianity*, and the 'Church Catechism'; later were added algebra, geometry, astronomy, chemistry, etc. they early began, also, giving their students practice in writing compositions, a new feature of school life to them. As early as the summer of 1867, drill in debate was established as one of the regular features of the school." From the aptly titled biography of Julia written by her brother-in-law, Robert McCheyne Mateer, *Character-building in China: The Life-story of Julia Brown Mateer* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1912), 50.

[26] Julia refused to take any credit; from *Character-building in China*, 38f.

Chinese, *Mandarin Lessons*, an indication of their commitment to doing all work in Chinese, and in making sure that all missionaries knew Chinese well. The little school that Julia founded and ran became the Tengchow College and later the Christian University of Shandong. Mateer's Christian College trained all students to be Christians in word and in deed, and they would also be thoroughly Chinese, doing all of their studies in the Chinese language. A Baptist friend once observed after hearing formal addresses delivered at graduation from students at the Mateer school (1876), "These accomplished and earnest young men have learned no English and have not been lifted above their natural position or in any way denationalized." This was in concert with the Nevius Plan, but it was also clearly moving against the missionary grain, for educationalists working in China felt that modern science had to be taught with Western languages; the Asian languages were not suited for these new ideas.[27] Over half of the graduates became teachers themselves, making possible a self-propagating educational system, if not a self-propagating church.[28]

Time does not allow for a full discussion of three other important missionaries who worked in Shandong—Charlotte (Lottie) Moon,[29] Gilbert Reid and Timothy Richard—but to illustrate our thesis we must briefly look at the third of these three. Timothy Richard (1845–1919)[30] was a Baptist Welshman whose Christianity was flavored by Welsh revivalism. Although he later became a missionary to many provinces of China, his early and formative years were spent in Shandong, working alongside men like Nevius and Mateer. In fact, Mateer's educational leadership, doing some of the early chemistry and physics experiments in classes, were a model for what Richard would later advocate for all of China.[31] Richard began his work as an evangelist

---

[27] When Henry Winters Luce became principal of the school, he moved it to Ji'nan and introduced English language education. Luce later moved to Beijing and became vice-president of Yenching.

[28] Irwin T. Hyatt, Jr., *Our Ordered Lives Confess, Three Nineteenth-century American Missionaries in East Shantung* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 140.

[29] Lottie Moon, because of the annual "Lottie Moon Mission Offering," is the best known of all Southern Baptist missionaries. She is also well known because of her long term and effective work in Shandong, work that was not without its problems but was strong and persistent.

[30] It is of interest that Richard, who developed a highly social and political theology, died the year after Washington Gladden and Walter Rauschenbusch.

[31] From the less than subjective work by William E. Soothill, *Timothy Richard of China: Seer, Statesman, Missionary and the Most Disinterested Adviser the Chinese Ever*

distributing scripture in far-off villages in 1870, but within his first six years he had two major transformative experiences. He began to talk to people of different religious loyalties (Daoist, Buddhist, Confucianists and Muslims) and he encountered the Great Famine. This first turned him toward the study of religion and what we might call early interreligious dialog. The famine caused Richard to quickly make the assessment that the problems in China were so great they demanded a good understanding of the politics and religions of the country. Changes that Christians want to see in individual lives will not take place unless the larger societal problems are confronted. Chinese will not understand the message unless it is shown to them, not just told to them. Richard began to make contacts with local officials to get food to the poorer regions. Then he began to organize relief efforts channeling money from Europe and Shanghai to Shandong and Shanxi provinces. His work with Chinese officials convinced him that the role of the missionary was to open doors of understanding among the elite leaders of China. The traveling evangelistic work must be done by the Chinese. In this regard he strongly supported the Shandong-Nevius method. However, educational work for Richard and others like him (W. A. P. Martin and Young John Allen) must reach the scholars and literati class. Richard was a modern Protestant Matteo Ricci in his approach. "Inquire for the most worthy. There was to be no stealthy progress by keeping in the shade, but open dealing with the most open-hearted and even-minded of the people."[32] Richard was redirected by his ten years in Shandong and became a global advocate for educational and relief reform for China.

INDIGENOUS CHRISTIAN MOVEMENTS IN SHANDONG

One might expect that indigenous Christian movements would develop in the twentieth century in China, and I think we might even assume that these movements would develop as a reaction to the oppressive

---

Had (London: Seeley, Service & Co. Limited, 1924), and Hyatt, *Our Ordered Lives Confess*, 193 and 217.

[32] From Soothill, *Timothy Richard of China*, 77, quoting from Richard's handwritten note on a published sermon of Edward Irving where Irving argues for missionary work in the pattern of Jesus, "seeking the most worthy."

Western dominance of Christianity in China. Such has been the case in many other areas of the world. Slaves in the Americas developed their own churches in opposition to white churches and as a matter of Christian self-definition. In Africa, African Initiated (Indigenous) Churches began developing in the late nineteenth century, and these churches, using African languages and religious rituals, resisted foreign domination and even culture. In China this also happened, but I think it is of note that many of these movements were initiated by or developed in Shandong. The great Chinese evangelist John Sung (Song Shangjie 宋尚節) is an example of an indigenous leader rising up and throwing off the blanket of Western Christianity, but he did not start a church: he was a prophetic figure. Andrew Ji and the others in the Bethel Evangelistic Band did evangelistic work, but they did not repudiate the Western church and Western institutions. Thus, the number of truly indigenous movements that became institutionalized before the Japanese War of Aggression is relatively small. We will briefly mention four churches, one revival and one modern development rooted in Shandong origins.

The Jesus Family was founded by a former Daoist and Confucianist, Jing Dianying 敬奠瀛 at Mazhuang 馬莊, Shandong in 1927. Although he attended a Methodist middle school in Tai'an 泰安, Jing was not converted until eight years later, in 1920, when he was living with a failed marriage. He then formed what he called the Saints Cooperative Society (Shengtushe 聖徒社) to call together other Christians to live a more Christian life in contrast to the corrupt lives around them. His second conversion, we might call it, came from a Pentecostal revival that occurred in 1925 in Tai'an, and he now began praying for a full manifestation of the Holy Spirit and he repented of sending off his wife by arranged marriage. Jing, now reconciled to his wife, focused on developing a Christian community that would manifest the leadership of the Holy Spirit. There were many influences upon Jing to bring him to this point. First, he was greatly influenced by the Methodist missionary Nora Dillenbeck, who taught at the Methodist girls school in Tai'an beginning in 1913.[33] Secondly we read of the influence of Hudson Taylor and the China Inland Mission on his thinking. Thirdly, the newly formed Assemblies of God Church in town was the conduit for the Pentecostal revival which seemed to be the catalyst to a much broader Shandong Revival in the 1930s. Finally, Jing received support

[33] Her photo album is now available online: http://gatheringmountains.net/Photoweb/Dillenbeck/index.htm.

from the Presbyterian medical missionary Dr. Thornton Stearns, who worked out of Ji'nan 濟南. Stearns provided needed financial support for a year or so after the Pentecostal experience.[34] However, the shape of the Cooperative Society and later of the Jesus Family was very much a product of Jing and his own background and Pentecostal experience with God. The Jesus family had four important aspects in the practice of the Christian faith: (1) break from your family (or leave) to join the Family; (2) a change of life since Jesus is Lord of the family; (3) do away with life essentials to actualize true life essentials; (4) resolve to live and die for the Lord with all your heart.

Individuals came to the community handing over all of their worldly possessions and they accepted the completely communal—even millenarian—life. All of life was religious life, from morning, through the day and even through the night. Much time was spent in prayers (out loud and often in tongues), interpreting dreams each morning, studying scripture, and even in ecstatic worship. This movement was so independent that upon liberation in China under the Communists, the Jesus Family was respected as a communal, anti-imperial existence. Later it was denounced by people from within. However, for our study, it is of note that this movement came from rural communities in Shandong and expressed much of the Confucian understanding of "family relationships" (now redefined, of course), much of the ecstatic religious experience of Daoist Chinese worship, and it was all in Chinese. Jing never adopted an English name.

Other, less visible independent churches were founded in Shandong, such as the Gospel of Grace Church (founded by Xi Shengmo 席勝魔 in 1881) and the China Christian Church,[35] founded by Zou Liwen 鄒立文, who was a Presbyterian and graduate of Mateer's school in Dengzhou. Zou formed his own independent evangelistic organization which eventually, possibly encouraged by the 1911 revolution, became an independent church. The first land for his first church in Ji'nan was donated by the mayor and soon other churches were starting throughout Shandong. Many independent churches were starting during this period in China, generally with friendly relations with the Western church families from which they were spawned, and so the Chinese

---

[34] Stearns, it is interesting to know, presented a paper at the China Medical Missionary Association meeting in Shanghai in 1923 on the treatment of tuberculosis of the knee joint in China. He was chief surgeon in the Chinese Christian University Hospital, founded by Mateer, moved by Luce.

[35] It is not to be confused with the China Christian Independent Church, founded about the same time in Shanghai.

Independent Church Federation was formed in Shanghai, with an initial membership of over 100 churches. The Shandong churches of Zou, however, were earlier and unrelated to the Shanghai federation.

One gets the feeling that with some careful research, many other indigenous, independent movements would be discovered. Many of these movements seem to be driven by a desire to separate from the West, others are influenced (possibly) by a Daoist background and a Pentecostal foreground, but some are less easily explained. The Christian Village of Nanbeiling 南北嶺, near to Qingdao, is one of those indigenous movements in Shandong that are hard to explain by resorting to secular "outside" influences. Recorded in a 1996 issue of the China Christian Council's periodical, *Tianfeng* 天風, this was one of the earliest movements and was once again tied to the earliest Presbyterian missionaries, in this case Hunter Corbett.[36] The villagers used to follow the Daoist form of folk religion known as Jindanjiao 金丹教, and were eager to seek after what was true. In 1873, about 100 of the villagers signed a petition inviting Hunter Corbett to come and teach them the Bible. Corbett naturally took this as an important invitation. He went and did as he was requested and soon thereafter there were 300 baptisms, more than the previous thirteen years. This began a movement and through the years many of the surrounding villages were evangelized by the Christians from Nanbeiling. Little has been written about this—in fact it is important to note that neither the Presbyterian Church's 1913 *Record of American Presbyterian Mission Work in Shantung Province, China* (edited by Hunter Corbett!), nor the 1940 history (*On the Shantung Front*) mention these villages. Both volumes were written about, or are organized around, institutions and missionaries, and so many of these indigenous movement are not on their historical horizon. More on this later.

Although little is written about Nanbeiling, much has been written about the Great Shandong Revival. In fact this revival, in part promoted by Pentecostals, had an impact upon the Southern Baptists, Norwegian Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, and the Assemblies of God.[37] Although people had come to promote revival decades ear-

---

[36] Dong Tingliang 董廷諒, "Ji Qingdao Nanbeiling fuyincun" 記青島南北嶺福音村, *Tianfeng* 天風, 1996, no. 2:18–19.

[37] Mary Crawford of the Southern Baptists collected many of the stories in her volume, *The Shantung Revival* (Shanghai: China Baptist Publication Society, 1933); the Norwegian Lutheran promoter of revival, Marie Monsen, wrote *The Awakening: Revival in China, a Work of the Holy Spirit*, a book published and promoted by the China Inland Mission in 1959; the Foursquare Gospel missionary Paul Stephen Dykstra wrote his book on the experiences, *Triumphs of His Grace in Shantung China* in 1936,

lier, it is only in the 1930s that a general revival broke out, which even the missionaries wrote home about. All sources find the earliest expressions in 1928 and all sources have some common identifying characteristics. Suddenly, many people were interested in hearing the Gospel preached. Numbers in attendance grew dramatically, almost overnight, and the number of conversions and baptisms grew by tenfold and at times by hundredfold. Public confession of sin became a new common part of worship and new commitments in giving money, volunteering to preach and entering full-time ministry all became more common. Some of the groups had more visions, exercised gifts of tongues, healings and visions, but all prayed much longer (sometimes all night) and out loud. The Presbyterians were rather concerned for the "extreme" group known as the "Spiritual Grace Society" (Ling'enhui 靈恩會) because this was newly organized Pentecostalism. The Presbyterian history devotes a full third of its report on the revival to the excesses of the Ling'enhui: "shaking dancing, jumping, loud wailing and rolling on the ground."[38] These excesses were avoided "where the foreign missionaries and the well trained native ministers kept in sympathetic touch with the revival," we are informed. And yet, even the cautious and well-educated Presbyterians were "touched." Later in the report we read, "The revival . . . has been the harbinger of many blessings, the renewal for religious vitality, the bringing of hundreds into the fold, and above all has made the Chinese feel that this revival is an indigenous Christian movement." Even with this paternalistic rendering, we can see that this was something that was indigenous and that came from the Chinese Christians and those becoming Christians. Remarkable prison work began, mission societies were founded, "tithing" societies started and even a "children's church," run wholly by children, was started. The movement spilled to other areas and was not unrelated to the work of the China Inland Mission, Jonathan Goforth, John Sung, Wang Mingdao 王明道 and others. Yet, the main flowering took place in Shandong.

Finally, as a way of looking forward from this period prior to the Japanese occupation, it is interesting to look at the present "Back to Jerusalem Movement." Jing and the early leadership of the Jesus

---

and even the Presbyterians acknowledged the revival, although with some concerns in their reports and finally in their history: John J. Heeren, *On the Shantung Front: A History of the Shantung Mission of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1861–1940 in Its Historical, Economic and Political Setting* (New York: Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the USA, 1940), 198–200.

[38] Heeren, *On the Shantung Front*, 198f.

Family had more than a vision for revival; he had a missionary vision as part of his overall understanding of faithfulness to Jesus. As with other revivals and awakenings, they sent out others to start Christian communities and to spread around what they have found. In the 1930s there was either a split in the Jesus Family, or a group was sent out called the "Northwest Spiritual Movement," which became an early missionary endeavor of the Jesus Family. I don't believe the language of "Back to Jerusalem" was used at the time of the founding of the Jesus Family, but today's website for the "Back to Jerusalem" claims Jing for their founder.[39] All these, and more, were movements that came out of the important province of Shandong.

PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

In our study we have seen that a number of contextual forces were at work that shaped the particular forms of Christian development that took place in China, radiating out from Shandong. I will comment on five conclusions, from our study, none of which are exclusively true of Shandong, but all are very easily illustrated from the unique Shandong experience. First, one of the key elements in Christian development was geography and climate. The Great Famine of 1876–79 was critical to missionary formation and the earliest transformation of Christian missionary thought was in Shandong. In a fascinating 1975 essay, entitled *British Protestant Christian Evangelists and the 1898 Reform Movement in China*, Leslie R. Marchant makes the following observation:

> The heaven sent sign British evangelists took to mark the end of the old regime and the awakening of the need to reform was the great famine of 1877. This event was too momentous for them to treat lightly or ignore . . . It provided them with opportunities to point out to the Chinese why their Empire was in a depressed state economically, and to show that they, the evangelists, could provide the necessary enlightenment needed to better conditions.[40]

---

[39] http://www.backtojerusalem.com/history.

[40] Leslie Ronald Marchant, *Marchant, British Protestant Christian Evangelists and the 1898 Reform Movement in China* (Nedlands: University of Western Australia, Centre for East Asian Studies, 1975), 4f.

From that point on, Richard, along with other British and American Evangelicals, turned to a different approach. They "presented themselves to the Chinese as men of science and men of reason as well as men of God who brought to China not only the words of Christ but also the benefits of the Enlightenment."[41] Not only did the concern of many of these people change, but their approach also changed. They became concerned to reach people of education and people with authority who could effect provincial and national changes. I believe further study will show that the expanding fissure between evangelical and progressive approaches to Christian mission in China (illustrated by the Mateer and Luce differences) are found in the enormous natural disasters of the period, primarily and then later from Western (imported) theological formulations. But on a more positive note, some of the greatest missionary work done "for the nation of China" came from this early Shandong experience.

A second conclusion that we can make without much thought is built upon the first. These disasters of epic proportions, being among the greatest in human history, caused great movements of people, both the poor, diseased and dying, but also the missionaries. While Chinese were moving out of Shandong, or being relocated in Shandong, the missionaries were moving into Shandong. It might be hard to quantify, but we have found that movements of people, forced more often than by choice, are a catalyst for Christian growth and development. Whether it be the Irish Potato Famine (1845–49), which brought many Christians to North America, or economic migration of Central Americans to North America, or the forced migration of Koreans from the north to the south (1950–53), in all cases Christianity developed as a result. The point is historically Christianity benefits from forced migration, and it has since the earliest persecutions under the Roman Empire as well as under the Persian Empire. But not only the forced migration of the poor caused by floods and famines, but also the forced migration of the missionaries shaped Christianity in the modern period. It is interesting how many missionaries ended up in Shandong because of the tropical diseases in south China. It is easy to see why so many missionaries worked in the major cities of the east—Shanghai, Beijing, Nanjing, Wuhan, Guangdong, and Hong Kong—but why the concentration of some groups like the Baptists, Methodists and Presbyterians in Shandong? The major port city of Qingdao was German territory, so

---

[41] See Timothy Richard, "China's Appalling Need for Reform," in *The China Mission Handbook* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1893).

the missionaries we have looked at did not even center their work there. Instead, the most important cities for Christian work were not major cities, but towns and cities, some of which were not even of provincial importance. Shandong illustrates the truth that Christianity is in two ways a "movement": it derives some of its health from the movements of people, and it resists "thick" rationalizations or institutionalization that restrain its need to be expressed as a movement.

A third conclusion, not directly related to geography and climate, but something that came as a surprise in my research, was the importance of relationships between missionaries of theological and ecclesial diversity. Of course disease and tragedies helped to bring these people together, but even without such external pressures, missionary and national church relationships were very important. Lottie Moon was a fairly bourgeois southerner from the States, from a fairly strong cultural background and yet she worked with Presbyterians from the North, soon after the Civil War. If we had time we could read through her letters and see how she requested that the Southern Baptist Mission Board send an official thank you note to Calvin Mateer for preaching in her Baptist Churches.[42] She was not always happy with this, and she even had a competitive streak in her ("The odds of heathenism and pedobaptism, make it hard for Baptists everywhere."[43]), and yet communication and support between Baptists (both British and American), China Inland Missionaries, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Congregationalists and others is important. There is nothing unique about this in Shandong, but it is a factor that the great human tragedies only augmented.

A fourth issue which is important in Shandong is the use of language. I look at this a few ways. First, the language acquisition of the missionaries themselves is worth noting. Secondly, the use of language in Christian development is consistently Chinese until the first decades of the twentieth century. We have seen that a few of our missionaries were excellent with languages, especially Chinese. Calvin and Julia Mateer wrote books on learning Chinese and Moon was multi-lingual before going to China. In addition, unlike the education programs that were starting in the international big cities, all of the early education in Shandong was in Chinese. I believe this had a great impact on the type of Christianity that developed and it both reflected and promoted the

---

[42] Keith Harper, ed., *Send the Light: Lottie Moon's Letters and Other Writings* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2002), 36, 46, 70, 73, 76, 78, 335, 337, 375, 389.

[43] Letter from Lottie Moon to Dr. Tupper, October 5, 1888.

rural and more *koine* (common) form of Chinese Christianity. Shandong Christianity was village and rural Christianity. Again, this was true in many other regions of China, but in Shandong there was purposeful and intentional resistance to teaching English.

Fifthly, and this is much more universal than the others, is the role of women. One of the most influential revivalist preachers of the early 1930s was the Norwegian, Marie Monsen. The work of the Presbyterian women in founding schools (Helen Nevius and Julia Mateer) and pioneering in education, and of course the itinerant missionary work of Lottie Moon, among others, should be mentioned. Further study might want to ask if single women and wives in tropical climates accomplished as much, or stood out as much. Many of these early missionaries in Shandong kept their same wives for decades, whereas in the tropics many of the missionaries lost one, two or three wives to diseases. A missionary had to live a long time in a single place to have much of an impact. Did women just survive longer in more temperate climates like Shandong?

Finally, I think the experience of indigenous Christian movements in Shandong is unique. There were many indigenous Christian movements in China beginning in the 1920s and 1930s, but in Shandong, there were even nineteenth-century movements. In addition there were a number of movements that were completely independent of foreign aid or promotion and yet they ended up having a national impact. Most of the missionaries who worked in China followed the Ricci method of reaching the best and brightest, realizing that China's Confucian sense of social order meant that influence would always be from the top down. The Shandong missionaries, at least those working with the Presbyterian and Baptist Churches, did not seek to reach the scholars and then show them the better (Western) way to live. Instead, their approach was quite intentionally to travel widely, entrust their ministry early, and gather only briefly. What this means is that they gathered their pastors and evangelists for annual or semi-annual training sessions in Cheefoo, rather than sending them away to a seminary to make them theologically proficient. It may have meant that many of them did not make good Presbyterians—in fact many Presbyterians and Baptists and Methodists did go off and create their own Church movements.

All of this happened in Shandong, the land of great disasters, home of the mighty Yellow River and of course the home of Confucius, who warned that "the study of strange doctrines is injurious indeed."

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 153–195

Protestant "Missionary Cases" (*jiao'an*) in Shandong Province, 1860–1900

R. G. TIEDEMANN

I had, of course—for what official has not—a great deal of trouble with our Protestant missionaries. . . . Now I do not mean to intimate that many missionaries are not good and earnest men, and that their womankind, although generally painfully plain, most excellent; but one and all are utterly lacking in judgment or in ordinary sympathy for other people's religious views. In my time I must have had to do with thousands of missionaries, male and female, and with the exception of some half-dozen, well, say a dozen, who were principally occupied in translating the Scriptures and writing dictionaries, they are, next to habitual criminals, the most troublesome people to deal with in the world. I have no doubt that their misconduct, for I can call it by no other name, is mainly due to their intense desire to save men's soul. . . . I will back a Protestant missionary to do more harm in a limited space of time than any other human being. They have absolutely neither tact nor judgment. The "end" in view sanctions every "means," good, bad or indifferent. I look on them as irresponsible beings.

—Sir Edmund Hornby [1]

R. G. TIEDEMANN is senior research fellow at the Centre for the Study of Christianity in China, Oxford, United Kingdom.

[1] Edmund Hornby, *An Autobiography* (London: Constable, 1929), 124. Sir Edmund Grimani Hornby (1825–96) was sent to China in 1865 to reform the Consular Court in the Far East, where he held the office of Judge of the (British) Supreme Court till his retirement in 1876.

The propagation of Christianity in China has since the arrival of the Catholic missionary enterprise in the late sixteenth century met with outright hostility as well as tolerance and acceptance, depending on the prevailing political and social circumstances in a given locality or time. However, in view of the rapid expansion of the missionary enterprise after 1860, violent anti-Christian protest became rather more common. From the middle of the nineteenth century missionary work in China was greatly facilitated by the so-called "unequal treaties" and associated agreements. The Sino–French Beijing Convention of 25 October 1860, in particular, created the framework that made possible the significant evangelistic expansion during the last third of the century. The infamous Article VI, with its surreptitious insertion by French translators of additional text in the Chinese version of the convention stipulated that all Catholic religious establishments confiscated by the Chinese authorities in the eighteenth century were to be restored to the Catholic Church. In addition, Catholic missionaries were permitted to rent and purchase land in all the provinces of the empire, and to acquire or construct buildings in the interior. The Sino–French treaty furthermore guaranteed to Catholic missionaries the right to preach in the interior, and to Chinese converts the right to practice Christianity without being liable to punishment. An imperial edict of 8 April 1862 exempted Chinese Catholics from making contributions towards communal endeavours if these included what the missionaries regarded to be "superstitious" practices. Most importantly, although not provided for in any treaty, France assumed the right to protect all Roman Catholic missions in China, regardless of nationality. More significantly, this French protectorate was, in practice, extended to Chinese converts as well.[2] In view of the privileged position the Catholic missionary enterprise and its Chinese adherents enjoyed after 1860, it is not surprising that the French state, as protector of foreign priests and Chinese Catholics, became rather frequently involved in so-called "missionary cases" (*jiao'an* 教案). Paul Cohen, who produced one of the earliest academic studies of anti-Christian violence in China, has helpfully explained the term "*jiao'an*" as follows:

---

[2] On the religious clauses in the treaties and the various edicts of toleration, see Louis Tsing-sing Wei, *La politique missionnaire de la France en Chine 1842–1856* (Paris: Nouvelles Éditions latines, 1960); Paul A. Cohen, "Christian Missions and Their Impact to 1900," in *Cambridge History of China*, vol. 10 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 552–53; Edmund S. Wehrle, *Britain, China, and the Antimissionary Riots 1891–1900* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966); Karl Josef Rivinius, SVD, *Weltlicher Schutz und Mission. Das deutsche Protektorat über die katholische Mission von Süd-Shantung* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1987).

> This is a general term denoting anti-Christian outbreaks, along with the whole gamut of legal cases and other difficulties involving Christian subjects and foreign missionaries. It is translated here as "missionary cases," with the implicit understanding that missionaries themselves were not always directly involved in *chiao-an*. Some missionary cases were of minor importance; others had international repercussions. The immediate causes behind them were complex, and the varied circumstances of time, place, and personality under which they took place offer little solace to the historian, ever in search of simple patterns.[3]

The "religious" clauses in the American and British treaties with China of 1858–60 were much weaker than those in the French treaties. Nevertheless, American and British Protestant missionaries were now able to expand their evangelistic operations as well. Having hitherto been confined to the five old treaty ports (Guangzhou 廣州, Xiamen 廈門, Fuzhou 福州, Ningbo 寧波, Shanghai 上海) and Hong Kong, they were now able to move into the new treaty ports as well as into the interior. However, as recent arrivals they lacked the established missionary infrastructure of the Catholic priests in China's hinterland. Moreover, given the fact that most Protestant evangelists had come with their families or had entered into matrimonial alliances shortly after their arrival, their advance beyond the treaty ports was tentative and slow at first. It is, therefore, not surprising that their early work in the interior, consisting principally of evangelistic itinerations and the distribution of religious tracts, brought rather meagre results. They had a somewhat better chance of being tolerated by the people on account of their "good works"[4] such as providing medical care, education and—especially in times a major calamities—famine relief. Once the foundations for permanent Christian congregations had been laid in particular localities, the expanding missionary enterprise required premises for prayer houses, chapels, churches, schools, workshops, hospitals, as well as residences for foreign missionaries. It was, however, in this connection that the Protestant missionaries frequently met with the determined resistance of the non-Christian Chinese inhabitants. Such hostility could stem from a number of causes: (1) local land scarcity; (2)

---

[3] Paul A. Cohen, *China and Christianity: The Missionary Movement and the Growth of Chinese Antiforeignism, 1860–70* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963), x–xi.

[4] On the missionary strategy of "good works" in general, see Irwin T. Hyatt, Jr., "Protestant Missions in China (1877–1890): The Institutionalization of Good Works," *Papers on China* 17 (December 1963): 67–100.

procedural problems (when land does become available in a locality, neighbours have first refusal); (3) geomantic concerns; (4) official objections on legal grounds; (5) existing property disputes. Missionary unwillingness to observe local customs could further inflame the situation. Claiming that it was their treaty right, the missionaries would insist on acquiring property in the localities of their choice. Rarely inclined to compromise, they claimed that local objections were merely a pretext to prevent the propagation of the Christian religion—perhaps not always without justification. In any case, the voluminous American consular archival material indicates that Protestant missionaries rarely missed an opportunity to impress on their consular and diplomatic representatives that they and their converts should enjoy the same privileges as their Catholic counterparts in China, including the right to acquire property.

Opposition to the foreigners' acquisition of premises was especially fierce in the higher administrative centres. Although their actual work was in the countryside, missionaries preferred to establish their permanent residences in walled cities. Such locations enhanced the prestige of the Church and provided easier access to Chinese officialdom. But since the upper gentry tended to be concentrated in the cities, resistance to missionary expansion was most persistent here. The missionaries invariably requested help from their government representatives, and usually received it. However, under the American and British treaties of 1858–60—and unlike Catholic missions in China, American and British Protestant missionaries did not have the right to acquire property outside the treaty ports.[5] The American envoy Frederick F. Low, for instance, pointed out that American missionaries had illegally moved inland and thereby intensified antiforeignism.[6] When the American Board missionaries, having been prevented from taking possession of premises in Linqing 臨清, took their complaint to the American Minister, Charles Denby, the latter went "so far as to say that missionaries have no right to rent property and live in the interior."[7] But this did not deter some Protestants from insisting that they were

---

[5] As concerns the problem of residence and acquiring for Protestants, this was not formally agreed until after the Boxer Uprising, in the American Treaty of 1903. See Sydney A. Forsythe, *An American Missionary Community in China, 1895–1905* (Cambridge, Mass.: East Asian Research Center, Harvard University 1971), 61–62.

[6] See David L. Anderson, *Imperialism and Idealism: American Diplomats in China, 1861–1898* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 73.

[7] Franklin M. Chapin, #24, Report of Linqing Station for the year ending 30 April 1887, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (hereafter cited as ABCFM), North China Mission, ABC:16.3.12, vol. 7, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

entitled to the same privileges as Catholic missionaries and their converts. Samuel Wells Williams (Wei Sanwei 衛三畏), a former missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions who had been present as interpreter at the negotiations concerning the American Treaty of Tianjin 天津 in 1858, noted at the time: "We shall get nothing important out of the Chinese unless we stand in a menacing attitude before them. They would grant nothing unless fear stimulated their sense of justice, for they are among the most craven people, cruel, selfish as heathenism can make men."[8] Indeed, during the last four decades of the nineteenth century, many missionaries continued to hold the view that a conciliatory approach would be taken as weakness and embolden the Chinese to resist a settlement in favour of the Christians or their foreign protectors. Thus, when "these missionaries called for war, they all seemed to perceive the same process: a Western military invasion would create turmoil and weaken China's institutional resistance to Christianity."[9]

Besides the property issue, several other causal factors gave rise to anti-Christian conflict. Among these ideological incompatibility with Confucianism was a long-standing source of upper-class Chinese hostility to the missionary presence in China.[10] Confronted by an intensely Sinocentric culturalism, the foreign evangelists, with few exceptions, launched an uncompromising attack on the Confucian value system. Clamouring for changes that were intended to facilitate the conversion of China, "all missionaries, by the very nature of their calling, posed a revolutionary challenge to the traditional culture."[11] Protestant missionaries affiliated with "classical" missions, in particular, advocated their version of "modernization" (for example, Western learning; the provision of medical services; promotion of individualism) as China's

---

[8] See Frederick W. Williams, *The Life and Letters of Samuel Wells Williams, LL.D., Missionary, Diplomatist, Sinologue* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1889), 268. Williams managed to have inserted into the American treaty clauses that not only extended religious toleration but also permitted travel anywhere in the interior of China.

[9] Stuart Creighton Miller, "Ends and Means: Missionary Justification of Force in Nineteenth Century China," in *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America*, ed. John K. Fairbank (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), 269.

[10] On the history of ideological incompatibility, see especially John D. Young, *Confucianism and Christianity: The First Encounter* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1983). For an analysis of the connection between the Protestant missionaries' customary employment of martial metaphors in a rhetorical sense and their active support of the forced opening of China, see Murray A. Rubinstein, "The Wars They Wanted: American Missionaries' Use of *The Chinese Repository* before the Opium War," *American Neptune* 48, no. 4 (Fall 1988): 271–82.

[11] Cohen, "Christian Missions and Their Impact to 1900," 544.

way forward to "salvation"—if need be at the point of a gun.[12] Chinese officials and literati, for their part, feared the disruptive effect of foreign missionary activities on the traditional political and cultural fabric of society. Indeed, throughout the late nineteenth century foreign missionaries were generally of the opinion that much of the anti-missionary and anti-Christian agitation had been fomented by the Chinese "gentry."[13] Note, for instance, the general "Appeal for Christian Work Among the Higher Classes in China," signed by twenty-nine of the leading Protestant missionaries and issued by the Society for the Diffusion of Christian and General Knowledge in the wake of the anti-missionary riots along the Yangzi River in 1891:[14]

> If the rulers oppose Christianity suspicions abound on every side; if they approve then all classes are stimulated to friendship and enquiry.
>
> One immense hindrance to missionary work in China is the *hostile attitude of the Mandarins, the gentry and the educated classes*. For millenniums the Chinese have been taught to consider themselves vastly superior to every nation under the sun, and, as their educational curriculum to this day is still unchanged, there is springing up annually a fresh crop of scholars in absolute ignorance of the outside world, and with the same intense pride and prejudice as of old. For centuries, too, the Chinese government has systematically opposed all intercourse with foreigners to the utmost of their power, as they regard it full of peril.[15]

Since the higher classes had been inaccessible, the "Appeal" continued, Protestants had primarily evangelized among the lower classes. Had the higher classes been more enlightened and accessible, "we should not have had the riots, which have so greatly imperilled the mission cause and excited fresh opposition, where it had almost died away." Work among the higher classes and strengthening the hands of the few Chinese reformers was, therefore, essential. "It is not enough to pray for an

---

[12] See Arthur J. Schlesinger, Jr., "The Missionary Enterprise and Theories of Imperialism," in Fairbank, *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America*, 360–61, 372.

[13] See Lü Shiqiang 呂實強, *Zhongguo guanshen fanjiao de yuanyin, 1860–1874* 中國官紳反教的原因，1860–1874 [The causes of the anti-Christian movement by Chinese officials and gentry, 1860–1874] (Taipei: Wenjing shuju, 1973).

[14] For further details concerning the riots and especially the British reaction to them, see Wehrle, *Britain, China, and the Antimissionary Riots*, Chapter 2: "The Riots of 1891: A Pattern Set" (pp. 19–43).

[15] Quoted by Timothy Richard in *The China Mission Hand-Book* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1896), Part 2, p. 308; emphasis in the original.

increase of a thousand missionaries; we must see that the doors are not shut against them by neglecting the enlightenment of those who, in God's Providence, hold the key to the hearts of the masses."[16] But in reality, the expanding missionary presence challenged the hierarchical structures and networks of power of the gentry and other notables, local officials, as well as the sub-bureaucratic elements in Shandong 山東.

While it can be argued that *anti-missionary* conflict was to some extent part of the growing resistance by the Chinese people to the increasing pressures exerted by the foreign powers, it should also be recognized that *anti-Christian* violence was often intimately linked to existing tensions within and among local systems. As we have shown elsewhere, in the traditionally turbulent parts of North China attacks on Christians were part of the competition over scarce resources. Especially during the last decade of the nineteenth century, Catholic missionaries were most successful in precisely those parts of Shandong where collective violence (banditry, feuding and salt smuggling) had long been endemic. As a result of their privileged position in China, Catholic evangelists were able to attract a following because they could provide material incentives and effective protection to adherents or potential adherents. It could, therefore, be argued that conversion to Christianity was an attractive survival strategy for a significant minority in violently competitive environments. It has been shown that existing patterns of conflict on the chronically turbulent North China Plain encouraged the expansion of the Catholic missionary enterprise.[17] It remains to be seen, however, to what extent the Protestant endeavour adapted to the culture of violence in Shandong Province.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, but especially in the 1890s, Shandong became a major arena of anti-Christian and anti-missionary agitation, culminating in the Boxer Movement (Yihetuan yundong 義和團運動) of 1898–1900. In this connection, most scholars seem to agree that the aggressive nature of the Catholic missionary enterprise—and more specifically the often militant approach taken by Johann Baptist Anzer (An Zhitai 安治泰), vicar apostolic of South Shandong—was responsible for the Boxer Uprising.[18] Yet a careful examination of the abundant primary sources reveals that Protestants,

---

[16] Ibid., 308–9.

[17] See R. G. Tiedemann, "Rural Unrest in North China 1868–1900: With Particular Reference to South Shandong" (PhD diss., School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1991), especially Chapter 5.

[18] See Joseph W. Esherick, *The Origins of the Boxer Uprising* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), especially Chapter 3: "Imperialism, for Christ's Sake."

too, had their share of *jiao'an*. Although the nature of the Protestant cases was somewhat different, they must nevertheless have contributed to the antiforeign and anti-Christian climate at the end of the nineteenth century. A few of the Shandong cases will be examined in detail to clarify the Protestant contribution to this development.

PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN SHANDONG

Although initial Protestant attempts to enter Shandong after the 1858–60 treaties were made at Yantai 煙台 (called Chefoo [Zhifu 芝罘] by the foreigners) by Joseph Edkins (Ai Yuese 艾約瑟, 1823–1905) and Griffith John (Yang Gefei 楊格非, 1831–1912) of the London Missionary Society, they soon moved on to other provinces. It was missionaries from other societies that established themselves in the coastal cities Dengzhou 登州 (now called Penglai 蓬萊), Tianjin and Yantai and then gradually moved inland from these coastal footholds. As Table 1 indicates, most mission stations in the interior were established in the 1880s and 1890s. At the same time, there were few conversions to the Protestant faith during the first two decades after 1860. The first significant breakthrough did not come until the late 1870s and can be attributed to the famine relief afforded in certain parts of Shandong during the devastating drought of 1876–79. In the course of their earlier extensive itinerations in the province, Protestant missionaries had been able to establish a number of contacts. They were now able to set up famine relief centres in locations where they had previously made acquaintances or created some interest in the foreign religion. Consequently, the American Presbyterian John Livingston Nevius (Ni Weisi 倪維思, 1829–93) set up his relief station in the market town of Gaoyai 高崖 in western Anqiu *xian* 安邱縣. Timothy Richard (Li Timotai 李提摩太, 1845–1919) and Alfred George Jones (Zhong Jun'an 仲鈞安, d. 1905) of the Baptist Missionary Society worked from Qingzhou 青州 in central Shandong, and the American Board missionaries distributed relief from the village of Pangzhuang 龐莊 in En *xian* 恩縣, northwestern Shandong.[19]

---

[19] On missionary famine relief work in Shandong in 1876–79 in general, see P. Richard Bohr, *Famine in China and the Missionary: Timothy Richard as Relief Administrator and Advocate of National Reform, 1876–1884* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univer-

It would be an exaggeration to claim that all the converts gained during and immediately after the 1876–79 famine (and similarly during the 1889 famine relief campaign) were typical "rice Christians" (or perhaps more appropriately called *gaoliang* 高粱 Christians in North China). What is beyond question is the fact that the number of Protestant converts increased significantly during and immediately after severe subsistence crises. There may have been a number of motives for joining the Protestant church, but the missionaries' involvement in large-scale charitable work created a climate conducive to conversion. This climate made it possible for members of rural society interested in Christianity to come forward without immediate fear of persecution. An American Board missionary at the Pangzhuang relief centre remarked in 1878: "There I felt that the wall of *antagonism* had been broken down, only the wall of ignorance remaining."[20] At the time of the 1889 famine, American Presbyterians noted: "Throughout the Province there is (has been) a growing feeling in our favor. The large amount of famine relief afforded (distributed) during the past year . . . has made a profound and wide spread feeling of gratitude toward the missionaries. . . ."[21] Having distributed famine relief in the Jimo 即墨 district in eastern Shandong, Hunter Corbett (Guo Xiande 郭顯德, 1835–1920) observed: "This interest is not confined to those who, when dying of starvation, were aided by us, but includes some who formerly were our bitter enemies. . . ."[22] The American Board missionaries confirmed that interest in Christianity began in connection with the famine work in Shandong.[23]

---

sity Press, 1972); Helen S. C. Nevius, *The Life of John Livingston Nevius, for Forty Years a Missionary in China* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1895), 319–24; John L. Nevius, "Methods of Mission Work," *Chinese Recorder* 17, no. 2 (February 1886): 56; Charles Perry Scott, *An Account of the Great Famine in North China, 1876–79, Drawn from Official Sources; Together with an Appendix of Extracts from Private Letters* (Hull: William Kirk & Sons, printer, 1885).

[20] Devello Zelotes Sheffield, 19 July 1878, *Missionary Herald* 74 (Boston, November 1878), 392.

[21] Petition dated 7 January 1890, signed by 23 missionaries of the Shandong Mission, Presbyterian Foreign Board of Missions (hereafter cited as PBFM), China, vol. 24.2 #17, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia. See also *China Mission Hand-Book*, Part II, p. 43; Ernest Whitby Burt, *Fifty Years in China: The Story of the Baptist Mission in Shantung, Shansi and Shensi, 1875–1925* (London: Carey Press, [1925]), 36.

[22] Corbett, Chefoo, 8 June [1877], *The Foreign Missionary* 36 (September 1877): 118. Although the famine episodes offered brief but crucial windows of opportunity to the missionaries, anti-Christian hostility could nevertheless resurface rather quickly.

[23] See the *Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (1879), 67.

This correlation of famine relief and the increase in conversions is quite apparent when we look at the numbers and geographical distribution of adherents in Shandong Province between 1880 and 1900 (see Table 2). The Protestant missionary societies with the largest numbers of communicants were the American Presbyterians, the Baptist Missionary Society and the Methodist New Connexion. The relevant statistics show that the bulk of neophytes were gained in precisely those areas where famine relief had been distributed by missionaries in 1877–79 and in 1889: in the Qingzhou–Wei *xian* 濰縣, Ji'nan 濟南–Zouping 鄒平 and Leling 樂陵 areas of northern Shandong.[24] At any rate, Table 2 indicates that there was also a significant increase in conversions in the 1890s.[25] However, compared to the nearly 45,000 Catholic "converts" in 1900, the Protestant presence in the province, if measured in numbers of communicants, was still rather modest at that time.[26] Nevertheless, the American and British missionaries had their share of *jiao'an* to deal with between 1860 and 1900.

ISSUES OF RECURRENT ANTI-CHRISTIAN CONFLICT

The expansion of the missionary enterprise was accompanied by a significant increase in "missionary cases." Anti-Christian agitation broke out over a variety as well as combination of issues. However, in one way or another, landed property, the most precious resource, was intimately bound up with disputes between missionaries and non-Christian

---

[24] In 1900, half the American Presbyterian converts were concentrated in the Wei *xian* area; the 4,000 converts of the Baptist Missionary Society were in the Qingzhou–Zouping area; and nearly 2,000 Methodist New Connexion converts in the Leling area. All in all, some 70% of the 14,000 Protestant Christians were in areas where substantial famine relief had been distributed in 1877–78 and/or 1889–90. See also the *Report of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions* 63 (1900): 71–91.

[25] For a history of Protestantism in Shandong, see especially Tao Feiya 陶飛亞 and Liu Tianlu 劉天路, *Jidujiao yu jindai Shandong shehui* 基督教與近代山東社會 [Protestantism in Modern Shandong] (Ji'nan: Shandong daxue chubanshe, 1994).

[26] A comparison of Catholic and Protestant conversion statistics presents a number of difficulties. Catholic figures are based on baptized members, including children, whereas Protestant figures for the most part represent communicant members, excluding children. The role of missionary spouses in the Protestant enterprise is also difficult to assess. See also Friedrich Schwager, *Die brennendste Missionsfrage der Gegenwart. Die Lage der katholischen Missionen in Asien* (Steyl: Verlag der Missionsdruckerei, 1914).

Chinese.[27] The earliest Protestant *jiao'an* in Shandong arose in connection with missionary residential property in the prefectural city of Dengzhou. Since that city had been designated one of the new treaty ports under the 1858 Treaty, some American Presbyterians and Southern Baptists settled there in 1860 in anticipation of its opening to foreigners. However, when Yantai (Chefoo) was substituted in its place as the officially designated treaty port under the Beijing Convention of 1860, these missionaries decided to retain their foothold in what now turned out to be a non-treaty port. Moreover, although they claimed to have the right to buy, lease or build residences in Dengzhou, both Tarleton Perry Crawford (Gao Dipi 高第丕 or Gao Lefu 高樂福 or Gao Taipei 高太培) (Southern Baptist) and Calvin Wilson Mateer (Di Kaowen 狄考文 or Di Dongming 狄東明) (American Presbyterian) resorted to rather underhanded methods by using their Chinese assistants to buy or rent premises and "sublet" them to the missionaries. When Crawford's deception in the summer of 1866 became known, Chinese crowds prevented him from taking occupancy. Thereupon Crawford, accompanied by two missionary companions and the US consul E. T. Sandford, "raised an American flag over the disputed property, an act which at once drew an angry crowd." Crawford even drew a pistol but did not fire it.[28] In the same year (1866), Calvin Mateer also employed middlemen who forged documents to rent a chapel in Dengzhou. Supported by Consul Sandford, Mateer and others persuaded Commander Robert Townsend of the USS *Wachusett* to bring his crew ashore and stage an armed demonstration. The Chinese, although aware of the treaty stipulations, eventually had to agree to the missionary demands under duress.[29]

British missionaries, too, considered it their right to acquire property outside the treaty ports. In a long letter on the protection of missionaries by Great Britain, Richard Frederick Laughton (Luo Feili 駱騑力, 1838–70), a member of the Baptist Missionary Society at Yantai, insisted in 1869 that Protestants should enjoy the same treaty rights as secured to Catholic priests by the Convention with France signed in

---

[27] Alexander Michie, *The Englishman in China during the Victorian Era: As Illustrated in the Career of Sir Rutherford Alcock*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1900), 235. See also Cohen, *China and Christianity*, Chapter 1; Charles A. Litzinger, "Patterns of Missionary Cases Following the Tientsin Massacre, 1870–1875," *Papers on China* 23 (July 1970): 87–108.

[28] Irwin T. Hyatt, Jr., *Our Ordered Lives Confess: Three Nineteenth-Century American Missionaries in East Shantung* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1976), 13.

[29] Ibid., 151.

Beijing in 1860. He feared, however, that both "the right and propriety of missionaries residing in the interior of China are now called into question." Alluding to the debate on the China missions in the British Parliament, he concluded:

> The [Chinese] empire is weak, rotten, and corrupt; and things have been made much worse by the opium trade which has been forced upon it, and has spread poverty, wretchedness, and death through the land. While our merchants are jealously guarded and protected in their privileges of selling opium and Manchester goods, are we who come to represent the Christianity of England . . . to have *our* treaty privileges held in abeyance, and even abrogated? [30]

Along with several of his colleagues, Laughton was, in fact, reacting to the reassessment by the British authorities of the Protestant missionary position, following a spate of anti-missionary incidents in various parts of China in 1868–69. Sir Rutherford Alcock, the British minister in Beijing, had suggested to the new foreign secretary, the Earl of Clarendon, that it would not be advisable to follow the Catholic precedent in regard of the property issue in the interior of China. Moreover, he argued that "Missionaries may be perfectly right in coming to China and yet not at liberty to do what they please; not altogether right in seeking to prosecute their work in a way eminently calculated to produce disturbances and grave political complications, and rendering resort to force or to war in the end all but inevitable." [31]

Laughton had wanted to know whether British subjects had the right by treaty to hire, purchase, or receive as a gift, land or buildings in China, if the local people were willing to let, sell or give such property. He was specifically referring to a case in which he had become involved in Qixia 棲霞 district near Yantai in 1868, where the Christians wanted to transfer the lineage temple to Laughton to be used for missionary purposes. It would seem that all family members had agreed to

---

[30] Richard Frederick Laughton, in *Missionary Herald*, no. 225 (London, 1 November 1869): 181, 183. Emphasis in the original. For views in favour of missionary acquisition of property in the interior, see also Gilbert Reid, "Chinese Law on the Ownership of Church Property in the Interior of China," *Chinese Recorder* 20 (September 1889): 420–26.

[31] Alcock to Clarendon, Beijing, 1 October 1869, annotations to a letter of British Protestant missionaries in Peking to Alcock, Correspondence Respecting Inland Residence of English Missionaries in China. China No. 9 (1870), *British Parliamentary Papers. China*, Irish University Press Area Studies Series (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1971), 205.

the transfer and the agreement was signed by Zhang Xu 張旭, the head of the Christian family, as well as by representatives of other lineage branches. However, the local official refused to recognize the transfer. Indeed, several members of the Qixia party were summoned to Yantai, where they were severely beaten.[32] Laughton was particularly disappointed that the British acting vice-consul, Chaloner Alabaster, had not insisted on enforcement of the "treaty right" of missionaries to acquire property outside the treaty ports. Alcock, for his part, conceded that

> what the French missionaries enjoy cannot, according to Treaty, be denied by the Chinese authorities to the British. But . . . the conditions of enjoyment are such as to make it entirely contingent on the disposition of the Chinese local authority to promote or oppose it, and the acquisition of any place of residence by missionaries in the face of such opposition would be impossible without the direct interference of a foreign Power.

He added that the recent occurrences at Yantai and elsewhere in China "all prove how active is the opposition to any assertion of this right, and to what dangerous extremities both authorities and people proceed in order to frustrate any attempt of missionaries to establish a new domicile in the interior." He concluded that these "untoward results of proselytizing labours" tended "greatly to complicate relations both political and commercial." It remained, therefore, "a serious question for Her Majesty's Government to decide, whether they will demand for British missionaries the same facilities and privileges that are claimed by the French Government for the Romish missions in the interior. Because certain terms have been conceded to these, it does not follow that the British Government must of necessity accept the same, with all their consequences of grave complications and national responsibilities."[33] Alcock's advice of caution and the debate in Parliament in the wake of the "riot season" of 1868–69 in China helped shape British policy that henceforth was rather less supportive of Protestant missionary claims.[34] Or as the *Times* of London put it in a lead article: "Mis-

---

[32] For a comprehensive account of this case, see *Jiaowu jiao'an dang* 教務教案檔 [Documents on religious affairs and missionary cases], 2nd ser., (Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan, Jindaishi yanjiusuo, 1975), 1:387–413.

[33] Alcock to Clarendon, Beijing, 12 March 1869, no. 2, Correspondence Respecting Inland Residence of English Missionaries in China, pp. 191–92.

[34] On the emergence of new British policy concerning the missionary question in the late 1860s, see Cohen, *China and Christianity*, 186–99.

sionaries are people who are always provoking the men of the world. . . . Parliament is not fond of missionaries, nor is the press, nor is general society. Some recent occurrences in China have tended to revive the prejudice against them."[35]

Opposition to the foreigners' acquisition of premises was especially fierce in the higher administrative centres of the Shandong area. Although their actual work was in the countryside, missionaries preferred to establish their permanent residences in walled cities. Such locations enhanced the prestige of the Church and provided easier access to Chinese officialdom, both important considerations for proselytism. But since the upper gentry tended to be concentrated in the cities, resistance to missionary expansion was most persistent here. Many of the celebrated *jiao'an* in the area resulted from elite opposition to missionary attempts to settle within the city walls, including the Ji'nan cases of 1882–91 and the Jining 濟寧 cases of 1886–91.[36] It was the elite's strong cultural antipathy that inspired the determined resistance to permanent foreign settlements in these urban centres. In Ji'nan the early Protestant missionaries identified the Benevolence Bureau (Guangren shanju 廣仁善局), supported and run by the city's prominent and wealthy leaders, as a source of strong opposition to their efforts to acquire premises within the city walls.[37]

Since the higher administrative centres were also the nodal points of local elite networks, the gentry and/or officials were in a position to spread anti-Christian sentiments far beyond the city walls into the rural hinterland. Here the most effective form of opposition was based on existing supra-village networks. The early rural attempts at concerted action and sustained elite-led anti-Christian mobilization were for the most part based on multi-village self-defence organizations. The violent agitation against American Presbyterian and Southern Baptist Christians in Huang *xian* 黃縣 in 1884, for example, was organized by the *gongju* 公局, "a self-constituted committee of seven or eight of the most wealthy men and prominent scholars of the district" who represented the local militia from twenty-four villages.[38] It should, however,

---

[35] *Times*, 10 March 1869, quoted in Cohen, *China and Christianity*, 195.

[36] Documentation in the *Jiaowu jiao'an dang* is too voluminous to be cited here. On some of the Ji'nan cases, see Philip West, "The Tsinan Property Disputes (1887–1891): Gentry Loss and Missionary 'Victory,'" *Papers on China* 20 (December 1966): 119–43.

[37] David D. Buck, *Urban Change in China: Politics and Development in Tsinan, Shantung, 1890–1949* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1978), 30–31.

[38] N. W. Halcomb to Vice-Consul Platt, 11 February 1885, National Archives (U.S.),

be noted that not all missionary attempts to settle in urban centres met with opposition. Local conditions and timing were crucial. In 1871 the American Presbyterian missionary Jasper McIlvaine peacefully acquired premises in Ji'nan with the help of an impoverished *xiucai* 秀才.[39] At Yizhou 沂州 the Presbyterians were aided by Zhang Mingjie 張莫階, an "intelligent and influential, but wicked, bigamous, opium-smoking heathen."[40]

The right to acquire property in the interior had still not been resolved in 1895 when the American Minister Charles Denby raised the issue once more. Although a response from the American missionaries in Shandong has not yet come to light, it can be assumed that their response was similar to that of the American Board missionaries in Shanxi 山西 Province:

> Whereas through the good offices of the French the Roman Catholics are permitted to acquire property in the interior of China in the name of the Catholic Church and
>
> Whereas the Minister of the United States, resident at Pekin, has asked us to declare whether we wish our Government to enter on the same footing under the terms of the "Most Favored Nation" Clause.

Six Shanxi missionaries signed the above statement, stating that they were "unite[d] in requesting our Government, through its Minister, to secure for us the same rights."[41]

Disputes in connection with local socio-religious practices constituted another major source of anti-Christian conflict. In villages where Christians were a minority, they could be ostracized by the rest of the community. But more importantly, in many ways the Christians chose to set themselves apart so as to enjoy the privileges which the missionaries had won for them under the treaties' religious toleration clauses. Such behaviour was bound to create or exacerbate intra-communal tensions. As a result of their conversions, neophytes withdrew from all

---

Record Group 84 (hereafter cited as NA: RG84), Chefoo Miscellaneous Correspondence, vol. 3C; Hunter Corbett to Platt, 11 February 1885, in ibid.

[39] See McIlvaine to Dr. Martin, Ji'nan, 15 April 1871, PBFM: China, vol. 10, #74.

[40] Killie, Yizhou, Dec 1890, PBFM: Killie Papers, p. 14; *Linyi* xian *zhi* 臨沂縣志 [Gazetteer of Linyi (formerly Lanshan 蘭山) district] (1935), pp. 173–74. Note also the peaceful acquisition of premises in Qingzhou and Wei *xian*.

[41] "On the Purchase of Property in the Interior of China," in NA: RG84, Tianjin, vol. 69, fol. 30. The right of Protestants to acquire property outside the treaty ports was not conceded by China until 1903, in the Sino–American treaty of that year.

communal practices that were said to have a "superstitious" character. The Christians' refusal to take part in traditional ancestor worship, "the most important ritual expression of the value attached to the family," was especially contentious, for their rejection of it "directly challenged values which lay at this culture's core."[42] Weddings and funerals were the principal occasions giving rise to anti-Christian hostility and even violence. Arthur Henderson Smith (Ming Sipu 明思浦) noted, for instance, that the villagers of Guanzhuang 管莊 (En *xian*, western Shandong) had organized "a boycott on the few church members, especially in the item of weddings and funerals, at which it is customary for villagers to render mutual aid, in carrying, driving, etc. It is said that forty-eight out of a little over fifty families in the village are united in this compact, under the lead of a few evil-disposed persons."[43]

The Christians' refusal to take part in communal religious observances could have particularly grave consequences during times of prolonged drought. Note, for instance, the case in the Deping 德平 district of northwestern Shandong in late 1872, involving Christians of the Methodist New Connexion mission.[44] Presumably intended to minimize hostility within drought-stricken villages, in some localities Christians organized rival rain processions, as reported from the Baptist Missionary Society field during the critical drought in central Shandong in the summer of 1899. The local missionary had notices posted in the Qingzhou area, advising the people that the *Yesu jiao* 耶穌教 was also praying for rain.[45] It is doubtful whether this particular effort reduced tensions, because the Boxer Movement emerged at this time when much of Shandong was affected by a severe drought.[46]

In times of crisis seemingly insignificant matters could cause serious tension, as an incident at Linqing, Shandong, demonstrates. Some years

---

[42] Cohen, "Christian Missions and Their Impact to 1900," 568. On conflict over Christian refusal to perform the ancestor worship, see the cases in Haiyang *xian* 海陽縣 in 1890–91: Hunter Corbett to Fuller, Chefoo, 23 April 1891 and 13 July 1891, NA: RG84, Chefoo Miscellaneous Correspondence, vol. 4.

[43] Arthur Henderson Smith, in *Missionary Herald* 85 (Boston, May 1889): 201.

[44] For details, see *Jiaowu jiao'an dang*, 3rd ser., vol. 1, #347.

[45] C. Spurgeon Medhurst, in *Missionary Herald* (London, May 1900): 220. On rain prayers in Shandong, see also Anton Volpert, "Chinesische Volksgebräuche beim T'chi Jü, Regenbitten," *Anthropos* 12–13 (1917–18): 144–51; and Wilhelm Lutschewitz, *Alte und neue Zeit in Tsimo, der Kreisstadt vom Hinterlande in Tsingtau* (Berlin: Buchhandlung der Berliner evangelischen Missionsgesellschaft, 1910), 43–44.

[46] On the link between prolonged drought and the rise of the Boxers, see Paul A. Cohen, *History in Three Keys: The Boxers as Event, Experience, and Myth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).

earlier the American Board missionaries had acquired premises in the city without much difficulty. However, when a break in the Grand Canal embankment threatened to flood the neighbourhood on 16 August 1895, a crowd armed with firearms and knives gathered and accused the missionaries of having caused the breach. Although an attack was averted by means of a compromise, the missionaries nevertheless decided to inform the American consul in Tianjin. They did not want any action to be taken against the leaders of the crowd (they suspected that a women—who was operating a bordello in an adjoining property—had instigated the trouble). Nonetheless, they pointed out that the local officials had not intervened to disperse the "rioters." "These are, we hope, days of transition for China. And may not the representatives of our government who hold office in China hope to aid her by urging upon her the substitution of reality for sham in her administration?"[47]

As the Linqing case indicates, the common people were not only curious about but also exceedingly suspicious of outsiders. Incendiary placards and lurid anti-Christian tales that appeared from time to time ensured that this fear of foreigners and their strange beliefs and practices was smouldering below the surface, only to break out into the open in times of crisis. Thus, Charles Killie described the agitation against the American Presbyterians in Yizhou in 1893 in terms that were familiar to observers since at least the early eighteenth century:

> The story of our trouble is the same story that has been told from various parts of China at intervals ever since missionaries first entered the land. With the change of a few details it would be the history of almost every riot that has taken place. Foolish or malicious stories are at first circulated about the missionary as to his ability to transmute various substances into silver; his stealing little children and digging their eyes and hearts out to use in making medicines; his putting medicines into the public wells to bewitch the people who use the water therefrom, etc., etc., and then some rascal, being offended in some way, stirs up the people and a riot is precipitated. It seems almost incredible that such stories should be believed, and such leaders followed, but the facts before us prove it but too true. . . . The principal things charged against us were the suspiciously large number of chimneys on our various houses, and more recently the fact that we had dug a well. The argument was that every chimney meant

---

[47] Henry P. Perkins and Edward R. Wagner to Sheridan P. Read, Linqing, 28 August 1895, NA: RG84, Tianjin, vol. 69, fols. 20–29. The Linqing missionaries hoped that their experience "may perhaps throw some useful light upon the right action of our government" regarding the rather more serious Sichuan riots in 1895.

> a furnace for the manufacture of silver, and the well an opening to an underground passageway by which we sent children, silver, etc., to Shanghai, 500 miles away.[48]

That such lurid tales could have a powerful effect on the minds simple folk is attested to by the systematic and widespread dissemination of this kind of propaganda by the Chinese Communists as late as the early 1950s.[49]

In traditional China it was impossible to separate religious matters from secular village affairs. As Charles Litzinger's study has shown, the village temple had an important integrative function "as an institution to which the entire village community belonged by virtue of residence in the village and which functioned as the center of village social life." The temple was thus more than simply a religious institution. It served as the natural focus for community festivals, theatricals, local defence and education (serving as the *yixue* 義學, or charity school).[50] The Christians' refusal to support temple-based activities increased the burden for the rest of the community and provoked further enmity:

> Village elders and trustees of temples unite in efforts to exact from Christians contributions for theatres and the repairs of temples. When the native Christians persist in asserting their purpose to follow their own convictions of duty in opposition to those who think they have both the right and the power to control them, open outbreaks ensue, resulting in brutal assaults, house burning, and in some cases driving Christians from their homes.[51]

From the non-Christians' point of view, the converts' withdrawal from local socio-religious affairs seriously undermined communal cohesiveness.[52]

---

[48] Killie, Yizhou, 1893, in PBFM, Killie Papers, private, pp. 25–29.

[49] For details and illustrations, see Johannes Schütte, *Die katholische Chinamission im Spiegel der rotchinesischen Presse. Versuch einer missionarischen Deutung* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1957).

[50] Litzinger, "Temple Community and Village Cultural Integration," 79. On temple-based theatricals as part of mediation settlements and at times of drought, plague and famine, see Anton Volpert, "Das chinesische Schauspielwesen in Südschantung," *Anthropos* 3 (1908): 367–80. Volpert found that each household's material contribution was assessed on the basis of the size of its land holding.

[51] Nevius, "Methods of Mission Work," 104.

[52] When in the aftermath of the Tianjin Massacre (1870) the Chinese authorities sought to regulate missionary intercourse with Chinese society (the "Chinese Memoran-

Unfortunately the paucity of relevant materials does not permit a detailed evaluation of the Chinese establishment's point of view to determine more precisely the ideological component of local elite resistance in Shandong. In any case, we have to keep in mind that his confrontation occurred against the background of a Confucian order in decline. Many lower degree holders, in particular, had become alienated from the establishment, and some of them were even prepared to join the Christian Church. Furthermore, as a result of the uneven distribution of upper gentry in Shandong,[53] certain areas of the province were not firmly committed to Confucian orthodoxy anyway. However, it should also be noted that ideological opposition could also be fostered by non-Confucian elements, such as Buddhist and Daoist religious specialists. Consider, for instance, the activities of a Daoist priest who led a "mob" in attacks on Christians in several villages of Pingduzhou 平度州, eastern Shandong, in 1896. According to missionary Paul Bergen, he was supported by a "Society of Heroes" (*Yingxionghui* 英雄會) that had been making trouble more than once before.[54]

The growth of heterodoxy in the nineteenth century is another indication that the Confucian *weltanschauung* was disintegrating. In this connection, it should be noted that Christianity had been declared to be a heterodox religion by the Yongzheng 雍正 emperor in 1724 and had been treated accordingly by the authorities.[55] Although the heterodoxy label was removed from the Qing Code in 1870, Christianity continued

---

dum"), Protestant missionaries were vehemently opposed to any such control. See, for instance, Alexander Williamson's reaction: Alexander Williamson and Carstairs Douglas, *Analysis of the Circular of the Chinese Government on Missions: The Circular Was Communicated to HM Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs by the French Charge d'Affaires and Presented to Both Houses of Parliament . . . June 1871*, 2nd ed. (London: Presbyterian Church Foreign Missions Committee, 1871). As representative of the National Bible Society of Scotland, Williamson had travelled extensively in Shandong and had his base in Yantai.

[53] A spatial analysis of the distribution of degree holders who obtained their degrees between 1850 and 1900 shows that most civil *juren* 舉人 and *jinshi* 進士 came from the Ji'nan and Wei *xian* trading systems. In contrast, western Shandong produced very few civil *juren*, with the exception of the commercial-administrative centres of Jining (*benzhou*) 濟寧（本州）and Dongchang 東昌 (Liaocheng *xian* 聊城縣). However, western Shandong produced more military degree holders, probably a reflection of the prevailing martial spirit in this area. See maps and tables in Tiedemann, "Rural Unrest in North China," 24–25.

[54] See Calvin Mateer and Watson M. Hayes to the Pingdu magistrate, encl. in P. D. Bergen, Report of 19 October 1896, NA: RG84, Chefoo Misc. Corr., vol. 6. See also Bergen to Fowler, Chefoo, 22 October 1896, in ibid.

[55] For details, see Jan Jacob Maria de Groot, *Sectarianism and Religious Persecution in China: A Page in the History of Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1901), 329–34, 387–405.

to be regarded as a subversive sect by many officials, gentry and commoners alike. According to late nineteenth-century missionary accounts, hostile magistrates persisted in persecuting and punishing neophytes and "enquirers" for conspiring with foreigners to introduce corrupt and dangerous doctrines.

As long as the Chinese state and its local representatives continued to treat Christianity as a proscribed sect, any links between "foreign heterodoxy" (*yangxie* 洋邪) and indigenous outlawed religious groups, often indiscriminately and inaccurately referred to as the White Lotus tradition (*Bailian jiao* 白蓮教),[56] would obviously be of considerable interest to this study. Daniel Bays has indeed noted a degree of commonality in value content, structure and social role which provided a substantial common ground of identity between Chinese folk religious "sects" and Christianity.[57] He proposes, furthermore, that in nineteenth-century China Christianity should not be seen solely as a "foreign religion":

> In terms of the way in which it functioned in Chinese society, it can be and should be seen as a variety of the wide range of heterodox religion or sectarianism . . . which was already well established and flourishing in many parts of China. In religious ideas and in the structure and role of local religious groups, significant parallels appear when we consider Christianity and indigenous Chinese sectarians.[58]

These affinities are reflected in a rather surprising and important development. Our comprehensive investigation of the missionary enterprise in the Shandong area has revealed that a significant number of converts came from indigenous sectarian backgrounds. As Susan Naquin has noted, switching one's sect affiliation was common within the White Lotus tradition: "There were some people who went from sect to sect, joining first one and then another, always searching for the 'best' system."[59] For some sectaries it was, therefore, a relatively

---

[56] For a comprehensive discussion, see B. J. ter Haar, *The White Lotus Teachings in Chinese Religious History* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

[57] Daniel H. Bays, "Christianity and the Chinese Sectarian Tradition," *Ch'ing-shih wen-t'i* 4, no. 7 (June 1982): 37; idem, "Christianity and Chinese Sects: Religious Tracts in the Late Nineteenth Century," in *Christianity in China: Early Protestant Missionary Writings*, ed. Suzanne W. Barnett and John K. Fairbank (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1985), 127–28.

[58] Bays, "Christianity and the Chinese Sectarian Tradition," 33.

[59] Susan Naquin, *Millenarian Rebellion in China: The Eight Trigrams Uprising of 1813*

small step to turn to Christianity because it offered an attractive *religious* alternative. For their part, both Catholic and Protestant missionaries were well aware of the considerable conversion potential amongst White Lotus believers. The approach used by Timothy Richard of the Baptist Missionary Society in the Qingzhou area of Shandong was fairly typical of missionary attitudes towards heterodox religious groups: "Richard's guiding principle was ever to seek out those that were worthy. Many of these seekers after the truth are found among the secret sects with which China is honeycombed and from which came some of our most earnest Christian leaders."[60] In connection with their early converts in the village of Diqi 第七, near the Grand Canal city of Dezhou 德州, Shandong, the American Board missionaries were rather more cautious: "But it became apparent that care must be exercised, as there were indications that other motives than a pure desire to hear what we had to say were present in the hearers' minds. The 'White Lily sect' . . . has thousands of adherents in this section of country; and there is danger of their becoming connected with us for political ends."[61]

Indeed, from the perspective of the Chinese ruling class, the acceptance into the church of indigenous "heterodox" elements by the missionaries tended to reinforce the assumption by the Chinese state that Christianity was a subversive creed. It is, therefore, not surprising that some local officials viewed the expansion of Christianity with apprehension and sought to prevent its advance. In the early 1880s, for example, the Dezhou magistrate Chen Siliang 陳嗣良 was, according to the American Board missionaries at Pangzhuang, particularly active in this regard. They intimated that his hostility had been provoked by the arrival at Dezhou of their cargo boats with building material for the "strange and new" missionary residences at Pangzhuang. This event "was the slow match that let loose his thunderbolts upon our little church". In the weeks and months that followed, the magistrate set out to frustrate the settlement of a number of cases. More alarmingly, the American consul James C. Zuck, who had been sent by the chargé d'affaires Chester Holcombe to investigate, was "rudely received" by the magistrate and assaulted by a "miscellaneous mob" in the streets of Dezhou. The missionaries asserted that owing solely to the instigation

---

(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 37.

[60] Burt, *Fifty Years in China*, 20.

[61] Tianjin Station Report 31 March 1870 to 31 March 1871, ABCFM, North China Mission, ABC:16.3.12, vol. 1 (1860–71), Houghton Library, Harvard University.

of the local official, the people "have exhibited a bitterness and hostility hitherto totally unknown in this field." They rejoiced when Chen Siliang was removed in June 1882 through the vigorous efforts of Mr. Holcombe. "This fact made a great impression of the prestige of foreigners, an impression which will not soon fade."[62] It is, however, unlikely that this action made the missionaries more popular with Chinese officialdom. Even if local officials wanted to settle cases with the missionaries, they had to take into account the feelings of the local elite and the people in general. Note, for instance, the incident in the village of Zhanghaoliujia 張郝劉家 in Haifeng *xian* 海豐縣, northern Shandong. When two villagers were accepted into the church as probationers, their former teacher, the *xiucai* Lu Tianwen 逯天文, being "greatly grieved over their connecting themselves with the Christian Church," lodged a complaint with the district magistrate. Not obtaining satisfaction, Lu gathered a crowd and caused damage to the Christians' property. Subsequently, the magistrate declined to intervene, because, according to the Methodist Episcopal missionary George Ritchie Davis (Da Jirui 達吉瑞), it was "an affair between *Master* and *pupil*."[63]

Missionary interference in lawsuits was another major causal factor in the proliferation of "religious cases," usually in connection with the expanding Catholic missionary enterprise. In other words, often it was not until the intervention of priests that an ordinary case of litigation was transformed into a "*jiao'an*." In the early days of their presence in Shandong, Protestant missionaries, too, sometimes attempted to help Chinese adherents in lawsuits. Calvin Mateer went to great lengths to help a native worker, Miao Huayu 苗化育, arrested for allegedly preaching "sorcery" and "sedition"; but Miao "tried to use his foreign connections to assume the standing and privileges of the highest literary rank." After this case, Calvin Mateer ceased to intervene in support of native Christians.[64]

---

[62] Station Report for the Shandong Station for the Year ending 31 March 1882, ABCFM, North China Mission, ABC:16.3.12, #25; Shandong Station Report 1882–83, in ibid. Note also that the dismissal of Shandon governor Yuxian 毓賢 in late 1899 came as a result of American diplomatic pressure. A few days prior to the event, Henry D. Porter had written: "If we could persuade the American Minister to demand the removal of the Governor we should be glad." Porter to Friends, Pangzhuang, 27 November 1899, ABCFM, North China Mission, ABC:16.3.12, vol. 20.

[63] Davis to Read, Tianjin, 18 July 1896, NA: RG84, Tianjin, vol. 69, Letters received from Missionaries, fols. 60–65. Emphasis in the original.

[64] Irwin T. Hyatt, Jr., "The Missionary as Entrepreneur: Calvin Mateer in Shantung," *Journal of Presbyterian History* 49, no. 4 (Winter 1971): 308–9.

However, his younger brother Robert McCheyne Mateer (Di Lebo 狄樂播) was still prepared to take up a case on behalf of converts in the Le'an *xian* 樂安縣 (now called Guangrao 廣饒) in 1886–87. The background to this "persecution" is not clear. It would seem, according to R. M. Mateer's reports, that the trouble had been fomented by yamen "underlings and salt commissioners." He insisted that since "the Christians are so utterly clear from blame that we must push it promptly to the bitter end even if it costs much money and trouble."[65] Yet it is significant that Calvin Mateer and John L. Nevius advised him to get out of the case and let the local parties get on with it on their own.[66]

The "backslider" phenomenon in Christian communities was a matter of constant concern to the Protestant ministers. However, as the Pangzhuang case of 1885 shows, the expulsion of undesirable elements could be a source of further trouble. According to a report by Henry Dwight Porter (Bo Hengli 博恆理), the American Board missionaries had been living "in remarkable quiet and harmony" since moving to Pangzhuang in the summer of 1882. But a few years later the peace was rudely disturbed. "A resident of the village, Ma Zunshi 馬遵式, about 60 years of age, and of some local influence having been at times an inspector of salt, has become exceedingly envious of our chief native assistant." Although Ma had been a candidate for admission to the church, he was suspended after he reviled the missionaries in a drunken fit. "The hostility of the man Ma began in the fact that last year we declined to lend him money to start in a small business. . . . This simply enraged him, so that he spread abroad evil reports about our houses, with deep dungeons underneath and many other mischievous rumors in order to injure and destroy our influence. . . . In the autumn of 1884 he was greatly incensed because we would not employ him to buy our winter's supply of coal wishing to put himself in the way of making a squeeze." He continued to quarrel with various people employed by the mission and instigated a disturbance when the carts with the coal supplies for the mission station arrived. Porter was outraged when the En-*xian* magistrate did not have Ma arrested. "I consider the arrest and examination of the ringleaders the first requisite to our personal safety and future quiet. . . . The villaincy [*sic*] of calling the village together

---

[65] R. M. Mateer to Vice-Consul Halcomb, Dengzhou, 25 January 1887, NA: RG84, Miscellaneous Correspondence Chefoo, vol. 4.

[66] R. M. Mateer to Dr. Archer Russell Platt, Qingzhou, 25 November 1886, NA: RG84, Miscellaneous Correspondence Chefoo, vol. 3C; R. M. Mateer to Vice-Consul Halcomb, Dengzhou, 25 January 1887; R. M. Mateer to Halcomb, Wei *xian*, 10 March 1887, NA: RG84, Miscellaneous Correspondence Chefoo, vol. 4.

by 'sounding the gong and drum' is on par with that which led to the Tientsin massacre of 1870. Had our village been a large one, instead of one of 90 families we could scarce have escaped a very serious catastrophy [*sic*]." It was only after the intervention of the US consul George Tisdale Bromley and the "viceroy" (presumably the governor-general of Zhili 直隸 in Tianjin) that a satisfactory settlement was reached. The village elders undertook not to molest the missionaries, their Chinese helpers and the converts. Finally, the elders agreed to end the affair by providing the customary "feast,"[67] i.e. a reconciliation meal (*hemu cai* 和睦菜). Only time would tell whether relations in the village would remain harmonious in the longer run. This case also demonstrates how easily enmity could be fostered in the unpredictable and contentious environment of the North China countryside as well as the length to which missionaries went to have disputes settled on their terms.

In times of crisis or perceived crisis, outsiders and alien beliefs are more likely to come under attack. Thus, anti-missionary and anti-Christian agitation increased markedly in Shandong at the time of the Tianjin Massacre (1870), the Yangzi Valley Riots (1891), the events between 1898 and 1900, as well as during the war between China and France (1884–85). In connection with the Sino–French War, for instance, John L. Nevius reported that anti-Christian placards were appearing and converts were assaulted in Anqiu district because of the unsettled conditions. In conformity with Chinese official procedure, Nevius addressed a petition (*bingtie* 稟帖) to the magistrate of Anqiu district, pointing out that Christians were being beaten by "a company of rioters" in Zhangjiazhuang 張家莊, a village near the place where the inflammatory placard had appeared. According to Nevius, this was one of many cases. "If these cases are all left without investigation or redress, it is to be feared that subalterns and underlings will still take the lead in opposition and persecution; and helpless Christians be involved in lawsuits."[68]

In this context, "subalterns and underlings" refers, no doubt, to the much reviled sub-bureaucratic staff of yamen clerks and runners who collected fees from litigants and extorted money from the common people. "Yamen clerks and runners, like the nefarious litigation brokers (*songgun* [訟棍]), were . . . thought capable of gulling their witless vic-

---

[67] Porter to Bromley, Pangzhuang, 4 November, 23 November and 3 December 1885, NA: RG84, Tianjin, fols. 217–44 verso.

[68] Nevius to Platt, no date, NA: RG84, Miscellaneous Correspondence Chefoo, vol. 3B.

tims into presenting petty disputes before the court, after which the victims found themselves enmeshed in a web of fees and charges, often to the point of being left penniless."[69] Among the runners (*yayi* 衙役), the constables (*buyi* 捕役) were the most feared. Since they derived a large part of their livelihood from litigation, many of these yamen underlings must have viewed missionary interference with hostility. Effective missionary intervention often prevented the clerks and runners from extracting fees from Christian litigants. Rather than suppress anti-Christian activities, some subalterns and underlings may, in fact, have fomented it.

The likelihood of future anti-Christian violence increased when the foreigners intervened and the "Christians" did not have a just cause. Frequently the situation was further aggravated by the missionaries' unwillingness to compromise. They felt that they had to win at all cost to preserve or augment their credibility. Chinese officials, for their part, increasingly decided cases in favour of converts, for they realized that the missionaries could—and usually did—exert considerable pressure on the Chinese government by appealing to their consular representatives. Furthermore, the Christians began to exploit their privileged position by bringing false cases and generally oppressing their non-Christian neighbours. As early as the mid-1880s, John Nevius observed that "when through the influence of the foreign teachers the tide of fortune has turned in favour of the Christians, they have not always been free from a spirit of revenge and retaliation."[70]

The difficulty of apportioning blame in so-called "religious cases" can also be seen in the conflict involving a Presbyterian congregation in the Rizhao 日照–Juzhou 莒州–Zhucheng 諸城 border area in eastern Shandong. On 7 November 1898 the Christian school at Mantangyu 滿堂峪 (Rizhao *xian*) was broken up by people from the neighbouring village of Xilou 西樓 (a.k.a. Hejialou 何家樓) "who had heard that all foreigners were being driven out of China." On the following day there was a second attack, in which the Christians' grain was stolen, their cattle killed, and the school teacher taken prisoner. Upon hearing of these assaults, the Presbyterian missionaries Wallace S. Faris (Fu Weisi 富維思), William P. Chalfant (Fang Weilian 方偉廉) and Charles A. Killie set out from Yizhou to carry out an investigation, arriving

---

[69] Bradly W. Reed, *Talons and Teeth: County Clerks and Runners in the Qing Dynasty* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 202.

[70] John L. Nevius, "Methods of Mission Work," *Chinese Recorder* 17, no. 3 (March 1886): 105.

at their principal outstation of Liucun 留村 on 12 November.[71] They found that

> There has been for some time a feud between the two villages which culminated last spring in the intimidation of the Christians by parties of violent men from Ho Chia Lou [Hejialou], the beating by them of our school-teacher at Liu Ts'un [Liucun] and several other minor outrages. Matters went to such a length that we were compelled to appeal, last spring, to the Ji Chao [Rizhao] official and succeeded in getting the case settled by the usual Chinese expedient of exacting a public feast from the offenders.[72]

As the above indicates, the initially isolated conflict at Mantangyu had become caught up in the wider antiforeign agitation in the aftermath of the Hundred Days Reforms. Although another compromise was quickly reached with the original Xilou adversaries in November 1898, through the mediation of a "man named Shuin [Xun?], who has authority over ten villages," the unrest continued to grow in that area.[73] "The primary trouble was a spirit of unrest throughout that region, due in great part to the recent coup d'état at Beijing. The people knew that the reform party at the capital had been overthrown, that the empress dowager had taken the reign [*sic*] of government into her own hands."[74]

However, in spite of the fact that this was a time of growing anti-Christian agitation in eastern Shandong, in the aftermath of the German occupation of Kiaochow Bay (Jiaozhouwan 膠州灣), the American Presbyterian missionaries realized that their Mantangyu converts were not necessarily blameless. The Rev. Killie conceded: "From the evidence it is pretty clear that the [Christian] schoolteacher . . . and his

---

[71] Killie, diary notes 9–14 November 1898, Yizhou, 29 November 1898, PBFM: Killie Papers, pp. 55–58. See also W. S. Faris, "A Itinerating Experience," *Presbyterian Banner* 85, no. 33 (2 February 1899): 12–13. For the dates of the attacks at Mantangyu, see Killie, Faris and W. P. Chalfant to Fowler, Yizhou, 29 November 1898, encl. 2 in Fowler to David Hill, Chefoo, 15 December 1898, NA: RG59, M102 reel 4; also in *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States 1899*, 154–57.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Killie, diary notes, 13 and 16 November 1898, in PBFM: Killie Papers, p. 57 (quote) and p. 62.

[74] Faris, "A [*sic*] Itinerating Experience," *Presbyterian Banner* 85, no. 33 (2 February 1899): 12–13. On the circulation of rumours concerning an imperial edict to the effect that foreigners and Chinese Christians had been/were to be expelled from China, see Killie, Faris and W. P. Chalfant to Fowler, Yizhou, 29 November 1898, encl. 2 in Fowler to Hill, Chefoo, 15 December 1898, NA: RG59, M102 reel 4.

family, together with the elders of the church here, have been acting unwisely in the conduct of some public affairs and have made enemies who are now getting revenge."[75] The Catholic missionaries, who also had converts at Mantangyu, claimed that the Protestant Christians had imposed heavy fines on the non-Christians prior to the violence.[76] In any case, the initial Protestant settlement in November 1898 stipulated that while the Hejialou people were to return the stolen property and rebuild the Christian school, the converts were to provide a one-table reconciliation meal, *since they were not without blame either*.[77] Such combinations of old and new grievances were, of course, at the bottom of many individual *jiao'an*. Furthermore, the missionaries' frequent claims to the contrary notwithstanding, their assertiveness—as well as that of their converts—was highly provocative and likely to generate, aggravate or revive intra-village animosities.

The term *jiao'an* is usually taken to refer to disputes between Christians and non-Christians. However, an aspect that has hitherto received little scholarly attention is the bitter contest between local Catholics and Protestants in China. In typically un-Christian fashion, both sides characterized the work of the other in negative terms in their reports back to Europe and North America.[78] Moreover, the voluminous published and unpublished missionary sources reveal the intense competition for Chinese souls between "Papists" and "heretics." The for Protestants rare case of "mass conversion" along the Shandong–Zhili border near the Grand Canal city of Dezhou in the late 1860s may serve as an example. The specific case concerns the conversions at Zhujiazhaizi 朱家寨子, a village of some 2,000 souls in Leling *xian*, northwestern Shandong. According to the Methodist New Connexion history, an old man by the name of Zhu had wandered into their preaching chapel at Tianjin in early summer 1866, having been led there as a result of a dream to "meet with those who would show him

---

[75] Killie, diary notes 9–14 November 1898, Yizhou, 29 November 1898, PBFM: Killie Papers, 58.

[76] Johann Baptist Anzer to Heyking, Ji'nan, 23 November 1898, Bundesarchiv Berlin Lichterfelde, Bestand: Deutsche Gesandtschaft Peking (R 9208), vol. 327.

[77] Faris, "Itinerating Experience," 12–13; emphasis added.

[78] For further details, see Jean-Paul Wiest, "Roman Catholic Perceptions and Critiques of British and American Protestant Missions (1807–1915)," unpublished paper presented at the North Atlantic Missiology Project Symposium, held in Boston, Massachusetts, 21–24 June 1998; R. G. Tiedemann, "Works of the Antichrist: Protestant Views of Catholic Missions in China," unpublished paper presented at the Dixième Colloque International Ricci de Sinologie: Les rendez-vous manqués entre Chine et Occident (1600–2000), Centre Sèvres, Paris, 6–8 September 2004.

the way of truth." This encounter subsequently led to the formation of the successful Protestant evangelistic work and the establishment of a permanent rural mission station in the interior of Shandong province.[79]

Yet in 1870 the Jesuit priest Prosper Leboucq (Xu Tingbo 徐聽波), working in neighbouring Hejian *fu* 河間府 or prefecture, Zhili, told a rather different story. According to him, a young native from Shandong was dismissed from an English warehouse in Tianjin. "Finding himself without money or occupation, he became a Protestant," promising that if the Protestant ministers established themselves in Zhujiazhai, the entire village would convert to Protestantism. However, at that time ten families of that village had already become Catholic catechumens. "The [Protestant] preachers scattered money about in profusion, but the [Catholic] faithful wanted none of it." Nevertheless, some 500 "pagans" succumbed. Yet in spite of the large gratuities, these 500 disciples disappeared by degrees from the chapel, only forty or so remaining. In contrast, during the three years that "English or American money has been preaching the Gospel in Zhujiazhai, the ten Catholic families have remained firm in the faith."[80] A Protestant response exposed five "misrepresentations" in Leboucq's account. Specifically, it was pointed out that the Methodists had admitted to church fellowship only 45, not 500 persons. Nor had they been won over by English money, for the work at Zhujiazhai and neighbouring villages had been initiated by native agents for five months prior to the arrival of foreign pastors. "Thus nothing in the shape of 'money and dinners' can be said to have been employed to bribe or 'win over' the people to Protestantism."[81] While it is difficult to establish the truth in this matter, it is indicative of the mutual hostility and intense rivalry between Protestants and Catholics in China.

As the 1892 *jiao'an* in Anqiu *xian* reveals, sometimes the disputes between Catholics and Protestants were not only contests over the provision of spiritual benefits but could also be struggles for material resources. Essentially, the dispute was about a piece of land and a chapel,

---

[79] John Hedley, "The Rev. John Innocent, and the Work of God in Laoling," in *Shantung, the Sacred Province of China, in Some of Its Aspects*, ed. Robert Coventry Forsyth (Shanghai: Christian Literature Society, 1912), 225.

[80] Leboucq to the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, Zhaoerzhuang, 18 January 1870, *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* 42 (September 1870): 339–41. A free English translation of Leboucq's Zhujiazhai account was published by "Inquirer," London Mission, Wuchang, "Protestant Mission in Laoling, Shantung," *Chinese Recorder* 3 (February 1871): 255–56.

[81] *The Independent* (New York), 8 December 1870, reprinted in *Chinese Recorder* 3, no. 1 (June 1871): 9–10.

which arose when two converts connected with the American Presbyterian Mission in the village of Juntunzhuang 軍屯莊 joined the Roman Catholic church. Such defections were by no means unusual, because—the Protestant ministers frequently informed their readers back home—the foreign priests were prepared to intervene in lawsuits or were prepared to accept "backsliders" whom the Protestants had expelled. In this instance, the defector Zhao Benchu 趙本初 had been "excommunicated" by the American missionaries for an unspecified misdemeanour. However, according to the Catholic side of the story, Zhao was a wealthy villager who had made available both land and money for the construction of the premises which served both as the Protestant school and chapel. Having changed his creed, he now wanted his property back, the officially sanctioned transfer of which the Protestants, led by the American Joseph A. Leyenberger (Lei Yinbai 雷音百, sought to prevent "by force of arms." According to the Protestant version, the chapel had been for several years in the possession of Protestant converts who had all contributed toward its construction. Since the dispute could not be settled locally, the provincial governor, American and French diplomats as well as the Zongli Yamen 總理衙門 became involved—which was bound to complicate matters. After a protracted struggle the case was eventually settled, thanks to the successful mediation of the *daotai* 道臺. The Protestants agreed to build a new meeting house on another plot of land.[82]

As has been shown in the preceding passages, the causes of anti-Christian and anti-missionary conflict were many. Moreover, as the "Jimo Case" of 1873–74 demonstrates, *jiao'an* often were complex and multi-causal affairs. In this case, missionaries had once again pushed beyond what were considered agreed treaty rights. As the American consul at Tianjin, Eli Taylor Sheppard, put it, "in such cases as this, where a missionary is driven to abandon a place, where he has no right of residence under the Treaties, a policy of extreme caution and moderation is the only one that is like to receive the sanction of our Government, as a missionary, equally with any other American citizen, residing in the interior far from a Treaty Port, has no rights that can be

---

[82] For further details, see *Jiaowu jiao'an dang*, 5th ser., 1:532–41. See also the reports in the *North-China Herald*, 13 May 1892, 631; 27 May 1892, 714; 17 June 1892, 811; 12 August 1892, 221; 9 September 1892, 374; 28 October 1892, 637; 16 December 1892:, 906. For similar conflict between Catholics and Baptists in eastern Guangdong Province, see Joseph Tse-Hei Lee, *The Bible and the Gun: Christianity in South China, 1860–1900* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003), Chapter 7: "The Lord of Heaven versus Jesus Christ."

insisted upon under Treaties to secure to him the position he has assumed."[83] It transpires that Hunter Corbett of the American Presbyterian mission had gone to the Jimo district in the autumn of 1873 with his three children to reside temporarily among his Christians in the village of Kebu 科埠, where there were 150 adult "converts," in addition to a large number of enquirers. According to Nevius, these converts had been members of an "old religious sect . . . earnestly seeking the truth."[84]

It cannot now be ascertained whether the Christians' former affiliation with an indigenous folk religious sect was an underlying factor in the ensuing conflict. The immediate cause of the riot seems to have been Corbett's appearance at a time when the people were in a state of high excitement. Even in normal times people may find unfamiliar customs, behaviour and styles of dress perplexing or even objectionable. Thus, when the missionary, dressed in Western clothes, proceeded to preach and distribute religious books during a theatrical performance in the village Huayanji on 30 November 1873, he caused a little riot and was assaulted. Two weeks later Corbett and some converts went to preach and distribute books at a fair in the Yuhuang 玉皇 Temple, 30 *li* south of Jimo, and again was met with a hostile reception. Since the anti-Christian agitation had by now reportedly spread over the entire district, Corbett and his children fled to the relative safety of Jimo City and from there made their way to Yantai.

While the Jimo magistrate and the "deputy" (*weiyuan* 委員), sent from Yantai to investigate, denied that a disturbance had taken place, Consul Sheppard insisted that the 42 "principal rioters" whose names had been given be arrested and punished. In the end the Yantai Customs *daotai* yielded, "but not, however, until I had been obliged to say that failing in his arresting these men I would consider the question of arresting them myself by virtue of the power given to U.S. authorities in the last clause of Article 11 of the U.S. Treaty."[85] In view of the presence of the American gunboat *Palos*, the customary art of procrastination by Chinese officials had to be abandoned. The accused men were duly arrested and brought to trial in Yantai. While the people of Yantai were in sympathy with the "rioters" and the *daotai* was vilified

---

[83] Sheppard to William Alexander Cornabé (US vice-consul at Chefoo), #48, 9 February 1874, NA: RG84, Tianjin, vol. 76, fols. 56–58.

[84] Nevius to Ellinwood, Chefoo, 5 November 1873, PBFM, China, vol. 11, #85.

[85] Memorandum of the interview with the *daotai* in Yantai, enclosed in Sheppard to S. Wells Williams, #17, Tianjin, 22 June 1874, NA: RG84, Tianjin, vol. 76, Letter Book, Miscellaneous Correspondence Sent, fol. 79.

in placards "for partiality or submission to Foreigners," the trial was concluded on 25 May 1874. Those to be punished were conducted to a neighbouring yamen where they were beaten as sentenced, "in the presence of Mr. Cornabé, the officers of the [American gunboat] 'Saco,' and the Acting Interpreter, Mr. [Jesse Boardman] Hartwell."[86] According to Consul Sheppard, the peculiarity of the case was the fact that people had been brought from the interior to a treaty port where intimidating "mobs" could not be mobilized and where treaty rights were better understood. He added: "The presence of Gunboats at the open Ports and the interest taken by naval authorities in such questions as this, is a sure, and sometimes *only* guarantee of a speedy and equitable settlement."[87]

Consul Sheppard reported the following specific terms of the settlement of the "Jimo Case" to his superior in Beijing:

> After some discussion the following terms of settlement were speedily decided upon [on 3 June], viz:—
>
> *1*. Four men convicted of having been prominently engaged in the two cases of stoning, to be beaten with the heavy bamboo,—one of them 80 blows, two others 60 each, and one 40 blows.
>
> The local constables (Ti-pao) of Ko-pu and Hua-yen to receive 80 blows each and be dismissed from office.
>
> *2*. Mr. Corbett's pecuniary losses, estimated at Taels 380, to be paid within fifteen days by the persons who entered his house, they to be imprisoned in the meantime, and the Taotai to guarantee payment.
>
> *3*. The remainder of the criminals to be pardoned at my special request.
>
> *4*. All the prisoners to enter into a bond to keep the peace and guarantee Mr. Corbett's personal safety while he remains in Chi-mi [Jimo]. All accusations or suits arising out of this case or connected with it in any way, to be suppressed.
>
> *5*. The Taotai to issue a stringent proclamation giving a full account of this case and how it was settled, and threatening severe punishment upon any one who may dare to engage in similar outrages in the future.

---

[86] Sheppard to Williams, #17, Tianjin, 22 June 1874, in ibid. Hartwell was a Southern Baptist Convention missionary at Yantai.

[87] Ibid., fol. 87.

> *6*. When Mr. Corbett returns to Chi-mi, the Taotai is to furnish him with a special passport, and also with a letter to the Chi-mi magistrate.[88]

Given the favourable outcome to the missionaries, it comes as no surprise that they commented approvingly on this case:

> It has thus become an amicable test case of the treaty right of American missionaries not only to travel but to rent houses and locate permanently in the interior: the U.S. Government by this precedent pledging its support in so doing. It is believed that this is higher ground than has yet been taken by the representatives of any Western government.[89]

MISSIONARIES AND IMPERIALISM

Without the frequent diplomatic interventions and threats of military action, the position of the missionaries would have been far more precarious in the interior. In view of the fact that so many *jiao'an* were settled only after foreign diplomatic intervention, the missionary enterprise has long been closely identified with the overall process of imperialist expansion. As a matter of fact, many Chinese scholars still claim that the missionaries were the "tools for spreading the invasion of foreign aggressors." They see the anti-Christian struggles as a product of the wider conflict between imperialist powers and the Chinese people. Although it is clear that the missionary enterprise could not have flourished to the extent it did without the active support of the foreign powers, to what extent can we speak of purposeful collusion between missionaries and foreign governments?

Between 1860 and 1895, American Protestant missionaries demanded on several occasions direct foreign intervention in Shandong, but especially at times of general antiforeign agitation. When the reverberations of the Tianjin Massacre reached eastern Shandong in 1870,

---

[88] Ibid., fols. 83–84.

[89] Charles R. Mills, Dengzhou Report, 2 February 1875, PBFM, China vol. 12 #172. The Jimo Case was also featured in *The Shanghai Budget and Weekly Courier*, 15 January 1874, 30–31; 2 April 1874, 197–98; 16 May 1874: 309–10; 30 May 1874, 345; 6 June 1874, 355–56.

rumours spread to the effect that foreigners were to be massacred. The Presbyterian missionaries at Dengzhou called for armed intervention and hailed the incident as "a golden opportunity for a final Anglo-Saxon invasion of China."[90] The Americans at Dengzhou were, in fact, evacuated by the British naval vessels HMS *Barossa* and HMS *Grasshopper*.[91] In this connection, Calvin Mateer deplored the fact that there was no adequate US force in East Asia. "We live here solely on the prestige of England and France and when we get into trouble we can only appeal to them for help."[92] The missionaries did, however, find some comfort in the fact that they were able to return in the American man-of-war USS *Bernicia*, notwithstanding the fact that the US consul had pointed out to Edward P. Capp that "it is his opinion that Tungchow [Dengzhou] is not a treaty port, i.e. that we have no right to live here."[93] Although the American diplomats had serious misgivings about the missionaries' insistence on living in the interior, they nevertheless felt bound to protect them once they had managed to get into trouble. And the American missionaries at Dengzhou continued to call for American warships to visit this non-treaty port. Note, for instance, Rear-Admiral Chandler's report on a request from certain American residents of Dengzhou in 1887 "to the effect that a United States man-of-war may visit that port 'to perpetuate the good feeling now existing between Americans residing there and the Chinese authorities.'"[94]

The use of violence or threat of violence was, of course, a long established stratagem in the settlement of *jiao'an* in China. Most foreign clergymen, Protestant as well as Catholic, were driven by their all-consuming sense of "mission" to convert the reluctant millions of China. If foreign secular penetration, whether economic or military, facilitated the spread of Christianity, then it would be supported by most missionaries. At the same time, the aggressive nature of the missionary enterprise, which was constantly pushing the issue of "treaty rights" to the limit, was bound to create complications that would require foreign intervention and could thus be exploited by the imperialist powers. In connection with local missionary grievances in western Shandong, the Linqing correspondent of the *North-China Herald* (and

---

[90] Calvin Mateer to Walter Lowrie, 31 October 1870, PBFM, China, vol. 9 #336. The quote is by S. C. Miller, p. 268.

[91] Helen S. C. Nevius, *The Life of John Livingston Nevius*, 287.

[92] Calvin Mateer to Lowrie, Dengzhou, 5 September 1870, PBFM, China vol. 9 #336.

[93] Capp to Lowrie, Dengzhou 4 November 1870, PBFM, China vol. 9 #365.

[94] Chandler, US Flagship *Brooklyn*, 13 September 1887, NA: RG84, Chefoo Miscellaneous Correspondence, vol. 4.

a member of the American Board Mission there) suggested that the missionaries exploit the prevailing international situation in China to press for the settlement of outstanding *jiao'an*, because "when the Chinese Government is so anxious to have tariff rates changed, it is a very opportune moment for those who have grievances to bring them forward with the prospect of having them righted." Alluding to the famous passage in Charles Dickens' *David Copperfield*, the writer added: "*For the time being* 'Barkis is willin.'"[95]

American secular and religious interests were on the whole quite intimately intertwined. American Protestant missionaries were, therefore, generally more attuned to the expansionary aims of American secular interests in China. Diplomats, traders and evangelists were, in fact, more likely to be committed to the propagation of the gospel of the American Way of Life. According to Arthur Schlesinger, "the American Protestant missionary enterprise contained within itself from the start strong drives toward political, national, and technological as well as religious evangelism."[96] Indeed, some American evangelists engaged in trade or acted as agents for American mercantile enterprises, with the support of their diplomats. Although initially sceptical of the missionary presence in the interior, Charles Denby (Tian Bei 田貝, 1830–1904), from 1885 to 1898 the American Minister in Beijing, later viewed the missionaries as "pioneers of trade and commerce." As David L. Anderson has put it:

> In a classic American convergence of ideals and interests, he [Denby] proclaimed that the missionary "is the forerunner of commerce. . . . The drummer boy follows behind, and foreign commerce begins. From the missionary dwelling there radiates the light of modern civilization. . . . In the interest therefore, of civilization [i.e., commerce], missionaries ought not only to be tolerated, but ought to receive protection."[97]

In Shandong, at the height of the "scramble" for economic concessions in the late 1890s, John Fowler, US consul at Chefoo, relied on certain missionaries in the interior for economic information. He also used them to keep an eye on German activities in the province.[98] In 1884

---

[95] *North-China Herald*, 27 November 1896, 919.

[96] Schlesinger, "The Missionary Enterprise and Theories of Imperialism," 350.

[97] Quoted in Anderson, *Imperialism and Idealism*, 154.

[98] See e.g. Earle D. Sims to Fowler, Tai'an, 16 January 1899, NA: RG84, Chefoo Consulate, Miscellaneous Correspondence, vol. 8. For a general discussion, see Paul A.

Fleming D. Cheshire, the American consul in Shanghai, sent 10,000 circulars in Chinese "upon the advantages and harmless nature of kerosene," printed by William Herbert Libby, John D. Rockefeller's representative in China, to Tianjin vice-consul and missionary Leander W. Pilcher (Li Ande 李安德, 1848–93), requesting distribution throughout the Tianjin consular district[99] (which included western Shandong at this time). To what extent the role played by the American missionary-diplomat influenced the outcome of *jiao'an* cannot be established with certainty. It should, however, be noted that whereas the British had established a professional consular and diplomatic service in 1860,[100] the selection of personnel for American consular and diplomatic posts continued to favour personal connections rather than professionalism. Thus a number of ex-missionaries as well as active missionaries were to be found among the American consular and diplomatic staff, including Samuel Wells Williams (American Board), Chester Holcombe (American Board), Leander W. Pilcher (Methodist Episcopal) and Ninian Weston Halcomb (Southern Baptist Convention). Holcombe wrote in 1884 in connection with the "Chinanfu Case," in which he had become personally involved: "You may rest well assured that so long as I am connected with this Legation, no labor will be spared to secure our Missionaries in all parts of China complete protection in their work, and all the direct and indirect assistance which it may be possible and proper to give them. As a good Presbyterian, and formerly myself a missionary, I can safely promise this."[101]

Many missionaries aggressively proclaimed the superiority of Western values and identified themselves with imperialist forces. Especially within the American missionary community evangelical and patriotic emotions were running together.[102] There was, for example, an explicit sense of American cultural superiority in the refusal of many missionaries to blend into their Chinese surroundings. While the medical mis-

---

Varg, *Missionaries, Chinese and Diplomats: The American Protestant Missionary Movement in China, 1890–1952* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958), 31 and 82–85; John K. Fairbank, "Introduction," in Barnett and Fairbank, *Christianity in China*, 4; John M. H. Lindbeck, "American Missionaries and Policies of the United States in China, 1898–1901" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1948), 88–89.

[99] Cheshire to Pilcher, #163, Shanghai, 23 February 1884, NA: RG84, Tianjin, vol. 38, fol. 13.

[100] On the development of the British consular service in China, see P. D. Coates, *The China Consuls: British Consular Officers, 1843–1943* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1988).

[101] Holcombe to Ellinwood, #271, PBFM, vol. 18, China Letters 1884.

[102] Schlesinger, "The Missionary Enterprise and Theories of Imperialism," 346–50.

sionary Stephen Hunter of the Presbyterian mission at Ji'nan wore Chinese dress, others advised against it. "Many of the missionaries, I am sorry to say, not only disapprove of such a course, but are unjustly severe in condemning it. They seem to regard it as evidence of a disordered brain!" Hunter added that his critics felt he was giving up being American. However, the doctor insisted: "We are to *Christianize* the people, not to *Americanize* them."[103] His colleague Gilbert Reid was likewise willing to adopt Chinese ways because he was "a guest in China and should therefore conform to the rule of etiquette as established by my host."[104]

The issue of external accommodation had, of course, long been a hotly debated issue within the Protestant missionary community in China. We have to keep in mind that the great majority of rural dwellers had never seen Europeans and derived their opinions of them from the long tradition of lurid tales propagated in incendiary posters, calumnious pamphlets and ugly rumours. Whatever the pros and cons, the following account of a trip in central Shandong by a Scottish Presbyterian missionary may help illustrate the potential trouble the appearance of foreigners in Western garb might cause.

> We were dressed in home fashion,—in good tweed. Our coat and trousers were of the present absurdly tight fashion, and we wore a large sun hat. I shall not attempt to convey to you in words what phantoms we appeared to the simple Chinese, very many of whom, I know, had never seen a foreigner before. My marvel is that we got through the country at all. Suppose we had studied to shock Chinese taste, we could not have succeeded better. Our hairy faces and our short-cropped heads, our skin-tight garments, our heavy shoes, all were object of remark. In China men may not wear beards till they are fifty, and then a man is proud of a few silken hairs. Our profusion

---

[103] Hunter, Report, Ji'nan, 6 December 1880, PBFM, China: Incoming Letters, 1860–1900, vol. 15, no. 161. American Presbyterian opposition to external accommodation had been voiced even earlier by Charles R. Mills, in connection with Jasper S. McIlvaine's "Chinese ways." See Mills, 26 May 1873, in ibid., vol. 11, no. 41. Mills was still opposed to the accommodationist approach many years later. See his letter of 18 March 1889, in ibid., vol. 24, no. 31. On the Chinese dress issue in Shandong, see also Lottie Moon, "Advantages and Disadvantages of Wearing Native Dress in Missionary Work," *Woman's Work in China* 5, no. 1 (November 1881): 14–22. On the insistence of the China Inland Mission, the "pigtailed tribe," to wear Chinese garb, see Alvyn Austin, *China's Millions: The China Inland Mission and Late Qing Society, 1832–1905* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2007), 1–2, 121–23.

[104] Reid, PBFM, vol. 20, no. 173. China Letters, 1886.

> of hair is a stumbling to them: they ask if our bodies are all covered with hair. Then our short-cut garments associate us in their eyes with the *coolie*.[105]

Other foreign missionaries were rather more determined to avoid anything that could be construed as accommodation to things Chinese. Eliza Jewett Hartwell of the Southern Baptist mission in Dengzhou, for example, decided "to maintain her Southern ideas of hygiene and civilization in Tengchow, she resisted any vestige of Chinese culture in her home. She wore the largest hoop skirts any foreigners, much less Chinese, had ever seen."[106]

CONCLUSION

As is well known, Chinese Christians and foreign missionaries were the principal victims of the Boxer fury that swept across much of northern China in the summer of 1900. Initially Catholic converts became the targets of the early Boxer movement, but it was not long before Protestants were affected by the unrest as well, especially in the provinces of Zhili and Shanxi. It is, of course, important to remember that the Catholic missionary enterprise has a longer history than the Protestant missions in China and the number of Chinese Catholics was significantly larger. To what extent can it therefore be argued that a numerically stronger Catholic presence was bound to bring about more instances of friction between Christians and non-Christians? Certainly a careful examination of the *Jiaowu jiao'an dang* 教務教案檔 establishes for China as a whole that there were considerably more Catholic than Protestant "missionary cases." However, this multi-volume collections contains only the cases that were handled by the Zongli Yamen. Many cases were settled locally at district or prefectural level, or as the result of the intervention of provincial governors or foreign consuls before they reached Beijing. Since the relevant sources no longer exist

---

[105] John McIntyre, in *Missionary Record of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland*, n.s., 5 (February 1873): 398. Note that virtually all Catholic missionaries were wearing a form of Chinese dress.

[106] Carol Ann Vaughn, "'Living in the Lives of Men': A Southern Baptist Woman's Missionary Journey from Alabama to Shandong, 1830–1909" (PhD diss., Auburn University, 1998), 240.

or are not easily accessible, the magnitude of the *jiao'an* problem cannot be properly established and an accurate statistical analysis of Catholic and Protestant cases is difficult.

As the preceding examples of Protestant missionary cases indicate, the causes of the confrontations with non-Christians were diverse, essentially the result of a combination of internal and external factors. As concerns the exogenous component, Protestant missionaries, too, relied on foreign power, albeit to a lesser extent than their Catholic counterparts, to have cases decided in their favour. Certainly the Americans in Shandong demanded and usually received assistance from their diplomatic and consular representatives. In contrast, the smaller British missionary contingent was less likely to enjoy the support of the British government and its representatives in China. Indeed, that relationship was rather strained, if not hostile. Or as Lord Curzon put it, "the missionaries, as a class, are rarely popular with their own countrymen."[107] Whatever the real nature of this symbiotic interaction between missionary expansion and foreign aggression, from the Chinese perspective these issues were inseparable. Missionary activities were increasingly viewed with suspicion not only because of their challenge to the Chinese socio-cultural order, but also because of their presumed association with secular imperialist ambitions in China.

One recurrent theme in the Protestant missionary literature is the accusation that Catholic missionaries were fond of intervening in lawsuits. As a Methodist Episcopal missionary pointed with regard to Shandong at the end of the 1890s: "Roman Catholic activity has greatly increased, and their chief business seems to be to manage cases of litigation in the interest of their adherents."[108] Indeed, as we have indicated above, the Sino–French treaties and the French religious protectorate encouraged Catholic priests to pursue more aggressive conversion strategies, which included—sometimes explicitly but mostly implicitly—missionary involvement in litigation. Yet as some of the cases discussed in this paper have revealed, Protestant missionaries were no strangers in the magistrate's yamen.

---

[107] George Nathaniel Curzon, *Problems of the Far East: Japan–Korea–China* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1894), 425. For a discussion of the relationship between British diplomats and missionaries in China in the 1890s, see Wehrle, *Britain, China, and the Antimissionary Riots*, Chapter 3: "Efforts to Control the Missionaries."

[108] Wilbur C. Longden, report on the Shandong district, *Annual Report* of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1899, p. 110.

One major difference between Protestants and Catholic concerned conversion methods. Whereas Protestant were more likely to focus on the conversion of individuals, Catholics pursued an inclusive strategy of "mass conversion," especially in the unstable and highly competitive environment of southwestern Shandong (where Protestants had not yet gained much of a foothold before 1900). Individual conversion could lead to tensions within families, lineages or village society. On the other hand, since the enrolment of adherents *en masse* included both the "good" and the "bad," conflict with the Chinese authorities was rather more likely. Moreover, in such a setting certain so-called *jiao'an* were, in fact, very much part of patterns of competitive conflict that antedated the missionaries' arrival. In many instances existing animosities were merely aggravated by the introduction of Christianity.

Although a more comprehensive examination of the fate of Protestant converts during the Boxer upheaval would no doubt be of interest, this paper has sought to shed light on Protestant *jiao'an* in one particular province of China prior to the momentous events of 1898–1900. Whereas most "religious cases" in Shandong involved Catholics, we have shown that the more recent and much smaller Protestant missionary enterprise became from time to time also involved in conflict with non-Christians. It is, however, rather more difficult to determine whether the "missionary cases" had engendered smouldering resentment that found expression in anti-Christian violence during the Boxer crisis or whether the converts were merely scapegoats during a severe and prolonged crisis which threatened the lives of millions.

Among the several major developments in China at the end of the nineteenth century, two events are said to be of particular relevance to the rise of the Boxer Movement: the occupation of Kiaochow Bay by Germany in November 1897 and the failure of the Hundred Days Reforms in September 1898. Whereas relations between Chinese and foreigners were relatively peaceful in Shandong in the immediate aftermath of the occupation of Kiaochow Bay and up to and including the Hundred Days reforms, this period of relative quiescence came to an abrupt end in Shandong soon after the palace coup of 21 September 1898. When militant-conservative and reactionary elements assumed leadership in the Court and the government, the pragmatic approach to foreign relations gave way to a more pugnacious one. The effects of conservative retrenchment were soon felt throughout the empire. Henry D. Porter of the American Board mission noted this sudden change of attitude during a journey through the Xiajin 夏津, Gaotang 高唐 and Chiping 茌平 region of western Shandong in late 1898. "The whole trip was full of incident, showing how completely the tide of the new

life has been stayed." In Xiajin the "double-faced" magistrate Zhao Ercui 趙爾萃, who had been incumbent for four years and had in the past sent the missionaries "personal letters," exceedingly courteous, "has suddenly veered around and was trying to undermine our increasing influence." Zhao had written, printed and distributed a twelve-page pamphlet, "full of dangerous possibilities." From what we can gather from Porter's extracts, the contents is in some ways similar to the older inflammatory literature. It attacks Western religion rather than "Western learning," although Zhao claimed that

> Western sciences each have their ancient root in Chinese principles, which have been stolen, and shrewdly expanded. . . . In the matter of skilful search into the secrets of the earth, they are far shrewder than we, but they do this simply for gain, and are barbarous still with their industrial skill. . . . These barbarians have stolen our scientific principles; they seek only gain from our country; they aim to deceive our people, to surround our land, to disturb our national laws and customs.[109]

It is certain that the failure of the Hundred Days and the rise of the militant-conservative faction at court contributed significantly to the rise of an anti-Christian and antiforeign spirit in Shandong on the eve of the Boxer Uprising. It was, however, the prolonged deadly drought of 1898–1900 that created widespread anxiety in North China. In the face of crisis, people felt that the growing power of the Christians lay behind these destructive forces. In this situation, some people would remember lost *jiao'an* of long ago and half-forgotten grievances would serve as a pretext to attack Christian neighbours.

---

[109] Quoted in Porter to Judson Smith, Pangzhuang, 13 January 1899, Archives of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, North China Mission, vol. 20 #192. Zhao Ercui was a Han bannerman (Plain Blue Banner) and magistrate of Xiajin *xian* from 1895 to 1899. *Shandong tongzhi* 山東通志 [Gazetteer of Shandong], comp. Sun Baotian 孫葆田 (Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1934–35; reduced print of the 1910 edition), 62:2130.

TABLE 1: Protestant Missionary Societies in Shandong (1860–1900)

Symbol	Missionary Society	Nationality	Work Begun	Permanent Foreign Residence	
				Established at:	Year
ABCFM	American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Congregational) 美國公理會	American	1867	Pangzhuang Linqing	1880 1887
AEPM	Allgemeiner Evangelisch-Protestantischer Missionsverein (General Evangelical Protestant Mission Society, or Weimar Mission) 同善會	German	1898	Qingdao	1898
BMG	Berliner Missions-Gesellschaft (Berlin Mission Society) 巴陵信義會	German	1898	Qingdao	1898
BMS	Baptist Missionary Society 大英浸禮會	British	1860	Qingzhou Zouping	1875 1888
CIM	China Inland Mission 內地會	British / International	1879	Yantai (Chefoo) Ninghai 寧海	1879 1887
CMML	Christian Missions in Many Lands, or Plymouth Brethren (Unconnected) 弟兄會	British	1889	Shidao 石島 Weihaiwei 威海衛 Wendeng 文登	1889 1982 1898
GM	Gospel Mission (Baptist)	American	1893	Tai'an 泰安 Jining Shuibeijie 水北街	1894 1894 1894
MEC	Methodist Episcopal Church (North) 北以美會	American	1874	Tai'an	1899
MNC	Methodist New Connexion 聖道會；循道公會	British	1866	Zhujiazhaizi	1878
PN	Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (American Presbyterian, North) 長老會（美北）	American	1861	Dengzhou Yantai (Chefoo) Ji'nan Wei *xian* (Shandong) Yizhou Jining Qingdao	1861 1862 1872 1882 1891 1892 1899

SBC	Southern Baptist Convention 美國南浸信會	American	1860	Dengzhou Huang *xian* Pingdu	1861 1885 1885
SBM	Swedish Baptist Mission 瑞華浸信會	Swedish	1892	Jiaozhou	1893
SPG	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (Church of England) 大英安立甘會	British	1874	Yantai (Chefoo) Tai'an Pingyin 平陰 Weihaiwei	1874 1887 1893 1899
UPCS	United Presbyterian Church of Scotland 蘇格蘭長老會	British	1871	Yantai (Chefoo)	1871

Note also the brief presence at Yantai of the French Protestant Mission in the early 1860s and the later work of the Chefoo Industrial Mission.

TABLE 2: The Growth of Protestant Christianity in Shandong

MISSIONARY SOCIETY	1880		1890		1900	
	CONVERTS (Communicants)	FOREIGN RESIDENT MISSIONARY WORKERS[a]	CONVERTS (Communicants)	FOREIGN RESIDENT MISSIONARY WORKERS[a]	CONVERTS (Communicants)	FOREIGN RESIDENT MISSIONARY WORKERS[a]
ABCFM	327	0	350	10	831	8
AEPM	——	——	——	——	0	2
BMG	——	——	——	——	37	5
BMS	361	3	1,196	25	4,195	37[b]
CIM	8	4	42	23[c]	82	40[d]
CMML	——	——	?	4	45	15
GM	——	——	——	——	?	19
LMS	496[e]	0	——	——	——	——
MEC	17	0	140	0	263	4
MNC	351[f]	4	1,296[g]	?	1,883	7
PN	521[h]	21	2,292	53	5,980	59
SBC	120[i]	4	?	8	416	12
SBM	——	——	——	——	4	6
SPG	?	3	?	6	451[j]	10
UPCS[k]	38	4	——	——	——	——
SHANDONG TOTAL	2,239	43	5,316	129	14,187	224

[a] Includes single ladies and wives of missionaries
[b] Includes seven single ladies of the Zenana Baptist Mission
[c] Includes 11 teachers working in the CIM schools for foreign children at Yantai
[d] Includes 30 teachers at Yantai
[e] The small Shandong work of the LMS (London Missionary Society) was transferred to the MNC in 1880
[f] Statistics for c. 1877
[g] Statistics for 1893
[h] Statistics for c. 1877
[i] Statistics for c. 1877
[j] Statistics for 1898
[k] In 1886 the Shandong work of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland was transferred to the CIM

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 197–214

The Chinese Nation-state, Missionary Medicine and Chinese Women

M. CRISTINA ZACCARINI

China's state-building era during the Nanjing decade (1928–37) and the subsequent wartime period of the early 1940s defined an expanded role for the Chinese government while simultaneously allowing for the emergence of new opportunities for Chinese women as professionals. This newly defined and expanded role for the government, as well as for women, came to fruition with the proliferation of government medical institutions to serve grassroots level needs.

What role did medical missionaries play in this endeavor to improve the health of the Chinese? Since the 1834 arrival of the first Protestant medical missionary to China, Peter Parker, in Canton, relations among them and native Chinese practitioners of both Western and Eastern medicine, had been complex, as both vied for influence among local Chinese. During the Nanjing decade and the wartime period, however, medical missionaries were most often supportive, sometimes working side by side with the Nationalists, educating medical professionals and at other times doing work that was complementary to governmental efforts. Missionary sources such as the *Chinese Recorder*, published in English in Shanghai from 1868 to 1932, reflect the understandings of Western and Chinese Protestants.[1] Primary sources from missionary

---

M. Cristina ZACCARINI is associate professor of history at Adelphi University, Garden City, New York, USA.

[1] The *Chinese Recorder*, published monthly from Shanghai from 1868 to 1932 under

collections suggest that through their medical work, particularly grassroots efforts in the countryside, and their education and support for Chinese men and women medical professionals, missionaries can be seen as assisting in expanding not only the role of the Chinese government, but also opportunities for Chinese women.[2] Thus, as Protestant missionaries worked toward improving the health of the Chinese, they simultaneously became agents of gender change, aiding in the process of modernizing and expanding Chinese women's roles and the opportunities for healthcare for Chinese women.

Since 1928, the Nationalist government, through its health administration, issued stringent regulations on education and registration of medical professionals. While it is true that before 1928 practitioners such as acupuncturists, midwives and herbal doctors operated without any interference or uniform standards, the ramifications of new government regulations would have a larger impact upon Chinese women than Chinese men.

Prior to the Nanjing decade, most Chinese women were both unable to receive medical care of any kind and confined to the domestic sphere. The seclusion of women, enforced by the social restrictions of Confucianism and the tradition of foot binding, often restricted the Chinese woman's domain to the private sphere. Scholars have examined these social restrictions and some have concluded that missionaries aided in the process of empowering women and expanding their opportunities.[3]

Existing cultural restrictions impeding movement for women were tied to limitations on access to medical care and linked to Chinese views of medicine and conceptions of the body. According to the Chinese understanding of health, blood was considered essential for life and "yang" energy; due to its loss during menstruation and parturition,

---

the direction of editor Frank Rawlinson, can be found in microfilmed form in its entirety at Adelphi University. Access to the collection is facilitated by the painstaking and invaluable work of Kathleen Lodwick, editor of *The Chinese Recorder Index: A Guide to Christian Missions in Asia, 1867–1941*, 2 vols. (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, 1986).

[2] The primary sources that have informed this manuscript originate from the China Medical Board (CMB) records, at Rockefeller Foundation Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York; the China Records Project (CRP) and the General Board of Global Ministries, United Methodist Church, Central Records microfilmed collections, now located at Drew University, Madison, New Jersey. The Frank C. Gale Collection is located at Adelphi University.

[3] Judy Yung explains how missionary education contributed to the anti-footbinding campaign and led to the liberation of Chinese women. See *Unbound Voices: A Documentary History of Chinese Women in San Francisco* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999).

women were considered perennially weak and vulnerable.[4] The associations among childbirth, loss of "yang" energy and lack of cleanliness led to sexual division and precluded the possibility of male midwifery, although a male physician might attend a childbirth case and prescribe herbs. Prior to the twentieth century, with Western emphasis upon asepsis and disease control, female midwives were highly respected members of society and might receive a fee as high as that of a male physician for taking care of a wealthy patient; however, even prior to the twentieth century, many Chinese women did not have access to these sought-after midwives because they could not afford such care. Moreover, because in China, all female occupations outside the home were frowned upon, many women, regardless of wealth, did not have access to healthcare during parturition or healthcare in general.[5]

Chinese intellectuals began to correlate a healthy Chinese nation-state to the health of its people during the late 1900s, as the Qing dynasty began to crumble under the force of imperialism. Despite the formidable and invaluable medical traditions of the Chinese, by the 1911 revolution, many Chinese saw Westernization of much of China's culture and society as necessary for survival against imperialism, and they willingly and actively sought out Western medical knowledge to replace indigenous Chinese healing. Chinese intellectuals like Kang Youwei 康有為 accepted the Social Darwinism of the 1890s, writing books about nations like Turkey and India and admiring the victories of Peter the Great's Russia and Meiji Japan in the struggle for survival among nations.[6] Clearly, they believed that if China was to survive and thrive, she must embrace many Western "isms," and Western medicine was a large part of this cultural shift. Despite this acceptance, after the end of the Qing dynasty and the Republican revolution of 1911, China was disunified and ruled by scattered warlord factions and only those with power would make isolated and uncoordinated efforts at improving the health problems of the Chinese. The post–World War I period, culminating in the climactic events of the May 1919 student movement,

---

[4] Charlotte Furth, "Concepts of Pregnancy, Childbirth and Infancy in Ch'ing Dynasty China," *Journal of Asian Studies* 46, no. 1 (1987): 7–35. See also E. M. Ahern, "The Power and Pollution of Chinese Women," in *Women in Chinese Society*, ed. Margery Wolf and Roxane Witke (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975), 193–214.

[5] C. Cullen, "Patients and Healers in Late Imperial China: Evidence from the *Jingpingmei*," *History of Science* 31 (1993): 99–150. See also Bridie Andrews, "From Bedpan to Revolution: Qiu Jin and Western Nursing in China," in *Women and Modern Medicine*, ed. Anne Hardy and Lawrence Conrad (Amsterdam and London: Rodopi, 2000).

[6] See Merle Goldman and Leo Ou-fan Lee, eds, *An Intellectual History of Modern China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

brought increasing enthusiasm for Western medicine. In the midst of intense nationalism of the 1920s, as Chinese intellectuals came to embrace scientific values, Sun Yat-sen, the Nationalist leader, unified with a Soviet-promoted Communist party in order to remove both imperialists and warlords.

With Sun's death from cancer, Chiang Kai-shek's control of the National Revolutionary Army led to his emergence as the new Nationalist leader, and in mid-1926 his army embarked upon the Northern Expedition, capturing Nanjing and Shanghai. By April 1927, Chiang engaged in a bloody purge of the Communists and, by June 1928, reached Peking, changing its name to Peiping (Beiping 北平). With the new capital remaining in Nanjing as of 1927, these events marked the onset of the Nationalist era.

From 1928 to 1937, or until the outbreak of the Sino–Japanese War, the Nationalists sought to solidify a central government with administrative units that could promote economic growth, education, scientific research and amelioration of people's livelihood. At this time, as Communists struggled to establish themselves in the South, offering the Chinese their own effective means of improving people's livelihood, the Nationalists efforts to eradicate them led not only to continued fragmentation, but also efforts to emulate Communist success by engaging in grassroots efforts that would reach the rural, poor Chinese. As Robert Bedeski has illustrated, nation-state building efforts of the Nationalists, albeit inclusive of the emulation of Communist programs, set the foundation for Communists. Because these efforts were tied together by the belief in the necessity of introducing Western models such as those of medicine and healthcare, the role of missionaries in supporting Nationalist endeavors was important.[7]

Some reformers saw the strength of Western nations as lying in their establishment of public health programs because, as Ka-che Yip notes, over 80 percent of the 450 million Chinese lived in rural areas with unsanitary living conditions and the "virtual absence of modern health care." While the population was mostly rural, most doctors were not only rare in China (by 1920, according to one estimate, there were 1,400 Western-trained doctors in China, 600 of whom were foreigners

---

[7] Ka-che Yip, *Health and National Reconstruction in Nationalist China: The Development of Modern Health Services, 1928–1937* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Association for Asian Studies, 1995). Robert E. Bedeski, *State-Building in Modern China: The Kuomintang in the Prewar Period* (Berkeley: Center for Chinese Studies, Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1981).

with private practices), but also restricted to urban areas.[8] This new Nationalist-established state medicine aimed to meet the needs of the rural as well as urban population, particularly when the Communists were gaining adherents based upon their appeal to the rural poor.[9]

With the creation of the Ministry of Health in 1928, and the work of its advisory boards, which recommended policy directions which included regulations regarding "pharmaceuticals, industrial hygiene, rules for the examination of unregistered physicians, administration of medical schools, and issues related to state medicine," the government aimed to assert control over medicine and health care in the provinces; however, while it appeared that the Ministry of Health controlled a myriad of organizations, in reality, "at the beginning of the Nationalist era, the government had direct jurisdiction over only the provinces of Jiangsu, Zhejiang, and major portions of Anhui, Fujian and Jiangxi."[10] In May 1931, a Central Field Health Station began establishing practical field work, training staff and soon operating laboratories and branch stations where public-health work was carried out in eight provinces, including Shaanxi, Gansu, Qinghai, Ningxia and Jiangxi.[11] These public health endeavors would make an impact upon women, as missionaries worked to support the Westernization of medicine and health care in China, in accordance with the aims of the Nationalists.

Together with the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health established the National Midwifery Board in 1929, and the First National Midwifery School was soon founded. With the new government regulations, midwives were, like physicians and pharmacists, required to register with the government and become part of its effort to bring professionalism and uniformity to health care practitioners. Marion Manly, a China-born, Methodist single woman missionary, described midwives as designated by the special term "*jieshengpo*" 接生婆 or delivery ladies.[12] Only women between thirty and sixty years of age would be considered qualified and these women had to enroll in a two-month

---

[8] Yip, *Health and National Reconstruction*, 12–13.

[9] James Thomson, *While China Faced West: American Reformers in Nationalist China, 1928–1937* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1968).

[10] Yip, *Health and National Reconstruction*, 47, 48, 49.

[11] Ibid., 58–60.

[12] Tina Phillips-Johnson, "Childbirth Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China: Marion Yang and the First National Midwifery School," paper presented at Medicine and Culture, Chinese–Western Medical Exchange (1644 – ca. 1950) conference, Ricci Institute for Chinese–Western Cultural History, San Francisco Center for the Pacific Rim, March 9, 2007.

course on asepsis and rudiments of modern midwifery. The new Ministry of Health had recognized the difficulty of training modern midwives, realizing that it would be years later when enough would be trained.[13] Since there were few local authorities that had the funds to offer training classes, the impact of the new regulations were minimal and many Nationalist government plans, led by Dr. Marion Yang (Yang Chongrui 楊崇瑞), a Peking Union Medical College and Johns Hopkins–trained obstetrician and gynecologist pioneer in the public health field, could not be implemented due to both the turbulence of Nationalist–Communist civil war and Japanese invasion. As Tina Phillips notes, "the Nationalist plans that focused on midwifery training illustrate the intent, if not the reality, of dramatically improving maternal and child health in China."[14] However, in aggregate, the work of women missionary doctors was particularly important because, while many scholars have seen the work of missionaries as curative and mostly uninvolved with issues of public health, there were instances where Nationalist ideas promoting public health were implemented by missionary doctors.

Dr. Marian Manly, daughter of Methodist missionaries, is an example of this oft-unacknowledged phenomena. Manly recalled in 1948 that when she returned to her childhood home in Chengdu 成都, China in 1925, "medical work . . . was nothing compared to what" it would be during the era of Nationalist control. She noted that "chance or predestination" led her into obstetrical work in her first term as missionary, suggesting that she had not realized the enormity of the need for this medical specialization at that time. She had initially been assigned to the Women's Hospital in Chongqing 重慶, but Manly experienced first-hand "the political disturbances and civil war" that "forced the closing of most mission work in the province." Conducting a general dispensary until 1928, when there was no public health department, she immediately found that she would get calls to deliver babies in Chinese homes. Chinese women at this time were still resistant to being seen by a male doctor or visit a hospital for delivery, but, in keeping with China's traditions, it was considered acceptable for a woman doctor to go to a home. Given this need, and Manly's awareness of the Nationalist government's goals and the work of Marion Yang, she responded by

---

[13] Yip, *Health and National Reconstruction*, 59.

[14] Phillips-Johnson, "Childbirth Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China," 6.

creating and sustaining a school of midwifery in Chengdu, beginning in 1931.[15]

Manly's work can be considered both supportive of the work already being done by the Nationalists and in keeping with other American women medical missionaries' efforts in China as political disturbances necessitated the relocation of health care facilities and services. As mentioned, Marion Yang had opened the first midwifery school in Peiping, with Rockefeller Foundation funding, in order to train traditional midwives. Yang deplored circumstances in China that made childbirth such a perilous endeavor for women and strove to establish the school in order to reduce the cases of death from infection. Recognizing the dire shortage of midwives, Yang worked with the women already practicing at the time, and since they were mostly illiterate, visual aids were used. Yang and others viewed the midwives as necessary, yet dangerous, for their lack of hygienic awareness.[16] According to historian Tina Phillips, Yang's aim was to professionalize midwifery and replace the traditional midwife with the professional *zhuchanshi* 助產士, thus retraining the *jieshengpo* so that they could then be eligible for government certification.[17]

Trained in Western biomedicine, Manly shared Yang's view of midwives. She noted that the motivation for her own school, which she named the "Chin I School of Midwifery," stemmed from the understanding that "old style . . . midwives" were responsible for the fact that she saw more pathology than obstetrical cases during the first three years of the 1931 opening of her school. These midwives were often called onto the scene because, while a woman doctor was acceptable to patients in their home "they were not likely to call . . . unless things had already gone wrong."[18]

---

[15] Childbirth was almost invariably attended by a midwife, who would frequently receive a payment that was at least as much as that of a more esteemed literate male physician, particularly if the patients were wealthy. The literature of the Qing dynasty reflects the roles of physicians and midwives during childbirth as complementary, as had been the case in the west. The midwife would often massage the pregnant woman and/or manipulate the position of the child while a physician would prescribe drugs. Bridie Andrews, "From Bedpan to Revolution," 54, cites the work of Cullen, "Patients and Healers in Late Imperial China."

[16] Marion Yang, "Midwifery Training in China," *Chinese Medical Journal* 42 (1928): 768–75.

[17] Phillips-Johnson, "Childbirth Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China," 9–10.

[18] Dr. Marian E. Manly, Women's Division of Christian Service of the Methodist Church, "Chin I School of Midwifery, Chengtu, Szechuan, China," Yale Divinity School Archives, New Haven, Group 8, Box 131, Marian E. Manly folder, 1948, 6 pages.

Manly's rationale for her school was also that, while there were now many more doctors in China during the late 1920s and early 1930s, often these doctors would train for many years and then "go in for numerous specialties" with relatively few becoming obstetricians, leaving Chinese women in as precarious a state as they had been prior to the introduction of modern medical care in China. Manly's solution to this was to find a fresh pool of women and provide them with an opportunity for a healthcare profession. She sought to find "intelligent girls with about ten years' schooling," of "over 18 years of age . . . which would make them at least 21 on graduation" (as it was a three-year course), and instruct them in much the same way as one would train nurses, except "with less emphasis on medicine and surgery, far more on obstetrics, and a solid Western bioscience foundation in anatomy, physiology, bacteriology, pathology and material medica." In short, this new midwife trained in her school was given a significant scientific background.[19]

Manly's emphasis on science was balanced with other priorities that reflected traditional Western conceptions of womanhood. The girls were carefully picked, as of the "over a hundred applicants" the school took only twenty, and even after that initial selection, she explained that "we sift them rather carefully" and put them through a probationary period. She aimed to find not only young girls, in contrast to the older women usually associated with midwifery in China, but also mature girls. What did this emphasis on maturity mean, given the youth of the students? Since Manly explained that maturity and age were not automatically related, she clarified with the explanation that there must be a certainty that the girls possess character traits not only of responsibility but "sympathy."[20] Thus, the girls embodied both the science of modern medicine and the nurturing qualities that were deemed by many Americans to be intrinsic to the medicine practiced by women in the nineteenth century.

While the students accepted the Westernization of what had been an important female occupation, they held steadfast to their cultural traditions, staying true to Chinese beliefs. The students viewed themselves as representations of Goddesses of Mercy, the female manifestation of the compassionate Buddha, who many believed to have been a princess

---

[19] Manly, "Chin I School of Midwifery."

[20] When she first built the school there was no registering with the government, since this type of school was so new . . . as soon as regulations were made, we secured registration" (Manly, "Chin I School of Midwifery," 4). See ibid., p. 5 of 6.

who, over her parents' objection, later became a nun.[21] Students were determined to display their devotion to this Goddess by having themselves photographed during at least one graduation in 1932: They dressed in white, like Goddesses of Mercy, and held lotus blossoms. Manly noted: "It was their idea" and "a number of them have lived up to the name."[22]

The work of midwives is not only important for understanding the significance of Chinese women's contribution to medical advances during China's nation-state building era, but it also helped to weaken the traditional gender divide that was socially entrenched in traditional China. Contemporary observers in the medical field noted that women's access to medical care was poor. Chinese women's seclusion, enforced by the social restrictions and the emphasis in medical texts on the deleterious effects of parturition and "yin" associated traits, had likely restricted Chinese women's access to medical care.[23] Josephine C. Lawney, the Dean of Christian Woman's Medical College in Shanghai, China, noted in 1936 that, while in the United States there were more women than men in the hospitals (with around the same population gender ratio as in China), women were underrepresented in Chinese hospitals. This was particularly troubling, according to Lawney, given the fact that there were more illnesses among women than among men in China. Thus, the presence of more women health care providers doubtlessly helped motivate women to seek medical care when they needed it, rather than shying away due to the prevalence of male providers.[24]

Indeed, the presence of Chinese women doctors was essential when considering the challenges that Chinese women faced. According to Dean Lawney, women were particularly in need of public health care because even after a women could be coaxed to visit the hospital to deliver her baby (and by 1936, 1,500 babies were born in the Margaret Williamson Hospital), there were challenges for women after they took their babies home, yet they were unable to return to the hospital.[25] The

---

[21] Marjorie Topley, "Marriage Resistance in Rural Kwangtung," in Wolf and Witke, *Women in Chinese Society*, 67–89. For references to Guanyin 觀音 (Kuan Yin) see ibid., 75.

[22] Manly, "Chin I School of Midwifery," 4.

[23] Ahern, "The Power and Pollution of Chinese Women."

[24] Josephine C. Lawney, "Christian Woman's Medical College Shanghai, China," August 1936, Department of education and promotion, Woman's Section, Board of Missions Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Nashville Tennessee, Board of Missions & Church Extension of the Methodist Church, Fifth Avenue, NY, pamphlet, 6–7.

[25] Ibid, 3.

role of the modern midwife, according to the policy of the First National Midwifery School, was to continue to help mother beyond the time of birth, making postnatal visits to the mother and even were responsible for providing "up-to-date methods of childrearing" after the child had already gone to school.[26] The impact of Nationalist endeavors to set uniform standards for health care not only improved women's access to medical care, but also enhanced the opportunities of women who wished to enlarge their sphere beyond the private, allowing them to identify with the goals of the new Chinese nation-state in a way that provided them with a more public identity and offered them increasing economic options.

While in China there were female midwives, catering to wealthy clients, traditionally, male doctors were the most respected. This attitude would be, at least, altered, as the efforts of Chinese Christians and women missionaries likely led to shifting conceptions of female legitimacy in the public sphere and in the medical profession. Additionally, Nationalists' state-building efforts and encouragement of women in medicine led them to embark upon medical careers, thus transcending gender boundaries and serving other Chinese women.

Nursing provided an important area of professional growth for Chinese women in the Nationalist era. While China had had no history of hospitals or professional nurses, by 1926 there were over one hundred nursing schools registered under the Nurses' Association of China. By 1936 when the Nanjing government asked for cooperation so that nursing schools and graduate nurses would comply with state registration, the Nurses' Association of China noted that

> [a]t this critical time in the history of nursing in China, when the Chinese government is asking for our wholehearted co-operation . . . our N.A.C. has "matched us with this hour" and "that we are prepared as nurses of China to fit our service into the Government's system of State Medicine and that we will do our best to register as soon as possible.[27]

At the 13th Biennial Conference of the Nurses' Association of China at the University of Nanjing, the delegates attending "were fully aware of its significance," as demonstrated by the "addresses by Gov-

---

[26] Phillips-Johnson, "Childbirth Reform in Early Twentieth-Century China," 16–17.

[27] "Chinese Nursing History in the Making at Nanking Conference," *Chinese Recorder* 67 (December 1936): 796.

ernment Officials, Reports, Papers on Nursing subjects, Discussions, Business sessions and most interesting visits to Government buildings, Hospitals, and a Rural health Centre."[28] Clearly, Western missionaries were motivated to improve their standards so that they could meet the higher standards of the Chinese Nationalist government.

Methodist missionary wife and physician Ailie Gale's adopted Chinese daughter Mary Kao was inspired by Chiang Kai-shek's call to meet these national needs. Passing her nursing examinations with distinction, Kao was a government nurse by 1936 and when she went on to fulfill the government's requirement that all nurses in training take three months of public health nursing, it was then that she determined that this specific sub-field was her career of choice.[29] As part of her training, Kao was sent out to both urban and rural Nanjing areas to dispense free vaccinations. Kao's job was to "go into the homes and try to argue the folks into being vaccinated." Not surprisingly, many refused vaccinations so that on one particular day from 1:30 to 5:00 in the afternoon she was only able to do twenty-six vaccinations, and both Kao and Gale saw this as a low number.[30] In May, Kao was sent to the countryside on a two-week public health trip, and in keeping with the Nationalist government's emphasis on emulating Communist attention to economic challenges, Kao would be studying the homes of the poor. According to Gale, who likely viewed this as resonating with the American progressive era's attention to the use of statistics for social improvement, Kao would have to "find out what their salary is . . . their occupation, what money they have borrowed and what interest paid (which is exorbitant in most cases) and all their other problems." While American women progressives of Gale's time worked with immigrants in cities, Kao was part of the workforce of nurses that would help to ameliorate the problems of poverty in the Chinese countryside, and she found this work very stimulating and meaningful.[31]

Kao's job was difficult but not impossible. In 1936, Josephine Lawney described her hospital's work, shedding light upon the process of providing public health care to Chinese women through visiting nurses and highlighting the "many difficulties":

---

[28] Ibid., 796.

[29] M. Cristina Zaccarini, *The Sino–American Friendship as Tradition and Challenge: Dr. Ailie Gale in China, 1908–1950* (Bethlehem, Pa.: Lehigh University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2001). Ailie Gale to Miss Burtis, August 23, 1936, Frank C. Gale Collection (hereafter, FCG Collection).

[30] Ailie Gale to boys, April 5, 1936, FCG Collection.

[31] Ailie Gale to Boys, May 17, 1936, FCG Collection.

> The families (of women who had been to the hospital) were not expecting us to call and were not quite sure whether we had come to collect an unpaid hospital bill or just what our motive was. Then, too, the addresses were often incorrect or insufficient and, not being very familiar with the streets of Shanghai, we did a lot of wandering up and down alleyways searching for an elusive patient.[32]

This situation improved when the hospital took the time to communicate better with patients and became more attentive and precise regarding the location of each patient's residence. Each patient that left the hospital was told that "she could be visited by the nurses soon after leaving the hospital, and greater care was taken in obtaining correct addresses from the patients." Moreover, friendships with patients grew. Lawney explained that "after more than seven years of doing visiting nursing in Shanghai, almost half of our visits are made in homes where we have called before and where we are now welcomed like old friends." Chinese patients' families prepared for the arrival of the visiting nurses with anticipation:

> Recently a patient's address was given to us which gave the section of the city, the street, alley and house number, the name of a cross street near by, and the name of a factory directly across the street from the alley. When we were some distance from the home a child came running up to us and asked if we were looking for No. 26. We said we were, whereupon he dashed ahead of us shouting: "They've come! They've come!" Arriving at No. 26, the door was thrown open and we were warmly welcomed. The mother said she had told her five children that the nurses from the hospital were going to come to see the new baby and they must all be clean and properly dressed when they arrived. She said they put unusual energy into washing their faces and hands and keeping their clothes clean and each morning the wondered if that would be the day the nurses would arrive.[33]

While it was true that missionary health institutions benefited a limited number of people, progress like that described by Lawney meant that more and more Chinese would spread the news of their positive experience to others, thus increasing the numbers of patients of Western medicine and also the increasing the need for Chinese women practitioners who were able to provide this patient and caring positive con-

---

[32] Lawney, "Christian Woman's Medical College Shanghai," 3.
[33] Ibid., 4.

tact with patients, particularly women. The benefits that Chinese medical practitioners experienced during the years of Nationalist rule impacted Kao, who would become a successful nurse who would command a high salary at a time when nurses were in significant demand. Kao sought nursing positions in order to learn more, broaden her horizons and increase her salary. In 1939, Ailie Gale reported that the hospital where she worked tried all "kinds of schemes to hold her" and keep her from leaving. Despite this, Kao decided upon going to another hospital and working as an operating room nurse, which would mean a doubling of her salary. She was "very highly recommended to the new place by" a doctor from Nanchang 南昌 a surgeon for the Red Cross units, who was impressed by "her ability" as well as her superb mastery of English and Chinese.[34] In short, Western educated Chinese women medical practitioners could find themselves in an enviable position during the years of Nationalist rule.

Kao's enthusiasm for public health nursing and the possibilities for women in the China medical field deserve much more attention from scholars. Women were 16.9 percent of the total 3,655 medical students in China who were attending five government schools, eight provincial government schools, seven mission schools and eight private medical schools.[35] These numbers are impressive given the seclusion that circumscribed women's lives in the history of China and particularly when compared to conditions in the United States in the 1930s. With the beginning of the Progressive era, women's possibilities in the American medical field had deteriorated considerably, as women's medical schools closed and women were, for the most part, barred from existing medical schools for men.[36] In contrast, in 1933, it seemed to one Chinese doctor commenting upon Chinese women that "[m]edicine

---

[34] Ailie Gale to Boys, March 26, 1939, FCG Collection; Ailie Gale to Boys, April 9, 1939, "Easter Sunday," notes that there is a shortage of nurses. Gale also notes that the Chinese girls who are trained in America become Superintendents of Nursing.

[35] By 1931, China had 6,500 western trained doctors, 300 of which graduated from Japanese medical schools and about 300 holding degrees from the U.S., Great Britain, France and Germany. The national government was planning to initiate about twenty secondary medical schools with four year courses (compared to the seven-year courses of the existing schools in 1931. By the mid-1930s, there was a total of twenty-eight medical schools in China; twenty-six were coeducational and two were exclusively women's schools. See "Doctors in China," *Chinese Recorder* 62 (November 1931): 732.

[36] Regina Markell Morantz-Sanchez, *Sympathy and Science: Women Physicians in American Medicine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

is the only profession in this country . . . in which women have thoroughly established themselves."[37]

Josephine Lawney observed in 1936 that the Margaret Williamson Hospital, which provided obstetrical care for Chinese women and a visiting nurse service for babies and recovering patients who could not afford to revisit the hospital, had established a training center, first for Chinese women doctors (the first in China in 1906) and later, for nurses in 1922. These two schools had, by 1936, graduated 170 students who had gone on into many different health fields. Government regulations had helped the school improve. According to Lawney:

> Gradually the grade of nursing has been improved, by increasing requirements as to preliminary education, and today there are even college trained girls studying nursing . . . Today there is not only a large undergraduate school, but each summer a class of post-graduate nurses is received, which aims to help meet the great need for superintendents, instructors, and teaching supervisors. The graduates are found all over the Chinese Empire, serving in the fields of public health, school nursing, institutional churches, social service and private nursing . . . they are in turn establishing other schools of nursing . . .

Acknowledging that most graduates were in mission hospitals, Lawney observed that there was "a need for an increasing number of nurses . . . to assist the public health program of the government."[38]

Missionaries often viewed the education of women as tied to their empowerment through Christianity, and associated the improvement in women's status with modernization and revolution. As early as 1885, when women's hospitals in the United States had made impressive strides, women doctors were conscious of the differences between attitudes toward Western female physicians in the United States and in China. The *Chinese Recorder* noted that "Surgical, as distinguished from Medical Women, are hardly as yet recognized by the public in this country (United States)," but in the "East . . . a different state of things prevails . . ."[39] At the end of the Qing dynasty, missionaries of-

---

[37] See S. M. Tao, "Medical Education of Chinese Women," *Chinese Medical Journal*, 1933, reprinted in *Chinese Recorder* 65 (February 1934): 129.

[38] Lawney, "Christian Woman's Medical College Shanghai," 6.

[39] See "The Queen," *Chinese Recorder* 16 (April 1885): 153, which recounts a news bulletin from the *North China Daily News* of "an operation, one of the most severe known even in modern surgery, having been successfully performed by a woman, Miss Elizabeth Reifsnyder, of the American Woman's Union Mission, who was, at

ten prided themselves on the fact that "the only women and girls who had any part in the revolution were the Christian women and girls" and when missionaries gave an invitation to revolutionary leaders to speak at the Girls' School at Yenping city, they found that the leaders' agenda—"equality of the sexes; the single standard for men and women; the unbound foot; the monogamous home; adult betrothal; marriage contracted on the high plane of love"—represented all the social reforms for which Christian missionaries had advocated "for more than a century."[40]

While some Chinese women connected China's modernization and nation-building to the expanded opportunities for Chinese women during the Nanjing decade, they viewed the roots of this change as rooted within Chinese history and culture. One influential Chinese woman linked the "whole process of the modernization of China to the "emancipation" of women in the twentieth century. She expounded upon the virtues of ancient Chinese culture, suggesting that it was this unique tradition that led China's women to emancipation in the 20th century. Yi-Fang Wu (Wu Yifang 吳貽芳), who went on to have a brilliant career as president of Ginling College, saw the remarkable progress of Chinese women as rooted in the "rich heritage that modern Chinese women have received from (Chinese) women of the past." In a 1935 *Christian Advocate* article she explained that, while missionaries maintained "girls' schools side by side with those for boys," before the early twentieth century, China's reforms had allowed the education of girls, and the high standard of "*hsien mu liang chi*" (*xianmu liangqi* 賢母良妻; prudent mother and good wife) gave Chinese women such training and discipline. This high standard had resulted in Chinese women's possession of such "strong characteristics . . . as self-denial, forbearance, patience, poise, family loyalty and high ideals." While these characteristics mirror those espoused by missionaries and appear to diverge from those of modern Chinese feminists who emphasized egalitarian goals for women, she applauded the draft constitution completed by the Legislative Yuan of the Nanjing regime. Yi-Fang Wu explained that she supported this document because it gave "women . . . exactly the same franchise as men. Wu convincingly explained how this revolutionary modernization process in China made it possible for

---

this time founding a hospital for 'native women' in Shanghai." For similar reports from 1886, see "Reports of Medical Missionary Ladies in China," *Chinese Recorder* 17 (January 1886): 16–17.

[40] Mamie F. Glassburner, "The Revolution among the Women & Girls," *China Christian Advocate*, quote on pp. 9, 9–12.

women in China to gain within two decades all the rights and privileges which took years of struggle for women in Western countries to secure."[41] Wu espoused what missionaries would consider "Western" ideas, while rooting them in Chinese culture. She praised China's rich history and even posited Chinese women as having a more enviable evolution (quicker) toward emancipation than that of their Western sisters.

Yi-Fang Wu was rightfully impressed with the speedy evolution of Chinese women, and, while missionaries may have been projected by some scholars as encouraging Chinese women to remain in the household, significant missionary publications suggest that their views complement those of Wu. A 1931 *Chinese Recorder* editorial noted that the Moukden Medical College graduated its first Chinese women doctors in 1930. Drs. Lu Shu Hsien, Chia Yu Jung and Leo Su Chen "proved themselves worthy of the name of student. In scholarship they have equaled and at times excelled their fellow-students of the other sex." In 1931, the missionary periodical not only lauded their intellect but their dedication to the empowerment of women: for "Dr. Lu and Dr. Leo have shown singular courage in their determination not to be coaxed into binding marriage agreements that would have cut across their medical careers." In short, the women doctors were lauded for not letting family come before career, in keeping with the treatment accorded them by the Nationalist Legislative Yuan, which had given them equal enfranchisement, thus suggesting that the missionary periodical, in 1931, applauded a form of gender equality in China.[42]

Missionaries had recognized the need for women doctors in China and encouraged instruction of Chinese women even prior to the Nationalist regime's efforts. Doctors Ida Kahn and Mary Stone, two Chinese Christians, were the subjects of much missionary literature lauding their achievements and inspiration to Chinese women. Describing a 1915 conference, the *Chinese Recorder* remarked that of the many interesting papers contributed were "those written by women physicians and nurses, and in the consideration of this side of the work a most important part was taken by Dr. Mary Stone, Dr. Ida Kahn, and other Chinese lady doctors, whose experience lent great weight to the discussion."[43] Mindful of the need to publicize the Chinese medical field as

---

[41] Yi-Fang Wu, "Women Leaders in New China," *Chinese Recorder* 66 (January 1935): 17–21. For a background on this Ginling College president, see http://www.umich.edu/~bhl/bhl/exhibits/UMChina/China/people/Wu.htm (accessed August 27, 2006).

[42] "Chinese Women Doctors," *Chinese Recorder* 62 (June 1931): 398.

[43] "Women's Work," *Chinese Recorder* 46 (March 1915): 184.

influenced by Chinese women, the *Chinese Recorder* criticized the lack of attention given to women's medical schools. The *Recorder* noted that the 1915 "Report of the China Medical Commission" did not mention women's schools "in Soochow, Peking and Canton," and that they did not "appear to be receiving the attention given to schools for men." The article observed that there was a special need for woman's work and there was difficulty in "obtaining a sufficient number of women physicians."[44] A 1917 *China Christian Advocate* article shed some light upon how this need for women was rooted in problems that men had studying women's diseases and how this offered opportunities for women.

> It may be difficult for the young men students in China medical colleges to gain the best facilities for study of women's diseases, but the deficiency promises to be compensated for by the popularity the Chinese people are ready to concede to women in the medical profession.[45]

The *Chinese Recorder* offered numerous examples of Chinese women in positions of authority at hospitals in China. At the Danforth Hospital, Jiujiang 九江, Jiangxi 江西, Dr. Mary Stone was the directress and in that capacity served "rich and poor." When she obtained "thirty trained nurses, more home visits were possible and the city was sectioned off for district nursing and the systematic education of the public on health and sanitation. . . . the city authorities recognize our work and want us to help to take charge of the city orphanage . . . On the district the flying doctor has been "besieged by the city officials, gentry and merchants to station a dispensary in each of the leading centers—pledging their support."[46]

Chinese women doctors gained prestige and legitimacy depending upon the political circumstances. Dr. Hü King Eng, recruited by Dr. Signourney Trask of the Women's Foreign Missionary Society, offers an example of how Western medicine meant increased opportunities that would place Chinese women in great danger and alienate them from traditional Chinese society. Her parents were early converts to Christianity, and allowed her to travel to the United States in 1882 to

---

[44] "Medical Schools for Women," *Chinese Recorder* 46 (November 1915): 659.

[45] *China Christian Advocate*, May 1917, 4. On Ida Kahn, see "In Remembrance," *Chinese Recorder* 63 (January 1932): 46.

[46] *China Christian Advocate*, May 1917, 9.

study at Ohio Wesleyan in Delaware, Ohio. She finished her medical degree in America in 1894 and returned to China to work at the Woman's Hospital at Liang Au, training her sister to work with her as an assistant. By 1927, Dr. Hü saved enough money to build a hospital of forty-five beds and a nurses' home for twelve nurses; however, Hü King Eng's difficulties came later that year when mobs looted her hospital in when she was asked to testify either for or against Catholic nuns in an orphanage near her hospital who had been accused "of taking out the eyes of the babies and steaming their bodies to make medicine and healing broth." When Hü testified in favor of the women, whom she had known for many years, the mob turned on her and she went South.[47]

Despite the inherent dangers of affiliation with Western imperialism, Chinese women often crossed entrenched gender divides during the period of Nationalist nation-building in China, receiving both greater access to medical care and increasing economic and professional opportunities. Western and Chinese Protestants both linked Chinese modernization and nation-building to improvements in the lives of women, and Christian missionaries often worked to support Chinese nation-building in the important area of health care, simultaneously working to support improvements in the conditions of women, women's access to medical care, as well as education and career opportunities for women in medicine. These improvements, while limited to the areas of missionary and Nationalist presence, were integral to the nation-building process of the Nationalist government from 1927 to 1937.

---

[47] *China Christian Advocate*, January 1930, 9–10.

Ching Feng, n.s., **8.1–2** (2007) 215–240

Dealing the Culture Card against Episcopal Women's Ministry in Asia

ELIZABETH KOEPPING

There is no debate [on women's ordination] where scripture, tradition and common sense are clear.[1]

Are there some places in the world where it would be inappropriate to expect the ordination of women by reason of respect for the particular culture?[2]

"Culture" has been tossed around a good deal in recent years, to explain or proclaim or, more often, to ward off or to attack, especially concerning "sensitive" issues such as women or sexuality—though it is stowed away when discussing structural poverty or corruption, which are equally important ecclesial and moral issues for Christians as for other faiths in Asia. When used, the relevant segments of "culture" are presented as fixed, neatly contained in a box which lacks that diversity and ranking by class, caste, place, status, gender, age, otherwise assumed when two or three are gathered. This essay will examine this use of "culture" within the Anglican Communion in Asia, and the facility

---

Elizabeth KOEPPING is lecturer in world Christianity at the University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom.

[1] So noted by the Province of the Anglican Church in South East Asia, according to *The Eames Monitoring Group Report*, August 1997, www.anglicancommunion.org/lambeth/reports/report10.html, par. 29.

[2] Ibid., par. 21.

with which elite users[3] assume they can and do honestly represent this chimera as both *Vertreter* and *Darsteller*. The specific issue for assessing the validity of the "cultural card" is the ordination of Episcopal women in Asia.

Culture regularly pops up in Anglican Reports and Statements, though rarely accompanied by its crucial mate "representation," and its convenient use flourishes across Asia, in all traditions. In talking to clergy across Asia about culture in the context of ordination, it is clear that current anthropological views of the contested manner in which it is used in daily life are ignored or set aside, as are the views of a considerable proportion of the laity, also conversation partners. Given that all in "one culture" are enculturated into specific ways of seeing and reflecting on the world, every person sees through culturally created lenses. It is true that players of the culture card are themselves embedded in "a culture" and their agency is blinkered: but so is that of all others in that same "culture" who may see the world from rather different perspectives. "Culture" in the way is used by those in authority to subborn if not silence those outside the game. If "locally sensitive issues" (usually sex rather than money) are to be matters of dogma, then questions such as that posed in the title to this essay can be abandoned in favour of "no debate here please."

While the dealing of a custom-made culture card to silence internal dissent may be seen for what it is by a local audience, doing the same for an international audience which may lack the awareness of internal contestation is quite another, and hardly provides a sound foundation for sober reflection and reflexive action on crucially important areas of church life such as the impact of caste, ethnicity and gender on priestly ministry which, if the priesthood of all believers is still relevant, means the church itself.

One important consequence is the effect on the world-wide church's recognition of and response to local institutional power, another the implications of that for informed (rather than slogan-led) inter-group communication, particularly delicate in a loosely linked world Communion, headed by an Archbishop who has no actual power beyond his own Province, and made up of equally ranked Provinces across the world, and sharing, apart from a common though in no way mandatory liturgy, a commitment to scripture, tradition and reasons. The argu-

---

[3] This is not to imply that only the elite make use of "culture": but all too often only their voice is heard. Any critique of South East Asian priests pertains to aspects of their role performance, not their person.

ments I shall bring substantiate the sage comment of Mary Tanner (a member of the Eames committee) in her 1998 post-Lambeth reflections that "the bare facts of Eames 1997 do not reflect the substantial minority that remains opposed to women's ordination in those provinces that do ordain. Nor do the figures reflect the numbers of those in favour of those provinces which are opposed."[4] This problem of representation is central to my argument.[5]

To demonstrate the fudging of dissent and mis-representation potentially enabling partial views and princely powers to be maintained locally despite well-intentioned inter-Provincial consultation, it will be helpful to focus on a specific context, Southeast Asia, and to discuss Reports—Eames (1988),[6] House of Bishops (1990), Eames Monitoring (1997), Lambeth (1998)[7] and Virginia;[8] Provincial and Synodal comments; the views of various priests, ordinands and church workers in East Malaysia; and Sabah Anglican laity represented by Kadazan villagers in Borneo.

South East Asia is a particularly interesting Province. First, it firmly objects to the ordination of women, cited above in a statement approved of if not made by a former Primate, Archbishop Moses Tay, and by his successor, the recently retired Archbishop Yong Ping Chung. Secondly, it co-supervises with Rwanda the Anglican Mission in America movement, also opposed to female priests.[9] Thirdly, it is important in the history of women's ordination for, not forgetting Flor-

---

[4] Mary Tanner, "Is Reception Really Open?", 1998, http://trushare.com/39aug98/au98tann.htm.

[5] A female ordained Buddhist monk in Thailand in 2007, listening to a lecture on this topic, pointed out the arguments in her religion and country against female ordination were precisely the pseudo-cultural ones discussed here, the Buddha having ordained women in his life-time, just as St. Paul worked with women and St. Hilda in 650 was Abbess (with Episcopal rank) in charge of male and female religious.

[6] *A Digest of the Second Report by the House of Bishops* (London: Church House Publishing, 1990).

[7] Resolutions from the Lambeth Conference 1998, sec. 3, "Called to Be Faithful in a Plural World," www.anglicancommunion.org/lambeth/3/report7.html.

[8] *The Virginia Report: The Report of the Inter-Anglican Theological and Doctrinal Commission*, 1997, chap. 4, www.anglicancomunion.org/lambeth/reports/report1b.html.

[9] D. Virtue, "AMiA Draws International Primates," 2004, www.virtueonline.org/portal/modules/tinycontent/index.php?id=25; "Mission Improbable: American Anglicanism Reborn. Interview with Bp Thad Barnum," 2004, www.orthovox.org/orthovox/barnum.htm; *Women's Ordination Study* (Pawley Island, N.C.: Anglican Mission in the Americas, 2003). The Anglican Mission in the Americas (AMiA) does allow, but has not ordained its own, female deacons.

ence Lim's wartime ordination,[10] it was in response to a request from the Church of South East Asia by the then Bishop of Hong Kong acting with the approval of his Synod[11] that the 1971 Anglican Consultative Council's first meeting in Limuru, Kenya, affirmed that "if he decides to ordain women to the priesthood, his action will be acceptable to this Council."[12]

Generalisations and assumptions are inevitable in a world communion, yet they can all too easily veil ignorance with hopeful supposition. Attention to this one topic and region may enable us to reflect on the extent to which any regionally independent and locally embedded practice of Anglicanism risks resembling repeating that silencing of the subaltern of the colonial past. Inadequate understanding of hegemony and the intentional and privileging use made of "culture" in intra-group communication, incorrect assumptions about just who holds to what attitude are common enough within one community or country: when elites in one Province exchange "information" about supposed internal norms with elites from another, the outcome may side-line justice and equity in local contexts anywhere, and therefore fail to incarnate the Word, the core of the enterprise. That, encapsulated by but *in no way* restricted to "the gender issue," is surely germane to the institution and the priesthood of *all* believers.

INTERLUDE: MYANMAR

Amid the careful building up of the argument, it may be helpful to pause and give the reader a Geertzian "thick description" from a 2007 discussion in Southern Asia on the ordination of women in Myanmar and then from a subsequent long teaching session with Anglican undergraduates there on this very article, especially on representation. This allows the reader to follow a typical discussion on culture and

---

[10] There being no priest left in war-time Hong Kong, a trained woman, Florence Lim, was ordained and served as a priest until the end of the war. She voluntarily ceased working as a priest, but was honoured as a priest in Westminster Abbey before she died in 1992 in Toronto.

[11] Yong's consecration of two American Episcopal Bishops did not have his Province's approval: he and his wife felt cold-shouldered at the subsequent South East Asian Provincial meeting.

[12] Resolution 28b, *The Time is Now* (London: SPCK, 1971), 39.

representation with "Edward," an open friendly Anglican priest who had no problem with a visiting Anglican woman celebrating the Eucharist and looks forward to the ordination of Myanmar women—but not quite yet.

I asked where the problem lay. He replied, "We agreed in 1973—I was at the meeting—that there was no theological barrier and many women are trained, but we have not ordained any yet." The reason he offered was its unsuitability for "our Burmese culture." 70% of Myanmar is peopled by the Bamah, almost all of whom are Buddhists; as Edward agreed, almost all Anglicans are Karen, an ethnic group (not unlike Kadazan) with equal land-owning and ownership of moveable and heirloom property, and the maintenance of a woman's tie to her natal family after marriage. Asking Edward what the cultural problem therefore was, I was not surprised to hear: "Well, the women really have to push more if they want to be ordained." Ascertaining from him that any change demands agreement of the Synod—50% clergy and 50% lay, 95% of the latter being male—despite efforts from the church for better female and youth representation at Synod, it was clear that that avenue too was a blind alley. The "culture card," having failed along with "blame the victim," he drew the final card, "the missionaries," pointing out that "it will need a revolution to change. When we've gone, the generation of clergy trained by the missionaries, they can change." Given that the decision regarding theological acceptability in the then Diocese of Rangoon was taken eleven years after the last foreign church staff had left, by people all of whom had been trained by missionaries, it can hardly been used now when almost all have been trained by local personnel. Yet still, "culture" was Edward's first straw, and it continues to be a second, or even a last, straw for people who prefer to think in pre-formed categories or clichéd buzz-words which safely ignore difference of power, of particularity, and personal integrity.

This conversation had to move from issues of "culture" to issues of structure, culture as expressed by Edward being not helpful to his cause. Usually, just as conversations in a secular context can easily be stopped if the words "it's my religion" are uttered, so too "culture" can stop the polite or colonial cringe outsider. "Missionary" is currently another catch-all category for blame or powerlessness, but given that the decision regarding theological acceptability was taken, eleven years after the last foreign church staff had left, by people all of whom had been trained by such people, it can hardly been used now when almost all staff have been trained by local personnel.

The next day, I went to the Anglican undergraduate college to talk for three hours to a group of six youths and nine young women on issues of culture and representation as outlined in this paper. The three hour session went as follows:

> We started with culture, then representation, then outlining major divisions within a context—age, sex, education, etc.—and then how and who defines what is Chin culture in general and in each of the four major Chin groups, and so on. I mentioned the ordination of women as one example, but used other examples too, mainly from Myanmar ethnography and mission history. Finally, having ensured the class fully understood "representation," I divided the class into four mixed-sex groups, asking them to talk about problems with the use of the word "we" in mission and ministry—a division I had already demolished as unhelpful—explaining each must chose a spokesperson to summarise the agreed and the minority views. Four leaders, all male, did the job. Two presented issues such as "do not use the word 'we' in mission but rather 'I,'" "try to survey the people and learn what they think and understand by listening." The other two, representing eight people, summarised only on the women issue, saying firmly that it was inappropriate to ordain women as the majority (Buddhist) group ruling the country would be appalled, and similar cultural explanations: clearly women should be at home! As the women issue seemed to be a problem, I then asked each person to write on a scrap of paper whether they were for or against the ordination of women. Four papers were against, nine for, and when I asked for a show of hands, exactly the same results appeared—all the nine women and two of the men voting for women's ordination. So where were those voices?

CULTURE

Culture has been firmly established in the social sciences these last 130 years. It was commonly used to explain or validate a particular collective and *unified* understanding of existence with consequent expectations, perceptions, attitudes and actions, defined as "the functional system which integrated the major institutional domains of social life—the economy, polity and legal system—and made them consistent with each other . . . the individual being treated as a micro-replicate of the

larger social and cultural entity."[13] This coherent and cohesive "functioning entity," as seen by E. Tylor, E. Durkheim and others,[14] may have been a territorially contiguous region, "Kadazan-Dusun culture in Sabah," an institution, "Anglican church culture," or a cartographically conjured up "Asian culture." There is a good deal of imagination and intention in those three usages: Kadazan-Dusun, loosely-linked disparate non-Muslim people in Sabah, Malaysia, have carried that name for less than forty years; "Anglican church culture" is a similarly amorphous beast both within and across Provinces; and "Asian" is the epitome of the sound-bite, saying as much about the user as about the billions to whom it is supposed to refer. Imagination too in the implied absence of agency, critical appraisal, scepticism, divergence, in the thousands of "micro-replicates."

Moreover, such a use of "culture" (still rather common in ecclesiology and mission studies) touches on another problem. "Entity" implies demarcations, all within being broadly the same as each other and therefore discernibly different from those in the next entity: Kadazan not Murut or Chinese, Anglican not Methodist or Catholic, Asian not African or European. In context, there may be reasons for using these short-hand labels, but even then, in the Borneo village as in Lambeth Palace, the insistent rhetorical thread of a specific and authoritative view of identity or behavioural norm attributed to others is lost on others who know neither context nor local audience. And rhetoric is a stable foundation neither for dispassionate reflection on nor understanding of a gospel which, properly speaking, is owned by no one; yet in church rhetoric, "culture" can be the silencing ace up the maniple.

There is a big shortcoming with neatly defined and boxed "cultures"—and I use the word "box" advisedly because it sums up the word in use—which is why current anthropologists eschew that usage. There are neither fixed boundaries to "a culture" nor, logically therefore, unitary and agreed content "within." As Clifford Geertz writes, "The discrimination of cultural breaks and cultural continuities, the drawing of lines around sets of individuals as following a more or less identifiable form of life as against different sets of individuals following more or less different forms of life is a good deal easier in theory than in practice." He continues, "the view of culture, a culture, this

---

[13] A. Cohen, *Self Consciousness: An Alternative Anthropology of Identity* (London: Routledge 1994), 129.

[14] E. Tylor, *Primitive Culture* (London: J. Murray, 1871); E. Durkheim, *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, trans. J. Swain, 2nd ed. (London: Allen & Unwin, 1976).

culture, as a consensus on fundamentals—shared conceptions, shared feelings, shared values—seems hardly viable . . .: it is the faults and fissures that seem to mark out the landscape of collective selfhood."[15] Whether there ever actually were "closed systems" other than in the imagined politico-legal "eternally and only us" in the mind of interested parties is questionable.

Indeed, division—gender, age, status, class, ethnicity, dialect—within attributed "entities" is inevitable, for people and peoples recognise and reflect on both similarity and difference in finely discriminating contexts. The probability of open or covert contestation is high, a fact which earlier consensualists ignored in their search for surface coherence and ready comparability. Given this, who can define? Who can speak? On the "cultural" behalf of whom can the Province of South East Asia in the figure of its Primate and its vocal Bishops, but *not* all of the younger priests, church workers and laity, say: "We do not want women priests on the grounds of scripture, tradition, and commonsense?" Who is "we"? The royal "We" of the monarch who represents and symbolises the whole? The religious hierarchy "we" as God's representatives to the people, a slope so easily slipping, as Stephen Sykes has cogently argued, into a merging between Godly and Episcopal Will?[16]

It cannot surely represent some cultural "we" of Anglican Asians from Nepal to Bali. In the multi-ethnic context of almost all Dioceses in the Province, "the culture" projected to the outside is usually that of the particular elite within the institution: whether that coincides with the national elite in part depends on the particular history of the church especially within the colonial context, during which certain ethnic groups got greater educational and therefore employment benefits from government and missions than others, a still-entrenched inequity which can be readily defended by those who as readily (when useful) attack "the missionaries." Within Dioceses, those lower in the inevitable pecking order tend to know more about the elite than vice versa, for underdogs need to react to if not negotiate with masters. Following from that, therefore, while we may know what the Eames monitoring report cited above meant by "respect for some cultures," we do not actually know who is giving respect to which appropriators and purvey-

---

[15] C. Geertz, *Available Light* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000), 247 and 250.

[16] S. Sykes, *Unashamed Anglicanism* (London: Dart, Longman & Todd, 1996), Chap. 6.

ors of which culture, nor indeed why. Indeed if the aim of Gospel inculturation is truly to challenge the enculturated status quo of *all* ways of being at the deepest level in all places, including that of the Diocesan "owners," we are not entirely sure to what end this sudden delicacy arises.[17] This is not to deny that past and still present practices[18] of denigration of "other" ways of being—unfairly typified by and *in no way* restricted to the colonial missionary context, for it lives and breathes in modern mission and ministry—demand courteous and self-reflexive care by the modern institutional church: but *no one* is free of such obligation to others in *any* context.

REPRESENTATION

The next linked point in this argument is that of "representation." A Bishop, as a priest, is a representative of the people in their prayer to God and also to the next level up in the hierarchy: s/he also represents Christ liturgically during the Eucharist. "Representation," though, is not a straightforward act. The one figure is the *Vertreter* as representative, legitimately speaking for others, on their behalf, according to the theology of the particular denomination. Setting aside the theology of priesthood, "speaking on behalf of" is as necessary in the church as in any other institution because supra-local institutions function on the basis of the effective disenfranchisement of most of the people. But the Bishop as representative of the collectivity beneath also acts as, or performs as, the *Darsteller*, the representer, the one re-presenting, setting forth and demonstrating what we can perhaps call almost the cultural

---

[17] See A. Gittins, "Beyond Liturgical Inculturation: Transforming the Deep Structures of Faith," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 69 (March 2004) 47–72: "What's wrong with Inculturation," clearly differentiating between contextualisation, the minimal requirements of language and etiquette (all too often understood as inculturation, though actually surface accommodation) and engagement with the deep structure of "any way of being" in context. In this regard, "inculturating" the Gospel in India by embedding it in Vedanta brought *and thereby further validated* the main instrument of oppression of Dalit from the Hindu system into the Christian, surely the ultimate in false representation.

[18] Near-Manichean demonisation of non-Christian practice is strong among conservatives: denigration of others, especially Africans, is also done by liberals such as Holloway and Spong. See the editorial to *The Anglican Free Press*, Summer 1998, www.stpeter.org/oldedit3.html and www.trushare.com/39aug 98comm.html.

content, the world-view, of the collectivity. Yet that is a doubling up of roles, for s/he is also the representative speaking on behalf of the people in the narrowly defined role of *Vertreter*. As the sociologist Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak puts it, "there is rarely an identity of interests between representer and representative. The event of representation as *Vertretung*, on behalf of the other, behaves like *Darstellung*, setting out of the other on behalf of the representative."[19] Just as the priest and Bishop both represent God to the people and the people to God in that double role, so too a Bishop uses his taken for granted knowledge of the other when apparently speaking about them on their behalf but actually, in that moment, speaking for himself. In other words he has the awesome honour of being the people's representative on their behalf while also bearing the dangerous (because easily deluded) burden of re-presenting their being on his own.

And therein lies the problem. Is it, must it be, "on his own behalf"? In theory, probably not: but let us work carefully through the various levels of knowledge within the triangle of representation. Knowledge of the ways of being within one parish can be gleaned by a diligent local pastor if people will speak to rather than hide from that figurehead: such knowledge of the peoples and groupings within a Diocese is that much more unlikely given the almost algebraic increase in contestation. Knowledge of thinking, being, doing in a Province is impossible less on account of numbers and more through contestation both within and between agglomerations. Even a trusted diligent listening priest who says "my people are such and such saying this and acting thus" is already taking a straw poll from those around him, omitting any awkward marginalised or forgotten sector. And the higher up the organisation's ladder, the more problematic that is and the more any generic statement based on "culture" should be profoundly mistrusted. Thus *Darstellung*, "re-presenting," is so fraught with potential ignorance, so amenable to selectivity, that it affords a maximum of humility and caution from Priests and Primates.

Let us take a specific example. At the local level in an east Sabah Kadazan-Dusun village, a resident Kadazan-Dusun[20] Anglican priest may, if fortunate enough to have parents well versed in local mores, know something of local perceptions, though having moved out of the

---

[19] Gayali Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 276.

[20] The first was priested in 1996, some seventy years after the first Chinese.

village for education, a separation completed by insistent rejection in training of "everything pagan," just what he will understand and summate is uncertain, and the more a church engages in active disciplining of members for infractions the less s/he will know of actual practice. In the nearby city, Anglicans will be Chinese, Marathi, Kadazan-Dusun, Iban, Toraja, Bisaya, Timorese, and while the first two usually go to the Mandarin, Hokkien, Cantonese or English services, the rest—actually from several countries and ways of being—are in the Malay language congregation. Outsiders see that last as one unit "culturally," insiders do not: yet the senior clergyman (not from the Malay language congregation) speaks about all and for all. At the Diocesan level, Sabah adds Tamil, Murut, Hakka, Tagalog, and various Europeans and, once again, the (Chinese) Bishop speaks for this motley mass. The Province stretches from Nepal to Eastern Indonesia, adding Nivari, Thai, Cambodian, Orang Asli, Javanese, and many others. And while various Bishops and the (Chinese) Primate may and must speak for their respective cures in theological terms, they would be hard put, even if they wished to act otherwise, to "set out" cultural issues without privileging their own version.

Thus when the former Primate reported to the 1997 Eames Monitoring committee[21] that any debate on the ordination of women, any talk of "open reception," was irrelevant on the grounds of "scripture, tradition and common-sense," he spoke with the implied authority of the "universal human," the world, as Geertz notes, being the authority for common sense.[22] Therein lies the sleight of hand. An appeal to common-sense is both insulting and culturally specific. "Commonsense" is usually taken to mean what the average person understands, what is commonly held. It includes the sense clearly expressed in German of "healthy people's understanding" (*Gesundermenschenverstand*): if healthily sane people understand that women cannot be priests, those who assert the opposite would logically not be hale but sick. This deviation from the more usual Anglican "reason" is a moral judgement, with little respect for those holding different opinions. "Commonsense is a cultural system," says Geertz, "though not usually a very tightly

---

[21] Or another person with his full agreement: the tendency to top-heavy leadership (noted in M. Green's otherwise adulatory and unfortunately titled *Asian Tigers for Christ* [London: SPCK, 1999]) with a degree of (self-)censorship makes it impossible for Eames to have received a report from other than the primate hand.

[22] C. Geertz, "Common Sense as a Cultural System," in his *Local Knowledge* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), 75, gives an implicit critique of Cartesian reason, as culture bound as Aristotelian either-or logic.

integrated one, and rests on that any other such system rests: the conviction by those whose possession it of its value and validity. As a frame of thought, and a species of it, common-sense is as totalising as any other: no religion is more dogmatic . . ."[23]

This is a rather difficult base for a Primate with Episcopal duties in both America and South East Asia. Moreover, it seems that "culture" at some times is to be opposed, and at others extolled. Bishop Yong Chen Fah could say in 1999 that "We disagree with the ordination of women because we are Asian";[24] his Archbishop brother Yong Ping Chung choosing the rather vaguer "culture," as did Bishop Bolly of Kuching who told his Synod[25] meeting in 1995 that "The ordination of women would be against our culture."[26] Archbishop Tay sought recourse for the rejection of women's ordination on grounds of "scripture, tradition and [culture-bound] common-sense." Yet such embedding is implicitly rejected by Archbishop Yong Ping Chung's 2004 sermon in Florida on "[not] allowing the temptation of our cultures . . . to blind us to the faith that was once entrusted to the saints."[27] Unless American culture is wrong and Asian is not on unknown grounds, it seems cultural virtue or vice depends on the speech context and audience.

Now if the person at the top finds it difficult to speak for the silenced subaltern as *Vertreter*, it is possible that the demonstration of "cultural unity" so carefully selected by the *Darsteller* that the outcome is almost inevitably partial and for some segments false is *also* part of the suppression of alternative perceptions, even though the *Darsteller* should in all honour valiantly try to do just that. If we were to respond to the title of Spivak's paper noted above—"Can the Subaltern Speak?"—the answer must be "No, s/he cannot." By publicly acquiescing in the misrepresenting of their views, the silent acquiesce in the banalities and even insults the hierarchy visit upon them. Why do they

---

[23] Geertz, *Local Knowledge*, 84.

[24] Discussion with Bishop Yong Chen Fah, 1999, Sabah.

[25] Synod government in East Malaysia is top-down and male, made up in Sarawak of five unmarried and four ex-officio women (mainly Women's Fellowship) and 110 male church workers and clergy. Iban and other rural men at the 1995 Synod remained silent when one clergyman, arguing against women priests, asserted "they would be raped when going to longhouses": itinerant female rural parish workers are safe.

[26] Bishop Bolly of Kuching at the 1995 Sarawak Synod.

[27] From his opening sermon at the AMiA conference, Destin, Florida, 14 January 2004, www.virtueonline.org/portal/modules/tinycontent/index.php?id=25. In private discussion in Kota Kinabalu, he expressed solidarity with the views of his local brother bishop.

do this? The lay underclass remains faithful because their spiritual and religious-cultural Christian identity and private inner tie to God (however they themselves see that) survive despite the organisation.

REPRESENTATION AND THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION — IN GENERAL

If it can be difficult for a Diocese faithfully to represent the "*Sitz im Leben*" of its people rather than just the theological views of the religious in-group—for that is what is attempted in the playing of the culture card—it is that much less likely that "culture" will be used at the Provincial level in way manner which relates to people's lives and views. This may not be a problem: but it is if one Province uses the culture card to defend itself against another who guilelessly or lazily accept the toss as legitimate. This is an important issue when the world-wide communion, sensitive either to their forbears' (or their own) cultural oppression or suppression, is considered. "Culture" is uttered in recent Anglican debates to defend many a position in inter-Provincial or inter-Diocesan discussions, but in so doing a speaker may trump others by ignoring internal contestation. If that is then accepted as a valid working basis for discussions with other units, especially ones which for historical reasons might be properly sensitive to accusations of cultural imperialism, it is likely that little space is given to the Holy Spirit and rather more for finagling an extra ace, which may indirectly support precisely the cultural hegemony over the internally suborned the church is anxious to leave behind. Yet both in official reports on ordination, and locally based discussions, "culture" is bandied about by both sides in a way which can actually facilitate internal oppression by the hierarchy within a Diocese or Province.

. . . AND IN PARTICULAR

So if there is a risk that a Province re-presents its version of cultural views in an "*ad meum*" manner, and there is a potential constraint on others' deconstructing such usage, what does the designation of Provinces in the 1997 Eames Report as "Not Ordaining" or "Ordaining"

women actually signify? The argument so far has suggested the content of "a culture" may belay the label, and this is the conclusion arrived at by Mary Tanner, a member of the Eames committee already referred to above. Her point derives from the representation argument: naturally there will be trickles, undercurrents, major tidal waves in sees designated by the governing Primate as either "sees with male and female priests" and "sees with male priests," because no hierarchy, even one which is alert to the whole, can speak for the whole, even if they wished. Decisions will be more partial the more multiplex the Province is, the more ethnicities, languages, races, regions there are. Yet any decision, given age, class, gender, origin, is a shorthand summary which short-changes some.

This issue of the "for or against" label subsuming people's lived faith and ties to the Church within their particular institutional segment is worth examining further before going deeper into Reports or the Province, Diocese and villages of Southeast Asia, for it is of general significance for the Communion and especially inter-Provincial understanding. Let me start with an easy example safely beyond the Anglican fold, the whole Roman church being labelled as "rejecting the ordination of women."

A NON-ORDAINING CHURCH: ROMAN CATHOLIC UNITY AND DISSENT

In the Roman Catholic church, despite strident silencing edicts such as the 1994 *Ordinatio sacerdotis* irrevocably ruling out women's ordination, the ground-swell "for" is growing far beyond that noted in the Lambeth ordination debates of 1992. All candidates since 1987 for ordination, consecration or teaching posts have had to agree to the Vatican ruling, anyone taking and maintaining a contrary position being liable to excommunication.[28] Edward Schillebeeckx in 1994 said that the exclusion of women from ecclesiastical office is a cultural matter, "purely culturally conditioned historical circumstance."[29] How-ever,

---

[28] This is summarised from a "We are Church" lecture in Würzburg, 2002 by the retired (Roman Catholic self-confessed orthodox) German church lawyer Professor Werner Böckenförde; see http://www.we-are-church.org/forum/boeck3.htm.

[29] E. Kreuzeder, "The Emancipation of Women as a Challenge to the Church," *Anglican Theological Review* 84, no. 3 (2002): 678.

he continued, "the time is not right." Yet in the June 1995 "We are the Church" plebiscite, 580,000 active Austrian Catholics voted in favour of women priests, followed by a similar outcome between September and November of that year in Germany with over 1,540,000 votes of active Catholics, and the ordination (declared invalid) of several women by a willing Bishop. This movement, whether under the "We are the Church" banner, or St. Catherine of Siena group,[30] is now active within the Roman Catholic church *throughout the world* including South Asia, East Asia and Southeast Asia.[31] Thus one large church which represents itself in church law, in speeches, in teaching, as being totally committed to the ordination of males alone (just as four Anglican Provinces world-wide) speak on behalf of an unknown but neither silent nor insignificant number committed to the ordination of called *people*.

DISSENT AND CHANGE IN TWO ANGLICAN PROVINCES: MELANESIA AND KOREA

"Women not wanted" is not quite the case for all Roman Catholics, despite the whole being so defined. Let me turn to two Anglican Provinces in the rough longitude of South East Asia, noted as non-ordaining in the Eames monitoring report. I have already discussed the process of the cultural argument in Myanmar. Melanesia does not ordain women although as it is cited as reflecting theologically though hesitantly on the issue: that position may well change, as indeed it did for Japan in 1999. Melanesia is a region where overall women are subordinate to and feared by men, a region where patrilineal organisation (together with women's control of economic ritual interaction on which male power networks depend) is crystal clear. It seems from the Eames context as if Melanesian hesitancy is attributed to cultural causes. However, this may be rather too simple a way out. We read elsewhere that

> The first [female] ordinations in the Pacific were in the United Church of Papua New Guinea and the Solomons formed in 1968

---

[30] St. Catherine of Siena Network (www.womenpriests.org).

[31] The Indian and wider situation post-Dublin is usefully collected in J. Kottoor, *Woman Why Are You Weeping?* (Delhi: Media House, 2002).

> from the merger of the Methodist and LMS bodies. It is striking that the Papuan part of this nation has taken the lead in opening positions for women. Innovation in a newly united church may be a more likely explanation of the Protestant advance.[32]

Institutional church culture[33] may indeed be as much an influence as "overall culture," and while it is the case that female Melanesian pastors rarely serve at the altar, that is frequently the case in Hong Kong (and in Britain for many married Anglican male priests re-ordained into the Roman Catholic church). However utilised, all these people are validly ordained and that is the issue, the admittance of women to Holy Orders, not the use made of them by the institution once admitted. Melanesian Anglican hesitancy may become agreement to change: it may become agreement to remain.

Korea has also long counted as an area where women have been oppressed, represented by "*han*," the sense of inner burden and hopelessness, actually relevant for the powerless which include non-elite men. Yet while Korean elite women have not played a prominent public role, their "suppression" was promulgated to an extent by missionaries stressing their own contribution to Korean women's betterment, and woven into Korean church history, as well as by Korean male and church views of their proper place. Only a few liberal Korean Presbyterian churches ordain women, as do Methodists. The Korean Anglican church, led by Archbishop Matthew Chul Bum Chung, did not accept women priests[34] according to the 1997 Eames monitoring report, and thus represented one of the four Asian "non-ordainers." Yet that did not mean silent acquiescence in the status quo, either by Anglican or other Korean women.[35] In one of the two invited lectures given that same

---

[32] C. W. Forman, "Sing to the Lord a New Song: Women in Oceania Churches," in *Rethinking Women's Roles, Perspectives from the Pacific*, ed. D. O'Brien and S. Tiffany (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

[33] A view supported by the ordaining of Anglican Aboriginal women in northern Australia, where males have some broadly similar power over women as in Melanesia: see for example "Respected Anglican [aboriginal] Priest Retires," 2002, www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/stories/s679669.htm.

[34] It would be interesting to see the extent to which rejection of women's ordination goes hand in hand with the rejection of other religions. Archbishop Chung pointed out at that Synod that "half the population of Korea still has no religion." Given close to 40% are said to be Christians, one can only assume Chung means those who follow Buddhism, Confucianism and shamanism have no religion.

[35] The Korean Catholic Women's Community for a New World, while not set up specifically to call for women's ordination, is affiliated to the Roman Catholic "We are Church" movement, which has that aim.

year at the Anglican Provincial Synod of 1997 in Seoul,[36] the then President of Myongji University, Song Ja, urged the "development of lay ministry and of women's leadership including the promotion of women's ordination,"[37] and in that same year, Sister Catherine Oh of the Anglican Order of the Holy Cross in Seoul also complained that "women's voices [in this man-centred church] cannot be heard properly."[38] In 2003, Yin Tae-deuk, a Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Korea, spoke scathingly about women's ordination, citing a prohibition that "those who wear diapers may not stand in the place where God's words are proclaimed."[39] Prominent among the vociferous opposition to Yin's words was the Professor of New Testament at the Anglican Sungkonghoe University, Choi Young-sil, who in a newspaper article on the event made clear not only that Yin was utterly out of order but that the "female clergy of Korean churches must work together with Catholic sisters to take charge of this [women's ordination] work as they did with the peace movement and anti-dictatorship."[40] Hardly the words of suppressed Korean women who accept their exclusion from ordination, but rather people within "Korean culture," who strongly contest the hegemonic version promulgated to the outside world. And in the period between 1997 and 2003, Korean Anglican women were indeed ordained by the Bishop of Pusan, the first being priested in 2001. The version inevitably summed up in the Eames Monitoring report as "Does not ordain women," had thus little life left in it—but nevertheless left a lasting impression. If not shaking up "culturally given male rights" is a valid ground against women's ordination, Anglicans in Japan and Korea, both countries with a Buddhist and variously Confucianist history and ideology and very clear male rights, seem to have chosen a different game from that of Myanmar, equally Buddhist at the level of the state but absolutely not in terms of the background of actual adherents, and Melanesia.

---

[36] Province of Korea Synod Report, 1997.

[37] In his 1997 Province of Korea Synod lecture.

[38] www.iawn.org (International Anglican Women's Network), November 1998.

[39] 30 October in the hall of the Theological Institute, Seoul. Yin's comment about menstruation are not specific to "Korean culture" being cited during the Anglican debates in Britain. While Chinese and Indian elite attitudes to menstruation, broadly speaking, are negative, those of Kadazan and similar minorities of Southeast and East Asia are not.

[40] As reported in Seoul, 31 October 2003.

INCULTURATION, CULTURE AND RECEPTION IN THE COMMUNION REPORTS

We have seen the problems both with the use of culture, the mis-use of representation, and the opposition within Provinces officially rejecting ordination on grounds including culture. Well-armed, let us now look at the reports before assessing the South East Asian context more concretely.

The Eames comment which headed this essay, based on the cake-making principle of culture as a defined mass with predictable ingredients, asks the question: "Are there some places in the world where it would be inappropriate to expect the ordination of women by reason of respect for the particular culture?" Exactly what "respect for a particular culture" means when talking at the Provincial level is unclear, given our previous discussion of the representation issue. Moreover, the question is framed as if culture is relevant only to the Mission field outwith the Euro-American domain rather than everywhere the gospel is. Indeed, Eames in the same paragraph implies a very odd grasp of inculturation and culture: "[we] invite reflection on the inherent tension between the need for the inculturation of the gospel and the encouragement of a development which is contrary to a particular culture."[41] This suggests "inculturation" comes from outside and can be coddled and encouraged—but does not make clear by whom. Yet inculturation is the *internal* challenging of *any* socio-historical-cultural context by the Holy Spirit so that Trinitarian faith as locally understood enables all who would believe to do so with ordinary human dignity and identity. It is not done by well-meaning outsiders or vocal insiders, but is rather the voicing of the voiceless in their own time and place.

The Subsidiarity and Interdependence chapter of the *Virginia Report* notes that "Care needs to be taken to prevent a Province from becoming bound by its culture,"[42] and while this appears in the paragraph noting that "the proclamation of the gospel to all humanity must embody its universal coherence," it does seem that what sprouts up on the implied periphery is suspect, neither the Holy Spirit nor the "Missionised" community being entirely trusted. There is a certain ambiguity

---

[41] *The Eames Monitoring Group Report*, 1997, par. 21.
[42] *The Virginia Report*, Chap. 4.14.

here, which is not entirely clarified by the apparently definitive statement: "At all times the theological reflection and praxis of the local church must be consistent with the truth of the gospel which belongs to the universal church . . . especially when particular practices or theories are locally developed which lead to disputes" (4.25). Does "local church" really include *all* local churches from New York to New Caledonia? Does "culture-bound" apply as much to the Dioceses of Colorado and Edinburgh, which ordain two categories of candidates rejected by the Diocese of Kuching, as to that latter Diocese? One is left with the suspicion that "culture" does not seem to be a universal attribute of human existence but rather an attribute of otherness,[43] universally available to deal humanely with local "anomalies," or to silence the suddenly othered.

The 1990 Digest of the Ordination of Women report notes the benefit of reception, "whereby the church is able to continue its life and mission effectively while testing where the Holy Spirit leads." Eames 1997 makes clear that for some Provinces, the assumption was that even if they were not keen to ordain women, reception would sooner or later ensure that they did: reception, in other words was not seen as a long-term open-ended process, but a velvety way of enforcing change. Eames made clear that this was not the intention, Australia being noted as having a firm grasp of this fact. Yet the uncertainty over "reception" is not surprising. Firstly, because there is a tradition of change being ushered in by the back door or by fiat in some regions. And secondly because there is some blurring of the meaning of both "reception" and inculturation. Both the 1990 and the 1997 reports' use of "inculturation" bears a striking resemblance to "reception," Eames surprisingly and in my view utterly wrongly, seeing "inculturation" as "external impetus for change." Some Provinces sourly see "reception" in the same way, as something which will be forced.[44] Clearly in the Province of South East Asia, automatic acceptance of change is thankfully no longer the norm, but does that merely change the locus of force?

---

[43] Common usage is no base for inter-Provincial understanding. The German "*Ausländer*" include only unwelcome resident foreigners; the Australian migrant likewise includes SE but not middle class NW Europeans; "ethnic" food, dress, votes, in Britain does not mean NW European, but Asian.

[44] The difference between orders and advice may be irrelevant to those at the receiving end, who consequently regard discussion as pointless, exemplified by a villager in Sabah replying to my question about a new national law concerning marriage: "what a stupid question: when they make a law, it is force (*paksa*) so what we think doesn't come in to it."

Eames (1997, par. 23) noted that reports from the provinces indicate occasional or more general attitudes of contempt for opponents on both sides of the continuing debate. The Province of South East Asia's scathing comment (under Archbishop Tay) that "It is wrong to consider the open process of reception where the principle is wrong and not accepted" (par. 29) is hardly mitigated by that of Archbishop Yong that "We have sought not to get involved in criticizing and slandering the work and policy of other orthodox bodies," which continues, "Blatant false teaching, doctrine and practice should not be accompanied by remaining in fellowship with those who espouse it."[45] If only the orthodox merit courtesy, he is at least consistent. While this diatribe was especially in the context of current Anglican tensions, Tay and Yong made clear prior to Lambeth 1998 that they would not participate in liturgies or Bible Studies where female Bishops are present.[46] Clearly Yong felt that his view represented the correct one when he pointed out in Florida that "In every generation God raises up and calls out his own children to be his faithful witnesses in the world to do his unfinished task of making Jesus known."[47]

An interesting Anglican Mission in America (AMiA) report, incidentally, points out that "where deep division in culture and language exist between different sections of society, and clergy are drawn mainly from one section, it is likely to have serious difficulties in communicating with members of other social groups,"[48] which is a valid point *all* Dioceses and Provinces (including AMiA Archbishops) need to reflect on continually, for communication both within and across Provinces. *Virginia*, indeed, made the equally useful comment that "at each interface between Province and World-wide Communion, the aim is to free the people of God to use their God-given gifts responsibly and cooperatively" (4.14). As has been made clear so far, this is easier said than done if the content of each Province is not understood or mis-represented either wilfully or through sociological ignorance and naively taken by others as "true." For Christians to use or be silenced by the culture card "owners" is surely to collude in the silencing of members equal before God.

---

[45] Yong in "Classical Anglican News," 28 Jan. 2004, www.anglican.tk/modules.php?.

[46] In Episcopal News Service website on Lambeth, by David Skidmore.

[47] Anglican Mission in America, www.resurection.org/anglican_mission_in_america.htm

[48] "Anglican Mission in America: An Apologetic Vindicating Its Creation Organization and Purpose," www.anglicanmissioninamerica.org.

But even fascinating reports distance us from the everyday life of ordinary communicants, and while we have considered the response of the elite of the South East Asia Province to the various reports, indeed their contribution to the writing thereof, let me turn now to the bottom of the heap, the ethnographic "us" of rural women and men in Sabah, to set the Reports and utterances against their version of "being a person."

THE LOCAL CONTEXT

One Bishop rejects women's ordination because "we are Asian," even though more Anglican churches than not in Asia do ordain. Another rejects it on cultural grounds even though Kadazan-Dusun were the mainstay of spiritual and therefore daily life, and Iban and Bidayuh women had a ritual position within the longhouse and could be the leader of the village. What are local concepts of the person, and perceptions of the subordinated and their relation to the vocally empowered elite?

Local ways of being give an ideologically equal position to women in much of indigenous South East Asia: each person's soul and spirit are equal to each other's, and while the social persona should mimic that appropriate to the context, each individual has a unique and private inner self.[49] The bodies of males and females are also seen as essentially the same, both containing fluids—menstrual blood, male and female sexual fluid—the stagnation of which led to spiritual danger: each person's body is inviolate.[50] Women worked as healers, seers and domestic ritual specialists (*bobolian*) in the Kadazan context, backed by thorough training, usually begun during late adolescence though occa-

---

[49] An interesting slant on personhood is conveyed by the following comment of a priest about his sister, whom I had known as a child. "When J's husband came to see us four brothers before her marriage, we agreed, but said, 'Understand this: you will have rights over her body, as she over yours, but no rights over her spirit. If you hurt that, then we four, Christian or not, will bash you up.'"

[50] Menstrual bleeding, sexual intercourse with the spouse—and masturbation in the latter's absence—avoid stagnation. If either spouse hit the other and drew blood the aggrieved party had the right to complain to the headman: but see my "A Game of Three Monkeys: KadazanDusun Villagers and Violence against Women," *Sojourn* 18 (2003): 279–98. Women can and do sue men who touch them inappropriately, the cost depending on the spot touched.

sionally in mid-life, and remunerated by clients for mutual protection. They were and are felt to be at least as "spiritual" as men in the sense of being able to link with the world beyond the immediately material. Accepting the church view that women were and are not spiritually strong (even if the Diocese did not intend that, that was what aspirants to the priesthood understood) meant a struggle for those ordinands whose mothers had indeed had the power to mediate and heal.[51] Taxed with the fact of Anglican ordination in other parts of Asia and Kadazan acceptance of women priests, Bishop Yong Chen Fah attributed such enthusiasm to Kadazan having "priestesses when they were pagan: they just want to revive that."[52]

So if we take the "pagan priestesses" and "Asian values" for what they are, rhetorical devices to defend the view of the speaker by "othering" the listener, how does one segment of the Province, the Sabah Kadazan-Dusun villager or urban settler, see the ordination issue? Do they accept that priesthood is only for men, that "Asian" is a relevant category, that "interest in women priests" is a throw-back to the past? Discussing the comment on "Asian" and "priestesses" with Kadazan women and men, the general reaction was, "Well, he would say that, wouldn't he: he's Chinese. Indian and Chinese men control their wives . . . What's he talking about: we are Asian, and Kadazan . . . Women would be good as priests, because they listen better." Is "Asian" actually used by Kadazan? Rarely, and never by Kadazan living far up isolated rivers for whom it is a meaningless category. Chinese and Indian men (and Kadazan town-based businessmen taking Chinese as role models) do use it in supporting an imagined male–female status quo. Ethnic markers, scathingly used, are more usual. The mocking response to a Chinese female speaking authoritatively at a village church meeting urging an anonymous questioner to stay with a husband who hit her,[53] indeed to pray for him, was, "Pray and stay? No way. Leave the guy first, then maybe pray for him. But probably not. Chinese want that? Let them: we don't."

---

[51] Persuading priests to reject their experience by (in some cases) implying their mothers or other close female relatives were involved in Devil-activity seems an example of hegemony which may contain the seed of resistance.

[52] Discussion at the Church of the Good Shepherd, Sandakan, Sabah with Bishop Yong in 1999.

[53] Such views were not usually voiced in church. The issue of marital violence is largely ignored, as by other churches, though several Kadazan priests said privately that they preferred to be blamed for advising women to leave violent husbands than risk the death of one who stayed.

What do Kadazan-Dusun Anglicans get and what might they want? While in no way suggesting only paid work counts, or only ordained ministry—though if that is the institutionally accepted "full status" then anything less is indeed less—let me first describe women's paid work in the Sabah Anglican church. Women may teach and preach—the prime work of a priest in the currently more Protestant Anglican church—but neither exercise discipline nor celebrate the Eucharist. True, female evangelists are employed, if unmarried, on the same basis as males, both living far from home with another peer in church property in their allotted village. Villagers regard evangelists, male and female, as adequate and even, depending on the person and their respect for local custom, excellent for house-visits and prayer services, in part because all are Kadazan.[54] Males evangelists can train for the priesthood: single women who train further with their clerically-hopeful male peers may continue to work as low-paid evangelists or pastors,[55] and go overseas for post-graduate training. Yet if supported by the Diocese, and given the costs support is normally essential, "bonded-labour" rules allow such women to marry eight years after departure against five for men.

There is a clear logic in this last point. Married female evangelists must resign to look after home and family rather than be moved about by the church. Should a priest's wife with children work, she too is expected to give up her job—with the grudging exception of teaching or nursing—and the pressure so to do can be relentless, however important a witness the women's work is nor however unbiblical the abjuring of hard-honed talents. Whoever the working of married female church workers would upset, it is not Kadazan, even where this means husband and wife may be separated by demands of work—indeed such arrangements are now almost expected to accompany education and later employment in government service. Provided the couple agree, the community and extended family support them.[56] Kadazan-Dusun do not recognise any cultural problem in women become Anglican

---

[54] Evangelists are criticised for disrespect to local mores and people, but these complaints are not gender- or status-specific, certain priests also coming in for similarly scathing criticism. The main, again gender-neutral, criticism is over briefly trained evangelists doing exorcisms.

[55] Since 1997, male and unmarried female church workers between the ranks of evangelist and priest have been called pastor: they are not ordained.

[56] Church employment of married women occurs in Roman Catholic villages where the local catechist (the closest parallel to the Protestant evangelist, though not taking full services) is seen as ideal *precisely* because she is married and understands and can talk about things the unmarried should not.

priests. They do recognise the lack of justice and affirmation in that ruling, however, as a reflection of the church's inequitable culture.

CONCLUSIONS

"Collective representations" do imply a representing collectivity, and to that extent it is inevitable that any *Vertreter* or *Darsteller*, any person with representative functions from parish councillor through parish priest to Primate, runs the risk of misrepresenting those included in whatever is being uttered or enacted. Clearly too this need not be fatal, for it is inevitable. The issue is surely the extent to which all are aware of the problem, even when not cognisant of that which is actually being represented, and hold that awareness in reflective tension. The evidence I have presented suggests that this is not being done as regularly and carefully as it might. For a world church, this presents a difficulty, as the ability to "read the hand" of a speaker at a Provincial or World meeting and deconstruct the "cultural and representative" game tends to diminish the more distance there is between speaker and listener, especially when the speaker's origin is of low estimation.

Moreover, if dissent is seen as threatening, or even heretical, the chance that Tanner's comment on the veiling of opinions of those in a "non-ordaining" or an "ordaining" see will continue. We have noted that in the Roman Catholic church, there is a strong swell of opinion for women priests, despite the Curia having ruled it out, and in Provinces such as Melanesia, Myanmar, Japan and Korea, seen externally as male-dominated, other denominations as well as Anglicans do already have, or wish to have, women at the altar. Dissent may not ultimately be as destructive to the individual and the organisation as suppression. The 1989 Eames Report on Women in the Episcopate notes: "Sensitively and clearly expressed dissent can be creative in the forming of the mind of the whole church, as it seeks critically to test and refine the truth: dissent should not be marginalized or excluded . . . The fact that a Synod has reached a decision does not foreclose the matter."[57]

---

[57] Eames Report on Women in the Episcopate, 1989, par. 31.

Indeed the pain of rejection for "Mary," a non-Kadazan Sabahan within the Diocese of Sabah at the 1993 Synod at which all further discussion of women's ordination was ruled out of order "for ever" was as deep as her commitment. She recalled that time some years later. "The night after the meeting, I felt mortally wounded, from which I have never recovered. I remember weeping long into the night. As I review that time for you, it's no wonder I have no desire to attend Anglican services on Sunday." Writing to me recently, she explained: "In the Sabah Chinese context, men are perceived of as leaders, but if Kingdom values supersede cultural values, and they should, the work of Christ's kingdom would not be hindered if women's leadership is recognised at par with the men." She is bitterly aware that other Protestant churches in Sabah, serving Chinese- and Malay-language congregations, ordain women but nevertheless remains in the Anglican fold, unlike some equally well-educated sisters. Concluding her letter, she tells of a younger Chinese Anglican who says bluntly—though quietly: "Discrimination against women is not God's plan and this church has to discuss this issue and be renewed."

In bringing up yet more ethnographic material at this late juncture, I do so intentionally, for it is crucial to keep in mind the relationship between people like Mary and those other unnamed but not essentialised Kadazan women and men, the church as an institution, and the church as an organisation with an ideology of equality before the key figure: God. I am not following those ordained spokesmen, who *reject* women's ordination on "common sense/cultural" grounds, by *validating* it on equally inadequate cultural grounds because an unknown proportion of Kadazan-Dusun (and Chinese, Toradja, Timorese) Sabahans would be happy to see it. Of course that would be nonsense! The moral of the example is surely that if there may be mis-representation at every level based on the twin grounds of ignorance and ethnocentrism,[58] dealing in "cultural meaning" so obtained is fraught with danger.

The Communion reports discussed here, carefully prepared and presented though they are, nevertheless indicate a great need for a sounder sociological and anthropological grasp, especially where issues of culture and representation may be relevant, for there is a strong risk that the implicit elitism of Euro-American "ways of being" is replicated in the Provinces of the world in the mind-set of the ecclesiastically suc-

---

[58] The AMiA comment cited above (written in the context of their debates on women's ordination!) is one of the most perspicacious on this issue.

cessful. Recent Anglican in-fighting has seen both sides hurl their Christian (often rather Manichean) or Human Rights (often falsely universalist) ideologies at each other and the implied audience of extolling, bemused or exasperated spectators. As Willis Jenkins recently said, "Participants in an argument of Scripture versus rights have nothing really to say to each other but assert the watchword of their perspective as normative foundation, a trump-card in any ethical discussion."[59] There has been a simplistic, even obscurantist, tendency to see this and other issues as a North–South clash: it is not. In *every* Province, Diocese and Parish, there is exclusion, rank-ordering, distain based on ethnic, class, gender assumptions. Given that speeches have to be made, reports to be written, decisions to be made, it is inevitable that a degree of superficiality and unfounded essentialising is present. Yet an intentionally and effectively false representation for the purposes of winning an ostensibly Christ-based argument would surely be rather inappropriate, given the clear biblical objections to false witness. If Christianity (and other religions where this issue is live) maintains that all are equal before the Other, yet throw facile, partial and at times illogical "culture" arguments on the table for the comfort of the few, the problem is not merely that of women's ordination but the far deeper one of power, convenience and honour. It *is* difficult, very difficult, for winners to let go; it *is* challenging to consider that expectations about gender roles, for example, may be based as much in convenience and comfort for some as in respect for all, it *would* be embarrassing to conclude that The Text, as The Culture is being made use of. Nevertheless, any trumping by the culture card to eliminate the silent masses for the sake of intra-Provincial order or inter-Provincial status should be ruled out of play:[60] the stakes are too high.

---

[59] W. Jenkins, "Episcopalians, Homosexuality and World Mission," *Anglican Theological Review* 86, no. 2 (Spring 2004): 300.

[60] I appreciate that people may be deeply opposed to, for example, the ordination of women because women should be at home looking after children: such a view is honest, and to be honoured. There are, though, rather too many drama queens, would-be-kings and cowards using culture for their own ends.

08 **Logos & Pneuma**
Chinese Journal of Theology
No.28 (Spring 2008)

THEME: Patristics and Chinese Academia

WANG Xiaochao Introduction to the Main Theme*
Charles KANNENGIESSER Note: The Future of Patristics*
WANG Xiaochao The Developing Prospect of Patristics in China: A Review on Charles Kannengiesser's "Note: The Future of Patristics"
Kam-lun Edwin LEE The Future of Patristics in China — A Response to "Note: The Future of Patristics"
ZHOU Weichi The Succession of Doctrine of Imago Dei— Thomas Aquinas' Succession to and Transformation of Augustine's Imago Dei Doctrine and its Problem
ZHANG Xinzhang On the Refutation Against Gnostics by St. Irenaeus: And the Relevance of Heresiology to the Study of Gnostic Religion
XU Liemin The Spirituality of Desert Fathers
Simon WONG Patristics Studies and Biblical Studies

THOUGHT AND SOCIETY

ZHANG Xuefu On Bonhoeffer's Christ-Event and its Significance for Sino-Christian Theology
XU Tao The Humanizations of Christian Philosophy and Chinese Buddhism: Illustrating with Transcendental Christology and laical Bodhisattva Theory
TIAN Haihua "She Is Righteous, Not I": An Analysis of Genesis 38
SHI Minmin Gregory of Nyssa on Free Will
Wang Yen LEE A Pragmatic Case against Pragmatic Theological Realism

BOOK REVIEW

GAO Zhe A Comment on *Divine Economy: Theology and the Market*
SUN Xiangchen The Origin and Duty of Political Theology in Modern Society: On Jürgen Moltmann's *Der Gott im Projekt der modernen Welt*
TENG Yuan-wei Review: Edward Schillebeeckx's *Geloofsverstaan: Interpretatie en Kritiek*
YU Tsz Ling Vivian A Book Review on *Trinity, Creation and Culture: An Interpretation of Colin E. Guntons's Theology*

ACADEMIC NEWS

XIE Zhibin The Possibility of the "Publicity" of Sino-Christian Theology

* No English abstracts are provided for translated articles, brief book reviews or reports.

This journal is published by the ***Institute of Sino-Christian Studies Limited*** in Hong Kong.
33 To Fung Shan Road, Shatin, N.T.,Hong Kong
Tel.:852-2694-6868 Fax:852-2601-6977
E-mail:editorial@iscs.org.hk Web-site://www.iscs.org.hk

ORDER FORM FOR *CHING FENG* AND BOOKS PUBLISHED OR DISTRIBUTED BY THE CHRISTIAN STUDY CENTRE ON CHINESE RELIGION & CULTURE

Parties who wish to subscribe to the new series of *Ching Feng* and/or to order our publications, please complete this form and return it to The Chinese University Press (address: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong; tel.: 2609-6508; fax: 2603-6692; email: cup@cuhk.edu.hk) together with a crossed cheque or a bank draft made payable to "The Chinese University of Hong Kong". Please note that the following listed prices (for local order *only*) in HK$ include local postage, and that the following listed prices for international order in US$ include surface mail postage. Please refer to the front matter for the rates of subscription to *Ching Feng*.

CONTACT PERSON: Rev. / Prof. / Dr. / Mr. / Miss * _____

INSTITUTION: _____

DELIVERY TO: _____

INVOICE ADDRESS (IF DIFFERENT): _____

E-MAIL: _____

CHEQUE NO. (IF APPLICABLE): _____

DATE OF ORDER: _____

* Circle where appropriate.

Publication Details	$ / Unit	Qty. Ordered
English Publications		
Ching Feng, New Series Subscription beginning with Volume _____, Number(s) _____	Please refer to the front matter for the rates	
Ching Feng, New Series Volume 1, Number 1 ☐ Volume 1, Number 2 ☐ Volume 2, Numbers 1–2 ☐ Volume 3, Numbers 1–2 ☐ Volume 4, Number 1 ☐ Volume 4, Number 2 ☐ Volume 5, Number 1 ☐ Volume 5, Number 2 ☐ Volume 6, Number 1 ☐ Volume 6, Number 2 ☐ Volume 7, Numbers 1–2 ☐ Volume 8, Numbers 1–2 ☐	Please refer to the front matter for the rates	

Interpretations of Hope in Chinese Religions and Christianity Edited by D. L. Overmyer and Chi-tim Lai	HK $ 135 US $ 19	
Struggling for Survival: The Catholic Church in China 1949–70 By Kim-kwong Chan	HK $ 39 US $ 6	
Taoist Tradition and Change: The Story of the Complete Perfection Sect in Hong Kong By Bartholomew P. M. Tsui	HK $ 55 US $ 9	
Double-Edged Sword: Christianity and 20th Century Chinese Fiction By Lewis Steward Robinson	HK $ 72 US $ 12	
Karl Ludvig Reichelt: Mission, Scholar and Pilgrim By Eric J. Sharpe	HK $ 70 US $ 11	
Chinese Publications		
香港教會系列 Hong Kong Churches Studies Series		
「社會良心」抑「搞事份子」：香港基督教工業委員會歷史之研究 *Social Conscience or Troublemaker? A History of Hong Kong Christian Industrial Committe* By Tong Wing-sze 湯泳詩 著	HK $ 34 US $ 5.3	
一個華南客家教會的研究：從巴色會到香港崇真會 *A Study of the Hakka Church in South China: From Basel Mission to the Tsung Tsin Mission of Hong Kong* By Tong Wing-sze 湯泳詩 著	HK $ 70 US $ 11	
香港基督徒使命和身份尋索的歷史回顧 *The Mission and Identity of Hong Kong Christianity: A Historical Analysis* By Lo Lung-kwong and Yeung Kwok-keung 盧龍光、楊國強 著	HK $ 39 US $ 6	
福利與信仰：香港教會推行「慈惠」之果效研究報告 *Welfare and the Christian Faith: A Report on the Hong Kong Chinese Churches' Understanding of Financial Assistance* By Kung Lap-yan and Chan Chak-kwan 龔立人、陳澤群 著	HK $ 34 US $ 5.5	
汪彼得牧師在香港工作之初探 *A Preliminary Study of Rev. Peter Wong's Ministries in Hong Kong* By Poon Yuk-kuen 潘玉娟 著	HK $ 34 US $ 5.5	
景風系列 Ching Feng Series		
開放與委身：田立克的神學與宗教對話 *Openness and Commitment: Paul Tillich's Theology and Inter-religious Dialogue* By Lai Pan-chiu 賴品超 著	HK $ 90 US $ 13.5	
承受與持守：中國大地的福音火炬 *The Torch of the Testimony in China* By Deng Zhaoming 鄧肇明 著	HK $ 90 US $ 13.5	

尋真求全：中國神學與政教處境初探 *Chinese Theology in State-Church Context: A Preliminary Study* By Francis C. W. Yip　葉菁華 著	HK $ 90 US $ 13.5	
反帝・愛國・屬靈人── 倪柝聲與基督徒聚會處研究 *Anti-imperialism, Patriotism and the Spiritual Man: A Study on Watchman Nee and the "Little Flock"* By Ying Fuk-tsang　邢福增 著	HK $ 90 US $ 13.5	
中國，開門！馬禮遜及相關人物研究 *Open up, China! Studies on Robert Morrison and His Circle* By Su Ching　蘇 精 著	HK $ 137 US $ 21	
上帝的人馬：十九世紀在華傳教士的作為 *Under God's Command: Papers on Early Protestant Missionaries in China* By Su Ching　蘇 精 著	HK $ 90 US $ 13.5	
其他 Others		
謝扶雅百齡詩文集 *Poems and Essays of Xie Fuya in Celebration of His 100th Birthday* By Xie Fuya (N. Z. Zia)　謝扶雅 著	HK $ 97 US $ 15.5	