

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. XI.—NOVEMBER, 1879.

SOME WORDS REGARDING THE HYPOTHESIS
OF KUENEN.

NOTHING is more characteristic of the thought of the present day, than the extent to which it is ruled by the idea of development or evolution. This idea is the originative principle of the vast intellectual movement which has given rise, in recent times, to comparative anatomy and comparative physiology in physical science, to comparative philology in linguistic science, comparative psychology in mental science, comparative politics in social science, and comparative theology in religious science. It is impossible to trace the influence which it is exerting in every department of research and life, without perceiving that the world is far more powerfully swayed by ideas than is commonly believed. Notwithstanding many appearances to the contrary, great general ideas will be found to be the mightiest of all social forces.

The idea of development, while modifying theology throughout its whole extent, is acting with special power on the direct and immediate study of the Bible. We owe to it a host of problems and theories,—of generalisations, good and bad,—of illusory promises and satisfactory results. It may safely be said that there is not an erroneous hypothesis regarding the Bible, now popular, which is not a part, or application, or consequence of an erroneous theory of development; and that no greater service could be rendered to the cause of Biblical science, than an adequate exhibition of the true theory of development in revelation. But the one true theory will only be reached by the refutation of many which are false; and this will only be effected by strictly testing all theories by the facts which they ought to explain.

In this paper, I purpose considering merely whether or not one very prevalent theory of the development of the Hebrew religion stands the test of one definite fact. The theory of development to which I refer is that which has its best known expositor in Professor Kuenen of Leyden. The thoroughly naturalistic character of this theory—its seeming self-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

peace has come, it will be found that a time of blessing will come for the people too.

Thus I have introduced the Presbyterian Boers of the Transvaal to their brethren throughout the world. There have been witnesses enough to bring up a report of the evil there is in the land ; it has been my privilege to tell of the good there is, and the good we hope for. Let every Christian give them a cordial welcome to their place in the Church Catholic, and, amid the present troubles, a large share of sympathy and prayer. God is able to raise them up, and, even from among them, take pioneers in the work of winning Africa for Christ.

[We have pleasure in inserting the above communication from a gentleman of the highest character in the Cape Colony, although some of his views fail to carry conviction to our minds. On this point, however, we do not venture to say anything of our own ; but, as reference is made to the case of Dr. Livingstone, we deem it right to allow the great missionary to speak for himself. We happen to have in our possession, and at our disposal, an elaborate paper by Dr. Livingstone on the Boers, in which he goes into a number of points very interesting at the present day, and throws light on the origin of the troubles of England with the natives of South Africa—troubles which he thinks might have been easily avoided. We propose, in our next number, to give some portions of this striking paper.—Ed. C. P.]

NATURALISATION OF THE CHURCH IN HEATHEN COUNTRIES.

FROM various causes, the Churches established by our missionaries in foreign lands have, in very many cases, a character almost as distinctly foreign to the country as the missionary himself who founded them. The evil and disadvantage of this state of things are more and more felt by those engaged in mission-work ; hence, the naturalisation of our foreign mission Churches is taking a place among the foremost questions of the day touching evangelistic work. In one form or another, it presses upon our Mission Boards and Committees, and has even made its appearance lately in our General Assemblies.

To the naturalisation of the Church in any country, three things seem to be essential :—

I. The standards of doctrine and polity must be adapted as closely as possible to the actual, specific conditions of society in each country.

II. All Churches, at one in their fundamental articles of doctrine and polity, waiving minor distinctions, should be organically united.

III. Finally, in due time and order, there must be entire ecclesiastical severance from the parent Churches in Europe and America.

In the present article, we propose to confine ourselves to the consideration of the first of these three propositions.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

This principle of the adaptation of doctrinal and ecclesiastical standards requires, in such standards, three conditions :—

(1.) Brevity and simplicity ; (2.) the exclusion of what is accidental and foreign ; (3.) adaptation, in form, to the special prevailing errors and needs of each people.

1. As distinguished from the symbols of our occidental Churches, the articles of faith for our foreign mission Churches should be few and briefly stated ; their form of government should be given in general principles and outline, rather than in detail. By this, it is not intended that we should seek to base our mission Churches upon a few propositions, vaguely stated, or elastic enough to comprehend alike Calvinism and Pelagianism. What is brief is not necessarily indefinite. Five brief propositions suffice to carry, by implication, the entire Calvinistic system. Neither would we be understood to depreciate the value and importance, under proper conditions, of a Confession of Faith as elaborate as that of Westminster, or a Catechism as full as that of Heidelberg. Whether such detail of statement in doctrinal symbols be expedient or not, at present, for us in Europe and America, is an independent question, which is in no sense raised in the present paper. It is simply urged that, whatever may be expedient for us in Christian lands, yet, in organising a Church in a heathen or Mohammedan country, if we wish to see such Churches from the first take root, and grow as native to the country, we must beware of imposing on them our elaborate foreign formulas of doctrine and polity. We must be content to begin with a very brief and simple Confession. We must leave the elaboration of details to the native Churches themselves, under conditions which Providence may assign to them.

Even on the general principles which we follow in secular education, this appears to be sound policy. We teach the child, first, the general principles of any science ; acquaintance with minute details belongs to a later stage of his education. Practically, the "form of sound doctrine," which every sensible Christian parent delivers to a child, is a very simple thing as compared with the theology which he may get later in life. For very little children, we need something still shorter than the Shorter Catechism. Just so is it with Churches in their organic character. The young Churches in a heathen country, as compared with the mature Churches of Europe and America, whose life is already measured by centuries, are as children compared with men. We should have the sense to recognise this difference, and be content to begin by delivering to them, not details, but "the first principles of the doctrine of Christ." The rest will come in due time. And this, moreover, has been God's plan in the communication of His truth. There has been, as we all know, a progress in the Divine revelation of doctrine to the Church. After this manner, also, we are expressly told, did our Lord Jesus Christ teach the people. He did not deliver to them a full system of doctrine at once, but "spake the word unto them as they were able to hear it"

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1870.]

(Mark iv. 33). Even to His chosen apostles He plainly said : " I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now " (John xvi. 12). And the chief of the apostles, and first missionary to the heathen, followed, in this matter, his Master's example. He wrote to the Corinthians, he tells us—to a new Church, be it observed, in an idolatrous city—" as unto babes in Christ," and " fed them with milk, and not with meat " for, said he, " hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able " (1 Cor. iii. 2). Thus, both a due regard to the general principles which regulate all wise education,—and, much more, the authority and example of Christ Himself and His inspired apostles,—forbid us to deliver to our new-born Churches, in heathen and Mohammedan lands, the elaborate symbols of our Western Churches as the fundamental condition of their organisation. Under their method, the Church took root readily in every land alike, and was something else than a transplanted Jewish Christianity.

2. Our next proposition follows naturally from the foregoing. Both in general as Christians, and even as Presbyterians, if we would secure the early naturalisation of the Church in heathen lands, we must make up our minds to exclude from their creed and summary of Church law, whatever belongs merely to the accidents of Presbyterianism. Nor is this said in disparagement of any beliefs or practices peculiar to one body of Presbyterians or another, as if it were of no consequence, in such things, what one might believe. On the contrary, it is granted that this may often be of much consequence. None the less, however, do we urge that, when establishing the Church in a foreign land, we should base it on those things in which we all agree, and not on those in which we differ. Presbyterians have claimed and fought unto blood for liberty to determine freely their forms of faith and worship. We should be true to our traditions, and cheerfully allow, to our native foreign Churches, the same liberty which we have enjoyed. As the providence of God in this matter guided and determined the specific form of our Church confessions, so may we trust that, under different conditions, it will also guide them. Moreover, whatever we may conceive to be the importance of a " testimony " regarding any non-essential particular of our faith, we must all agree that it must be of still greater importance, that, in the midst of opposing heathen, ignorant of, or unable to appreciate, the deeper spiritual unity which binds together all true believers, the Church should, as far as possible, present a united front to the enemy. The evils of sectarian division, if great at home, must be far greater abroad. In our imperfect state, we may, perhaps, never be able entirely to avoid them ; but we are surely bound, among the heathen especially, to minimise our differences and magnify our agreements. It is a solemn responsibility to impose upon new Churches, in heathen lands, the lines of our denominational divisions. It can be justified by nothing less than the clearest light of duty, and the most imperious necessity.

It will, doubtless, be objected by some, that this line of argument

would seem to forbid our founding Churches which should have any one determinate form whatever, and not only forbid the reproduction of Presbyterian divisions in our foreign fields, but equally of any denominational distinctions whatever. But, while fully believing that it is quite possible, on heathen soil, to reduce the divisions of Christendom to a very small number, we must admit that our principle must be limited by the very nature of the case. For example, we are bound, by apostolic authority, to provide for such new Churches some form of government. Without such form, organisation is impossible. But then, it must needs be one form, and not another. From the very nature of the case, we are compelled to choose one which shall be essentially Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Congregational. Hence we argue, not for a general ignoring of denominational distinctions,—which is simply impossible,—but for a determined ignoring, on the mission-field, of all distinctions belonging to the several subdivisions of the Presbyterian family, as such. Both on general principles, and from personal experience, so much as this seems, to the writer, to be not only practicable, but a high Christian duty. To sum up this part of our argument, it is urged that, in order to the speedy naturalisation of the Church in any country, we are not to insist upon details, but only on general principles of doctrine and polity. Principles are of the God of the Bible, and therefore, like the Bible, are not of national and local, but universal use and application. Details, on the contrary, bear the marks of time and place; and in so far as we insist upon them, the Churches which we plant in heathen lands must remain as foreign in spirit, as in origin, from the country in which they exist.

3. In the third place, the principle for which we argue demands that the symbols of the Church, in each country, shall set forth the truth of God in specific contrast with the errors specially current among its people, and with careful regard to their specific conditions.

An illustration will make our meaning clear. Let us suppose the present state of thing reversed,—that India had been a Christian land for centuries, while America and Great Britain had remained, like the actual India of to-day, with considerable intellectual culture, yet in their original heathenism. Meantime, through the centuries, the Hindu Church would have been developing its creed, form of government, and mode of worship, under conditions exceedingly different from those which have given shape to our occidental symbols.

The doctrinal statements of the Hindu would, doubtless, have been framed to meet the inherent tendency of the Indian mind to idealism and pantheism. In form, they would probably have more resembled the sententious aphorisms of Kapila, than the elaborated propositions of the Westminster Confession. In this form of Presbyterial government, we would assuredly find little trace of that ultra-democratic sentiment which is so powerfully modifying Presbyterianism in America. His very forms of worship would have been different; like Christ Himself, the preacher

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

would have sat when preaching ; and, like Moses, he would have removed, not his head-dress, but his shoes, when entering the house of God. Now, suppose such a Hindu Christian missionary to come to a heathen London or New York, and retain and insist upon his converts adopting Christianity in its specific Hindu form ; is it not plain that he would be at an immense disadvantage ? He might teach the true doctrine of the cross ; but what if his doctrinal statements were shaped to meet, not Western errors, but Oriental ! Would formulas, determined by old controversies, of bygone centuries, on the banks of the Ganges or Yang-tse-Kiang, be likely to suit the case ? Or, is there any probability that the truth, presented in such a form to the supposed heathen European or American, would be readily received, or soon take deep root in the national life ? "To those without law," said the first great missionary to the heathen, "I became as without law, that I might gain them that are without law." That was Paul's way ; and if we would emulate Paul's success, we must in this, as in other things, imitate Paul's method.

It is, therefore, we believe, most important for the missionary, at the outset, to recognise the fact that our occidental confessions, and formulas of doctrine and government,—rightly so dear to him, just in proportion as they set forth with precision the truth of God in its relations to the history of opposing error in the West,—must needs be, so far, ill-adapted to the necessities of Churches under such different historical conditions. Let us not be misunderstood. God's truth is one and the same eternally. What is true in America or Great Britain is true in China or Japan. If, for example, the Calvinistic, as opposed to the Arminian system of doctrine, rightly represent, in its fundamental principles, the revealed truth of God, then this, and not something else, is the true system all the world over. But while this is true, it surely does not follow that every doctrine must always be stated in the same way, or have the same prominence in the system. None of us will be disposed to undervalue the syllogism ; but it does not follow that, for practical purposes, it is the best way of putting an argument before the mind of a Hindu, who is accustomed, instead, to the fivefold division of an argument. So with the case before us. We believe, for example, in the doctrine of fore-ordination, as set forth in the Westminster Standards. But, granting the doctrine, it does not follow that it must always be stated in that same manner, or even that it must have the same practical prominence in the system. We are to remember that the form and prominence of that doctrine, as set forth among us, has been largely determined by a general tendency, on the other side, to magnify the sphere of human freedom at the expense of the Divine sovereignty. But what if we find ourselves, as in a Buddhist or Mohammedan country, confronted with the opposite tendency,—to minimise or even nullify freedom, and affirm the predetermination of all actions, either by an impersonal fate, or by a supreme personal Will, who makes all free actions, not merely certain, but inexorably necessary ? Is it not plain that the doctrine in question

needs, under such conditions, a statement very different from that which has been wisely accepted among us? In a word, in the one case, we want a statement of predestination chiefly, as opposed to contingency; in the other, prominence must be given to human liberty and responsibility, as opposed to necessity and fatalism.

It will not be hard to show that, if Presbytery is to be naturalised among a foreign people, the same necessity exists for modification of many details of Church polity, as well as doctrinal statement. The elaborate systems of European and American Presbyterianism represent centuries of historical growth, and their present form has been determined under certain well-known historic conditions. But many of those conditions have been strikingly different from those under which our mission Churches find themselves. To illustrate: when our system of polity was framed, the work of modern missions was yet in the future; hence, they are absolutely silent as regards the precise functions and authority of the missionary or evangelist, his complex relations to the parent Church which sends him out, to the foreign churches which he organises, and to their several pastors. Hence has arisen no little confusion, and, if we mistake not, error in practice, among our mission Churches. Here we have a body of Presbyterian ministers, with no common Presbyterian organisation; here, again, a "mission," as it is called, consisting of foreign ministers only, coexisting, perhaps, with Presbytery, and exercising many of its most important functions, practically,—and we dare not say, unwisely,—holding, temporarily, some such position, in relation to the native ministry and churches, as a bench of bishops! Here, again, throughout whole missions, we find ministers sent out by the Home Church as evangelists, to preach and organise self-governing Churches, failing, as our standards do, to distinguish sharply the office of evangelist from that of pastor, and hence becoming themselves pastors of the native Churches. Hence, their evangelistic labours are incalculably diminished; and, worse still, the native Churches, in default of native pastors, are kept for years in a state of helpless dependence on the foreign missionary, which is simply fatal to the healthy growth of an independent, self-sustaining life. Thus, as the result, such "Mission Churches," preached to by foreign pastors, supported chiefly by foreign money, and governed, in great part, by a foreign mission, in a foreign fashion, stand before the surrounding heathen community as foreign and alien organisations, connection with which involves scarcely less the sacrifice of all independent, national spirit, than treason to an ancestral faith. This, happily, is far from being the universal state of things; but, in India at least, we have quite too much of it. Few, however, even among those who have felt themselves constrained to work in such a fashion, will deny that this condition of things is most undesirable, and that there can be no naturalisation of the Church in any country, so long as it exists. Hence it is evident that any form of government, however excellent, which fails to recognise and provide for such conditions, must be

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, November, 1879.]

greatly modified before it can well serve for an Indian, Persian, or Chinese Church.

All this becomes still more plain when we consider the pastoral office. Both at home and on the foreign field, the truth is every year more and more distinctly recognised, that, from the very first, our foreign Churches should be served by native pastors. If, for the present, many of these are often inferior to the foreign missionary in general intellectual character, still, their superior acquaintance with the language, modes of thought, and customs of the people, more than compensates for this. There can be no such thing as the naturalisation of the Church, without a native pastorate. And we hail it as one of the good signs of the times, that the home Churches are insisting,—of late much more than formerly,—upon the prompt formation of a native pastorate in their foreign mission-fields, and thereby show that they are waking up to the importance of naturalising the Church in foreign lands, and are perceiving one, at least, of the most important and necessary steps to that end.

In many missions, indeed—as, *e.g.*, those of the American Board in Western India, and in the Euphrates Valley, and in certain of the most developed Scotch missions in India—great and encouraging progress has been made, of late years, in this direction. But, in many other missions, the enormous difficulties which have met all endeavours to establish a native pastorate, after the European model, raise the question, whether, as regards the precise form of the pastoral office also, our Western forms of government may not be as ill-adapted to many foreign fields as our Western formulas of doctrine. This is, indeed, so far recognised by our missionaries, as that, if we mistake not, it would be hard to find a Presbyterian missionary in India or China who would insist upon those literary qualifications and specific Presbyterial examinations, as a prerequisite to ordination, which are so wisely required in our occidental Churches. But it is perhaps a question whether, if we will wisely meet the peculiar difficulties of many missions, we should not go much further. The pastoral office itself, as vesting in one man, endowed with authority, and supported by the people, was the growth of years.

If we rightly understand the history of the primitive Church, the government and instruction of the Churches were, first of all, vested in a bench of co-equal elders, who divided pastoral work among them as Providence might direct. On such a plan, feeble churches, unable fully to support a pastor, could yet be well served by the joint labours of a plural eldership, till such time as, by a healthy, natural growth, they were ready for the support of an individual pastorate. Granting, then, as we may without hesitation, that our pastoral system is the best for most European and American Churches, does it follow that it must be the best for most Churches in India, China, or Africa? And might it not very possibly, in many mission-fields, be wiser not to begin with our individual pastorate, but to go back to the primitive model, and commence with the form of government at once most primitive and most

Presbyterian,—a plural pastorate by co-equal elders? Beginning thus, might we not safely allow the native Churches, under due instruction, and, above all, the guidance of God's providence and Spirit, to develop details for themselves?

As regards the various suggestions made above, by way of illustration, the writer would not have them understood as dogmatic expressions of opinion. Those who, like him, have known, by some experience on mission-ground, something of the practical difficulties in which such questions are often involved, will be least inclined to dogmatise about them. The general principles which should govern our mission-policy, with a view to the naturalisation of the foreign Churches, seem sufficiently clear. Their specific application to the diverse conditions of different mission-fields, must be mainly left to those familiar with each field, and, as remarked at the beginning, is at present one of the most urgent and important practical questions connected with the foreign mission-work of the Church.

As to the general principles discussed, the writer believes that he is far from being alone in his judgment. But the views now expressed have been formed after a careful study of what has fallen within his own experience and under his observation.*

S. H. KELLOGG.

* We append a few references to similar expressions of opinion by various missionary bodies: these will be justly entitled to more regard than the opinion of any individual.

In November, 1873, there was held, at Allahabad, a Conference of Presbyterian missionaries in India, in which were represented eleven different branches of the Presbyterian family. They issued a letter to the Presbyterian Churches in India and Ceylon, from which we quote the following expressions:—

“All the Presbyterian Churches are one in doctrine and in polity. The lesser differences, to which their separate organisations at home are due, are not such as to require or to justify their continued separation in India. . . . While the fundamental principles of our polity are agreeable to the Word of God, and therefore of constant obligation upon us, the application of those principles must be determined, in part, by the circumstances of different countries and times.”

To these and similar expressions of opinion, we find appended the names of ministers of the American Presbyterian Church, the Established, the Free, and the United Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, and the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America. The Presbyterian Confederation of India, which was developed from this Conference in 1876, addressed to the General Assemblies and Synods in Europe and America a letter touching the organic union of Presbyterians in India. The General Assembly (1876) of the American Presbyterian Church referred this letter to their Board of Foreign Missions, which reported to the Assembly of 1877, affirming the same general principles in the following terms:—

“No one would wish to perpetuate, amongst Hindu, Chinese, or Japanese Christians, such national or local peculiarities of church organisation as may exist in the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, Holland, or the United States; but greater union is to be sought, provided it is not sought at the expense of truth and order.”

As regarding Church Standards, the Board further recommended, that—

“It shall be referred to the missionary Synods, or . . . Presbyteries which contain at least three foreign members, to take order concerning Articles of Faith, Government, Discipline, Directory of Public Worship, and Rules for Judicatories. It shall be left to

THE PROBLEM OF THE LABOURING CLASSES.

III.—IN GREAT BRITAIN.

WHATEVER the intelligent and aspiring working people of Great Britain may think of the schemes of German Socialists, American levellers, or French communists, it is certain that no such revolutionary projects are deliberately or extensively cherished among them at the present time. There is no revolutionary method of rectifying social wrongs, towards the realisation of which their united efforts are directed. Indeed, the social aims of the labouring classes have a more desultory aspect, at the present day, than forty or fifty years ago, when they were struggling for political emancipation. But it does not by any means follow that their minds are more at rest, or that they have become satisfied with things as they are. Rightly or wrongly, it is an unquestionable fact that there is much dissatisfaction among them. The problem of labour is far from being solved in Great Britain. The direction which the aspirations and efforts of the people themselves will take, towards the rectification of what they believe to be wrong, is one of the great uncertainties of the future. There is so much strong feeling on the subject as to make it possible that, ere long, something more definite will shape itself before them, and become the object of their eager pursuit. On nothing, probably, does the future history of this country more depend, than the direction which this current may take. Meanwhile, nothing revolutionary is contemplated; and if we should be favoured with a well-filled throne, considerate legislation, and a more sympathetic spirit between rich and poor, the current may flow on as quietly as before.

In this paper, my object shall be, in the first place, to indicate what the feelings of the working classes are in regard to our present social arrangements; secondly, in regard to religion; and lastly, to throw out some hints as to the manner in which the Christian Church seems called to treat the problem, alike in the interest of the people, and in the interest of Christianity itself.

their judgment to determine the parts that ought to be included in their action on these subjects, having a wise regard to the degree of Christian knowledge and advancement whereunto the native Churches have attained; but the condition is herein expressly made, that, in these standards, nothing contrary to the standards of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America shall be adopted."

The (American) Synod of India, at its next meeting expressed, formally and explicitly, its satisfaction with the above sentiments and recommendation of the Board of Foreign Missions.

Last of all, we may refer to the recent action of the Churches connected with the mission of the American Presbyterian Church in Persia, "touching the revising or enacting of a Book of Faith and Discipline for the Persian Church." (See *Catholic Presbyterian* for October, pages 319, 320.)