

THE PARADOXICAL CO-EXISTENCE OF SUBMISSIVENESS AND
SUBVERSIVENESS IN THE THEOLOGY OF YU-MING JIA

by

CHI-YEUNG LAM

A thesis submitted to The University of Birmingham for the degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theology
School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion
The University of Birmingham
30th July 2010

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to study Yu-ming Jia's theology from a postcolonial perspective. Yu-ming Jia (1880-1964) is a conservative Protestant theologian who was actively engaged himself in Chinese protestant churches and theological education during the first half of the 20th century. It was seen that he constructed his theology mainly in a hierarchical context, i.e., the subjugating relationship between missionaries and Chinese Christians appearing in missionary enterprise. This study will focus on three areas of Jia's theology: christology, ecclesiology and soteriology, which will be analysed with Homi Bhabha's three conceptions: ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity. These key concepts in postcolonial theory and discourse are regarded as the characteristic features and contributions of the theory. This study can provide a postcolonial perspective to understand Jia's theology and subsequently brings about the paradoxical insights which have not been discovered by previous scholars who solely apply the approach of systematic theology and restrained themselves within a binary framework, Liberal/Conservative or Modernist/Fundamentalist, to study Jia's theology. While subversiveness and submissiveness are both discovered in Jia's theological discourse, the study concludes that there is a paradoxical co-existence of subversiveness and submissiveness in Jia's theology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to many people without whose support and encouragement this study would have been impossible to complete. My very special thanks go to Mr. Edmond Tang and Professor R.S. Sugirtharajah, my two supervisors, for their patient, careful and meticulous reading of the drafts, which owes much to their thoughtful and helpful comments. None of them is responsible for the imperfections which remain in the thesis. I am grateful for the financial support I received from the New York Theological Education Centre in the midst of my study. Many thanks also go to the library staff of the Orchard Learning Resource Centre of the University of Birmingham, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, and the Baptist University of Hong Kong, who were always helpful and kind to offer me assistance in collecting materials. A special word of thanks goes to Rev. Lung-kwong Lo, the President of the Divinity School of Chung Chi College (CUHK), who helps me in fully utilising the library resources of CUHK. I am particularly grateful to my wife, Yee-man, for her unflagging support, love and patience. She has offered her constant support and has taken care of our family while I have been busy with my research, without which I wouldn't have finished the work.

CONTENTS

1. THE RESEARCH.....	1
1.1 Research Background.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the Research.....	3
1.3 Thesis Structure.....	3
1.4. Methodology.....	4
1.4.1 Historical Investigation	4
1.4.2 Theological Investigation	5
1.4.3 Postcolonial Criticism and Jia’s Theology	6
1.4.3.1 The Colonial Context of Jia.....	6
1.4.3.2 Ambivalence, Mimicry and Hybridity.....	9
Ambivalence.....	9
Mimicry.....	11
Hybridity.....	15
1.5 The Definition of Terms.....	20
1.5.1 Postcolonialism	20
1.5.2 Submissiveness and Subversiveness	21
1.5.3 Anti-colonialist resistance	22
1.6 Research Contribution.....	22
2. A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF YU-MING JIA AND THE CONTEXTS OF HIS THEOLOGY.....	24
2.1 Yu-ming Jia (1880-1964).....	24
2.2 The Background of Yu-ming Jia.....	28
2.2.1 Theological Background	28
2.2.1.1 The Theology of the Reformation.....	28
2.2.1.2 The Chinese Fundamentalism.....	31
2.2.1.3 The Social Concern of Chinese Theology.....	34
2.2.2 Historical Contexts	36
2.2.2.1 The Domination of Missionaries.....	36
2.2.2.2 The Union and Independence Movement.....	38
3. THE AMBIVALENCE OF JIA’S ECCLESIOLOGY.....	42
3.1 The Exportable Ecclesiology of the Missionaries.....	43
3.1.1 The Definition of the Church	44
3.1.1.1 The Universal Church and the Individual Churches.....	44
3.1.2 The Organization of the Church	46
3.1.2.1 A Formal and Structural Organization.....	46
3.1.2.2 The Ambivalence of Church Polity.....	46
3.1.3 The Council of the Churches	48
3.1.3.1 Mutual Watchcare and Exhortation.....	48

3.1.3.2 A Hierarchy among Individual Churches.....	49
3.1.4 Conclusion.....	52
3.2 The Mimicry of Jia’s Ecclesiology.....	53
3.2.1 The Definition of the Church.....	54
3.2.1.1 The Obvious Sameness of the Colonizers.....	54
3.2.2 The Organization of the Church.....	56
3.2.2.1 The Mimic Sameness with the Colonizers.....	56
3.2.2.2 The Mimicry of the Old Testament Church.....	56
3.2.3 The Council of the Churches.....	58
3.2.3.1 The Ambivalence of Jia’s Mimicry.....	58
3.2.4 Conclusion.....	60
3.3 The Hybridity of Jia’s Ecclesiology.....	60
3.3.1 The Denied Knowledge – Chinese Nationalism.....	62
3.3.1.1 The Union of Chinese Churches.....	64
3.3.1.2 The Union and Independence of Chinese Churches.....	65
3.3.1.3 The Struggle for Chinese Churches Sovereignty.....	66
3.3.2 The Newness – The Sinicized Church.....	69
3.3.2.1 The Promotion of the Sinicized Church.....	69
3.3.2.2 The Sinicized Church and Jia’s Nationalism.....	71
3.3.3 Conclusion.....	73
3.4 Concluding Remarks.....	74
4. THE AMBIVALENCE OF JIA’S CHRISTOLOGY.....	76
4.1 The Exportable Christology of the Missionaries.....	77
4.1.1 The Salvific Christology.....	77
4.1.1.1 The Two Natures of Christ.....	78
4.1.2 The Orthodox Doctrine.....	79
4.1.2.1 The Person of Christ.....	79
4.1.2.2 The Function of the Orthodox Doctrine.....	80
4.1.3 The Divinity of Christ.....	83
4.1.3.1 The Justification of Christ’s Divinity.....	83
4.1.3.2 Monotheism and the Canonical View.....	84
4.1.4 Conclusion.....	85
4.2 The Mimicry of Jia’s Christology.....	86
4.2.1 The Salvific Christology.....	86
4.2.1.1 The Works of Christ.....	87
4.2.1.2 The Importance of Salvation.....	88
4.2.2 The Orthodox Doctrine.....	89
4.2.2.1 The Sameness of Mimic Repetition.....	89
4.2.2.2 The Necessity of Clarification.....	91
4.2.3 The Divinity of Christ.....	92
4.2.3.1 The Sameness of Mimic Repetition.....	92
4.2.3.2 The Three Stages of Cross.....	93
4.2.4 Conclusion.....	95
4.3 The Hybridity of Jia’s Christology.....	96
4.3.1 The Newness – Dispensationalism.....	98

4.3.1.1 The Dispensations of the Bible.	98
4.3.1.2 Dispensationalism and the Salvation of Christ.	99
4.3.2 The Newness - The Kingdom of God	100
4.3.2.1 The Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingdom of God.....	100
4.3.2.2 The Recovery of the Kingdom of God.....	102
4.3.3 Conclusion.	103
4.4 Concluding Remarks.	104
5. THE AMBIVALENCE OF JIA’S SOTERIOLOGY.....	107
5.1 The Exportable Soteriology of the Missionaries.....	108
5.1.1 The Work of the Holy Spirit	109
5.1.1.1 The Ambiguity of the Holy Spirit.....	109
5.1.2 The Doctrine of the Election	112
5.1.2.1 The Privileges of the Elect.	112
5.1.2.2 The Privileges of the Colonizers.	114
5.1.3 The Sanctification	116
5.1.3.1 The Work of God.....	116
5.1.3.2 The Objection to Perfectionism.....	116
5.1.4 Conclusion	118
5.2 The Mimicry of Jia’s Soteriology.....	119
5.2.1 The Work of the Holy Spirit	120
5.2.1.1 The Study of the Holy Spirit.....	120
5.2.1.2 The Holy Spirit and the Dispensationalism.....	122
5.2.2 The Doctrine of Election.	124
5.2.2.1 The Humility of the Elect.....	125
5.2.3 Sanctification	127
5.2.3.1 The Sameness of Mimic Repetition.....	127
5.2.3.2 The Perfection of the Sanctification.....	127
5.2.4 Conclusion	130
5.3 The Hybridity of Jia’s Soteriology.....	131
5.3.1 The Newness – The Theology of Life	132
5.3.1.1 The Life of Spirit.	133
5.3.1.2 The Life of Spirit and the Salvation.	134
5.3.2 The Denied Knowledge - The More Abundant Life	137
5.3.2.1 The Three Stages of Life.....	138
5.3.2.2 Perfectionism and the More Abundant Life.....	140
5.3.3 Conclusion.	141
5.4 Concluding Remark.	141
6. JIA’S THEOLOGY COMPARED WITH THAT OF T.C. CHAO....	144
6.1 Introduction of T.C. Chao.....	144
6.2 The Content of the Works of T.C. Chao.....	145
6.2.1 Chao’s Ecclesiology	146
6.2.1.1 Chao’s Earlier Ecclesiology and Chinese Nationalism.....	146

6.2.1.2 Chao's Later Ecclesiology and Chinese Nationalism.....	151
6.2.2 Chao's Christology.....	153
6.2.2.1 Chao's Earlier Christology and the Divinity of Christ.....	153
6.2.2.2 Chao's Later Christology and the Divinity of Christ.....	155
6.2.3 Chao's Soteriology.....	157
6.2.3.1 Chao's Earlier Soteriology and Salvation.....	157
6.2.3.2 Chao's Later Soteriology and Salvation.....	159
6.3 The Uniqueness of Jia's Theology	161
6.3.1 The Ambivalent Ecclesiologies.....	161
6.3.2 The Mimic Christologies.....	163
6.3.3 The Hybrid Soteriologies.....	165
6.4 Concluding Remarks.	168
7. CONCLUSION.....	169
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	176
Primary Chinese Sources.	176
Primary English Sources.	179
Secondary Chinese Sources.....	181
Secondary English Sources.	184

CHAPTER 1

THE RESEARCH

1.1 Research Background

In 1998 a series of Bible commentaries by Yu-ming Jia, *Shen Jing Yao Ye* [The essential meaning of the Bible], which contains eight volumes and covers all sixty-six books of the Bible, was published by the China Christian Council in Shanghai. As an official organization in China, the Council's publication may be seen as an indication that official policy advocates that Jia's theology can be applied in the churches of China. There are approximately twenty million Christians in China,¹ therefore it is no exaggeration to say that the influence of Jia's theology has penetrated an enormous Christian organization in China. Also, Jia was one of the first generation of Chinese theologians of the twentieth century² and his theology is regarded as one of the main themes in contemporary Chinese Church.³ Nevertheless, little critical attention has been given to Jia's theology, and its teachings have not been seriously and sufficiently studied. I began to wonder whether Jia's theology is uncritically accepted in Chinese churches, and this question aroused my interest in studying Jia's theology.

¹ Xian-wei Fu, 'Zhong Guo Jiao Hui: Xin Ling Xiu, Xin Tiao Zhan [China Church – New Leaders, New Challenges],' [document on-line]; available from *Christian Times* website (http://christiantimes.org.hk/Common/Reader/News/ShowNews.jsp?Nid=49736&Pid=5&Version=0&Cid=220&Charset=big5_hkscs); accessed 25 February 2009.

² Jia and T.C. Chao were both regarded as the first generation of Chinese theologians in China. Jia-lin, Liang, *Pai Huai Yu Ye Ru Zhi Jian* [Between Confucianism and Christianity] (Taipei: Yu zhou guang, 1997), 296.

³ Fu-zeng Xing, *Xun Suo Ji du Jiao De Du Te Xing: Zhao Zi Chen Shen Xue Lun Ji* [In Search of the Uniqueness of Christianity: Essays on T.C. Chao's Theology] (Hong Kong: Alliance Bible Seminary, 2003), xi.

As regards the current studies on Jia's theology or biblical interpretation, most of the critics have not considered the particular context of Jia and have disregarded the influence of the entanglement between Jia and missionaries. Jia was trained by missionaries and worked with them for over three decades, but their prolonged relationship was built up within a hierarchy, in which Jia's subjugation was an inevitable fact.⁴ Nearly all Jia's theological works were written in these circumstances. Previous studies on Jia's theology neglect the fact that the predominance of the missionaries is an essential element in the composition of Jia's major theological discourses. Juan Luis Segundo articulates that 'every theology is political, even one that does not speak or think in political terms'.⁵ This idea suggests that there are probably some political elements embedded in Jia's theology. As the theological discourse of Jia as such are constructed in a hierarchical context, a subjugating relationship and a situation of racial difference, I argue that the dynamics between Jia and missionaries have to be considered when studying Jia's theology.

Shui-man Kwok has adopted the perspective of postcolonialism to study three prominent Chinese Christian thinkers; Yao-tsung Wu, Lei-chuan Wu and Tzu-chen Chao, and asserts that anti-colonial resistance or subversiveness can be found in their theological discourses.⁶ However, it is noteworthy that all these Chinese Christian thinkers or social activists belonged to the liberal wing during the first several decades of the twentieth century. Conservatives were neglected in the study, which raises the question: Does subversiveness or anti-colonial resistance merely appear in the discourse of the liberal wing? I presume that anti-colonial resistance also appeared in

⁴ For instance, Jia's salary in the seminary was sourced from foreign mission funding.

⁵ Juan Luis Segundo, *The Liberation of Theology*, trans. John Drury (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976), 74.

⁶ Shui-man Kwok, *Collaboration as an Alternative Mode of Anti-colonialist Resistance – A Postcolonial Rethinking of the Asia-West Binarity Inscribed in the Asian Theological Movement* (PhD thesis, CUHK, 1999), 196-259.

the theologies of the conservative wing, such as Jia. This research may help me to justify this assumption.

1.2 Purpose of the Research

This thesis aims to study Yu-ming Jia's theology from a postcolonial perspective. It will analyse three areas of Jia's theology; christology, ecclesiology and soteriology, with Homi Bhabha's three conceptions of ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity. I will argue that there is a paradoxical co-existence of subversiveness and submissiveness in Jia's theology. This thesis is significant because it provides a postcolonial perspective to the analysis of Jia's theology and subsequently leads to paradoxical insights which were not discovered by previous scholars of Jia's theology, who solely applied the approach of systematic theology, and restrained themselves within a binary framework of liberal/conservative or modernist/fundamentalist.

1.3 Thesis Structure

There are seven chapters in this thesis. Chapter one is an introductory chapter which explains the methodology and definitions of terms. Chapter two is to construct Jia's biography and illustrate his theological context. In chapters three to five we will discuss three subjects in Jia's theology; ecclesiology, christology and soteriology, in each chapter respectively. I will apply Bhabha's postcolonial conceptions of ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity to analyse these three subjects in order to explain Jia's submissiveness and subversiveness with regard to Western theology. I will argue that, on the one hand, in his own writings Jia directly translated Western theological writings into Chinese language, which reveals his submissiveness to Western

theological thought which was conveyed by missionaries. On the other hand, he transformed and contorted the Western theological writings and constructed his own theological discourse, which shows his subversiveness against Western theological thought/ideologies. Chapter six offers a comparison, which will reveal the uniqueness of Jia's theology with reference to the postcolonial concepts. C.T. Chao has been selected for comparison, as he was another key representative in Chinese churches during the first half of the twentieth century. Chapter seven is a concluding chapter which will demonstrate the research outcomes, the possible contributions and the need for further research.

1.4. Methodology

1.4.1 Historical Investigation

Historical investigation will be used in the research. Historians believe that one can find truth from knowing about the past, and original thought is possible only when the fundamental facts are mastered intelligently.⁷ My work in this thesis is concerned with the mission and church history of China, as historical investigation can provide important information for us to analyse Jia's theology, which was particularly influenced by Western missionaries. The historical materials are collected from periodicals at the Orchard Learning Resources Centre of the University of Birmingham, Selly Oak Campus, such as *The Chinese Recorder*, *Ching Feng*, *Student World*, *International Review of Mission*, *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, *China Christian Year Book* and *China Mission Year Book*. I consulted reports of conferences and meetings, including the China Centenary Missionary

⁷ F. Fussner, *The Historical Revolution, English Historical Writing and Thought 1580–1640* (London: Routledge, 1962), xvii.

Conference Committee in 1907, the National Christian Conference in 1922, and the Sixth Annual Meeting of the China Continuation committee in 1918-1919, in order to investigate Jia's participation in the Chinese Church in the first half of the twentieth century. Some materials were collected from the archives at the University of Hong Kong, the Chinese University of Hong Kong, the Special Collections and Archives of the Baptist University of Hong Kong and the Chinese Cultural Research Centre of the Hong Kong Alliance Bible Seminary.

1.4.2 Theological Investigation

The research will focus on Jia's theology. Jia had a considerable quantity of theological works published in articles and books. His *Shen Tao Xue* [The Study of Divinity], *Sheng Jing Yau Ye* [The Essential Meaning of the Bible], *Wan Quan Jiu Fa* [Perfect Salvation], *Jiao Mu Xue* [The Study of Ministry] etc. will be considered in order to analyse his theology with the postcolonial theories. Ecclesiology, christology, and soteriology are the major domains in Jia's theology. Jia discussed them in all his major theological works, and they reveal the character of anti-colonialist resistance; therefore, these three domains are selected for the study.⁸ I had no opportunity of interviewing Jia before he died in 1964. However, I have been able to correspond with one of Jia's friends, Li-gong Yu, through my personal network.⁹ It is hoped that oral history can provide some first-hand information for the study and help explore the meaning hidden between the lines in Jia's works, so that any bias of mine may be eliminated.

⁸ Although Jia's other theological thoughts, for instance, on Revelation, have similar characteristics, they are not selected for discussion due to their failure to reflect the main theme of Jia's theology thoroughly.

⁹ Li-gong Yu (1920–2010), a theological educator, who was the founder of the Christian Witness Theological Seminary in the USA.

1.4.3 Postcolonial Criticism and Jia's Theology

Postcolonial criticism will be applied to analyse Jia's theology in this thesis. I will argue that Bhabha's postcolonial conceptions of ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity are suitable tools for the study of Jia's theology. I will justify this methodological choice from historical and theoretical aspects.

1.4.3.1 The Colonial Context of Jia

Most postcolonial theories are developed from a former colony, and some of the best known postcolonial theorists – Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha – all belong to the non-Western world; so postcolonial theories are derived from non-Western origins and constructed by colonized experience. Jia's theological writings were developed in China in the first half of the twentieth century, when certain parts of China were governed by various countries. China, at that period, was deprived of social, economical, and political independence. Chinese society suffered serious intervention by the Western powers. Hence a colony-like context can be found in Jia's circumstances through both macroscopic and microscopic perspectives.

From a macroscopic perspective, historians regard China from 1840 to 1949 as a 'semi-colony' or 'hypo-colony', as China's sovereignty was seriously infringed by other countries. After the Nanjing Treaty, the first unequal treaty, was signed in 1842, China's political sovereignty was abidingly compromised. Before the collapse of the Manchu dynasty in 1911, China and Western powers signed a series of unequal treaties, which remained practically valid after the establishment of the Republic. Most of the major cities in China were financially and militarily controlled by foreign powers. In the 1920s, the imperialists from different countries continued their domination amid the divisions of the powerful warlords; from 1937 to 1945, Japan's

pan-Asian expansionist ambition launched its aggressive project relentlessly; from 1945 to 1949, a civil war was fought between the Kuomintang and Communists. Nevertheless, China, as a whole country, was not completely colonized by any particular foreign power, as happened to some Asian and African countries. Therefore scholars generally view China of this period as a 'semi-colony'.¹⁰ In fact, Sun Yat-sen, the leader of the Revolution in 1911, even classified China as a 'hypo-colony' by saying that 'China is not a colony of one nation, but of all; she is not a semi-colony, but a hypo-colony'.¹¹ Sun's words show that the situation of China was worse than that of a colony because China was not colonized by one country, but many countries simultaneously.

From a microscopic perspective, missionary enterprises can be regarded as the missionaries' 'small colonies' in China during the first half of the twentieth century, which was the context for the writing of Jia's theology. This argument can be analysed from two aspects; the aggressive attitude of missionaries and the practices in missionaries' enterprises. First, there was an expansionist ambition in missionary strategy that the Western Christians should conquer the land of China.¹² A survey, *The Christian Occupation of China*, recording the numerical strength and the geographical distribution of the Christian forces in China, conducted by the China Continuation Committee in 1922, can support this argument.¹³ Philip West argues

¹⁰ The topic of China as a semi-colony during the first half of the twentieth century, has been discussed in academic circles for years. See James Petras, 'Past, Present and Future of China: From Semi-colony to World Power,' *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 36/4 (2006), 423-441. Also Guang Xu and Jian-ying Fan, 'Zhong Guo Jin Dai Shi Liang Ban Hai Shi San Ban [Is modern China two halves or three halves?],' *History Monthly* 2(1996), 109-110; Hua-guo, Lin, 'Ye Tan Jin Dai Zhong Guo Ban Zhi Min Di Hua Yu Ban Feng Jian Hua Zhi Jian De Guan Xi – Li Shi Yue 'Liang Zhong Qu Xiang' Lun Zhi Yi [Relationship between Semi-colonization and Semi-feudalization in Modern China: A Further Discussion of Li Shiyue's Theme of Two Tendencies]'. *Journal of Peking University – Humanities and Social Sciences* 36/4 (1994), 43-48.

¹¹ Sun Yat Sen, *Dr. Sun Yat-Sen: His Life and Achievements* (Shanghai: Shanghai Mercury, 1927), 16.

¹² Philip West, *Yenching University and Sino-Western Relations, 1916–1952* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard U Press, 1976), 21-22.

¹³ West, *Yenching University and Sino-Western Relations*, 21-22.

that this expansionist ambition existed substantially and commonly among missionaries, the repeated usage of such aggressive words as ‘occupation’ aroused the mood of Chinese nationalism, and the cause of the anti-Christian movement in China during the 1920s was in part attributed to missionaries’ aggressive attitudes.¹⁴ Second, the Western missionaries possessed a dominating power in missionary enterprises, such as churches, schools, seminaries, hospitals, organizations etc., in which they had the absolute control of finance, and held the authority to interpret Christian doctrine. They neglected and devalued the virtues of indigenous cultures. Chinese pastors were not only deprived of a sense of independence in their churches, but also the Chinese Christians who worked with missionaries were upset by the way that missionaries worked in the enterprises and their attitudes. According to Y.L. Lee’s criticism, churches and mission schools were like small colonies, and the Christian spirit was actually absent.¹⁵

With the aggressive attitude and dominating practices in missionary enterprises, the spheres of influence of missionaries can best be described as their ‘colonies’ in China. This argument echoes Said’s interpretation of colonialization, i.e., ‘the practice, theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory’.¹⁶

A colony-like condition can be discovered in Jia’s context through macroscopic and microscopic perspectives, therefore I contend that the postcolonial theories constructed by colonial experience can be a suitable tool to investigate Jia’s theology.

¹⁴ West, *Yenching University and Sino-Western Relations*, 21-22.

¹⁵ Lee wrote, ‘Churches and mission schools have become like small colonies and Christians like foreign citizens...The true Christian spirit is lost and Chinese preachers are being controlled by foreigners and theology students have lost the sense of independence.’ Y.L. Lee, ‘The Anti-Christian Movement in Canton,’ *Chinese Recorder* Vol. 56/4 (Apr 1925), 224-225.

¹⁶ Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1993), 8.

1.4.3.2 Ambivalence, Mimicry and Hybridity

This study will apply Bhabha's theories of ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity to analyse Jia's theology in the colonial context of China during the first half of the twentieth century. These three conceptions are the typical examples which 'posited certain disabling contradictions within the colonial relationship', and 'revealed the inherent vulnerability of colonial discourse'.¹⁷ In other words, one would expect a sense of anti-colonialist resistance or subversive power to be found in the concepts. In chapters three to five of this thesis, Bhabha's construction will be applied in the analysis of the missionaries' theological discourse that was both translated and transformed by Jia during the first few decades of the twentieth century. Before the analyses of the theological works of Jia, I will illustrate the meaning of Bhabha's ambivalence, and how it relates to mimicry and hybridity, and intertwines with anti-colonist resistance.

Ambivalence

Bhabha's conception of 'ambivalence' is derived from Freudian analysis, and he elaborates it in his book, *The Location of Culture*.¹⁸ In psychology, ambivalence means two divergent instincts that exist at the same time. In postcolonial discourse, ambivalence can reveal that the colonial subjects experience irresolvable tensions between desire and derision simultaneously, as the colonized will not be simply entirely opposed to the colonizer but appears to be both 'complicit' and 'resistant' in the colonial discourse. The colonized is expected to be the compliant subject who imitates the colonizer's values and habits, which is regarded as mimicry by the colonizer. However, there is a plenty of evidence to show that the colonized turns out

¹⁷ Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies – The Key Concepts* (London and New York: Routledge, 2007), 37.

¹⁸ See Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 40-65.

to be an ambivalent subject whose mimicry is like a mockery. Bhabha gives an example of Charles Grant, a missionary who tried to teach Christianity in India in 1792. However, due to his concern for political stability, he blended the Christian doctrines with the divisive Indian caste system, which resulted in inaccurate translation of the Bible and ‘a false copy of English characters’.¹⁹

More noteworthy is that such ambivalence can bring disorder to the absolute authority of colonial domination by disrupting the binary relationship between colonizer and colonized. Bhabha wants to turn this indeterminacy of colonial discourse into an agency of counter-hegemonic resistance, as he contends that ‘the ambivalence at the source of traditional discourses on authority enables a form of subversion, founded on the undecidability that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention’.²⁰ Robert Young also suggests that the theory of ambivalence is a destruction of imperial discourse. Since the periphery is initially regarded as ‘the borderline, the marginal, the unclassifiable, the doubtful’ by the centre, now the centre is constituting itself with an ‘equivocal, indefinite, indeterminate ambivalence’.²¹ The conception of ambivalence is particularly important to this study, as it demonstrates how anti-colonialist resistance is possibly produced.²²

The ambivalence engendered in colonial discourse can create the instability of colonial power which may strengthen the anti-colonialist resistance. This

¹⁹ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 87.

²⁰ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 112.

²¹ Robert Young, *Colonial Desire – Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 161.

²² Young explains, ‘Thus Bhabha’s concern is to demonstrate an ambivalence in colonial and colonizing subjects by articulating the inner dissension with a colonial discourse structured according to the conflictual economy of the psyche. Without such instability of power, anti-colonialist resistance would itself be powerless. It is not Bhabha’s concern to focus on such resistance, but rather to show the hesitations and irresolution of what is being resisted.’ Robert Young, *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 186.

indeterminacy can be turned into an agency of counter-hegemonic resistance in colonial discourse. To constitute anti-colonialist resistance with the conception of ambivalence, we have to introduce another important concept of Bhabha – mimicry.

Mimicry

Bhabha regards mimicry as a mode of ambivalence that is able to fracture colonial discourse, and he contends that ‘mimicry emerges as one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge’.²³ It is an exclusive strategy deployed by the colonizer through acts of inclusion, and also it is a measure against rebellion by the inclusion of those who conform. In the colonial discourse, mimicry is the central project of a mission of civilization, converting the ‘primitive’ and ‘pagan’ natives to the conqueror’s civilization that is believed to be more advanced. According to Jacques Lacan, mimicry refers to ‘adaptation’.²⁴ However its meaning is converted into ‘subversiveness’ in Bhabha’s theory. Bhabha contends:

Mimicry reveals something in so far as it is distinct from what might be called an itself that is behind. The effect of mimicry is camouflage... It is not a question of harmonizing with the background, but against a mottled background, of becoming mottled – exactly like the technique of camouflage practiced in human warfare.²⁵

According to Bhabha, mimicry can be adopted by the colonized as a strategy of protecting themselves while they are confronted with the colonizer. The colonized may make use of this strategy to fracture the colonial discourse and to undertake anti-colonial resistance.

²³ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 85.

²⁴ Jacques Lacan, *Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, trans. Alan Sheridan (London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1977), 99-100.

²⁵ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 85.

Furthermore, Bhabha argues that colonial mimicry is unavoidably embedded in the sphere of ambivalence, in which mimicry is defined as ‘a difference that is almost the same, but not quite’.²⁶ The process of ‘repetition’ in colonial mimicry is accompanied by differentiation in the sense that a ‘good’ colonized, and a part-object of the metonymy, is only partly the same as the colonizer. In other words, mimicry is formed when the sameness of the colonizer slides into the otherness, and their traces are partly found in the midst of the colonized. The sameness and difference of mimicry characterize its ambivalence.

Besides, ambivalence hidden in colonial mimicry can stabilize and destabilize the colonial power and authority simultaneously.²⁷ The purpose of the civilizing mission with respect to mimicry is aimed at subjugating the colonial state. In the case of colonial India, the colonizer stabilized their colonial power and authority by training a group of translators. However, the mimicry also had potential to be a mockery, because if the colonial mimicry is successful, the colonized who have been trained can threaten the colonial authority by what they learn from the colonizer. When the colonized make use of the training as an anti-colonialist resistance, mimicry may engender a destabilizing effect also. These contradicting effects of mimicry exactly show the meaning of its ambivalence.

In addition, Bhabha argues that the intention of the colonizer in a colonial discourse is influenced by the emergence of mimic objects, and the colonial authority or power

²⁶ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86.

²⁷ Bhabha gives an example of the colonized Indian to explain the meaning of ambivalence. Bhabha writes, ‘[The] class of person of Indian in blood and color, but English in tastes, in opinions, in moral and in intellect – in other words a mimic man raised in the missionary English School during the period of colonial India to form a corps of translators and be employed in different departments of Labour.’ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 87.

will be disrupted by the practice of mimicry. Before the colonizer activates the mimicry, he/she believes that the colonizer ontologically is superior to him/her, therefore the inferior should be governed and the colonial authority should be maintained legitimately. However, if the colonial mimicry is successful, the difference between colonizer and colonized will be naturally narrowed down, the colonizer's superiority will become 'blurred', and the otherness of the Other is weakened correspondingly.²⁸ The intrinsic ambivalence is embedded in the course of colonial mimicry, since its components are conflicting to each other. On the one hand, the exercise of the colonizer's power demonstrates the colonizer's superiority in the sense that he/she is ontologically different from the colonized, justifying that the colonized should be subjugated by the colonizer. On the other hand, the acts of civilizing the Other will reduce the difference between the colonizer and the colonized, which creates difficulties in identifying the existence of the Other, so that the colonizer's superiority is found to be less superior than before and it brings subversiveness in the colonial discourse. The colonial premise and its outcome are obviously in conflict. Again, it demonstrates the ambivalence of colonial mimicry.

As mimicry is a mode of ambivalence, one would expect the anti-colonialist resistance embedded in ambivalence to be found in mimicry. In this regard, McLeod acutely points out that:

The colonized has the power to menace the colonizers because they threaten(ed) to disclose the ambivalence of the discourse of colonialism which the use of stereotypes anxiously tries to conceal. Hearing their language returning through the mouths of the colonized,

²⁸ Bhabha asserts that all identities are formed by the 'otherness' of the Other, which means an identity will not be formed until one encounters the other who is different from him/her. In other words, a colonizer's identity can only be constituted by realizing the difference of the colonized. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 44-45.

the colonizers are faced with the *worrying threat of resemblance* between colonizer and colonized.... It is a source of anti-colonial discourse in that it presents an unconquerable challenge to the entire structure of the discourse of colonialism.²⁹

When the colonized threaten to disclose the ambivalence of colonial discourse, they can menace the colonizers. When the resemblance is found between colonizer and colonized, i.e., by mimicry, the colonized can challenge the colonial discourse and make the colonizer feel worried. Obviously, it is a kind of anti-colonialist resistance.

In regard to the application of Bhabha's postcolonial theories, I argue that mimicry and ambivalence can be applied to Jia's theology. Firstly, ambivalence, as an inner dissension in a colonial discourse, is found embedded in Jia's theology. Jia did not simply oppose the missionary theology, but he combines 'complicity' and 'resistance' together in his theological writings. This is reflected in his ecclesiology. Not only did Jia imitate Western theology while he constructed his theology, but he also transformed and contorted the Western theology, resulting in 'differences, and slight alterations and displacements' which Bhabha regards as significant in the process of subversion.³⁰

Secondly, Bhabha's colonial mimicry can be applied to analyse Jia's theology, as Jia's theological discourse tallies with the definition of Bhabha's mimicry: a difference that is almost the same, but not quite. Jia's theology is not only a 'repetition' of Western theology, but also a deviation in its originality. Jia's theology is derived or imported from the missionaries' theological discourse; however, he makes transformations and

²⁹ John McLeod, *Beginning Postcolonialism* (Manchester and New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 54-55.

³⁰ Homi Bhabha, 'Translator translated: W.J.T. Mitchell talks with Homi Bhabha,' *Artforum* 33/7 (1995), 82.

contortions in his discourse. Jia's mimic theology is partly the same as the missionaries' theological discourse, and the traces of imitation are only partly found, which carry the meaning of Bhabha's 'sameness' and 'difference'.

In addition, the ambivalence embedded in mimicry, as mentioned, can stabilize and destabilize the colonial power and authority simultaneously; this intrinsic ambivalence is also found in the mimicry of Jia's theology. The exportation of Western theology is accompanied by the missionary intention of converting the 'pagan' natives to the holy religion of the conqueror; and missionaries regarded the Western theology as the only way to understand Christian faith. Faced with this sense of superiority of the Western missionaries, the Chinese Christians, like Jia, did not have an alternative except to learn Western theology. After learning the colonizer's theology, however, Jia's mimic theological discourse, for instance his *Shen Dao Xue*, enabled him to enhance the development of Chinese indigenous theology and to diminish the importance of Western theology in Chinese churches. This nurtures Jia's mimic theological discourse which contains the subversiveness rooted in the colonial ambivalence.

Hybridity

Ambivalence is related to another of Bhabha's important concepts, hybridity, which connects directly to the discussion of Bhabha's anti-colonialist resistance. To discuss the concept of hybridity, the term 'third space' has to be introduced because the two conceptions accompany each other.

According to Bhabha, hybridity exists in a third space that is a site of translation and negotiation in cultural encounter, its concept is useful for analysing the invalidity of dualistic categories as it goes beyond the boundary of colonial binary thinking and

oppositional positioning, such as centre/periphery, colonizer/colonized, powerful/powerless, black/white etc. Bhabha contends that 'by exploring this third space, we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves'.³¹ This borderline culture of hybridity is a powerful and creative 'space' in which 'newness' enters the world and the authority of the dominant discourse is subverted.³² It is important to note that the hybrid subject can negotiate inside the space that is neither one culture nor the other 'but something else besides, which contests the terms and territories of both' by a dialogic process,³³ in which cultural elements encounter and transform each other. It results in the uniqueness of hybridity being produced in terms of dual category.³⁴ This hybrid third space is an ambivalent site where cultural meaning and representation are revealed to have no 'primordial unity or fixity'.³⁵ Young acutely remarks on its character that:

[H]ybridity makes difference into sameness, and sameness into difference, but in a way that makes the same no longer the same, the different no longer simply different.³⁶

In the colonial discourse, hybridity can be characterized by colonial mimicry and subversive intention. Hybridity is a phenomenon by which the colonial governing authority works to translate the identity of the colonized (the Other) within a singular universal framework, but then fails, thus producing something familiar but new.³⁷ Such a phenomenon is characterized by the main thrust of colonial mimicry, i.e., a difference that is almost the same, but not quite, whereby the anti-colonial resistance,

³¹ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 39.

³² Rumi Sakamoto, 'Japan, Hybridity and the Creation of Colonialist Discourse,' *Theory, Culture and Society* 13/3 (1996), 116.

³³ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 28.

³⁴ Nikos Papastergiadis, 'Tracing Hybridity in Theory' in *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*, ed. P. Werbner and T. Modood (London and New Jersey: Zed Books, 1997), 258.

³⁵ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 37.

³⁶ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 26.

³⁷ Papastergiadis, 'Tracing Hybridity in Theory,' 258.

rooted in mimicry, can be also found in hybridization. As mentioned above, Bhabha articulates that a colonial power is the production of hybridization, the ambivalence enables a form of subversion which is founded on the undecidability that turns the dominated discursive conditions into the grounds of intervention.³⁸ Hybridity is inevitably characterized by the discourse of subversion.

How does hybridity become an operational resistance? Bhabha adopts Mikhail Bakhtin's insights on how the hybridity of social languages can work to undermine the single-voiced authority of authoritative discourse.³⁹ For Bhabha, hybridity becomes:

[T]he moment in which the discourse of colonial authority loses its univocal grip on meaning and finds itself open to the trace of the language of the other, enabling the critic to trace complex movements of a disarming alterity in the colonial text.⁴⁰

In the moment of hybridity the discourse of colonial authority not only loses its univocal grip on meaning, but also the authority will be transformed and contorted by the colonized. Bhabha further articulates that the colonized can return the language of authority to the colonizer with altering it, and this 'splitting' of the language of authority can destroy the 'calculations of the empowered, and allow the disempowered to calculate strategies' by which they are oppressed and to use that knowledge in structuring resistance.⁴¹ Bhabha believes that 'small differences' and 'slight alterations and displacements' are often the most significant elements in a process of subversion.⁴² Thus, in regard to subversiveness, Bhabha insists that it is not necessary to practise resistance in oppositional form, because resistance can be an

³⁸ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 112.

³⁹ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 21.

⁴⁰ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 21.

⁴¹ Bhabha, 'Translator translated', 82.

⁴² Bhabha, 'Translator translated', 82.

effect of ambivalence in the colonial discourse. He writes:

[R]esistance is not necessarily an oppositional act of political intention, nor is it the simple negation or exclusion of the ‘content’ of another culture, as a difference once perceived. It is the effect of an ambivalence produced within the rules of recognition of dominating discourses as they articulate the signs of cultural difference and reimplicate them within the deferential relations of colonial power-hierarchy, normalization, marginalization and so forth.⁴³

Therefore, hybridity can be found as an operational resistance, if difference, alternation and displacement are introduced to the colonial discourse.

Furthermore, some ‘denied knowledges’ of the colonized will inevitably enter the dominant discourse in the hybridization which takes place when the colonizer and the colonized encounter each other. The ‘knowledges’ are particularly important because they can signify the rooted ambivalence which reveals the meaning of ‘difference into sameness, and sameness into difference’, and become a force of subversion or an anti-colonial resistance in the colonial discourse. As a resistant strategy, Bhabha defines it as:

[A] problematic of colonial representation and individuation that reverses the effects of the colonialist disavowal, which results in other ‘denied’ knowledges can enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of its authority – its rules of recognition.⁴⁴

An unavoidable effect of exercising colonial power is hybridization, in which the ‘denied knowledges’ of the colonized can be inscribed in the domination of colonial discourse, which causes the colonizer’s dominance to be challenged in the end. While the two cultures are encountering each other, the translation, transformation and distortion will emerge in a space of hybridity, generating subversiveness within the

⁴³ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 110.

⁴⁴ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 114.

colonial discourse.

With regard to the conception of hybridity applying to Jia's theology, Jia's theology is found in a hybrid site, where Western theology and Chinese context encounter each other. With the feature of 'the difference into sameness, and sameness into difference', Jia's theological discourse can be negotiated inside the hybrid site, and can result in a new theological entity. The 'newness' of Jia's theological discourse is derived from the transformation and contortion of the Western theological discourse and the indigenous elements of Jia's context, i.e., the denied knowledges. If Bhabha's 'small differences' and 'slight alterations and displacements' are the significant elements in the process of subversion, Jia's mimic theological discourse, featuring ambivalence, i.e., the sameness and difference, can be regarded as an anti-colonialist resistance in the site of hybridity.

After discussing the conceptions of ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity, it can be seen that Bhabha is trying to convert the 'indeterminacy' of colonial discourse into an agency of counter-hegemonic resistance. Instead of deploying the external confrontation, the anti-colonialist resistance can be regarded as an 'implosion', as it is a kind of resistance engendered from inside the colonial dominance. This notion is important in the study, since such implosion – the anti-colonialist resistance – is found in Jia's theological discourse, which will be demonstrated in chapters three, four and five of the thesis.

1.5 Definition of Terms

1.5.1 Postcolonialism

Different academic disciplines have different definitions of postcolonialism. Each discipline has different meanings, and not all are applicable to each other. The prefix 'post' in the thesis does not only mean 'after' but also 'beyond', indicating a particular direction and intention of interpreting a text or a context. Segovia Fernando explains the 'postcolonial' in two ways: it covers 'a temporal (what follows the colonial) as well as a critical application (what questions the colonial)'.⁴⁵ The first application, referring to the elements of times and regions, concerns the 'period of time following the formal separation or "independence" of a "colony" or group of colonies from a governing empire'.⁴⁶ It is significant that 'independence' did not solve the problem of imperialism, and some other forms of colonialism still exist in the former colonies. The concepts of 'neo-colonialism' and 'neo-imperialism' are introduced to illustrate the situation of this informal subjugation of a sovereign state. The former colonies may claim political independence, but the imperialists can also wield power with their neo-colonial agencies.⁴⁷

The 'post', referring to critical application, in postcolonialism suggests an intention of moving beyond colonialism with all its forms. It indicates the prolonging effects of imperialism, both for the colonizer and the colonized. More importantly, postcolonialism can be regarded as a discourse of resistance against the dominant power.⁴⁸ Through the application of postcolonialism, we can see that Christian

⁴⁵ Fernando Segovia, 'Interpreting beyond Borders: Postcolonial Studies and Diasporic Studies in Biblical Criticism,' in *Interpreting beyond Borders*, ed. Fernando Segovia (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 12.

⁴⁶ Fernando Segovia, 'Interpreting beyond Borders,' 12.

⁴⁷ Robert Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 3.

⁴⁸ In this regard, R.S. Sugirtharajah states, 'Postcolonial discourse is not about the territorial ejection of imperial powers or about learning, Caliban-like, the art of cursing the evils of empire. Rather, it is an

theology could be utilized as a discourse of colonization by the colonizer and as an anti-colonial resistance by the colonized. The thesis will highlight the conception of interrogating hegemonic systems, and will be concerned with the discursive domination in Jia's theology. It provides an alternative reading to Jia's theological discourse through postcolonialism, so that we can explore the content which is blurred by the discursive domination. Young's approach may sum up the application of postcolonialism in the thesis:

Much of postcolonial theory is not so much about static ideas or practices, as about the relations between ideas and practices: relations of harmony, relations of conflict, generative relations between different peoples and their cultures. Postcolonialism is about a changing world, a world that has been changed by struggle and which its practitioners intend to change further.⁴⁹

1.5.2 Submissiveness and Subversiveness

Submissiveness means someone allowing 'another person or group to have power or authority over him/her',⁵⁰ and subversiveness refers someone who tries to 'destroy or weaken something, especially an established political system'.⁵¹ Literally they are antonymous to each other. However, in Bhabha's theories they are applied both to describe the complex combination of attraction and repulsion in colonial discourse, and to explain the relationship between colonizer and colonized who are never simply and completely opposed to each other. Bhabha suggests that an ambivalence, like

active interrogation of the hegemonic systems of thought, textual codes, and symbolic practices. In other words, postcolonialism is concerned with the question of cultural and discursive domination.' R.S. Sugirtharajah, *Asian Biblical Hermeneutics and Postcolonialism, Bible and Liberation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998), 17.

⁴⁹ Robert Young, *Post-colonialism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP, 2003), 7.

⁵⁰ Definition of Submissiveness [document on-line]; available from *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* website (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=79398&dict=CALD>); accessed 25 April 2009.

⁵¹ Definition of Subversiveness [document on-line]; available from *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* website (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=79543&dict=CALD>); accessed 25 April 2009.

submissiveness and subversiveness, exists in a fluctuating relation among the colonial subjects. He regards the ‘differences, alternations and displacements’ as the subversive elements in colonial mimicry.⁵² In contrast, the sameness which appeared in the colonial mimicry could be regarded as the submissive element. This thesis will analyse this ambivalent meaning in Jia’s theology.

1.5.3 Anti-colonialist resistance

Anti-colonialism is a theory that discusses how the colonized fight against colonialism, in which various forms of opposition become articulated as a resistance to the operations of colonialism.⁵³ Ironically, anti-colonialist resistance often deploys subverting forms that borrow from the institutions of the colonizer and turn them back on them. Anti-colonialism frequently regards resistance as the product of a definite relationship in which colonizer and colonized are in unchangeable opposition. However, it is not the feature of settled colonies, in which a more obvious form of complicity takes place between the colonial subjects. With a colony-like situation in China, the anti-colonialist resistance in Jia’s theological discourse has an obvious complicit form, as Jia adopts the Western theology which is derived from the institutions of the colonizer to develop the transformed and distorted version that his theology represents.

1.6 Research Contribution

By applying postcolonial theory, the present study can explore the hidden content that has been neglected by scholars in Jia’s theology. Previous studies on Jia’s theology

⁵² Bhabha, ‘Translator translated,’ 82.

⁵³ Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, *Post-Colonial Studies – The Key Concepts*, 11.

have always been confined to the spectrum of systematic theology, investigating and analysing Jia's key theological thoughts and their connections only.⁵⁴ These studies are not concerned about the colonial context of Jia's theology. However, this study aims to analyse Jia's theology with postcolonial theories, so that the content of Jia's theology which is blurred by discursive domination can be explored.

The current study may provide a new perspective to interpret Jia's theology, which goes beyond the boundary of binarism. In the analysis of previous studies, Jia's theology is always restrained by binary language, such as liberalism/conservatism, or modernism/fundamentalism. This language confines Jia to being either a conservative or a fundamentalist. However, postcolonial theory can explore the ambivalence and the hybridity of Jia's theology which is no longer constrained by binary language. Current critics have not discussed this aspect before. With postcolonial theory, we may understand Jia's theology from another perspective, resulting in a new insight for interpreting his theology. It launches a distinctive approach to the study of Jia's theology.

⁵⁴ The examples are: Wei-lian Guo, 'Ling Yi Yu Zheng Jie Jia Yu Ming Shi Jing Fang Fa Chu Tan [Spiritual Meaning and Right Interpretation: The Hermeneutical Approaches of Chia Yu Ming],' *Jian Dao* 7 (Jan 1997), 191-233; Guo, 'Jiu En Yu Sheng Ming: Jia Yu Ming Yi Ji Du Wei Zhong Xin De Shen Xue Lun Shu [Salvation and Life: A Reflection on Chia Yu Ming's Christocentric Theology],' *Journal of China Graduate School of Theology* 34 (Jan 2003), 55-93; and Guo, *Fan Dui He Yi?: Jia Yu Ming, Ji Yao Zhu Yi Yu He Yi Yun Dong De Jiu Jie* [Advocating Separatism? Chia Yu Ming, Fundamentalist and their Difficulties in Chinese Church Union Movement](Hong Kong: Tien Dao Pub. House, 2002).

CHAPTER 2

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF YU-MING JIA AND THE CONTEXTS OF HIS THEOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to provide some background information on Jia and his theology. Firstly, it will provide a biographical sketch of Jia. Secondly, it will discuss Jia's background from theological and historical perspectives. From the theological background, it will discuss; the theology of the Reformation, Chinese fundamentalism, and the social concerns of Chinese theology. From the historical background, it will discuss; the domination of missionaries, and the union and the independent movement of Chinese churches. Jia's background was influential in nurturing his theology.

2.1 Yu-ming Jia (1880–1964)

Yu-ming Jia was born in Shantung province in China in 1880. He became an influential evangelical pastor, biblical scholar, hymn composer, journal editor and theological educator of Chinese Protestant churches during the first half of the twentieth century. According to Martin A. Hopkins, Jia was a well-known professor and theology teacher, and a gifted preacher and author.⁵⁵ With a variety of professions, Jia was regarded as the best Chinese biblical scholar of his generation, and he earned the reputation from his followers as 'The Teacher of Reverends, and 'one of a few qualified Chinese theologians and theological educators in China and a respected

⁵⁵ Martin A. Hopkins, 'The Present Situation in North Kiangsu,' *The Presbyterian Survey* (February 1929), 89. Martin A. Hopkins was a Presbyterian missionary, and a faculty member of North China Theological Seminary from 1917 to 1951.

God's servant'.⁵⁶ Jun-ying Zhao, who was Jia's colleague at the seminary during the 1940s, stated that Jia was a leading authority on theology and an expert of exegesis from the 1920s to the 1940s.⁵⁷ Jia's *Shen Dao Xue* (The Study of Divinity) was published in 1921. It was the first Chinese publication of systematic theology and was regarded by Chinese conservatives as an important piece of work. In addition, it was the only text book written by a Chinese theologian and generally adopted by local seminaries.⁵⁸ Before the Sino-Japanese War in 1937, *Shen Dao Xue* had been published in six editions. This demonstrates that this book was very popular among Chinese Christians before the 1940s.⁵⁹ Besides *Shen Dao Xue*, Jia also wrote a number of biblical commentaries and contributed extensively to biblical hermeneutics for Chinese churches.⁶⁰

According to Li-gong Yu, Jia was converted to Christianity while he was a teenager.⁶¹ Jia studied in Dengzhou College (Tungchow College),⁶² the predecessor of Shantung Christian University that was established by an American Presbyterian missionary couple, Calvin Mateer and Julia Mateer, in 1881.⁶³ Calvin Mateer was Jia's teacher. Jia finished his college education in 1900 and his theological training in 1903 at

⁵⁶ Yi-cheng Chen, 'Rev. Chia Yu-ming and China Devotional Seminary in Sichuan,' *Nanjing Theological Review* 11 (February 1990), 103; Xue-li Zhang, 'In Memory of Rev. Chia Yu-Ming,' *Jin Ling Shen Xue Zhi* [Jinling Theological Review] 8 (April 1988), 59.

⁵⁷ Jun-Ying Zhao, *Man Tan Wu Shi Nian Lai Zhong Guo De Jiao Hui Yu Zheng Zhi* [A Talk on Church and Politics of China in the Past 50 Years] (Taipei: Chinese for Christ, Inc. Ministries, 1981), 157. Zhao is one of the founders of the Singapore Bible College.

⁵⁸ Rong-hong Lin, *A Half-Century of Chinese Theology 1900-1949* (Hong Kong: China Graduate School of Theology, 1998), 146.

⁵⁹ Lin, *A Half-Century of Chinese Theology*, 400.

⁶⁰ Jia's biblical commentaries, at least those known at present, include: The Essential Meaning of the Bible – Pentateuch, Books of History, Books of Wisdom, Books of Major Prophets; Leviticus; Deuteronomy; 1 and 2 Chronicles; Psalms; Song of Songs; Isaiah; Daniel; Gospel of John; Acts; Romans; Ephesians; Philippians; Hebrews; Revelation, and one for the New Testament.

⁶¹ Li-gong Yu, friend of Yu-ming Jia, a private letter to the author, 17 March 2009.

⁶² D.W. Richardson, 'Appreciation,' in Yu-ming Jia, *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ* (Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1921; reprint 1990), Preface.

⁶³ Charles Hodge Corbett, *Shantung Christian University – Cheeloo* (New York: United Board for Christian Colleges in China, 1955), 25.

Dengzhou College.⁶⁴ Jia then, served in Presbyterian churches for twelve years and was ordained as a Presbyterian pastor in this period. S. L. Zheng recorded that Jia baptized more than a thousand believers in his ministry.⁶⁵ From 1916 to 1936 he taught at Nanjing Theological Seminary⁶⁶ and was the vice-president of North China Theological Seminary.⁶⁷ He was awarded the Doctor of Divinity by the Presbyterian Westminster College in Missouri, USA. Hopkins claimed, 'It is a well deserved honor. The man honors the degree rather than the reverse.'⁶⁸

In 1936, due to a theological dispute between W.H. Hayes, the president of NCTS who advocated post- or nil-millennialism, and Jia who supported the pre-millennialism, Jia left the NCTS.⁶⁹ Nevertheless, Hayes and Jia still maintained their friendship.⁷⁰ Jia then established the China Devotional Seminary in Nanjing.⁷¹ With the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War in 1937, CDS was moved to Sichuan.⁷² During the war, the number of students in CDS declined, and there were only twenty to thirty students.⁷³ After the war ended in 1945, CDS remained in Sichuan for another four years, then it was moved to Shanghai in 1949.⁷⁴

⁶⁴ D.W. Richardson, 'Appreciation,' Preface; S.L. Zheng, 'Dr Jia Yu-Ming whom I know,' in *Asian Christians You Should Know: Short, Vivid Biographies of Some Outstanding Asians*, ed. Y.L. Liu (Hong Kong: Christian Witness Press, 1967), 66. Zheng was Jia's student in the 1930s, they kept in contact after Zheng had finished his seminary training. In a letter written by Jia to Zheng, Jia called Zheng 'my real son'. Zheng and Jia had a prolonged friendship.

⁶⁵ Zheng, 'Dr Jia Yu-Ming whom I know,' 67.

⁶⁶ Hereafter cited as NTS.

⁶⁷ Hereafter cited as NCTS.

⁶⁸ Martin Hopkins, 'The Present Situation in North Kiangsu,' 89. The title of 'Dr' had been accorded to Jia in the *Chinese Recorder* since 1930.

⁶⁹ Yu, a private letter to the author, 17 March 2009.

⁷⁰ Yu, a private letter to the author, 17 March 2009.

⁷¹ Hereafter cited as CDS.

⁷² Shi-jie Zha, *Concise Biographies of Important Chinese Christians* (Taipei: China Evangelical Seminary Press, 1983), 114-115; S.L. Zheng, 'Dr Jia Yu-Ming whom I know,' 67; Yi-Cheng Chen, 'Rev. Chia Yu-Ming and China Devotional Seminary in Sichuan,' 103.

⁷³ Yi-Cheng Chen, 'Rev. Chia Yu-Ming and China Devotional Seminary in Sichuan,' 103-104.

⁷⁴ S.L. Zheng, 'Dr Jia Yu-Ming whom I know,' 71-72.

In 1948, Jia attended the International Council of Christian Churches in Holland and was elected as the vice-chairman of the Council.⁷⁵ After the People's Republic of China was established in 1949, the communist government undertook a programme of religious manipulation over churches. One of the major policies was that all the Chinese churches had to cut their connections with foreign churches in order to inhibit any influence of imperialism. In July 1954, although Jia was appointed as the vice-chairman of the Three-self Patriotic Movement Committee of the Protestant Churches in China, he was unwilling to accept the appointment.⁷⁶ From 1954 to 1964, the last ten years of his life, Jia was politically isolated and was frequently monitored by the government, and the CDS was forced to close down.⁷⁷ His family also suffered from political oppression.⁷⁸ Jia died on 12 April 1964 in Shanghai at the age of eighty-four. Zha, a contemporary historian of Chinese churches, concluded that:

As to the contribution of Jia's theological writings, Jia has the record of the best quality and the greatest quantity among Chinese pastors in the last hundred years, and that what Jia achieved in his life would be the best model for Chinese Christians in the coming ages.⁷⁹

Fu-zeng Xing commented on Jia's writing as one of the major theological resources for contemporary Chinese Protestant churches.⁸⁰ Jia-lin Liang regarded him as the pioneer of Chinese theology in the 1920s.⁸¹ Xi-yi Yao described Jia as one of the top conservative Chinese systematic theologians, exegetes and educators,⁸² and Zhao

⁷⁵ S.L. Zheng, 'Dr Jia Yu-Ming whom I know,' 77; Shi-jie Zha, *Concise Biographies of Important Chinese Christians*, 116.

⁷⁶ S.L. Zheng, 'Dr Jia Yu-Ming whom I know,' 77; Shi-jie Zha, *Concise Biographies of Important Chinese Christians*, 118.

⁷⁷ Tianyue, 'Reverend Jia Yu-Ming – the record of latter part of his life,' *China and the Gospel* 6 (May-June 1995), 18, 20.

⁷⁸ Tianyue, 'Reverend Jia Yu-Ming,' 18-20.

⁷⁹ Shi-jie Zha, *Concise Biographies of Important Chinese Christians*, 116, 119.

⁸⁰ Fu-zeng Xing, *Xun Suo Ji Du Jiao De Du Te Xing: Zhao Zi Chen Shen Xue Lun Ji* [In Search of the Uniqueness of Christianity: Essays on T.C. Chao's Theology] (Hong Kong: Alliance Bible Seminary, 2003), xi.

⁸¹ Jia-lin Liang, *Pai Huai Yu Ye Ru Zhi Jian* [In between Confucius and Christianity] (Taipei: Yu Zhou Guang, 1997), 296. Another theologian who is regarded as a pioneer is C.T. Chao.

⁸² Xi-yi Yao, *The Fundamentalist Movement among Protestant Missionaries in China, 1920–1937*

introduced him as ‘the doyen of theology in China from the 1920s to the 1940s’.⁸³

2.2 The Background of Yu-ming Jia

In this section, we are going to discuss Jia’s background from the theological and historical perspectives. Jia’s background is thought to be influential in developing his theology.

2.2.1 Theological Background

2.2.1.1 The Theology of the Reformation

Jia developed his own theology based on the framework of the tradition of Reformation theology, particularly in regard to christology and soteriology. Two prominent Reformed theologians, John Calvin and Martin Luther, contend that christology and soteriology are intimately connected, and emphasize that humans cannot understand the personhood of Christ unless they receive the redemption of Jesus Christ through his salvific act. This linkage of christology and soteriology substantially influences Jia’s theology, as is shown in *Shen Dao Xue*. He combined christology and soteriology in his theology.

Jia, as a Presbyterian Chinese theologian, was influenced by Calvinist tradition. In Calvin’s theology, christology and soteriology are intimately connected. According to Calvin, humans should not fix their faith on the essence of Christ only, because it will not bring benefit to them. If humans disregard Christ’s office of salvation, they can

(Lanham, Maryland: University of Press of America, 2003), 159.

⁸³ Jun-Ying Zhao, *Man Tan Wu Shi Nian Lai Zhong Guo De Jiao Hui Yu Zheng Zhi* [A Talk on Church and Politics of China in the Past 50 years], 157. Jun-ying Zhao (1906–1996) was Jia’s colleague in 1944–1946.

only see the shadow of Christ.⁸⁴

To know who Christ is, the only way is to recognize his salvific office. Thus, Calvin's discussions of Christ's personhood must always be seen in the context of 'Christ's salvific office' towards humankind.⁸⁵ In addition, Calvin insists that there could be no redemption if there was no work of Jesus Christ, and the person and work of Jesus Christ are 'of central importance to the divine plan of salvation'.⁸⁶

Calvin argues that discussions of Christ's personhood have to focus on Christ's salvific office and the divine plan of salvation. Human can know the personhood of Christ only by 'attending to his power and office', and receiving his redemption and salvation.

In regard to the relationship between christology and soteriology, Luther's point of view is basically the same as Calvin's. Paul Althaus comments that Luther's christology is equivalent to his soteriology.⁸⁷ Marc Lienhard also articulates that Luther explores different questions about the person of Christ and the christological tradition of the church. In regard to the discussion of christology and soteriology, two

⁸⁴ Calvin writes, 'And, indeed, faith ought not to be fixed on the essence of Christ alone, (so to speak,) but ought to attend to his power and office; for it would be of little advantage to know who Christ is. . . . The reason why the Papists have nothing more than a shadow of Christ is, that they have been careful to look at his mere essence, but have disregarded his kingdom, which consists in the power to save.' John Calvin, *Commentary on the Gospel According to John (1:49)*, trans. William Pringle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950) [document on-line]; available at Center for Reformed Theology and Apologetics website (<http://www.reformed.org/books/index.html>), accessed on 29 April 2009.

⁸⁵ Stephen Edmondson, *Calvin's Christology* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 193.

⁸⁶ Alister McGrath, *A Life of John Calvin: A Study in the Shaping of Western Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1990), 161. Calvin argues that 'all that we have hitherto said of Christ leads to this one result, that condemned, dead, and lost in ourselves, we must in him seek righteousness, deliverance, life and salvation. . . . The name of Jesus was not given him at random, or fortuitously, or by the will of man, but. . . for he shall save his people from their sins.' John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion (Book 2, Ch 16, Section 1)*, trans. Henry Beveridge [document on-line]; available at Center for Reformed Theology and Apologetics website (<http://www.reformed.org/books/index.html>), accessed on 29 April 2009.

⁸⁷ Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 265.

issues in certain respects are the same.⁸⁸

Luther emphasizes that it is faith alone in the mere mercy of God through Christ that fully saves the human, and no works are necessary for one to attain salvation, and humans who have been saved can experience Christ's revelation and his communion with them.⁸⁹ For Luther, Christ's salvation and his revelation are inseparable.⁹⁰

According to Luther and Calvin, christology and soteriology are intimately connected, and humans cannot know Christ unless they are saved by the mercy of God through Christ.

In Jia's christology, he emphasizes that the discussion of christology is inseparable from that of soteriology. Jia emphasizes that Christ is the Salvation, and Salvation is the Christ, in which 'the success of salvation is in the works of Jesus; the foundation of salvation is in the works of Jesus'.⁹¹ Thus Jia's discussion of christology and soteriology is very similar to those of Luther and Calvin. Although this linkage of theological thoughts substantially influences Jia's theology, Jia does not simply 'translate' the theology of the Reformation, but 'contorts' it by combining another theological thought – dispensationalism – in his own theological discourse, so that he may create a 'new theological entity'. We will discuss Jia's christology with the

⁸⁸ Lienhard writes, 'it is important from the beginning to stress the intimate link between Christology, reflection about the person of Christ. These two aspects of the mystery of Christ are really inseparable: one might even say, in certain respects, that they are identical.' Marc Lienhard, *Luther: Witness to Jesus Christ*, trans. Edwin Robertson (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982), 371.

⁸⁹ Martin Luther, *Select Works of Martin Luther*, trans. Henry Cole (London: Simpkin & Marshall, 1826), 31.

⁹⁰ Luther writes, 'For whoever is a Christian, knows that this revelation of Christ is in his own experience.... For he that is a Christian, enters into communion with Christ and all his benefits.' Luther, *Select Works of Martin Luther*, 294.

⁹¹ Yu-ming Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* [The Study of Divinity] vol. 1-3 (Taipei: Christian Evangelistic Mission, 1962), 409.

‘translation and distortion’ in terms of Bhabha’s postcolonial theories in chapter four.

2.2.1.2 Chinese Fundamentalism

Jia was regarded as a Chinese fundamentalist theologian of the first half of the twentieth century.⁹² He was trained in a conservative theological seminary, and taught by Calvin Mateer, M.A. Hopkins, and Watson Hayes, who were prominent fundamentalist missionaries. While Jia was actively engaged in the Chinese fundamentalist movement, fundamentalist missionaries might still be able to take the lead in the movement. Fundamentalism not only provided the framework for Jia to construct his own theology, but also influenced his theology, particularly in regard to christology.

Missionaries dominated the Chinese fundamentalist movement during the first half of the twentieth century by supplying human and financial resources to fundamentalist organizations. As early as the beginning of the nineteenth century, China was regarded as one of the major mission fields in the world. Mission societies in North America and Europe invested enormous human and financial resources in China. While missionaries were preaching the gospel in China, they were also spreading their own theologies. In the early decades of the twentieth century, conservative and liberal missionaries not only introduced different theologies to China, but also brought their own controversy between liberalism and fundamentalism from the Western world to their mission fields. The fundamentalist movement in China was not an independent

⁹² Fundamentalism has a high view of Bible and its major tenet is that the Bible is inerrant. This was supported by two approaches: the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures at their origin, and the literal interpretation of the Scriptures in their use. In response to verbal inspiration, the fundamentalists regard Scripture as the word of God, which can be regarded as the criterion for judging the secular world. See George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), and James Barr, *Fundamentalism* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978).

incident, but was a part of the larger international fundamentalist movement.⁹³ In their battles against the modernists, fundamentalist missionaries established a number of inter-denominational organizations. The Bible Union of China and the League of Christian Churches were fundamentalist alliances. The NCTS was a fundamentalist seminary, and the China Sunday School was a fundamentalist publisher. In that period, the League of Christian Churches was the only fundamentalist association that involved Chinese church leaders, and Jia was elected as its president.⁹⁴ This fact suggests that Jia was a prominent Chinese fundamentalist among Chinese church leaders. Nevertheless, the missionaries still played a dominant role in the Chinese fundamentalist movement by supplying human and financial resources to the movement. For example, the Milton Stewart Evangelistic Fund, a foreign fundamentalist organization, was enthusiastic in sponsoring retreats and training conferences for conservative Chinese evangelists.⁹⁵ Their influences were significant and substantial, although a new generation of Chinese fundamentalists emerged.⁹⁶ Jia worked side by side with the missionaries who took the lead in the Chinese fundamentalist movement, and his theology was developed among fundamentalist missionaries.

Fundamentalists emphasize the utmost authority of the Bible, and adopt the

⁹³ The fundamentalist movement among Protestant missionaries in China influenced Chinese churches substantially; its impact was deep and long-lasting. The origin of Chinese fundamentalism in the early decades of the twentieth century came from North American fundamentalism. Although they were both conservative and in conflict with modernism, they were not exactly the same because of the different contexts. For details, see J.I. Packer, *Fundamentalism and the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1958), and Kevin Xiyi Yao, *The Fundamentalist Movement among Protestant Missionaries in China, 1920–1937* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2003).

⁹⁴ Fu-zeng Xing, *Zhong Guo Jji Yao Zhu Yi Zhe De Shi Jian Yu Kun Jing Chen Chong Gui De Shen Xue Si Xiang Yu Shi Dai* [Praxis and Predicament of a Chinese Fundamentalist: Chen Chong-gui (Marcus Cheng)'s Theological Thought And His Time](Hong Kong: Alliance Bible Seminary, 2001), 27.

⁹⁵ Xing, *Zhong Guo Jji Yao Zhu Yi Zhe De Shi Jian Yu Kun Jing Chen Chong Gui De Shen Xue Si Xiang Yu Shi Dai* [Praxis and Predicament of a Chinese Fundamentalist], 27.

⁹⁶ Yao, *The Fundamentalist Movement among Protestant Missionaries in China*, 286-287.

text-to-text approach to interpret it. In response to scientific query, fundamentalists regard the Bible as the only criterion for judging the values of the world, and human reason and experience. In addition, fundamentalists hold a theological view that there is a unity between the two Testaments, different messages inscribed in the Bible can be linked up, and all parts of the whole Bible are inter-related.⁹⁷

Fundamentalists argue that there is only a single theme in the Bible: God the Son and Father's saving purposes, and if we disregard it, we cannot rightly understand the Bible. This argument is a foundation for Jia to develop his theological discourse, particularly in regard to his christology. Jia wrote:

The subject of the whole Bible is salvation; the centre is Jesus; the theme is the Cross. The foundation of the whole Old Testament is the Cross, the source of New Testament is the Cross as well. Jesus can be seen in each book, each chapter and each page of the Bible.⁹⁸

The argument of Jia is basically identical to that of the fundamentalists. They both emphasize that the focus of the Bible is Christ and his salvation. This fundamentalist theological foundation is significant to Jia's theological works. In Jia's Bible commentaries, christocentrism and soteriology are the approach of Jia's biblical hermeneutics. In chapter four, we will explain how Jia combines christology and soteriology, and demonstrate how Jia deviates from his main reference, Strong's *Systematic Theology*, and develops his own christology.

⁹⁷ Barr, *Fundamentalism*, 55-72. And Packer argues, 'fundamentalists emphasize that Bible is a single book with single author – God the Spirit, and a single theme – God the Son and the Father's saving purposes, which all revolve round Him. Our Lord is therefore the key to Scripture, and its focal centre...no part of scripture is without its bearing on these central topics, and no part of scripture is rightly understood if read without this reference.' Packer, *Fundamentalism and the Word of God*, 84-85.

⁹⁸ Yu-Ming Jia, *Sheng Jing Yao Yi, Mo Xi Wu Jing* [The Essential Meaning of the Bible: The Pentateuch] (Hong Kong: Hong Dao, 1959), 5.

2.2.1.3 The Social Concern of Chinese Theology

The Chinese are a people who value practicability. Chinese theologians emphasized a practical way of doing theology and focused on the effect of practical theology on human life. The major concern was to construct a theology that could address the current situation and issues in society. Rong-hong Lin argued that Chinese theology was mainly a theology of the present which anticipated future possibilities and constructed a theology not for the past, but for the immediate time.⁹⁹ Social relevance became a theme in Chinese theology, particularly during the period of social instability.

Jia was concerned about social issues while he was doing his theology. In Jia's eschatology, he advocated the view of pre-millennialism and pre-tribulation rapture, which meant that Christ would come again before the millennium and Christians in the secular world would be free from afflictions.¹⁰⁰ Jia asserted that Chinese Christians should hold the view of pre-millennialism because it corresponded with the reality of social instability in China.¹⁰¹

Liang also agreed with Jia's point of view that, during wartime, Chinese Christians would prefer to hold the pre-millennialist view that the rapture would happen before the coming of afflictions, in contrast to post-millennialism, which held that Christians would continue to suffer in the present world.¹⁰² According to Jia, the world and faith

⁹⁹ Lin, *Chinese Theology in Construction*, 157.

¹⁰⁰ On the other hand, modernist theologians held the view of post-millennialism and declared that the kingdom of heaven could be built in the present world.

¹⁰¹ In this regard, Jia wrote, 'Now we can see that the quality of the world and religious faith are both decaying, the post-millennialism which holds the view, the kingdom of heaven could be built in the world, is no longer creditable. More and more Christians believe that the second coming of Christ will happen before the millennium. Pre-millennialism is more realistic as it is our common experience.' Yu-ming Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* [The Study of Divinity] vol. 1-10 (Taipei: Shao nian gui zhu she, 1971), 618.

¹⁰² Jia-lin Liang, 'Millennial Kingdom in the Eyes of Chinese Dispensationalists' in *Millennium*:

were decayed, so the view of pre-millennialism was correct. Although Jia's argument might be controversial, he tried to make use of social phenomena to justify his theological stance, and he bridged the social reality and his theological discourse.

Also, Jia responded to the social situation in his theological discourse, particularly with regard to bringing hope to Chinese Christians. In *Shen Dao Xue*, a number of chapters serve to demonstrate the connection of social concern and theology.¹⁰³ Take Jia's ecclesiology as an example. While Chinese people were experiencing the renewal of the old China during 1910s to 1920s, Jia responded to the concerns of Chinese nationalism, and placed emphasis on the renewal of Chinese churches, leading the Chinese Christians to struggle for sovereignty in their churches, and hoping to establish a Sinicized Church. Besides, Jia completed his final theological work, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, in 1945, just before the end of World War II. It was a memorial work for his wife who had died in the spring of the same year. Jia discussed the issue of 'the life of the Christian' in this work. He emphasized that the salvation of Christ could bring Christians eternal joy. Jia articulated that Christian life was like a running river that could pass through the valley of the shadow of death.¹⁰⁴ This river was a river of joy from God. Once Christians drank the water, their sadness and grief would disappear immediately.¹⁰⁵

In *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, Jia not only comforted his own grief at losing his wife, but also comforted those Chinese Christians who had lost their families in war. Jia's

Perspectives in the Chinese Context, ed. Shao-guang Deng (Hong Kong: Lutheran Theological Seminary, 2000), 73.

¹⁰³ The examples include: the theology of China Christianity, Revelation and Science, Church and Nation, and Remark of Millennium, etc.

¹⁰⁴ Yu-ming Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa* (Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1987), 159.

¹⁰⁵ Jia wrote, 'this is a world of grief. Nations, societies, families and individuals are all full of sadness and grief. Where is joyfulness? Those who live in the world are under the control of evil, and will die in sin. Where is joyfulness? But those who can drink from the joyful river of God will be full of joyfulness, and will have a life of joyfulness.' Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 178; 206.

theological discourse responded to the social reality during the war, and brought Chinese Christians the hope of an eternal life of joy. In regard to the meaning of the Christian's life, Jia developed a theology of life, which will be discussed in chapter five of the thesis.

2.2.2 Historical Contexts

2.2.2.1 The Domination of Missionaries

Before 1949, Chinese churches obtained their financial support primarily from foreign mission societies. Missionaries could subjugate and govern Chinese churches by means of financial aid. Chinese pastors were not the principal leaders in their churches. Their influence at management level was very limited. In reality, they were just the assistants of missionaries. All they had to do was to obey their masters – the missionaries. In addition, Chinese pastors were paid a very low salary which barely covered their cost of living. It was almost impossible for them to afford their children's education expenses.¹⁰⁶ It was reported that 'the compensation of the average minister, from when it began, had not risen much above the standard wages of the coolie'.¹⁰⁷ In addition, there was plenty of evidence to show that Chinese pastors were exploited by missionaries. Yu gave a fairly negative comment with regard to missionaries who financially exploited his family. He wrote, 'I saw the strength of Western powers while I was young. The missionaries' exploitation to my parents made me feel that their sense of superiority was unbearable.'¹⁰⁸ Another Chinese evangelist, Shang-Jie Song, demonstrated a more concrete hierarchical relationship

¹⁰⁶ Shang-jie Song, *Wo Di Jian Zheng* [My Testimony] (Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1982), 115.

¹⁰⁷ Chinese Educational Commission, *Christian Education in China: A Study Made by an Education Commission Representing the Mission Boards and Societies Conducting Works in China* (New York: Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1922), 164.

¹⁰⁸ Li-Gong Yu, *Ye Jin Tian Ming* [Dawn Breaks: The Imparts of Gospel in China] (Berkeley Calif.: M. Leekung Yu, 1998), 284.

between missionaries and the Chinese pastors in his biography. He wrote:

Chinese churches were financially controlled by missionaries. I think it is common everywhere [in China]. Those Chinese pastors who are under missionaries' supervision will certainly be dismissed immediately from the office once they disobey the master's order. Their 'rice bowls'¹⁰⁹ will be broken, and their belongings will have to be removed. 'Resign and land a better job' are the last words given to them in the office....Whether the missionaries' order is right or not, Chinese pastors have to regard the missionaries' instruction as a royal command.¹¹⁰

Also, Ming-dao Wang, a Chinese pastor, stated that in order to remain in employment, Chinese pastors had to be fully submissive to missionaries, to the extent that the dignity of pastors was sacrificed. Wang wrote,

If Chinese pastors are able to please missionaries, they will not be worried about their territories of influence.... For those Chinese pastors who are not good at pleasing and toadying [to] their masters, at the end they are unable to obtain appointments from the missionaries; therefore, the pastors who have moral integrity are unable to stay in the office of ministry.¹¹¹

Since missionaries financially supported the local Chinese churches and theological seminaries in China, they bore the responsibility of supervising the resources to make sure that they were used appropriately. Chinese pastors remained low in social status and received low pay. These features were intimately related to each other, and they became a vicious circle.¹¹² Missionaries were accused of being the exploiters as they

¹⁰⁹ The 'rice bowl' is the symbol of the means of livelihood.

¹¹⁰ Shang-jie Song, *Wo Di Jian Zheng*, 116.

¹¹¹ Ming-Dao Wang, *Wu Shi Nian Lai* [Fifty Years] (Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1971), 77-78.

¹¹² Chinese pastoral ministry was subject to exploitation: low remuneration and low social status. It definitely discouraged the young Chinese elite from joining the profession. The Chinese Education Commission (1922) observed that only a few college graduates were enrolled in Chinese seminaries, and the category of seminary students only focused on junior middle school level or below, and the difficulty of securing a higher grade of men for the church ministry was one of the most perplexing problems. The Commission suggested that the missions had to deal with it and its seriousness should not be overlooked. Chinese Educational Commission, *Christian Education in China: A Study Made by an Education Commission Representing the Mission Boards and Societies Conducting Works in China*, 162.

were manipulating Chinese pastors. This exploitation persisted because the exploited, Chinese pastors, had no bargaining power and had to be submissive continuously. In sum, Western missionaries had a paradoxical identity in Chinese churches: they were not only the financial supporters, managers, coaches and nurses of Chinese churches, but also the exploiters of Chinese pastors' governance and dignity.

Jia reflected upon the above issue in his theology, particularly in regard to his ecclesiology. He advocated that Chinese churches should be run by Chinese Christians. The Sinicized church had to be established in China, and the governance of the church should be handed over to Chinese Christians. Jia's declaration carried a strong sense of nationalism which appeared in his ecclesiology. In addition, the sense of nationalism embedded in Jia's ecclesiology can be regarded as Bhabha's 'denied knowledge' in the process of hybridization, and it turned out to carry a subversive nature in the colonial discourse. We will discuss Jia's ecclesiology from Bhabha's postcolonial perspectives in chapter three of the thesis.

2.2.2.2 The Union and Independence Movement

The Western missionaries launched the union and independence movement of Chinese churches in the 1870s. In 1877, the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries of China was held in Shanghai, in which missionaries discussed the issue of the union and independence of Chinese churches.¹¹³ In the following two Conferences, the Conference of Protestant Missionaries in China in 1890 and the Chinese Centenary Missionary Conference in 1907, the issue of union and independence of Chinese churches remained in the agenda.¹¹⁴ As Protestant missions rapidly expanded in the

¹¹³ J. Campbell Gibson, 'Presbyterian Union – and A Sequel,' *The China Mission Year Book*, 1918, 78.

¹¹⁴ However, the union and independent movement developed slowly in the mission field, with

first two decades of the twentieth century, interdenominational cooperation began to develop and the union movement achieved significant progress. The primary aim was to utilize fully the resources in the mission fields, and to avoid the overlap of manpower.¹¹⁵ The establishments of the China Continuation Committee (CCC) in 1913 and the National Christian Council (NCC) in 1922 were two major landmarks of the Chinese ecumenical movement. Wallace Merwin noted that the Presbyterian missionaries were actively engaged in the union movement during the first few decades of the twentieth century, to the extent that the Presbyterian missionaries could dominate the leadership of the CCC.¹¹⁶

Jia worked with Presbyterian missionaries, and was actively engaged in the union and independence movement. In 1907, Jia attended the Shantung Federation Conference, in which the missionaries and Chinese pastors from different denominations discussed the formation of Shandong Christian Federation, and the issue of church union and independence was an important item on the agenda.¹¹⁷ In 1914, Jia was elected as the secretary of Shandong Federation Council. The Council focused on the ecumenical issue and tried to form a committee to undertake the tasks.¹¹⁸ This fact shows that Jia was an activist in the ecumenical movement. In 1915, Jia joined the NTS as a professor. NTS was a landmark of the Chinese ecumenical movement as it was

obstacles created by the jealousy of missionaries' home churches which came from different denominations. *The Records of the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries of China, held at Shanghai, May 10-24, 1877* (Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1878), 439; *Records of the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries of China, held at Shanghai, May 7-20, 1870* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1890), 596; John C. Gibson, 'The Chinese Church,' *Records of Chinese Centenary Missionary Conference, at Shanghai, April 25-May 8, 1907* (Shanghai: Centenary Conference Committee, 1907), 3.

¹¹⁵ Norman H. Cliff, *A History of the Protestant Movement in Shandong Province, China, 1859-1951* (PhD thesis, University of Buckingham, 1994), 165-166.

¹¹⁶ Wallace Merwin, *Adventure in Unity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 22-23, 32-33, 201.

¹¹⁷ E.W. Burt, 'Report of Shantung Federation Conference, Sept. 1907,' *The Chinese Recorder* 39 (1908), 282; Norman H. Cliff, *A History of Protestant Movement in Shandong Province*, 244.

¹¹⁸ P.O. Hanson, 'Shantung Federal Council,' *The Chinese Recorder* Vol.45/11 (November 1914), 727.

established by different foreign denominations.¹¹⁹ In addition, in the 1910s, there were two major issues commonly inscribed in different Chinese Christian publications: union of Churches, and independence and self-support.¹²⁰ Jia was one of the writers who actively participated in the discussion.¹²¹ Jin-yong Chen wrote:

Mr Yu-ming Jia, is very enthusiastic about church independence. He is not concerned whether he may have an income from the church. Jia's income fully depends on the ability of the church members, and he has no selfish motivation at all.¹²²

Jia was devoted to the union and independence movement of Chinese Churches during the first few decades of the twentieth century.

Jia's engagement in the union and independence movement placed him in an ambivalent situation. From the point of view of Chinese Christians, the union and independence movement supported the sense of Chinese nationalism.¹²³ Dao-fei Li articulated that the establishment of the Shandong China Church of Christ in 1912 was derived from the Chinese revolution in 1911, as Christians thought that they could bear the financial burden of the church, and it was high time the national system restored religious freedom, and made great progress in Chinese churches.¹²⁴ In addition, a Shandong missionary, C. E. Scott, also found that 'the Chinese Christians, under the spirit of the Republic, want us (missionaries) to get rid of our patronizing

¹¹⁹ The denominations included: American Presbyterian (North and South), Disciples of Christ, Methodist Episcopal Church (South), and Methodist Episcopal Church. Yung-xun Zhang, 'Nan Jing Jin Ling Shen Xue Shi Mu Ji [The Beginning and the End of Nanjing Jinglin Theology],' *China Church Year Book* 2, 1915, 162-165.

¹²⁰ Kenneth S. Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1929), 672-680.

¹²¹ Guo, *Advocating Separatism?* 63.

¹²² Jin-rong Chen, 'Lun Bu Dao Yu Shandong [Mission Work in Shantung Province],' *The Theological Quarterly of the Nanking School of Theology*, 5/3 (June 1920), 6.

¹²³ Cliff, *A History of Protestant Movement in Shandong Province*, 165-166.

¹²⁴ Dao-fei Li, 'Ji Nan Shan Dong Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui Gai Kuang [The Situation of Shandong China Church of Christ],' *China Church Year Book* 7, 1924, 77.

just as fast as we can shuffle it off'.¹²⁵ Jia, as an activist of church independence who worked in missionary enterprises for years, inevitably was in a tension between nationalism and submission to Western missionaries. In this regard, Jia adopted an ambivalent approach in his ministry. He continued to involve himself in the ecumenical and independent movement, but he also maintained a friendly relationship with missionaries, and objected to any anti-foreign attitude in Chinese churches.¹²⁶ This ambivalence was also embedded in Jia's theological discourse, which demonstrated the paradox of submissiveness/subversiveness. I will demonstrate Jia's ambivalence in the following chapters.

¹²⁵ 'Letter, C E Scott to Presbyterian Home Board, 17/9/1912,' cited in Norman H. Cliff, *A History of Protestant Movement in Shandong Province*, 333.

¹²⁶ Yu-ming Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue* (Nanking: Spiritual Light, 1926), 382.

CHAPTER 3

THE AMBIVALENCE OF JIA'S ECCLESIOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the ambivalence of Jia's ecclesiology. It will focus on the colonial mimicry and the hybridity of Jia's ecclesiology. According to Bhabha, colonial subjects could deploy mimicry as a strategy in which the image of the colonized was shaped according to the colonizer's characteristics, but in fact it turned out to be 'a difference that is almost the same, but not quite'. In this chapter, we will examine how the co-existence of submissiveness and subversiveness in Jia's ecclesiology reflects the ambivalence of Jia's mimic ecclesiology. The 'difference, alternation, and displacement' in Jia's mimic ecclesiology are regarded as subversive elements against the dominant discourse. In contrast, the sameness found in Jia's mimic ecclesiology is regarded as the submissive element in relation to the colonial discourse.

During the first half of the twentieth century in China, the Western theologies which the missionaries taught in China were regarded as their 'exportable theology' to be taken to the Chinese Christians. Jia enabled himself to 'negotiate' between the missionaries and Chinese Christians in the process of hybridization, in which he embedded 'denied knowledge' and created 'newness' in his ecclesiology. The denied knowledge was Chinese nationalism, and the newness was a Sinicized church.

In this chapter, we will firstly discuss the exportable ecclesiology of missionaries in regard to the definition of the church, the organization of the church, and the council

of the churches. These three topics are important as they could reflect the missionaries' intention of supporting the church polity, which was connected to the colonial discourse. Secondly, we will discuss the mimicry in Jia's ecclesiology with regard to these three topics. Thirdly, we will discuss the hybridity of Jia's ecclesiology, which includes an investigation of the denied knowledge, i.e., Chinese nationalism, and newness, i.e., the Sinicized Church.

3.1 The Exportable Ecclesiology of the Missionaries

Augustus H. Strong's *Systematic Theology* (1907)¹²⁷ and Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology* (1899)¹²⁸ could be regarded as constituting the exportable theology of the missionaries in China in the 1920s. They were the main references Jia used as sources for his *Shen Dao Xue*, which was the first work of systematic Christian theology in Chinese.¹²⁹ These two theological works were important in the missionary enterprise, otherwise Jia would not have selected them as his main references. Therefore, Strong and Hodge directly influenced Jia's theology, and indirectly influenced Chinese theology, especially for the conservative wing. In this thesis, the theological works of Strong and Hodge will be applied as the reference to demonstrate the colonial sense of the exportable theologies.

It is noteworthy that Jia's theological works were published as part of the missionary enterprise, and the missionaries had to make sure Jia's theology adopted the 'correct' theological stance. Missionaries supervised the publication, and Jia had to obtain their

¹²⁷ Strong, Augustus Hopkins. *Systematic Theology*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson, 1907.

¹²⁸ Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. New York: Scribner, 1899.

¹²⁹ In the English introduction to *Shen Dao Xue*, P.F. Price stated that Jia used two English theological works as his references: Augustus H. Strong's *Systematic Theology* and Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology*. Price wrote, 'The work [*Shen Dao Xue*] is based on 'Systematic Theology' by Dr A.H. Strong, and with parallel reading of Hodge's Theology'.

approval for publishing his *Shen Dao Xue*. In fact, P.F. Price, Jia's colleague at NTS, showed clearly that he had read over the content of *Shen Dao Xue*, and expected that Jia's book would be used extensively in Chinese churches.¹³⁰

The primary reference of Jia's ecclesiology is Strong's ecclesiology, which was recommended by the missionaries. According to Strong, the church polity had to be maintained in the Church, because it was derived from the teaching of Scripture. Strong adopted a functional approach in his ecclesiology, which highlighted the concerns of the constitution, management and authority of the Church. The contents of his *Systematic Theology* were like a handbook or a manual for pastor to run a church, emphasizing hierarchy, and the authority of the council of the churches. In Strong's ecclesiology, there were three significant topics, which demonstrated his belief in the necessity of church polity; the definition of the church, the organization of the church and the council of the churches. They will be discussed below.

3.1.1 The Definition of a Church

3.1.1.1 The Universal Church and the Individual Churches

According to Strong, regeneration was essential to Christians as it was an indispensable character of redeemed humanity. The Church was composed of the Christians who were redeemed and regenerated in all ages, which was the body of Christ and the spiritual kingdom, in which Christ exercised his dominating power.¹³¹

¹³⁰ P. F. Price, 'English Introduction,' in Yu-Ming Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (Taipei: Christian Evangelist Group, 1962), English Introduction page. Although Price also stated that he provided some theological notes which were written in the Chinese language as Jia's reference, these theological notes have not been published. The author of the thesis regarded Strong's *Systematic Theology* and Hodge's *Systematic Theology* as the 'exportable theology' of the missionaries. Jia's ecclesiology was mainly derived from Strong's ecclesiology, because Hodge did not discuss ecclesiology in his *Systematic Theology*.

¹³¹ Strong wrote, 'The Church of Christ... is the whole company of regenerate persons in all times and ages, in heaven and on earth... the Church is identical with the spiritual kingdom of God; both signify

Strong pointed out the transcendence of Christ in the Church, i.e., an organism to which Christ gave the spiritual life, manifested his fullness of grace and power, and of which Christ symbolically was the head.¹³²

Strong also introduced the concept of the individual church of the Christians who were living on the earth. He asserted that Scriptures distinguished between the Universal Church and the individual church.¹³³ Strong argued that an invisible church could be seen in the individual church, which was the company of regenerated and redeemed persons, and the individual churches in different ages were a part of the Universal Church.

According to Strong, the Church was a group of redeemed and regenerate Christians, and it appeared in the form of individual churches on the earth. In addition, Strong stated that ‘the Church, like the state, is an institution’.¹³⁴ His ideal individual church should be formally organized and have fellowship with other individual churches. The fellowship in practice was the council of the churches, and ‘the general nature of this relation is that of fellowship between equals’.¹³⁵ Strong affirmed that the council of the churches should have the power to oversee the individual churches. We will discuss the church polity with its administrative power with reference to its colonial sense in the following sections.

that redeemed humanity in which God in Christ exercise actual spiritual dominion... The Church, in this large sense, is nothing less than the body of Christ’. Augustus Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Valley Forge, PA: Judson, 1907), 887

¹³² Strong wrote, ‘[The Church] is the great company of persons [whom Christ has saved, in whom he dwells, to whom and through whom he reveals God (Eph 1:22-23). This was called ‘the Universal Church’.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 888.

¹³³ Strong stated, ‘The Scriptures, however, distinguish between the invisible or the Universal Church, and the individual church, in which the Universal Church takes local and temporal form, and in which the idea of the Church as a whole is concretely exhibited.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 889.

¹³⁴ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 892.

¹³⁵ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 926.

3.1.2 The Organization of the Church

3.1.2.1 A Formal and Structural Organization

Strong emphasized that it was necessary for a church to have a structural organization, because it was part of the Scriptures. Strong argued that ‘[it] is however not merely informal, but formal, organization in the church, to which the New Testament bears witness’.¹³⁶ Strong did not agree that a church was a purely spiritual body or some separate small groups.¹³⁷ Strong affirmed that a church should be organized, and the Scriptures have demonstrated a perfect model. Therefore, Christians could not construct the church organization according to their own mind. The organization mentioned in the Bible was the standard reference for a contemporary church to work out the most ideal model.¹³⁸

Strong emphasized that it was necessary for an individual church to construct a formal organization because it was derived from the Bible.

3.1.2.2 The Ambivalence of the Church Polity

In regard to the government of a church, Strong affirmed that it was an absolute monarchy, but also an absolute democracy. It was a monarchy because ‘Christ, as sovereign and lawgiver, that the government of the church, so far as regards the

¹³⁶ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 894

¹³⁷ Strong criticized, ‘The theory that the church is an exclusively spiritual body, destitute of all formal organization, and bound together only by the mutual relation of each believer to his indwelling Lord. The Church, upon this view, so far as outward bonds are concerned, is only an aggregation of isolated units. Those believers who chance to gather at a particular place, or to live at a particular time, constitute the church of that place or time. This view is held by the Friends and by the Plymouth Brethren. It ignores the tendencies to organization inherent in human nature.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 895.

¹³⁸ Strong wrote, ‘But a proper theory of [church] development does not exclude the idea of a church organization already complete in all essential particulars before the close of the inspired canon, so that the record of it may constitute a providential example of binding authority upon all subsequent ages.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 896.

source of authority.’¹³⁹ It was democracy because the Spirit could lead the body of Christ to make a right decision.¹⁴⁰ Strong argued that the government of the church could be democratic and congregational, and it was the responsibility of the whole church to maintain pure doctrine and practice.

With regard to the congregational and democratic government, ambivalence would appear in the exportable ecclesiology of the missionaries. According to Bhabha, the ambivalence would occur in the colonial discourse especially when the colonizer promoted a notion to the colonized, which would result in damage to the interests of the colonizer in return. Bhabha gave the example of Charles Grant in India in 1792.¹⁴¹ During the first half of the twentieth century, missionaries dominated the government of Chinese churches. However they also exported Strong’s ecclesiology, which promoted a ‘congregational and democratic government’. What the missionaries did in dominating Chinese churches contradicted their own teachings. Strong’s view would damage the dominance of the missionaries, and it became a source of ambivalence in the exportable ecclesiology. In fact, congregational government and missionary domination are mutually exclusive in Chinese local churches.

In sum, in the exportable ecclesiology it was necessary for an individual church to

¹³⁹ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 903.

¹⁴⁰ Strong wrote, ‘The Holy Spirit enlightens one member through the counsel of another, and as the result of combined deliberation, guides the whole body to right conclusion. This unity, since it is a unity of the Spirit, is not an enforced, but an intelligent and willing, unity. While Christ is sole king, therefore, the government of the Church, so far as regards the interpretation and execution of his will by the body, is an absolute democracy, in which the whole body of members is intrusted with the duty and responsibility of carrying out the laws of Christ as expressed in his word.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 903.

¹⁴¹ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 87. Grant desired to inculcate the Christian religion in India, but worried that this might make the Indian converts ‘turbulent for liberty’. His solution was to mix Christian doctrines with divisive caste practices to produce a ‘partial reform’ that would induce an empty imitation of English manners.

have a formal and structural organization, because the church polity was derived from Scripture. The government of the church was both an absolute monarchy and an absolute democracy. However, it is noteworthy that the concept of congregational democracy as it appeared in the exportable ecclesiology became a source of ambivalence in the colonial discourse.

3.1.3 The Council of the Churches

3.1.3.1 Mutual Watchcare and Exhortation

According to the missionaries' exportable ecclesiology, the individual churches should bear the responsibility of 'mutual watchcare [*sic*] and exhortation', and a council of the churches should be established to fulfil this function. The council was regarded as a fellowship among the local churches. However, in the context of Chinese Christians, the council was in practice a supervisory body, which could directly influence the Chinese churches. Although the concept of the 'absolute equality of the churches' was introduced in the exportable ecclesiology,¹⁴² it was only an ideal situation in individual churches. In practice, it did not exist in Chinese churches.

According to Strong, 'the sole object of the local church was the glory of God, in the complete establishment of his kingdom both in the believers' hearts and in the world'.¹⁴³ Strong contended that the object was to be achieved by 'united worship', 'common labors for the reclamation of the impenitent world', and 'mutual watchcare and exhortation'.¹⁴⁴ The 'united worship' and the 'common labors' could be regarded as the union of church members, but the 'mutual watchcare and exhortation' as such

¹⁴² Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 926.

¹⁴³ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 899.

¹⁴⁴ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 899.

was a duty to oversee the other local churches. Strong contended that the establishment of a local church should be recognized by other local churches or by the council of the churches.¹⁴⁵

However, the ‘watchcare and exhortation’ in practice became a mode of supervision undertaken by the council of churches. Although Strong argued that the council was primarily based on fellowship and its action was ‘not constitutive’, the recognition of the council was still important and desirable in relation to the development of the Chinese churches. As mentioned, the missionaries were the financial supporters of the Chinese churches.¹⁴⁶ Theoretically a church could be a true church without the recognition of the council, but in practice whether a Chinese church could survive largely depended on the missionaries’ financial support.¹⁴⁷ If the church was not recognized by the council, no financial support would be approved by the missionaries either. Individual Chinese churches were probably unable to survive. According to Strong, the recognition of the council was not a necessary procedure in relation to the validity of a Chinese church, but in practice it was closely linked to financial concerns in the context of Chinese Christians.¹⁴⁸

3.1.3.2 A Hierarchy among Individual Churches

According to Strong, the council of the churches had the responsibility to consult the

¹⁴⁵ Strong wrote, ‘It is important, where practicable, that a council of churches be previously called, to advise the brethren proposing this union as to the desirableness of constituting a new and distinct local body; and, if it be found desirable, to recognize them, after its formation, as being a church of Christ. But such action of a council, however valuable as affording ground for the fellowship of other churches, is not constitutive, but is simply declaratory; and, without such action, the body of believers alluded to, if formed after the N.T. example, may notwithstanding be a true church of Christ.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 902.

¹⁴⁶ Song, *Wo Di Jian Zheng*, 116.

¹⁴⁷ Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 386-87.

¹⁴⁸ Ironically, Strong also held the view that the government of a local church should be independent from other local churches, ‘since each local church is directly subject to Christ, there is no jurisdiction of one church over another, but all are on an equal footing, and all are independent of interference or control by the civil power.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 898.

individual churches, which in the Chinese context involved consulting on the ordination of Chinese pastors. Although Strong regarded the nature of the council as a fellowship, he added that ‘this fellowship involves the duty of special consultation with regard to matters affecting the common interest’, and every church should have the ‘duty of seeking advice’ and the ‘duty of taking advice’.¹⁴⁹ Strong argued that the council had the duty to consult the local churches due to the mutual furtherance of ‘common interest’. Each local church should have this responsibility.¹⁵⁰ In other words, churches were expected to influence each other for the reason of ‘common interest’. Strong raised a concrete example – the ordination of a pastor. He highlighted the correct relationship between the recognition of ordination and the authority of the council. According to Strong, other church leaders should be invited to sit in the council to decide whether a candidate was qualified for ordination because the ordination could influence not only a local church but also the other churches. Strong stated that ‘it is desirable in ordination, as in all important steps affecting other churches, that advice be taken before the candidate is inducted into office, and that other churches be called to sit with it in council’.¹⁵¹

Although Strong affirmed that ‘the power to ordain rests with the church, and that the church may proceed without the council, or even against the decision of the council’,¹⁵² he warned that without the consent of the council, the ordination was disqualified beyond the bounds of the individual church. If the minister moved to another church for his ministry, it was necessary for that church to ordain the minister

¹⁴⁹ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 927.

¹⁵⁰ Strong wrote, ‘No church can properly ignore, or disregard, the existence or work of other churches around it.... There must therefore be sympathy and mutual furtherance of each other’s welfare among churches, as among individual Christians. Upon this principle are based letters of dismission, recognition of the pastors of other churches, and all associational unions, or unions for common Christian work.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 926.

¹⁵¹ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 920.

¹⁵² Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 921.

again.¹⁵³ In addition, the council could revise the decision of the individual church by declaring the decision was ‘not Scripturally constituted’. If an ordination was declared to be ‘not Scripturally constituted’, it would certainly not be respected by other local churches, and such a declaration would become a serious accusation. The council and the other local churches would definitely terminate their fellowship with the ordained minister and his local church. A church which objected to the decision of the council would face pressure from the majority of its fellow churches. In this regard, the council was not only a fellowship, but also an authority able to influence the member churches. According to the exportable ecclesiology, the power to ordain rested with the individual church, but in practice the council of the churches could restrict the individual churches by its influence. Here another ambivalence took place in the colonial discourse.

Strong developed a practical hierarchal structure in the relationship between the individual churches and the council. When the individual churches and the council were in conflict, the council could override the decisions of the individual churches.¹⁵⁴ Strong warned that any action of local churches which ignored the decisions of the council could harm the relationship with other churches. The consequence was so serious that the relationship would be terminated. If a church finally did not follow the decision of the council, the sister churches had the right to terminate the

¹⁵³ Strong stated, ‘In every case, however, where a minister from a body of Christians not Scripturally constituted assumes the pastoral relation in a rightly organized church, there is peculiar propriety, not only in the examination, by a Council, of his Christian experience, call to the ministry, and views of doctrine, but also in that act of formal recognition and authorization which is called ordination.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 922.

¹⁵⁴ Strong wrote, ‘Where no immediate exception is taken to the decision of the Council, that decision is to be regarded as virtually the decision of the church by which it was called. The same rule applies to a Council’s decision to depose from the ministry. In the absence of immediate protest from the church, the decision of the Council is rightly taken as virtually the decision of the church.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 921.

membership.¹⁵⁵

In the exportable ecclesiology, a hierarchal relationship was formed between the individual churches and the council. It was noted that whether a Chinese church ‘manifests departures from the faith or practice of the Scripture’ was decided by the missionaries, whom Chinese Christians hardly challenged. The duty of the missionaries was to supervise the local churches, to keep them on the right track of the faith and to guide them according to the Scriptures. In the missionary enterprise, a ‘broken fellowship’ implied that the missionaries no longer financially supported a Chinese church.¹⁵⁶ In this regard, the authority of the missionaries in the hierarchal structure was recognized.

3.1.4 Conclusion

Through its Chinese translation in Jia’s *Shen Dao Xue*, Strong’s ecclesiology was expected to be introduced to Chinese Christians as part of the missionary enterprise. According to the exportable ecclesiology, the Church was a group of redeemed and regenerate Christians. It appeared in the form of individual churches on the earth, and ‘the Church, like the state, is an institution’.¹⁵⁷ Chinese Christians were taught to recognize a formal and structural organization in their churches, in which there would be absolute democracy. Based on Bhabha, this absolute democracy could become a source of ambivalence in the missionary discourse. In addition, although the concept

¹⁵⁵ Strong stated, ‘This fellowship may be broken by manifest departures from the faith or practice of the Scriptures, on the part of any church. In such case, duty to Christ requires the churches, whose labors to reclaim a sister church from error have proved unavailing, to withdraw their fellowship from it, until such time as the erring church shall return to the path of duty. In this regard, the law which applies to individuals applies to churches, and the polity of the New Testament is congregational rather than independent.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 928.

¹⁵⁶ Song, *Wo Di Jian Zheng*, 116; Wang, *Wu Shi Nian Lai*, 77-78.

¹⁵⁷ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 892.

of the ‘absolute equality of the churches’ appeared in the exportable ecclesiology,¹⁵⁸ the fellowship among the Chinese churches, i.e., the council of churches, was actually a supervisory body by which the missionaries could dominate the Chinese churches. In sum, the council could facilitate the missionaries in supervising the Chinese churches, and ‘absolute equality’ did not exist in Chinese churches in practice.

3.2 The Mimicry of Jia’s Ecclesiology

Repetition occurred in the process of colonial mimicry. Strong’s ecclesiology was the dominant discourse in the missionary enterprise, and it substantially influenced Jia’s ecclesiology. In Jia’s mimic ecclesiology, the sameness of the colonizer and the differentiation of the colonized were both found in the mimic repetition. Jia’s ecclesiology was constructed when the sameness of the colonizer slid into otherness, and traces of the colonizer were found in the midst of Jia’s ecclesiology, so that the ecclesiology of the colonized, as a ‘part-object of the metonymy’, was only partly the same as that of the colonizer. Jia’s ecclesiology featured the colonial mimicry which Bhabha defined as ‘a difference that is almost the same, but not quite’.¹⁵⁹ The mimic sameness embedded in Jia’s ecclesiology could reveal the attraction of the colonial discourse and Jia’s submissiveness in the missionary enterprise. On the other hand, the mimic difference embedded in Jia’s ecclesiology could reflect the repulsion of the colonial discourse and Jia’s subversiveness of the missionary enterprise. The sameness of the colonizer could be found in Jia’s ecclesiology in terms of the definition of the church, the organization of the church, and the council of the churches. We will focus on the sameness and the differentiation between the

¹⁵⁸ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 926

¹⁵⁹ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86.

exportable ecclesiology and the mimic ecclesiology, by which the hidden ambivalence of Jia's ecclesiology may be discovered.

3.2.1 The Definition of the Church

3.2.1.1 The Obvious Sameness of the Colonizers

In regard to the definition of the church, there is mimicry in Jia's ecclesiology, and the sameness of the colonizer is particularly obvious. Jia mainly repeated the exportable ecclesiology of the missionaries.¹⁶⁰ There was no vivid difference between Jia and Strong in terms of the definition of the church. Both of them agreed that the church was defined as a group of regenerate Christians. Some key concepts which Strong adopted to define the church, such as the body of Christ and the spiritual kingdom, could be found in Jia's definition.¹⁶¹ Jia defined the church as 'a body of Christians' and 'a spiritual body', and such body was exactly 'the body of Christ'. He further enriched the definition by stating that Christ was the 'head', 'activeness', 'strength' and 'life' of the church.¹⁶² In addition, Jia adopted different metaphors, e.g., spiritual palace and spiritual family, to explain the definition of the church and to demonstrate the mutual connectedness of Christians in Christ.¹⁶³ Nevertheless, Jia still emphasized that 'body' was the most suitable metaphor for revealing the meaning of the church.¹⁶⁴ This point was that same as in Strong's definition.

Jia also contended that the church may have two categories; the invisible church and

¹⁶⁰ Jia argued, '[The] church is the regenerate Christians who have the salvation and who are union in Christ. For those Christians who are in the heaven, on the earth, in different countries and in different times, and have been regenerated by spirit in the faith of Christ are a part of the church. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 786.

¹⁶¹ See Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 887.

¹⁶² Yu-ming Jia, *The Lecture of Ephesians* (Hong Kong: Tien Dao, 1984), 9. First published as Yu-ming Jia, 'The Lecture of Ephesians,' *Ling Guang* [The Spiritual Light], 10 December 1926, 32.

¹⁶³ Jia, *The Lecture of Ephesians*, 9.

¹⁶⁴ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 679.

the visible church. The visible church was constituted by all the baptized Christians and their children.¹⁶⁵ Jia emphasized that the visible church has a considerable quantity of Christians, but many of them were titular Christians who could influence the church by their participation. At the end of the day, they, like Judas Iscariot, ‘might go to their own place’.¹⁶⁶ On the other hand, the invisible church was the spiritual organism which Jesus regarded as the ‘goodly peals’ (Matt 13:45). The invisible church would be regarded as the sons of God in the future, and became the heavenly spiritual visible church. The life of Jesus was given to the invisible church which would be seen some day.¹⁶⁷ Apparently, Jia adopted these different definitions of the church to express his dissatisfaction with the Chinese Christians. He warned that many Chinese Christians were not real Christians, and the consequences would be the same as for Judas. Jia mimicked the concept of ‘the visible church and the invisible church’ which was derived from the exportable ecclesiology of missionaries,¹⁶⁸ and he added a warning to the local Chinese churches.

In regard to the definition of the church, sameness with the colonizers obviously slid into Jia’s ecclesiology. Jia further affirmed its correctness by adding a variety of metaphor in his definition. Jia held the same view as that of the colonizer, and he made his definition within the parameter of the colonizer’s tradition, i.e., the Calvinist. The ‘invisible church’ is an example of this. It reveals the attraction to the colonizer, and Jia’s submissiveness in his mimic ecclesiology. The differentiation appearing in Jia’s mimic process would be seen when Jia discussed the issues of the organization of the church and the council of the churches. We will discuss these two points in the

¹⁶⁵ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 790.

¹⁶⁶ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 791.

¹⁶⁷ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 791.

¹⁶⁸ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 889.

following sub-sections.

3.2.2 The Organization of the Church

3.2.2.1 The Mimic Sameness with the Colonizers

Based on the colonizer's definition of the church, Jia held the view that a church had to maintain the church polity, and there must be a structural organization in each church. In his ecclesiology, Jia asserted that 'a church is a spiritual body, but it is also an organization of the Truth. Church must have its own standard system, and it is not allowed to be anarchic.'¹⁶⁹ Jia argued that a formal and structural organization of a church was 'Scripturally constituted', because a number of posts in the church are mentioned in the New Testament, such as pastor, deacon, bishop and elder, who were all the servants of the church, and whose duties were found in the earliest churches.¹⁷⁰ Jia expected a formal organization to run all Chinese churches. In this regard, Jia's argument was same as the exportable ecclesiology. The sameness with the colonizer slid into Jia's theological discourse.

3.2.2.2 The Mimicry of the Old Testament Church

Jia argued that the Church of Christ was inscribed in the Old Testament, and the image of the New Testament Church existed in the Old Testament.¹⁷¹ Jia's argument seemed to be different from his mimic ecclesiology, but in fact it was another mode of the colonizers' sameness with the colonizer that slid into Jia's ecclesiology.

According to the exportable ecclesiology, the Church of Christ was inaugurated from

¹⁶⁹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 800.

¹⁷⁰ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 788-89.

¹⁷¹ Yu-ming Jia, *Yi Sai Ya Shu Jiang Yi* [Exposition of Isaiah] (Taipei: Gan lan ji jin, 1994), 159; Yu-ming Jia, *Chuang Shi Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Genesis] (Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub. Society, 1935), 37.

the New Testament. However, Jia argued that the Church of Christ was derived from the Old Testament, and ‘those who lived in the time of the Old Testament, feared the Lord, and waited for the Messiah were the members of the Old Testament Church’.¹⁷² Jia viewed the Old Testament Church as a ‘shadow of the New Testament Church’.¹⁷³ The New Testament Church was the real Church of Christ that was founded by the birth, divinity, law, redemption and resurrection of Christ, it was an organism that included the gentile Christians, and was the bride of Christ.¹⁷⁴ In this regard, Jia’s Old Testament Church could be regarded as a differentiation in the mimic ecclesiology of the colonized, as in the exportable ecclesiology the Church of Christ started with the New Testament only, not the Old Testament.

Nevertheless, the sameness with the colonizer with reference to the Old Testament Church still slid into Jia’s mimic ecclesiology, because the Old Testament Church was not Jia’s own idea and it could be derived from fundamentalism. As mentioned in chapter two, the fundamentalists held a theological view that there was coherence between the two Testaments, different messages inscribed in the Bible could be linked, and all parts of the Bible were inter-related.¹⁷⁵ Based on this theological stance, Jia adopted the concept of the Church of Christ as a linkage between the two Testaments, so that the Church of Christ existed not only in the New Testament but also in the Old Testament. The Old Testament Church did not appear in Strong’s ecclesiology, and this seems to be a differentiation in Jia’s mimic ecclesiology, but in fact it was actually a mimic sameness with the colonizer which was derived from another source and slid

¹⁷² Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 790.

¹⁷³ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 790. According to Jia, before the Flood in Genesis, there was a difference between the sons of God and the humans. The sons of God were the Church. However, ‘those who lived in the Old Testament probably misunderstood the conception of God, and could not see the way of salvation’.

¹⁷⁴ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 790.

¹⁷⁵ Barr, *Fundamentalism*, 55-72.

into Jia's ecclesiology

It can be concluded that the sameness with the colonizer could subtly slide into Jia's theological discourse with regard to the Old Testament Church. The differentiations would seem to have appeared in Jia's mimic ecclesiology; however, they were actually derived from the colonizer's view. Jia tried to make the mimic differentiations, but he turned out to make another mimic sameness in his ecclesiology.

3.2.3 The Council of the Churches

3.2.3.1 The Ambivalence of Jia's Mimicry

As to the council of the churches, there is ambivalence in Jia's mimic ecclesiology. Jia did not discuss the function, responsibility, regulation and authority of the council of churches in his ecclesiology, but he focused on a related issue – the various denominations of the Christian Church. Jia clearly showed his support for the denomination to which he belonged, i.e., the Presbyterian, and he accepted the fact that different Western denominations existed in Chinese churches. Jia's advocacy of the system of denominations may be regarded as mimic sameness and attraction to the colonizer which in part slid into Jia's ecclesiology. However, Jia argued that it was not suitable for real Chinese Christians to accept the Western denominations in China. Jia's arguments showed ambivalence on the issue of the denomination. Such ambivalence appearing in Jia's mimic ecclesiology reflected his simultaneous attraction to and repulsion from the colonial discourse.

Jia asserted his advocacy of Christian denominations in his mimic ecclesiology. To justify the foreign denominations appearing in Chinese churches, Jia discussed the

issue from a historical perspective, and demonstrated the formation of various denominations. Jia did not criticize these denominations, and just regarded them as a part of the history of the Church.¹⁷⁶ He hoped that Chinese Christians could understand the foreign denominations from a historical point of view. Jia compared and analysed the characteristics of the major denominations in China, such as Congregationalist, Anglican, Presbyterian and Roman Catholic.¹⁷⁷ He contended that the constitutions of these denominations and councils were based on the Scriptures, and each of them had different strengths. Jia, as a Presbyterian pastor, advocated that the polity of the Presbyterian denomination was the best among the other denominations:

The Presbyterian tradition can work together with one heart, especially in times of difficulty. It can actualize the idea of the republic, and its polity is neither too complicated nor too simple. It is the best church polity.¹⁷⁸

Jia not only gave his adherence to the Presbyterian denomination, but also to the system of Christian denominations. In this regard, the denominations of the Western Church which appeared in China were justified, and sameness with the colonizer was embedded in Jia's ecclesiology.

It is noteworthy that Jia did not fully support the polity of denomination. Jia developed his ecclesiology along with Chinese nationalism, thus he encouraged Chinese Christians not to accept the Western denominations in Chinese churches. This was a major differentiation or ambivalence in his mimic repetition, reflecting the subversiveness of his ecclesiology. We will discuss the ambivalence of Jia's ecclesiology in terms of hybrid Chinese nationalism in section 3.3 below.

¹⁷⁶ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 794-95.

¹⁷⁷ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 801-03.

¹⁷⁸ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 802-03.

3.2.4 Conclusion

The sameness with the colonizer is found to have slid into Jia's ecclesiology, as it involved the definition of the church, the organization of the church, and the council of the churches. Although mimic differences might seem to have appeared in Jia's ecclesiology, they were merely derived from the colonizer. Ironically, they enriched the sameness with the colonizer in the mimicry. Such sameness reflected the attraction to the colonizer and Jia's submissiveness to the dominant discourse of his masters.

On the other hand, the ambivalence of Jia's ecclesiology has not been revealed, as the major differentiation in the mimic ecclesiology was still concealed. In the next part, we will apply Bhabha's concept of hybridity to investigate Jia's ecclesiology, so that the subversiveness of Jia's mimic ecclesiology may be uncovered.

3.3 The Hybridity of Jia's Ecclesiology

In this part we will focus on an area of Jia's ecclesiology that was 'quite different' from the exportable ecclesiology. According to Bhabha, the colonized could adopt mimicry as a strategy for protecting themselves while they were confronted with the colonizer. The colonized could make use of this strategy to fracture the colonial discourse and to undertake anti-colonial resistance. This strategy was 'exactly like the technique of camouflage practiced in human warfare'.¹⁷⁹ Jia's mimicry can be regarded as a mode of Bhabha's camouflage strategy against the colonizer. Jia was able to fracture the colonial discourse, and undertake anti-colonial resistance by constructing his ecclesiology which was 'not quite the same' as the colonial discourse. Jia's ecclesiology could be a subversive discourse, as Bhabha argued that colonial

¹⁷⁹ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 85.

resistance was not necessarily ‘an oppositional act of political intention’¹⁸⁰ – even a ‘small difference, slight alteration and displacement’ could be and often was the most significant element in the process of subversion.¹⁸¹ Jia developed a theological discourse – the Sinicized Church in his ecclesiology – by adopting the camouflage strategy. The Sinicized Church was the ‘difference’ or ‘alteration’ in the colonial discourse, so that Jia’s ecclesiology became subversive against the colonial discourse.

For Bhabha, hybridity is a colonial resistance strategy which can estrange the basis of colonial authority, especially when the ‘denied knowledge’ enters upon the dominant discourse. Jia clearly included nationalism in his ecclesiology, which could be regarded as the denied knowledge in the colonial discourse, because the missionaries disregarded it in their ecclesiology. It was seen that Jia embedded such ‘denied knowledge’ in his ecclesiology, so that the discourse of colonial authority lost its univocal grip on meaning and found itself open to the trace of the other theological language. With the mood of nationalism, Jia developed his ecclesiology, in which he aimed at excluding the Western influences in Chinese churches.

In addition, hybridization resulted in a ‘newness’ which could enter the world, and could ‘make differences into sameness, and sameness into difference’ in colonial discourse.¹⁸² With the mood of nationalism, the newness was the concept of a Sinicized Church, which was current during the first half of the twentieth century in China. Through the combination of the exportable ecclesiology and Chinese nationalism, Jia made the missionaries’ ecclesiology ‘no longer the same’, and his ecclesiology was ‘no longer simply different’ from the missionaries’ ecclesiology.

¹⁸⁰ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 110.

¹⁸¹ Bhabha, ‘Translator translated,’ 82.

¹⁸² Young, *Colonial Desire*, 33.

In the following paragraphs, we will discuss how Jia embedded the newness and the denied knowledge in his hybrid ecclesiology.

3.3.1 The Denied Knowledge – Chinese Nationalism

Chinese nationalism was regarded as the ‘denied knowledge’ in the process of hybridization. The Western missionaries constrained the Chinese nationalism for their own interests, and they denied the existence of Chinese nationalism in their colonial discourse.

From a historical perspective, when the Boxer Rebellion took place in 1900, the foreign missions were a major target. When Western armies marched on Peking and put down the uprising, missionaries applauded the troops. For some missionaries, it seemed, the more brutal the liberation, the better. A missionary of the American Board, William Ament, told the *New York Sun* that, ‘The soft hand of the Americans is not as good as the nailed fist of the Germans: If you deal with the Chinese with a soft hand they will take advantage of it.’¹⁸³ In fact, the missionaries thought that toughness must be the policy in the future, and the policy they wanted was even tougher than the businessmen did. The former president of the China Educational Association, the Presbyterian Devello Sheffield, explained to the American Board that, ‘It is not “blood-thirstiness” in missionaries to desire further shedding of blood, but an understanding of Chinese character and conditions’.¹⁸⁴ In 1900, Chinese nationalism was regarded as an enemy of the missionaries, and it was certainly dangerous to their enterprise. In the following years, prudent evangelists recognized the growth of

¹⁸³ Arthur Schlesinger, ‘The Missionary Enterprise and Theories of Imperialism,’ in *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America*, edited by John Fairbank (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), 357.

¹⁸⁴ Schlesinger, ‘The Missionary Enterprise and Theories of Imperialism,’ 358.

nationalism in the non-Western world and laid increasing emphasis on the need for national churches, staffed and run by converts. However, according to Schlesinger, ‘Yet most missionaries, their careers bound up with their superior status abroad and their condescension toward converts unimpaired, tended...to favor the nationalization of churches more in theory than in practice’.¹⁸⁵

In the 1920s, the missionaries were concerned about the issue of church independence, but their idea of church independence was substantially different from that of the Chinese Christians. The missionaries simply thought that the establishment of the Church of Christ in China would have achieved the goal of an independent Chinese church. They thought that such a united church nominally ‘belonged to’ Chinese Christians.¹⁸⁶ They also warned that the movement of self-support and self-governance in Chinese churches had to proceed in a realistic way, i.e., it had to proceed slowly.¹⁸⁷ The missionaries were merely concerned about the establishment of a united organization, but they did not take into consideration the sense of nationalism in Chinese churches which was closely related to the governance of Chinese churches. They skipped over the issue of the Chinese nationalism to avoid the conflict of interest, so that the existence of Chinese nationalism was denied in the dominant discourse.

However, the ‘denied knowledge’ of missionaries can be found in Jia’s ecclesiology so that the hidden anti-colonial resistance appears in the theological discourse. Jia participated in the union and the independence movement of Chinese churches from

¹⁸⁵ Schlesinger, ‘The Missionary Enterprise and Theories of Imperialism,’ 358.

¹⁸⁶ A.R. Kepler, ‘What is the Church of Christ in China?’ *The Chinese Recorder* 58 (1927), 27-32.

¹⁸⁷ Frank Price, ‘The Church of Christ in China,’ *Presbyterian Survey* 18/2 (1928), 83; Lucile DuBose, ‘The Church in China: Suggested Plans for the Study Class,’ *Presbyterian Survey* 19/12 (1929), 736.

the first decade of the twentieth century, and he promoted the establishment of a Sinicized Church which was expected to be a well-structured organization. Jia's argument regarding the movement was derived from his sense of Chinese nationalism, and he aimed at excluding the Western influence in Chinese churches. The union and independence movement of Chinese churches are discussed below.

3.3.1.1 The Union of Chinese Churches

Jia argued that Chinese churches could strengthen themselves through their collaborations. With the success of the union, Chinese churches could manifest the 'life' of Christ, and could bring a tremendous change to the country.¹⁸⁸ As a Presbyterian minister, Jia firstly launched the union movement among Chinese Presbyterian churches. In 1913, Jia was elected as the Chinese representative of the Presbyterian Church in China.¹⁸⁹ Jia was keen to engage in the union movement, and he justified his engagement by three reasons. Firstly, he discovered that each Presbyterian council in China shared the same tradition, but they were independent from each other. This violated the Lord's command of unity in John 17:11. Secondly, Chinese Presbyterian churches had been established for several decades, and they had been separated from the Western Presbyterians for many years. It was inappropriate that Chinese Presbyterian churches did not have their own council. Thirdly, the Republic of China adopted the policy of religious freedom. Chinese people were willing to accept the Christian faith. Therefore, Chinese churches had to unite to

¹⁸⁸ Jia wrote, 'If we really want the shining of the True Light, the spreading of Holy Word, the new life of Christ, transforming the old morals into the character with the truth, and [having] the salvation of Christ in order to prepare the foundation and the spirit of the new Life in our country, and change our dimming and rotten old China into a shining new heaven, we have to unite our churches in Christ, instead of relying on the branches of independent Chinese church.' Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 389-90. In addition, Jia regarded the union of churches as an organization that could function in various ways: 'Union can be a consultation; Union can be an encouragement; Union can be an adjustment; Union can be an assistance; Union can be a thanksgiving.' Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 389-90.

¹⁸⁹ 'List of Delegates to the Conference,' *The Chinese Recorder* 44 (1913), 237.

facilitate the evangelization.¹⁹⁰

Jia thus tried to link the issue of evangelization to Chinese nationalism. He presumed that the establishment of the union could enable Chinese churches to be independent from Western churches, and the new regime in China could facilitate the Chinese churches to evangelize the country. The issues of independence from Western churches and Chinese nationalism were always put together in Jia's ecclesiology.

Jia had very optimistic expectations for the future of the union movement and his country. Jia saw a high correlation between the union and the independence of Chinese churches, and Chinese nationalism became more obvious in his ecclesiology. This correlation is discussed below.

3.3.1.2 The Union and Independence of Chinese Churches

According to Jia, the union and the independence of Chinese churches were strategically connected. The union of Chinese churches was regarded as an important step towards the independence of Chinese churches. Jia believed that the 'three selves' were the key to the success of the Sinicized Church whereby Chinese Christians could exclude the influence of the Western councils. Jia affirmed that Chinese Christians needed their own churches.¹⁹¹

Jia justified himself by three reasons. Firstly, he contended that the independence of Chinese churches was the hope and desire of Chinese Christians. Chinese Christians

¹⁹⁰ Jia, 'Zhong Hua Quan Guo Zhang Lao Hui Lian He Zong Hui Zhi Cheng Li [The Establishment of the National Association of Chinese Presbyterian Churches]' *China Church Year Book 1* (1914), 25.

¹⁹¹ Jia wrote, 'Knowing the fact that in order to achieve the aim of Christianity in China, each church has to self-support, self-govern and self-propagate in order to complete church independence, the barriers set by the Western councils have to be demolished by all means.' Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 394.

were willing to make a commitment to their churches. They would no longer regard Christian churches as the subsidiary of Westerners and the church workers as the foreigners' slaves, but would take the opportunity of developing indigenous Chinese churches.¹⁹² It was high time for Chinese Christians to initiate the movement in different regions of China. Secondly, since Chinese people regarded Chinese churches as the foreigners' churches, and they regarded Christians as the foreigners' slaves. Some Chinese Christians were ashamed of being Christian. Once the churches were independent, the sense of Western religion was expected to fade out, and the Chinese churches would no longer carry names from a foreign country. Consequently, more Chinese people would be willing to convert to the faith and to join the Chinese churches.¹⁹³ Thirdly, Jia asserted that the independence of the Chinese churches was also the expectation of foreign churches. Jia added that some missionaries who were engaged in the National Christian Council of China also advocated the movement.¹⁹⁴

A mood of Chinese nationalism was embedded in Jia's engagement with the union and independence movement of Chinese churches, and Jia continued to struggle for the Chinese churches' sovereignty, which will be discussed below.

3.3.1.3 The Struggle for the Sovereignty of Chinese Churches

The missionaries disregarded the Chinese nationalism which had appeared among Chinese Christians. Nevertheless, Jia still embedded Chinese nationalism in his ecclesiology, and in practice he struggled for the sovereignty of the Chinese churches. For Jia, the union movement was so concrete that he had named the proposed united church, 'The Church of Christ in China'. Jia believed that 'the faithful Christians in

¹⁹² Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 383-84.

¹⁹³ Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 384.

¹⁹⁴ Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 384.

China are intent on the union of Chinese churches... and the most suitable name of the united church should be The Church of Christ in China,¹⁹⁵ and ‘Our Lord bless all the councils of churches in China, they are connected in China without barriers, and they organize a Church of Christ in China.’¹⁹⁶ In Jia’s ecclesiology, the union of Chinese churches was not solely a slogan or propaganda, but definitely an action.

In addition, Jia argued that the success of the Church of Christ in China largely depended on whether the Chinese churches were able to be independent and self-supporting.¹⁹⁷ These two concepts were intimately related to whether the image of foreign religion could fade away, and whether the spiritual life of Chinese Christians was mature. He contended that the Chinese Christians had to be responsible for the management of the Sinicized Church, and they had to run their churches by independent and self-supporting means.¹⁹⁸

Jia was concerned about the sovereignty of Chinese churches, and he argued that in order for the image of foreign religion, slavery or subsidiary status to fade away, Chinese churches had to be independent from the influence of the missionaries. According to Jia, such change could make the Christian faith more pervasive among the Chinese people. Jia added that independence might have advantages for both the Chinese churches and the foreign churches: the Chinese churches no longer needed

¹⁹⁵ Jia, ‘Zhong Guo Jiao Hui Tong Yi Zhi Yu Bei [The Preparation of the Unification of Chinese Churches]’ *China Church Year Book* 1, (1914), 19.

¹⁹⁶ Jia, ‘Zhong Hua Quan Guo Zhang Lao Hui Lian He Zong Hui Zhi Cheng Li [The Establishment of the National Association of Chinese Presbyterian Churches],’ 25.

¹⁹⁷ Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 394.

¹⁹⁸ Jia wrote, ‘The authority of [the] Chinese church presently is in hands of the missionaries. Missionaries are the masters; Chinese pastors are their assistants. For this reason, the Chinese church is unable to develop perfectly. For the advantage of Chinese churches, Chinese Christians have to be responsible for the procedures and operations of churches in different levels. It is true that this policy is the basic element of [the] Sinicized Church. If Chinese churches can be independent, self-supported and self-propagated, then Chinese churches can be administrated by Chinese Christians.’ Yu-ming Jia, *Xin Bian Huo* [A New Differentiation of Doubt] (Nanjing: Spiritual Light, 1925), 257.

the assistance of foreign churches in their daily operations, which had made the Chinese churches like ‘a child with weak and dependent character’; and the foreign churches could reduce their financial assistance to Chinese churches.¹⁹⁹

With limited financial resources, Jia tried to eliminate the Western influence in Chinese churches by undertaking the union and independence movement. Although Jia had stated clearly that the purpose of church union and independence was to facilitate the spreading of the Gospel,²⁰⁰ the tension between Chinese Christians and missionaries was revealed in his discourse. Jia did not want the Chinese churches to receive assistance from foreign churches, because he thought that this assistance would obstruct the healthy development of Chinese churches. He regarded the Chinese churches which were not self-supporting as the ‘spoiled child’ of the foreign churches,²⁰¹ and argued that this situation discouraged the maturity of Chinese churches and paralyzed their improvement.²⁰²

Nevertheless, Jia had to admit that some Chinese churches had to receive financial aids from foreign churches, and he fully understood that the management of these churches was in hands of missionaries. Although Jia did not want the Chinese churches to take foreign assistance, he was a Christian leader with practical mind. He did not adopt the radical approach to the project of union and independence. Due to financial concerns, Jia understood that not every Chinese church was ready to be

¹⁹⁹ Jia, *Xin Bian Huo*, 384-85, 387.

²⁰⁰ Yu-ming Jia, ‘Jin Ri Zhi Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui [Today The Church of Christ in China],’ *Nanking Theological Seminary quarterly* 8 (April 1922), 31-32.

²⁰¹ Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 386-87.

²⁰² Jia stated, ‘In regard to the financial issue in the church, those who offer the money can hold the authority. Once a church can run itself without foreign influence, the internal management of Chinese churches can operate freely, which is a pleasure. Foreign churches have been looking after Chinese churches. They were regarded as the merciful mother, and Chinese churches are like a spoiled child.’ Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 386-87.

independent from foreign assistance, but only those Chinese churches which had adequate financial resources could join the movement. Jia stated that ‘it is not possible that all the Chinese churches to whom the foreign churches formerly provided aid can be self-supported at once’.²⁰³

Chinese nationalism was seen as the denied knowledge of the colonizers, as the Western missionaries disregarded it in the dominating discourse. When Jia involved himself in the union and independence movement of Chinese churches in the 1920s, his motivation was driven from his sense of Chinese nationalism. In the process of hybridization, Jia embedded this nationalism in his own ecclesiology even though it was ignored in the colonial dominant discourse.

3.3.2 The Newness – The Sinicized Church

The union and independence movement of Chinese churches resulted in the promotion of the Sinicized Church. Jia promoted the idea of the Sinicized Church to the Chinese churches, which could be regarded as the newness in the hybridization. Jia developed the concept of the Sinicized Church by hybridizing the ideas of the council of the churches and Chinese nationalism, planning an organization totally excluding Western influences. Jia argued that the Sinicized Church could bring a spiritual superiority to Chinese Christians, and was related to the renewal of his nation.

3.3.2.1 The Promotion of the Sinicized Church

With the success of the union and the independence of Chinese churches, Jia believed

²⁰³ Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 388-89.

a Sinicized Church could be established in China. He regarded the establishment of the Sinicized Church as an opportunity for renewing the Chinese churches, the society and the country.²⁰⁴ In 1922, Jia stated, ‘The current situation of Chinese churches is the best opportunity for saving the souls of the country’.²⁰⁵ Jia argued that the real Sinicized Church had to contain valuable Chinese culture, to adopt the Chinese conservative views of religion and to harmonize the diversity of denominations.²⁰⁶ Jia understood that the prerequisite for the Sinicized Church was the union and the independence of Chinese churches, whereby Chinese churches could enhance the ‘three-self’ movement and exclude the influences of Western churches.

For Jia, the Sinicized Church had to be insulated from Western cultural elements. Jia argued that foreign culture was an obstacle to the indigenization of Chinese churches. When Jia responded to the liberal Christian thinkers who promoted the usage of the foreign language in Chinese churches, he criticized the liberals’ approach as wrong headed and said that they destroyed the image of Sinicized church. Jia’s argument reflected his dissenting stance against the foreign cultural elements which had infiltrated the Chinese churches.²⁰⁷ In response to the liberal Christian thinkers, Jia criticized, ‘In order to make the churches fashionable, they [liberals] only go with the times, and serve the needs of people without spiritual consideration. They are not establishing a real church, but they are destroying the character of Christianity in China.’²⁰⁸ It can be seen that Jia strongly objected to the foreign cultural elements which were infiltrating the Chinese churches.

²⁰⁴ The Chinese name is: ‘Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Hui’. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 731

²⁰⁵ Jia, ‘Jin Ri Zhi Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui [Today The Church of Christ in China],’ 25.

²⁰⁶ Jia, *Xin Bian Huo*, 258-59.

²⁰⁷ Jia wrote, ‘Those [liberals] who promote the Sinicized Church are mainly educated in Europe or America; their Western thoughts are contrary to Chinese minds. In some sermons, for the sake of giving a taste of foreign atmosphere, they cite some phrases in a foreign language. Their mismatched method obstructs the indigenization of Chinese churches which they are trying to achieve. Their behaviours make Chinese people laugh at them.’ Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 256.

²⁰⁸ Jia, *Xin Bian Huo*, 251-52.

In addition, Jia showed his social concern in regard to the establishment of a Sinicized Church. Jia argued that Christian faith not only could establish the Sinicized Church, but could also renew the old China. Jia was optimistic about the Chinese churches and the future of his country:

If all the Chinese people may obtain the new life of Christ... they may change the corrupt old China into a new China with a true light shining... When thousands of millions of my fellows convert to become Christians, the target of Christianized China will be accomplished, a Sinicized Church will be realized.²⁰⁹

According to Jia, the Sinicized Church was not only a religious issue, but it was also related to the prospects of the country. Jia linked the success of the Sinicized Church to the renewal of his country, and he expected that both would be actualized in the future.

3.3.2.2 The Sinicized Church and Jia's Nationalism

The promotion of the Sinicized Church was derived from Jia's nationalism. Jia argued that if the movement for the Sinicized Church could proceed to a successful stage, it would reflected that Chinese Christians could have maturity of spiritual life, and the image of foreign religion could fade away completely. Jia even asserted:

It was not appropriate for real Chinese Christians to accept the historical denominations... Chinese Christians have to adhere to the Sinicized Church that is free from the councils, and they should remove all the barriers set by the councils of foreign churches which obstructed Chinese people converting to Christ.²¹⁰

As a representative of the Chinese Presbyterian denomination, Jia radically demonstrated his subversive position with regard to the denominations. Nevertheless,

²⁰⁹ Jia, *Xin Bian Huo*, 260.

²¹⁰ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 690.

as mentioned, he was a leader with a practical mind, so he would not encourage all Chinese churches to leave the foreign denominations at once. He wrote:

If it is possible, [I] encourage all churches to join the union. But it depends on their actual situations; [churches] should not leave the denominations recklessly so that they harm themselves in return. The councils of the denominations have their own characters and values, and [we should] respect each other.²¹¹

Jia's argument reflected an ambivalence which appeared between the sense of nationalism and the practical situation of Chinese churches. He disliked the denominations that existed in Chinese churches, but he had to accept the fact that Chinese churches could not all detach themselves from the Western churches in his time.

For Jia, the success of the Sinicized Church revealed that the spirituality of Chinese Christians was superior to that of Western Christians. With the establishment of the Sinicized Church, Chinese Christians were free from the Western denominations. They could be a witness for Christ, because they were more willing to obey the Lord's command of union than the foreign churches, which were still dominated by many denominations.²¹² Jia highlighted that the Western churches were unable to witness the faith of union. In this respect, the Sinicized Church was expected to be superior to the Western churches in the future.

Newness, i.e., the concept of the Sinicized Church, took place in the hybridization, which was a hybrid product between the council of the churches and Chinese nationalism. And it appeared in Jia's ecclesiology. As mentioned, the 'council of the

²¹¹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 690.

²¹² Jia, *Jiao Mu Xue*, 367; Guo, *Advocating Separatism?*, 98.

churches' was derived from the exportable ecclesiology. Jia applied this concept with Chinese nationalism which was accompanied by anti-colonial resistance. As a result, the newness appeared in the discourse of the colonized. Jia promoted the Sinicized Church, which he believed would exclude Western influences, would ensure the superiority of Chinese Christians, and would bless his own country.

3.3.3 Conclusion

Chinese nationalism could be seen as the 'denied knowledge' in the hybridization, and it could estrange the authority of colonial discourse. Missionaries did not take into consideration the sense of Chinese nationalism in the dominating discourse. The exportable ecclesiology of missionaries was an example. Nationalism was accompanied by anti-colonial resistance, and it was as such subversive. Jia demonstrated his subversive force in his mimic ecclesiology, while he was intent to exclude Western influences in Chinese churches. Jia held the view that every Chinese church should be a 'three-self' church. In addition, the promotion of the Sinicized Church was regarded as a 'newness' which entered upon the colonial discourse. The Sinicized Church was a hybrid product between the council of the churches and Chinese nationalism. It manifested the dissatisfaction of Chinese Christians in Chinese churches, in which the Western missionaries dominated the governance. According to Bhabha, the 'newness' which took place in hybridity was subversive. In Jia's ecclesiology such newness was obviously subversive, as Chinese Christians wanted to take hold of their sovereignty.

3.4 Concluding Remarks

Jia was keenly engaged in the Chinese church union and independence movement during the first half of the twentieth century.²¹³ He contended that the union and independence of Chinese churches were intimately related, and claimed that his aim was to facilitate the spreading of the gospel. However, Jia took into consideration the tensions between missionaries and Chinese Christians in Chinese churches, so that a sense of nationalism appeared in his ecclesiology.

Mimicry occurred in Jia's ecclesiology, but it turned out to be only an ambivalent subject whose mimicry was like a mockery. In regard to the definition of the church, the organization of the church, and the council of the churches, the sameness with the colonizers is found sliding into Jia's ecclesiology. Nevertheless, the newness and the denied knowledge are also discovered in the hybrid space, which resulted in major differentiation appearing in Jia's mimicry ecclesiology.

Jia's ecclesiology possessed the meanings of submissiveness and subversiveness. Jia adopted the exportable ecclesiology of the missionaries as his main reference for constructing his ecclesiology, which reflected the attraction to the colonizer and his submissiveness to the dominant discourse. On the other hand, the sense of nationalism was embedded in Jia's hybrid ecclesiology, which turned out to be an anti-colonial resistance and challenged the colonial authority in Chinese churches. This reflected the subversiveness of Jia's ecclesiology. The co-existence of submissiveness and subversiveness was found in Jia's ecclesiology, which reflects its ambivalence.

²¹³ See Guo's *Fan Dui He Yi?: Jia Yu Ming, Ji Yao Zhu Yi Yu He Yi Yun Dong De Jiu Jie* [Advocating Separatism? Chia Yu Ming, Fundamentalists and their Difficulties in Chinese Church Union Movement], 53-82.

The conservative/liberal binary discourse has been operative in previous studies of Jia's theology, in which Jia was regarded as the key representative of the conservatives, and his theology has never been inscribed as a subversive discourse. However, this research demonstrates that subversiveness is embedded in Jia's ecclesiology. Such subversiveness is also an element of the Chinese liberal theologies.²¹⁴ It is clearly seen that the conservative/liberal discourse is blurred while subversiveness becomes a commonality, instead of a distinction, of the two wings. In this sense, the two sides of the conservative/liberal binary system are seen as less opposite to each other by their common subversiveness. Also, the term 'conservative' is seen to be inadequate to encompass the subversiveness, anti-colonial resistance, ambivalence and newness, as they all appear in the so-called 'conservative ecclesiology' of Jia.

²¹⁴ See Kwok, *Collaboration as an Alternative Mode of Anti-colonial Resistance – A Postcolonial Rethinking of the Asia-Theological Movement*, 196-259.

CHAPTER 4

THE AMBIVALENCE OF JIA'S CHRISTOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the ambivalence of Jia's christology. We will focus on the colonial mimicry and hybridity of Jia's christology. It is argued that colonial subjects can make use of mimicry as a strategy in which the image of the colonized is shaped according to the character of the colonizer. However, according to Bhabha, this mimicry turns out to be 'a difference that is almost the same, but not quite'. In this chapter, we will examine how the co-existence of submissiveness and subversiveness in Jia's christology could reflect the ambivalence of Jia's mimicry. As mentioned, the Western theologies which the missionaries taught in China were regarded as their 'exportable theologies' taken to the Chinese Christians. As a mimic man in the colonial context, Jia enabled himself to 'negotiate' between the missionaries and the Chinese Christians. His christology was embedded in the site of 'third space', and its hybridity could bring 'difference, alternation and displacement' into the dominant discourse. The 'differences' in Jia's mimic christology were dispensationalism and the discourse of God's kingdom. According to Bhabha, such differences are always elements in colonial subversion.

This chapter contains three parts. We will firstly discuss the missionaries' exportable christology. Secondly, we will discuss Jia's 'mimic repetition' in response to the exportable christology. Thirdly, we will discuss Jia's mimic 'differences' which slid into the dominant christology, and how these became subversive elements in the colonial discourse.

4.1 The Exportable Christology of the Missionaries

The christologies of Strong and Hodge could be regarded as the christology exported by the missionaries to Chinese churches during the 1920s. They were the main references used as sources for Jia's christology in *Shen Dao Xue*, and they became widely known throughout Chinese churches as Jia's *Shen Dao Xue* was commonly adopted as a theological textbook by Chinese seminaries during the first half of the twentieth century. Through the wide use of *Shen Dao Xue*, the exportable christology of the missionaries could successfully enter the Chinese churches. The exportable christology highlighted the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, which could be adopted by the missionaries as a criticism against the Chinese pagan religions. We will focus on three areas of the exportable christology: the Salvific Christology, the Orthodox Doctrine, and the Divinity of Christ, as they could particularly reflect the mimicry and the hybridity of Jia's Christology.

4.1.1 The Salvific Christology

As mentioned in chapter two, soteriology and christology were intimately connected in the theology of the Reformation. Strong and Hodge continued this tradition in their theologies, in which they both discussed christology within the parameter of soteriology. Strong regarded soteriology as 'the doctrine of salvation through the work of Christ,' and christology as 'the redemption wrought by Christ'.²¹⁵ Likewise, Hodge treated the Person of Christ, the Two Natures in Christ, the Offices of Christ, and the Redeemer Christ under all Dispensations within the parameter of his soteriology.²¹⁶ It can be seen that christology as such was part of soteriology in the exportable

²¹⁵ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 665. The contents of Strong's christology, such as the Person of Christ, the Two States of Christ, and the Offices of Christ, were placed under the heading of his soteriology. Ibid.

²¹⁶ Different dispensations included: From Adam to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, from Moses to Christ, and the Gospel dispensation. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 380-379.

theologies of the missionaries.

4.1.1.1 The Two Natures of Christ

According to Strong and Hodge, christology was embedded in soteriology, in which the linkage between christology and soteriology was the two natures of Christ. They held the view that salvation had to be achieved through Christ. Strong argued that ‘the redemption of mankind from sin was to be effected through a Mediator who should unite in himself both the human nature and the divine, in order that he might reconcile God to man and man to God’.²¹⁷ To facilitate humans in understanding the ‘Mediator’ of Scriptural doctrine, it was necessary to understand the Person of Christ.²¹⁸ Strong argued that humans had to understand the necessity of Christ’s two-fold nature: being man, Christ could make atonement for humans; being God, his atonement has infinite value.²¹⁹ If humans did not know the natures of Christ, they could not ensure the validity of the atonement, and they could not ascertain whether they were redeemed. Strong contended that the study of Christ, i.e., christology, was for the purpose of understanding the salvation and the redemption of Christ. Hodge held the same view, that only if humans could know Christ as the God-man, could they understand the salvation and the redemption of Christ. Hodge wrote, ‘When Christ is called our Redeemer, our Lord, our King, Prophet, or Priest, our Shepherd, etc. all these things are true of Him not as the Logos, or Son, nor as the man Christ Jesus, but as the God-man’.²²⁰ Hodge affirmed that the redeemer of humans had to be the God-man and humans had to understand the two natures of the God-man, otherwise they could not know the salvation of God. Christ alone could become the redeemer, because he

²¹⁷ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 669.

²¹⁸ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 669.

²¹⁹ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 698.

²²⁰ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 392.

possessed two natures.

According to Strong and Hodge, christology and soteriology were intimately connected, and the two natures of Christ was a linkage between these two theological thoughts. Although Jia constructed his christology by mimicking this intimate connection, he adopted another linkage, i.e., the works of Christ. We will discuss the mimicry of Jia in regard to salvific christology in sub-section 4.2.1.

4.1.2 The Orthodox Doctrine

During the early decades of the twentieth century, the christologies of Strong and Hodge successfully entered the Chinese churches through the teachings of the missionaries. The exportable christology was embedded in the parameter of soteriology – Chinese Christians had to know Christ through his redemptive work and his dual nature in order to ensure the validity of redemption and salvation. It is noteworthy that the exportable christology was based on those doctrines that the missionaries regarded as orthodox. In the colonial context of Chinese churches, the orthodox doctrines not only highlighted the uniqueness of Christianity, but also indirectly degraded the traditional Chinese religions. In the following part, we will discuss the orthodox doctrine of christology which missionaries exported to Chinese churches.

4.1.2.1 The Person of Christ

Both Strong and Hodge discussed the person of Christ in their christologies, but Jia's christology was directly influenced by Strong in particular. Jia simply translated and summarized the relevant parts of Strong's *Systematic Theology* in his *Shen Dao*

Xue.²²¹ Strong discussed the person of Christ in detail, and he conducted a historical survey of different types of heresies which demonstrated the dates and the problems of six major heresies in church history.²²² In contrast to these heresies, Strong upheld the orthodox doctrine which was promulgated at Chalcedon in AD 451.²²³ Strong argued that ‘the orthodox doctrine forbids us either to divide the person or to confound the natures; the doctrine is Scriptural and rational’.²²⁴ He concluded his argument as to the person of Christ by pinpointing two elements; the reality and integrity of the two natures, and the union of the two natures in one person.

4.1.2.2 The Function of the Orthodox Doctrine

The orthodox doctrine could help the missionaries identify the ‘falsehood’ of the pagan religions in the mission fields. When missionaries taught Strong’s christology, Chinese Christians could easily misunderstand the person of Christ due to their traditional preconceptions of the divine. Chinese people might hold a concept that

²²¹ In *Shen Dao Xue*, Jia discussed the doctrine of salvation, covering the topics: the Person of Christ, the Humiliation and the Exaltation of Christ, the Office of Christ, the theories of the Atonement, the Doctrine of Election, Regeneration, Conversion, Justification, and Sanctification, all of which are found in Strong’s *Systematic Theology* in the same sequence. Thus Jia just summarized Strong’s christology. As for the Person of Christ in Jia’s christology, there is no trace of Hodge’s influence.

²²² Firstly, the Ebionites (AD 107) denied the reality of the divine nature of Christ, and held Christ to be merely a man. Strong criticized Ebionism as ‘Judaism within the pale of the Christian church’. Secondly, the Docetoe (AD 70–170) denied the reality of Christ’s human body, and Docetism was criticized as pagan philosophy introduced into the Church. Thirdly, the Arians (AD 325) denied the integrity of the divine nature in Christ. Fourthly, the Apollinarians (AD 381) denied the integrity of Christ’s human nature, and held that Christ had no humanity. Apollinarism was criticized as an attempt to construe the doctrine of Christ’s person in the forms of the Platonic trichotomy. Fifthly, the Nestorians (AD 431) denied the real union between the divine and the human natures in Christ, treating it as merely a moral union. Sixthly, the Eutychians (AD 451) denied the distinction and coexistence of the two natures, and held there was a mingling of both into one, which constituted a third nature. Strong concluded that all the controversies over the person of Christ hinged upon three elements; the reality of the two natures, the integrity of the two natures, and the union of the two natures in one person. Ebionism and Docetism denied the reality of the natures; Arianism and Apollinarianism denied their integrity, and Nestorianism and Eutychianism denied their proper union. See Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 669-72. Hodge also discussed the heresies in regard to the Person of Christ in his soteriology. See Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 404-05. However, he included discussions of Gnostics, which are not seen in the soteriologies of Strong and Jia.

²²³ Strong wrote, ‘In the one person Jesus Christ there are two natures, a human nature and a divine nature, each in its completeness and integrity, and that these two natures are organically and indissolubly united, yet so that no third nature is formed thereby.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 673.

²²⁴ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 673.

human nature and divine nature could be mutually changed in one person, because persons who possessed both humanity and divinity were commonly found in Chinese legends, in which a man could become a god, and a god could go down from heaven to become a man. For instance, in *Feng Shen Yan Yi* (The Investiture of the Gods), one of the major vernacular Chinese novels written in the early seventeenth century, there were many stories about gods, goddesses and immortals who came to the Earth and changed the fate of everything with their magical power. Besides, there were human heroes in the stories who died and were later resurrected, and who were endowed with the title of god.²²⁵ Therefore the concept of interchangeability between god and man was not particularly strange to Chinese people. In addition, the emperor in China was traditionally called the son of heaven, and heaven was regarded as the God in Chinese culture. The concept of god-king, i.e., the union of god and king, had existed for thousands of years in China.²²⁶ Since missionaries addressed the kingly office of Christ, found in Strong's christology, Chinese Christians might easily hold on to their own preconceptions, and apply them to the person of Christ. Chinese Christians were likely to relate the person of Christ with Chinese legendary characters, and to be confused whether Christ was the same as the god-man in Chinese culture.

The account of the heresies in Christian church history in Strong's *Systematic Theology* was important for clarifying the misconceptions of Chinese Christians. The missionaries thus were able to demonstrate that the orthodox doctrine had a long

²²⁵ Chang-yu Shi, 'Feng Shen Yan Yi: Zheng Zhi Zong Jiao Yu Yi [Romance of Enfeoffment of Deities – The Meaning of Politics and Religion],' *Dong Yue Tribune* 25 (May 2004), 71-72, and see Zhang-chao Zhao, 'On the Sense of God and King in Collaboration in *Romance of Enfeoffment of Deities*,' *Journal of Tianjian University* 13 (June 2001).

²²⁶ For details, see Hui Wang and Hui Wu, 'Lun Zhou Dai Shen Quan Chong Bai De Yan Bian Yu Tian Ren He Yi [A Study of God-man and Theocracy in the Zhou Dynasty],' *Journal of Shanxi Normal University*, 27 (December 1998); Hong-tang Hou, 'Tian Ren He Yi Guan Zao Qi Fa Sheng Li Cheng [The Early Development of the View of God-Man],' *Journal of Anqing Teachers College*, 19 (October 2000).

history, from the fifth century, and it had been proved as the truth over the centuries. The implication was that the long history of Western churches was witness to the reliability of the orthodox doctrine. In addition, Chinese Christians, who commonly held preconceptions about a god-man, could learn from the history of the development of heresies and avoided repeating the corresponding errors. Chinese Christians had to realize the errors of the mythical ideas in Chinese legends. In fact, Jia observed that there were a number of heresies in Chinese churches, and there was an urgent need for Chinese Christians to know the orthodox doctrine.²²⁷ Besides, if the missionaries had not emphasized the reality, integrity and union of Christ's nature, Chinese Christians would find Christ to be merely similar to the gods in Chinese pagan religions. The uniqueness of Christianity would be blurred.

From the missionaries' point of view, Chinese mythical concepts obviously contradicted the orthodox doctrine of christology. The orthodox doctrine not only differentiated the true Christianity from heresies, but could also help the missionaries spot the falsehood of the pagan religions in the mission fields. As mentioned above, the central project of the missionaries was to convert the primitive and pagan natives to the conqueror's religion which was thought to be the true religion. Based on the Western interpretation of the Bible, missionaries would declare that there is only one God, and Christ is the God. Missionaries regarded the Chinese pagan religions as obstacles hindering Chinese people in knowing Christ. In the following section, we will discuss how Strong justified the divinity of Christ in his christology.

²²⁷ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 56.

4.1.3 The Divinity of Christ

4.1.3.1 The Justification of Christ's Divinity

The divine nature of Christ was emphasized in the exportable christology of the missionaries.²²⁸ According to Strong, the Holy Father, the Holy Son and the Holy Spirit were recognized as God. There was only one God, and Christ was one of the persons of God. He contended that 'in the nature of the one God, there are three eternal distinctions which are represented to us under the figure of persons, and these three are equal.'²²⁹ Strong tried to justify the divinity of Christ by quoting and interpreting different verses of the Bible.²³⁰

By citing different biblical verses, Strong in practice adopted an inductive method to construct his arguments. According to Strong, Jesus Christ is God because the Bible mentioned that Christ was expressly addressed as God. For instance, Strong quoted John 1:1, 1:18, 20:28, Romans 9:15, Titus 2:13, Hebrew 1:8, and 1 John 5:20 to prove that Jesus Christ is God. But it should be noted that in these verses, Jesus Christ actually did not claim to be God himself, only the authors of the Biblical books claimed that he is.²³¹ Strong applied the inductive method, and demonstrated that

²²⁸ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 304. Both Strong and Hodge emphasized the divinity of Christ in their christologies, but Jia adopted only Strong's christology as his main reference. Jia summarized Strong's discussion of Christ's divinity in his christology.

²²⁹ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 304.

²³⁰ Strong developed nine points to support the argument. They were: Jesus Christ is expressly called God in the Bible; the Old Testament descriptions of God are applied to Christ; Christ possesses the attributes of God; the works of God are ascribed to Christ; Christ receives the honour and worship due only God; the name of Christ is associated with that of God upon a footing of equality; equality with God is expressly claimed; the phrases 'Son of God', or 'Image of God' are addressed to Christ; these proofs are corroborated by the experience of early Christians. For each point, Jia cited a number of biblical verses to support his argument that Christ possessed the nature of divinity. See Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 305-15. For the citing of the biblical verses, see *ibid*.

²³¹ A typical example is John 20:28. Thomas answered Jesus by saying 'My Lord, My God'. Because Jesus did not correct Thomas' response, Strong presumed that Jesus agreed to Thomas' claim, and Jesus admitted that he is God. In fact, Jesus did not comment on what Thomas said in the conversation. That Strong constructed his argument solely by his own inference.

Christ is God because he was called or mentioned expressly as God in the Bible.²³²

4.1.3.2 Monotheism and the Canonical View

In arguing the divinity of Christ, two religious concepts were applied in the exportable christology of the missionaries. They were monotheism and the canonical view which could be regarded as the uniqueness of Christianity among Chinese religions. Strong's presupposition was that if it is written in the Bible it is true, because the Bible is the revelation of the one God.²³³ Christianity is a form of monotheism which emphasizes there is only one God, and Christ is the God. In contrast, Buddhism and Daoism, two traditional Chinese religions, are classified as polytheistic, with different gods and goddesses in their traditions.²³⁴ In addition, the missionaries treated the Bible as the revelation of their one God. The Bible was the canonical text of Christianity and was regarded as a single authoritative work. The Protestant Christian canon was thought to be closed, which meant the biblical books could not be added to or removed. Christians had to respect the authority of the Bible due to its divine nature. In Buddhism and Daoism, canon does not formally exist, although there are a number of religious texts in their traditions.²³⁵ Western missionaries affirmed that there is only

²³² Hodge also affirmed that Christ is truly God, and his argument was the same as that of Strong. See Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 483-521.

²³³ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 111.

²³⁴ As for the deity in Daoism and Buddhism, see Wei-qun Yao, 'Fo Jiao Yu Ji Du Jiao Shen Guan De Bi Jiao [A Comparison in the Conception of Deity between Buddhism and Christianity],' *Journal of Shanxi Normal University* 33 (March 2004); Li Min, 'Dao Jiao Shen Sheng Lun Ji Qi Dui Zhong Guo Wen Hua De Ying Xiang [The Deity of Daoism and Its Influences on Chinese Culture],' *China Religion* (July 2008). As regards the deity of Confucism, it is argued that Confucius was primarily interested in ideal ethical social living, and his ideas contain no doctrines of afterlife, priests or scriptures. Consequently, he had little to say about the concept of God. Besides, Jeaneane Fowler argues that 'the debates as to whether Confucism beliefs were based on a religious or totally humanist framework still engages scholars today.' Jeaneane D. Fowler and Merv Fowler, *Chinese Religions: Beliefs and Practices* (Portland, Oregon: Sussex Academic Press, 2008), 76.

²³⁵ In regard to the historical developments of the Chinese Daoist and Buddhist classics, see Ji-yu Zhang, 'Zhong Shi Dao Jing Yan Du Chuan Yang Dao Jiao Wen Hua [The Importance of the Study of Daoist Classics and the Spread of the Daoist Culture],' *China Taoism*, 1 (2002); Wen-ying Chen, 'Fo Jiao Jing Lu Bian Zhuan Ji Qi Dui Han Yi Fo Jing Chuan Bo De Zuo Yong [The Catalogue of Buddhist Classics and Its Influences on the Spreading of Translated Chinese Buddhist Classics],' *Journal of Henan Normal University* 34 (July 2007).

one God, and Jesus Christ is the God. The missionaries' Bible was the revelation of God and the canon of Protestant Christianity, and the Chinese religious texts were totally irrelevant. Missionaries regarded the traditional Chinese religions as primitive and pagan religions which kept Chinese natives away from Christianity.

In the exportable christology, the divinity of Christ was justified by the missionary's inductive method, in which monotheism and canonical view were applied. Chinese religions were not derived from the Bible of the missionaries, and they were regarded as irrelevant to the Word of God.

4.1.4 Conclusion

The exportable christology of the missionaries was intimately connected to soteriology, and the missionaries could apply Strong's christology to highlight the uniqueness of Jesus Christ. They could degrade the Chinese religions by claiming that pagan religions were not derived from the one God and his revelation, i.e., the missionaries' Bible. In the colonial discourse, mimicry was the central project of the missionary enterprise, which aimed at converting pagan natives to the conqueror's civilization which was believed to be more advanced. Likewise, in the mission fields the Western missionaries were intent on converting the pagan Chinese to their God who was regarded as the one true God. As mentioned, Jia's mimic christology was derived from the exportable christology of the missionaries. We will discuss the mimicry of Jia's christology in regard to the salvific christology, the orthodox doctrine, and the divinity of Christ in the following sub-sections.

4.2 Mimicry in Jia's Christology

Repetition occurred in the process of colonial mimicry. The missionaries' christology, especially that of Strong, substantially influenced Jia's christology. While Jia was constructing his christology, he was constrained by the dominant discourse in the missionary enterprise, and he had to follow the track that the missionaries had set before him. Nevertheless, Jia's christology was constructed when the sameness of the colonizer slid into the otherness, and the colonizer's traces were only partly found in the midst of it, so that the christology of the colonized, as a 'part-object of the metonymy', was partly the same as that of the colonizer. Jia's christology featured the colonial mimicry which Bhabha defined as 'a difference that is almost the same, but not quite'.²³⁶ The mimic sameness embedded in Jia's christology could reveal his attraction to the colonial discourse and his submissiveness to the missionary enterprise. On the other hand, the mimic difference embedded in Jia's christology could reflect the repulsion of the colonial discourse and his subversiveness to the missionary enterprise. The mimic examples in Jia's christology were found in the salvific christology, the orthodox doctrine, and the divinity of Christ. We will discuss the sameness and the differentiation between the missionaries' christology and Jia's mimic christology, so that the hidden ambivalence of Jia's christology may be discovered.

4.2.1 The Salvific Christology

The christology and the soteriology of Jia were intimately connected, and it was the tradition of Reformation theology. Jia's mimic christology was derived from the christologies of Strong and Hodge, and it was also embedded in the parameter of

²³⁶ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86.

soteriology. Based on the exportable christologies, Jia's christology emphasized that knowing the works, the life and the living of Christ were a matter of utmost importance for humans, because they were the preparations for God's salvation. By emphasizing the works of Christ, Jia could embed his christology in soteriology.

4.2.1.1 The Works of Christ

Jia contended that the works of Christ were the essence of Christianity, and their consequences resulted in Christianity. As mentioned, Strong argued that 'Christ is not only the central point of Christianity, but is Christianity itself'.²³⁷ Likewise, Jia argued that Christ was the core of Christian faith, and he emphasized that Christ was the centre of Christianity.²³⁸ 'The centre of Christianity is Christ' was concrete. In addition, Jia focused on the purpose of Christ's works in the world, and he argued that the works were preparing for the salvation of God. Jia contended that knowing the works, the life and the living of Christ was a matter of utmost importance for humans.²³⁹ Christ's incarnation could help humans know the salvation of God; it took place because humans had sinned; it was part of God's salvific plan for humans and was one of Christ's works. Jia also contended that the origin of salvation was derived from the moral attribute of God, and the foundation of salvation was Jesus' works which included incarnation, birth, death, burial, ascension to heaven, and second coming of Christ. All these works were the foundation of Christianity.²⁴⁰ Jia wrote, 'the life, the living, and the achievements of Christ are Christianity'. According to Jia,

²³⁷ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 691.

²³⁸ Jia wrote, 'Christianity cannot be separated from Christ who infuses the life into Christians. Because the source, truth, development and study of Christianity all rely on Christ, the centre of Christianity is Christ. In other words, Christianity is Christ himself, is the birth, death, resurrection, going up to heaven, and second coming of Christ. In short, if there were no Christ, there would be no Christianity.' Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 50-51.

²³⁹ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 1. However, Jia observed that many Chinese Christians did not understand Christ correctly, and neglected the incarnation of Christ.

²⁴⁰ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 353-54.

‘Christ as such is the salvation,’ and Christ and salvation are inseparable.²⁴¹ Thus it can be seen that the purpose and consequence of Christ’s works is necessarily linked to Jia’s soteriology.

4.2.1.2 The Importance of Salvation

Jia argued that Christ’s salvation could sum up Christianity. Jia highlighted the salvation of Christ in his theology, to the extent that ‘Christ is salvation’.²⁴² For Jia, knowing Christ and his works was only the beginning of Christian faith. More important was to know God’s salvation. In this regard, Jia also interpreted the salvation in relation to other major theological thoughts, such as the cross of Christ, the theme of the Bible and the Trinitarian God. As for the cross of Christ, Jia claimed that the focus of the whole Bible was the cross of Jesus. If there were no cross of Jesus, there would be no Bible. Jia emphasized that ‘salvation is the cross’, and the cross of Jesus was the sign of salvation.²⁴³ As to the theme of the Bible, Jia contended that the Bible demonstrated God’s salvation of humans, in which the focus was Jesus and the theme was the cross. Jia argued that ‘the subject of the Bible is salvation’.²⁴⁴ Thus Jesus appeared not only in the New Testament, but also in the Old Testament. The conclusion of the Old Testament was the salvation, the New Testament was sourced from the cross of Christ. Jia contended that ‘the image of Jesus can be seen in every volume, every chapter and every verse in the Bible’.²⁴⁵ As for the Trinitarian God, Jia held the view that the Holy Son was sent by the Holy Father for the salvation of humans, and the Holy Spirit was sent by the Holy Father and the Holy Son to save

²⁴¹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 353-54.

²⁴² Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 353-54. Guo argued that Christocentric thought could not characterize Jia’s theology, but it was an element in Jia’s soteriology. Guo, ‘Jiu En Yu Sheng Ming [Salvation and Life: A Reflection on Chia Yu Ming’s Christocentric Theology],’ 67.

²⁴³ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 156.

²⁴⁴ Yu-ming Jia, *Sheng Jin Yao Yee* [The Essential Meaning of the Bible, Vol.1] (Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1982), 5.

²⁴⁵ Jia, *Sheng Jin Yao Yee*, 5.

the world. Jia stated that ‘the Holy Father prepares the salvation, the Holy Son achieves the salvation, and the Holy Spirit facilitates the salvation. Three is one, and one is three.’²⁴⁶ Jia’s soteriology became the main theme of his theology, and the discussions of Christ, Christ’s works, Christianity, the Bible, the cross, and the Trinitarian God could all be connected in the parameter of soteriology. Thus Jia’s christology was unavoidably embedded in his soteriology.

Jia’s christology was embedded in his soteriology, which could be regarded as a mimic sameness to the exportable christology. In Jia’s mimic christology the works of Christ was the linkage between christology and soteriology, which could be regarded as sameness in the colonial mimicry. As mentioned, the nature of Christ was adopted as the major linkage in the exportable theology. In addition, Jia argued that salvation was the utmost importance of Christianity, and he regarded the works of Christ as part of God’s salvific plan. We have seen that Jia’s mimic christology was best placed in the parameter of soteriology also.

4.2.2 The Orthodox Doctrine

Regarding the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ, the sameness in Jia’s mimic repetition is particularly obvious. He mainly repeated the exportable doctrine of the missionaries in his theology.

4.2.2.1 The Sameness of Mimic Repetition

Jia presented a historical survey of views respecting the person of Christ, in which he discussed six major heresies.²⁴⁷ Jia summarized Strong’s account of the major

²⁴⁶ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 273-74.

²⁴⁷ It includes: those of the Ebionites, Docetoe, Arians, Apollinarians, Nestorians and Eutyichians.

heresies, and the order in which he presents the heresies is exactly the same as that of Strong.²⁴⁸ After summarizing each heresy, Jia introduced the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ, and merely translated Strong's content into Chinese.²⁴⁹ Jia made the translation almost sentence by sentence, and he did not try to re-interpret the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ. In his ecclesiology, as we have seen above in chapter three, Jia made a number of comments developing his own version of ecclesiology, such as the three-self movement of the Chinese churches, in which he even challenged the authority of the missionaries, and argued that Chinese Christians had to run the churches by themselves. Jia criticized the dominance of Western missionaries as the obstacle to the development of the Sinicized Church. However, in contrast, Jia did not express any personal interpretations of the orthodox doctrine, as he did in ecclesiology. This is no doubt because it was likely that any variations from the orthodox doctrine might engender the possibility of a 'Chinese heresy'. Missionaries would not accept the orthodox doctrine to be amended, added to or deleted, or negotiated. Missionaries held the right of interpreting the doctrine, and left no place for negotiation with Chinese Christians. Those who held a different view of the orthodox doctrine would be regarded as heretics, and must be condemned. They could not stay within the missionary enterprise.²⁵⁰ The orthodox doctrine was not a negotiable topic, the Western missionaries held the absolute authority of interpreting the Christian doctrine

²⁴⁸ See Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 410-13; Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 669-73.

²⁴⁹ Strong wrote: 'The Orthodox Doctrine (promulgated at Chalcedon in AD 451) holds that in the one person of Jesus Christ there are two natures, a human nature and a divine nature, each in its completeness and integrity, and that these two natures are organically and indissolubly united, yet so that no third nature is formed thereby. In brief, to use the antiquated dictum, orthodox doctrine forbids us either to divide the person or to confound the natures. This doctrine is scriptural and rational.' Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 673. In Chinese, Jia wrote, '正統派之說：於主後四百五十一年，堪司炭城的大議會，准定教會所認為正宗之說，則認基一位，兼有神人二性，且二性俱各完備，而合於一位之身；然非別成為一新性。以基督之位，不可分論；其性則不可混言；驗之聖經，揆之天理，當無不悉合。'

²⁵⁰ Song has demonstrated the inferior status of Chinese ministers in Chinese churches during the first half of the twentieth century. See Shang-jie Song, *Wo Di Jian Zheng*, 116.

in Chinese churches. It would have been best for Jia just to repeat the dominant discourse, and not to take the risk of challenging the inviolable doctrine and the authority.

4.2.2.2 The Necessity of Clarification

Jia summarized the orthodox doctrine of Christ's person into four points in his christology. Compared with Strong, Jia further clarified the ambiguity of Christ's person as it existed particularly in Chinese churches. Firstly, Jia argued that Christ's two natures could not be blended. Secondly, it was wrong to state that one of Christ's natures could be changed. Thirdly, it was wrong to state that Christ's natures could be separated. Finally, it was wrong to state that Christ's natures could be distanced.²⁵¹ Compared with Strong's two points which emphasized union and integrity, Jia focused on the inseparability of Christ's two natures. As mentioned above, the preconception of god-men was common to Chinese people. Those god-men could change themselves from god to man or vice versa. They could be gods or humans at different periods of time, whose deity and humanity could be mixed and separated without restraint. In Jia's summary, he highlighted the blended, changed, distanced and separated natures which were the characteristics of Chinese god-men. Jia tried to clarify the ambiguity of Christ's person, especially for those Chinese Christians who had the preconception of god-men. Jia did not re-interpret the orthodox doctrine, but he further elaborated the union and integrity of Christ's two natures, and he conformed the missionaries' orthodox discourse by formulating a summary tailor-made for Chinese Christians.

With regard to the orthodox doctrine, the sameness that appeared in Jia's mimic

²⁵¹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 413.

repetition was particularly strong, probably because there was no room for Jia to make alterations. Any amendment in the orthodox doctrine might arouse serious criticism from the colonizers. Jia could only hold the same view as that of the colonizers, and he thus emphasized the union and the integrity of Christ's nature.

4.2.3 The Divinity of Christ

Jia also made the mimic repetition in regard to the divinity of Christ. Jia repeated the inductive method which Strong had adopted to support his argument. Jia argued that Christ is the eternal God, and he emphasized that Christ is one of the persons of God.

4.2.3.1 The Sameness of Mimic Repetition

In order to justify the divinity of Christ, Jia cited a number of biblical verses to justify the divinity of Christ, as Strong did in his christology.²⁵² Likewise, Jia also adopted an inductive method to support his argument, which was exactly the same as Strong's approach. Jia claimed that Jesus Christ is God because in the Bible Christ is expressly called God. Jia held the same view as that of Strong: the messages written in the Bible were inerrant. The implication was that Chinese Christians had to regard the missionaries' Bible as authority, because it is the revelation of God. On the other hand, Jia adopted the cross of Jesus to interpret the divinity of Christ, and developed three stages of the cross: (1) before Jesus was on the cross; (2) when Jesus was on the cross; and (3) after Jesus was on the cross. Jia regarded the cross of Jesus Christ as the sign of salvation, and argued that the cross could help us understand the salvation. Jia wrote, 'salvation is Jesus, and salvation is the cross'.²⁵³ The discourse of Jesus' cross was supposed to be a differentiation in Jia's mimicry, but it also revealed its trace of

²⁵² See Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 305-15; Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 267-68.

²⁵³ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 123.

the sameness of colonizer at the same time. The three stages of Jesus' cross are discussed as follows.

4.2.3.2 The Three Stages of the Cross

Jia contended that before Jesus was on the cross, his life revealed the 'shadow of the cross' and 'he is the Christ on the cross'. Although Jesus Christ lived on the earth for a little more than thirty years, it did not mean he lost his divinity. When Christ lived on the earth, it was a stage of union of Christ's two-fold nature, divinity and humanity.²⁵⁴

Jia argued that before Jesus was on the cross, he possessed the perfect divinity of God, and he was the second person of God, the Holy Son. Although Jesus possessed his humanity, his divinity remained perfect, and Jesus was not inferior to God. Jia wrote, 'Jesus Christ is the God, and he is the Son of God on the earth and in heaven. Although he comes from heaven, he remains in heaven'.²⁵⁵ Jia did not explain how Christ could come down from heaven and also remain in heaven. However, Jia argued that before Jesus Christ was crucified on the cross, he was God; and before the inauguration of salvation, he is God.²⁵⁶ Even though Jesus Christ lived on the earth for a number of years, his divinity remained perfect, and without being inferior.

While Jesus was on the cross, according to Jia, Jesus still possessed his divinity which was embedded in his humanity. When the sins of all humans were placed on Jesus, he grieved due to his divinity.²⁵⁷ Although Christ's humanity was full of sin, his divinity could feel strongly the anger for sin. God had to leave his humanity at this moment, so Jesus cried loudly on the cross, 'My God, my God, why have you turned away from

²⁵⁴ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 123.

²⁵⁵ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 124.

²⁵⁶ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 124.

²⁵⁷ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 126.

me?’ But Jia emphasized that the sinfulness was just in Christ’s humanity. His divinity was not contaminated, and it remained free from sin. Christ’s divine nature never changed even though his humanity became responsible for the sins of all humans.²⁵⁸

Jia contended that, three days after Jesus was crucified on the cross, he was resurrected from death, and his divinity was no longer restrained by his humanity. Jesus recovered his divinity and the glory which had existed before the creation of God.²⁵⁹ Jia quoted John 17:5 to support the pre-existence of Christ, in which Christ’s glory had existed with God before the creation of the world. According to John 17:5, Jia further contended, while Jesus lived on the earth, he embedded his divinity in his humanity temporarily, and left his glory in heaven. After his resurrection, he went up to heaven.²⁶⁰ At this stage, the divinity of Christ was fully recovered, and was no longer embedded and restrained in his humanity.

Jia’s mimic sameness could be found with reference to the divinity of Christ. Jia related the divinity of Christ to the stages of the cross of Christ in his theological discourse. At the first stage, Jia focused on the originality of Christ’s divinity; at the second stage, Jia focused on human’s sin which aroused the anger of Christ’s divinity; at the third stage, Jia focused on the recovery of Christ’s divinity. Jia connected the divinity of Christ and his salvation through the discourse of the cross, which can also be regarded as a mimic sameness sliding from the colonizers. The discourse of the cross was unique to the exportable christology, so it would have been a differentiation in the mimic repetition. However, Jia still kept traces of sameness by following the

²⁵⁸ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 126.

²⁵⁹ Jia held the view that when God became man, it was a state of humiliation. Jia wrote, ‘He made himself of no reputation, and was made in the likeness of men. He was the being in the form of God, he humbled himself, and took the form of a servant. He gave up the glory of heaven.’ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 127.

²⁶⁰ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 127.

tradition of Reformation theology, in which the discussion of Christ was intimately connected with salvation. Jia embedded Christ's divinity in the parameter of soteriology, as Strong and Hodge did in their christologies. The discourse of the cross remains a mimic sameness based on the exportable christology, and Jia remains unable to go beyond the boundary of the missionaries' dominant discourse.

4.2.4 Conclusion

Jia revealed both difference and sameness in his mimic christology. The christology of the colonized, as a 'part-object of the metonymy', was only partly the same as that of the colonizer, and the colonizer's traces were partly found in the midst of the colonized's discourse. As to the salvific christology, Jia embedded christology in soteriology, as Strong and Hodge did in the exportable christology, so that the sameness of mimicry appeared here. On the other hand, Jia adopted the works of Christ as the linkage between christology and soteriology, as these two conceptions were intimately connected in the tradition of Reformation theology. This linkage could be regarded as differentiation in the mimic process. However, it was noteworthy that Jia still followed the tradition of the Reformation which connected christology and soteriology. Thus, the mimic difference actually remained within the parameter of the missionaries' tradition. In other words, the difference was embedded in the sameness in Jia's mimic christology. As to the orthodox doctrine of the person of Christ, the sameness with the colonizer appeared in a mimic repetition that was particularly obvious. Jia repeated the union and the integrity of Christ's nature in his mimic doctrine, but he focused more on the inseparability of Christ's two natures. Such inseparability was the difference which appeared in Jia's mimic doctrine, though it was not obvious. As to the divinity of Christ, Jia held the same view as the

missionaries that the Bible is inerrant and Christians had to regard it as authority because it is the revelation of God, which can be regarded as the sameness of the colonizer sliding into the colonized. On the other hand, Jia developed the three stages of the cross of Christ which was a differentiation from mimic repetition, as it did not appear in the exportable christology. However, it is noteworthy that the discourse of the cross remained intimately connected to the salvation of God, and Jia kept the discussion of Christ within the parameter of soteriology. Thus the mimic difference which Jia showed as to the divinity of Christ was embedded in the sameness of colonizer. Although Jia's sameness was more obvious than his difference in his mimic christology, their co-existence is exactly the feature of the colonial mimicry which Bhabha had defined as 'a difference that is almost the same, but not quite'.²⁶¹

In addition, there was ambivalence in Jia's christology when, as the colonized, Jia was not simply entirely opposed to the colonizers, i.e., the missionaries, but he appears as having been both 'complicit' and 'resistant' regarding the colonial discourse. Jia was supposed to be the compliant subject who just imitated the colonizer's character and features, adopting the exportable christology of the missionaries as the major source of his theology. However, Jia's christology turned out to be that of an ambivalent subject whose mimicry was like a mockery. Not only was Jia's christology prevalent among Chinese Christians during the first half of the twentieth century, but it also challenged the status of the colonizers' christology by diversifying the univocal voice of the missionaries' exportable theology.

²⁶¹ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86.

4.3 The Hybridity of Jia's Christology

In this part, we will focus on some areas in which Jia's christology is 'quite different' from the exportable christology. According to Bhabha, the hybrid subject can engage in negotiation in the 'third space', which is 'neither one culture nor the other but something else besides'.²⁶² The product of hybridization was a 'newness' which could enter the world, and could 'make differences into sameness, and sameness into difference' in colonial discourse.²⁶³ As mentioned, Jia was within the third space, and he could undertake the cultural negotiation. Jia's christology was neither the pure exportable christology nor his own authentic christology, but a hybrid christology which brought 'newness' to the Chinese churches. The newness of Jia's hybrid christology was derived from two 'different' theological ideas: dispensationalism and the kingdom of God. Dispensationalism was a theological idea which the conservative Chinese churches held during the first half of the twentieth century. With dispensationalism, Jia could introduce the concept of God's kingdom in his christology as well. The newness entered the 'same' theological discourse, so that Jia made the missionaries' christology 'no longer the same' and his christology 'no longer simply different' from the missionaries' christology.

In addition, Jia's christology could be regarded as a subversive discourse. According to Bhabha, colonial resistance was not necessarily 'an oppositional act of political intention',²⁶⁴ even a 'small difference, slight alteration and displacement' could often be the most significant element in the process of subversion.²⁶⁵ Jia embedded two theological ideas, dispensationalism and the kingdom of God, in his christology, and

²⁶² Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 28.

²⁶³ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 33.

²⁶⁴ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 110.

²⁶⁵ Bhabha, 'Translator translated,' 82.

these ‘differences’ may be regarded as subversive elements in his christology as well. Thus Jia’s christology became a subversive discourse.

4.3.1 The Newness – Dispensationalism

During the first half of the twentieth century, dispensationalism deeply influenced the conservative Chinese Christians. The Chinese Christians who held the view of dispensationalism were mainly conservatives.²⁶⁶ Li-gong Yu emphasized that ‘if Chinese pastors are doubtful about dispensationalism, they are usually liberals. Because the liberals do not take dispensationalism into consideration.’²⁶⁷ Yu observed that the conservative missionaries taught this theological idea to Chinese Christians, and many conservative Christian leaders were influenced by dispensationalism.²⁶⁸ For instance, M.A. Hopkins, who was Jia’s teacher in seminary, held the view of dispensationalism. Hopkins was a prominent missionary in conservative Chinese churches, and his idea was commonly adopted by conservative Chinese Christians.²⁶⁹

4.3.1.1 The Dispensations of the Bible

As a prominent conservative theologian, Jia argued that dispensationalism was derived from the Bible, and the Bible was not only a religious book, but also was a record of church history. The essence of the Bible could be divided into seven dispensations. Jia argued that the content of the Bible recorded the past and the future of the seven dispensations, in which humans had gone through five dispensations, and are living in the sixth dispensation presently, and the last dispensation will arrive soon.²⁷⁰

²⁶⁶ Liang, ‘Hua Ren Shi Dai Lun [Millennial Kingdom in the Eyes of Chinese Dispensationalist],’ 65; Yu, *Ye Jin Tian Ming* [Dawn Breaks], 301.

²⁶⁷ Yu, *Ye Jin Tian Ming*, 301.

²⁶⁸ Yu, *Ye Jin Tian Ming*, 301.

²⁶⁹ Yu, *Ye Jin Tian Ming*, 301.

²⁷⁰ The first dispensation was from the creation of man to the departure from Eden (the first three chapters of Genesis), and this was the dispensation of guiltlessness. The second dispensation was

4.3.1.2 Dispensationalism and the Salvation of Christ

In Jia's christology, dispensationalism was linked to the salvation of Christ. Jia contended that each dispensation was a part of salvation, and represented a partial process of salvation. As mentioned, Jia argued that the theme of the Bible was nothing but salvation. The salvation of Christ could be divided into four phases; reason, success, practice and consequence.²⁷¹ The seven dispensations could be embedded in these four phases of salvation. The first phase covered the creation of the world to the scattering of humankind in Babel, in which the world was corrupt, and humans sinned. This was the reason for salvation. The second phase covered the call of Abraham to Jesus' going up to heaven. This dispensation is to prepare for salvation. The Jews, laws, covenants, and promises which aimed at facilitating the success of salvation were the preparations for Jesus Christ. The third phase covered the ascension to the second coming of Jesus. It ranged from the Book of Acts to the Book of Revelation, which demonstrated how Christ's salvation was practised in gentile churches. The fourth phase covered the second coming of Jesus to the end of the world, which is mentioned in the Book of Revelation. It demonstrated the consequences of the Jews and the gentile churches. Eventually, the kingdom of heaven was actualized, and the new heaven and the new earth were seen. The world returned to the stage described in the first chapter of Genesis. Consequently, the success of Christ's salvation was fully

from the departure from Eden to the flood, and this was the dispensation of conscience. The third dispensation was from the flood to the call of Abraham, and this was the dispensation in which humans ruled the world. The fourth dispensation was from the call of Abraham to the mountain of Sinai, and this was the dispensation of promise. The fifth dispensation was from the mountain of Sinai to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, and this was the dispensation of Law. The sixth dispensation was from the ascension of Jesus to heaven to the second coming of Jesus, and this was the dispensation of grace. The seventh dispensation was from the second coming of Jesus to the new heaven and the new earth, and this was the dispensation of millennium. Yu-ming Jia, *Shi Tu Chuan Dao Mo Fan* [The Preaching Modal of Disciples] (Nanjing: Spiritual Light, 1926), 1; Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 216-17. Yu-ming Jia, *Chu Ai Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Exodus] (Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub. Society, 1933), 79.

²⁷¹ Jia, *Sheng Jing Yao Yi*, 31; Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 216.

actualized.²⁷² Thus Jia combined dispensationalism and the salvation of Christ in his theological discourse.

Jia interpreted the salvation of Christ from a historical point of view, and the four phases of salvation were based on the framework of dispensationalism. The four phases could cover the seven dispensations. The first phase covered the first three dispensations. The second phase covered the fourth and the fifth dispensations. The third phase was the sixth dispensation and the last phase was the seventh dispensation. Each dispensation became a part or a process of salvation, and the essence of each dispensation was to reveal God's salvific plan, in which Christ was the key. Jia embedded his christology in the dispensationalism which the conservative Chinese churches held as an inerrant theological idea. Jia regarded dispensationalism as a framework for Chinese Christians to interpret the salvation of Christ.

4.3.2 The Newness – The Kingdom of God

Jia embedded the concepts of the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven in his christology. Jia argued that these two kingdoms had been interrupted, and the work of Christ was to recover the kingdom of heaven. Christ would finally hand over the kingdom of heaven to God so that the kingdom of God would be actualized in the future.

4.3.2.1 The Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingdom of God

Jia contended that God had planned a visible kingdom in eternity. However, the kingdom was occupied by Satan.²⁷³ The Bible revealed how God recovered his

²⁷² Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 216-17.

²⁷³ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 355. However Jia does not mention which part of the Bible.

original kingdom.²⁷⁴ Jia connected the salvation of Christ with the kingdom of God in his theology. Jia argued that God planned a kingdom for his selected nation through Abraham, but the kingdom was not successful. Jesus Christ tried to establish ‘the kingdom of the Messiah’ but that kingdom also failed due to the unfaithfulness of the Jews. Then, God created the invisible kingdom which was the Church. Jesus Christ will be the king when the millennium arrives, and the kingdom of heaven will be actualized. According to Jia, the work of Christ was not only the salvation of humans but also the recovery of the heavenly kingdom. Even if the kingdom of heaven was recovered, the works of Christ would remain unfinished because God’s salvation would not be perfectly complete unless the kingdom of God was actualized.

Jia argued that Christ would not reign in the kingdom of heaven forever because He would hand over it to God, and the kingdoms of heaven and God would join together eventually.²⁷⁵ According to C.I. Scofield, the separation of the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven is one of the characteristics of dispensationalism. Dispensationalists held the view that the kingdom of God includes the kingdom of heaven, and the kingdom of God is the ultimately and the perfect kingdom. As a dispensationalist, Jia argued that the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God could be discussed separately, because the kingdom of heaven was only a process of the kingdom of God, and was a part of it. The kingdom of God included heaven and

²⁷⁴ Jia wrote, ‘God chose Abraham to establish a visible kingdom which belonged to his selected nation. However the kingdom eventually failed. After Jesus was born on the earth, God promised to hand over David’s throne to him. Therefore, Jesus said, ‘For the kingdom of heaven is at hand’. But the kingdom of the Messiah failed again due to the opposition of the Jews. As a result, God established an invisible kingdom which is the Church. After the time of the Church has past, the millennium will come. The Jews will return to their land, and Jesus will be the King. Then the kingdom of heaven will be realized.’ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 355.

²⁷⁵ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 352; Yu-ming Jia, *Ji Du Sheng Ji* [The Life and Teaching of Jesus] (Hong Kong: The Bellman House, 1990), 72-73; C.I. Scofield, *The Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1909), 996 n.1, 1003 n.1; Lewis S. Chafer, *Systematic Theology* (Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948), 1:44-45, 7:223-25.

earth, past and present, and the world of all spirits. And the kingdom of heaven was the kingdom of Christ, which was the content of the Bible. Hence, the Bible was only a part of the kingdom of God. Jia contended that in the kingdom of Christ the fall of all spirits would be recovered, and Christ would hand over his kingdom to the Holy Father. Ultimately, the kingdom of Christ would unite with the kingdom of God.²⁷⁶

4.3.2.2 The Recovery of the Kingdom of God

In Jia's christology, the work of Christ was embedded in the recovery of the kingdom of God. Jia contended that the salvation of God could not be fully revealed until the kingdom of God was perfected. Jia asserted that God had prepared salvation before he created the world. To achieve salvation, God revealed it to his people through prophets, prefigurations, laws, promises etc. The success of God's salvation could not be achieved until Christ's birth, death, burial, resurrection, ascension to heaven, and second coming had happened.²⁷⁷

Jia held the view that God actualized the kingdom of God through the kingdom of heaven, and Christ actualized the kingdom of heaven through the Church.²⁷⁸ Because Christ had to hand over his kingdom to God, the kingdom of Christ would be over some day.²⁷⁹ Jia argued that the kingdom of Christ was 'merely a part or a process' of actualizing the kingdom of God.²⁸⁰ In other words, Jia confined the salvation of

²⁷⁶ Jia, *Sheng Jing Yao Yi*, 32.

²⁷⁷ Jia wrote, 'When the perfect kingdom has come, the success of perfect salvation can be demonstrated completely. The perfect kingdom is the period of new heaven and new earth, it is the same as the original world mentioned in Genesis 1:1. This is also the process of the world...The Christ has to deliver his kingdom to the Holy Father, this perfect kingdom means the union of the kingdom of God.' Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 352.

²⁷⁸ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 358.

²⁷⁹ Jia quoted I Corinthians 15: 24-28 to support his argument and stated, '[Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom to God...the Son also himself will be subject unto [God]'. Jia, *Sheng Jing Yao Yi*, 32.

²⁸⁰ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 357.

Christ, the content of the Bible and the kingdom of heaven to the purpose of the recovery of the kingdom of God. Although Christ remained indispensable in the salvation of God, Jia shifted the focus of christology from the salvation of Christ to the recovery of the kingdom of God, to the extent that Christ was inevitably degraded in this regard.²⁸¹

Once the kingdom of God was embedded in Jia's christology, the salvation of Christ was no longer the focus of his christology. The salvation of Christ was regarded as a preparation job, and the major function of Christ was to recover the kingdom of God. From a human point of view, the salvation of Christ remained important to sinful humans, though more important was the recovery of the kingdom of God. The Salvation of Christ could not be perfect unless the kingdom of God was actualized.

4.3.3 Conclusion

Jia's christology could be regarded as a product in the process of hybridization. Dispensationalism, which conservative Christians commonly held as an inerrant theological idea, was embedded in Jia's christology. However, it deviated from the primary source which was the missionaries' exportable Christology. Jia's christology was derived from neither his masters' theology nor an original Chinese theology. It was a hybridized discourse which formed in the third space where a 'newness' could enter into the Chinese churches. The 'newness' which was formed by the embedding of dispensationalism and the kingdom of God demonstrated the character of 'the

²⁸¹ In regard to the role of Christ in Jia's christology, Guo acutely pointed out that, in Jia's theology, Christ is the focus just because of his indispensable role in salvation. The salvific work of Christ is only a process of the kingdom of God. Jia linked up christology and soteriology in his theological discourse, and in the meantime he also regarded Jesus Christ as only a saving 'tool' in the soteriology. Wei-lian Guo, 'Jiu En Yu Sheng Ming: Jia Yu Ming Yi Ji Du Wei Zhong Xin De Shen Xue Lun Shu [Salvation and Life: A Reflection on Chia Yu Ming's Christocentric Theology],' *Journal of China Graduate School of Theology* 34 (January 2003), 67.

differences into sameness, and sameness into difference’, in which the exportable christology was no longer the same christology as in the discourse of the colonized, and Jia’s christology was not simply different from the missionaries’ christology but contained mimic sameness in various ways. Such newness could shift the focus of the exportable christology, and changed the role of Christ in salvation.

In addition, Bhabha argued that anti-colonial resistance was not necessarily ‘an oppositional act of political intention’²⁸² – even a ‘small difference, slight alteration and displacement’ which took place in colonial mimicry could often be the most significant element in the process of subversion.²⁸³ It could work to undermine the single-voiced authority of authoritative discourse until the discourse of colonial authority lost its univocal grip on meaning.²⁸⁴ In this regard, the newness which appeared in Jia’s hybrid christology could be regarded as operational resistance undermining the single-voiced authority of the exportable christology, especially when the newness was written in Jia’s *Shen Dao Xue*, which was widely used in Chinese churches during the first half of the twentieth century. Although Jia’s christology did not fully substitute the dominant exportable christology in Chinese churches, it could cause the colonial discourse to lose its univocal grip on the meaning of christology. Thus, it reflected the subversiveness of Jia’s hybrid christology.

4.4 Concluding Remarks

According to Bhabha, mimicry could be regarded as a mode of ambivalence. Jia’s mimic christology was involved in the colonial ambivalence. On the one hand, Jia

²⁸² Young, *Colonial Desire*, 110.

²⁸³ Bhabha, ‘Translator translated,’ 82.

²⁸⁴ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 22; 112.

adopted Strong's christology as his main reference, and mimic repetition is seen in his christology. It reveals the attraction to the dominant discourse of the missionary enterprise and the submissiveness of Jia's christology. On the other hand, based on Bhabha, the 'newness' of Jia's hybrid christology could be regarded as an operational resistance against the colonial discourse, which challenged the univocal grip on the meaning of the colonizer's christology and demonstrated the subversive meaning of Jia's hybrid Christology. As mentioned, 'differences, alterations, and displacements' could also be the subversive elements. 'Newness' is reflected the subversiveness of Jia's christology.

Both submissiveness and subversiveness co-existed in Jia's christology. This co-existence as such was ambivalent in colonial discourse. Jia's christology was not simply entirely opposed to the colonizer but appears to be 'complicit' and 'resistant' regarding the colonial discourse. Jia's christology was expected to imitate the colonizer's discourse, to mimic the colonizer in order to generate a stabilizing effect in the missionary enterprise. However, Jia's christology became a hybrid theological discourse whose mimicry involved a 'destabilizing effect' on the colonial discourse, especially when Jia's christology became an alternative to the exportable christology for Chinese Christians. According to Bhabha, the colonial ambivalence could bring disorder to the absolute authority of colonial domination, as it 'enabled a form of subversion, founded on the undecidability that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention'.²⁸⁵ Bhabha's argument could characterize Jia's christology in regard to the co-existence of its submissiveness/subversiveness.

²⁸⁵ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 112.

The fundamentalist/modernist binary discourse has been applied in various studies of Jia's theology, in which Jia is regarded as the key representative of the fundamentalists. Jia's christology is considered to be based on orthodox doctrine and has never been described as a renewed theological discourse. However, this research has demonstrated that newness can be found in Jia's christology, and the renewed discourse has the character of modernist theology. Such newness appearing both in the fundamental and the modernist theologies actually blurs the fundamental/modernist binarism. The common factors of binarism cross over each other, and they resemble each other more than before. Also, the term 'fundamentalism' is seen to be inadequate to contain the elements of Jia's christology, which includes subversiveness, anti-colonial resistance, ambivalence and newness.

CHAPTER 5

THE AMBIVALENCE OF JIA'S SOTERIOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the ambivalence of Jia's soteriology. The co-existence of submissiveness and subversiveness in Jia's soteriology will be regarded as the ambivalence of Jia's mimicry, in which the colonial mimicry and the hybridity of Jia's soteriology were focused accordingly. Jia's soteriology was derived from the exportable soteriology of the missionaries. Jia's mimic sameness demonstrated the influence of the exportable theology, and his submissiveness in constructing his own theology. In addition, as a mimic man, Jia enabled himself to 'negotiate' between the missionaries and the Chinese Christians in the colonial context. His soteriology was embedded in the site of the 'third space', so that its hybridity could bring 'difference, alteration and displacement' into the dominant discourse. In his soteriology, Jia held the view of the perfectionism which was entirely different from the missionaries' theology. Jia's perfectionism may reflect his subversiveness in the colonial discourse.

This chapter contains three parts. Firstly, we will discuss the exportable soteriology of the missionaries, in which we focus on the work of the Holy Spirit, the Doctrine of Election, and Sanctification, as they are connected to the colonial discourse. Secondly, we will discuss how Jia responded to the exportable soteriology by his mimicry. Thirdly, we will discuss the hybridity of Jia's soteriology, in which we focus on the theology of life and perfectionism.

5.1 The Exportable Soteriology of the Missionaries

The soteriologies of Strong and Hodge could be regarded as the missionaries' exportable soteriology brought to Chinese churches during the early decades of the twentieth century. Both of them were the sources of Jia's *Shen Dao Xue*. Strong's *Systematic Theology* was the primary work of reference for Jia's soteriology in the *Shen Dao Xue*, and Hodge's *Systematic Theology* comparatively was the less important reference. Jia's soteriology was widely spread in Chinese churches as *Shen Dao Xue* was commonly adopted as a theological textbook by Chinese seminaries during the first half of the twentieth century. Through the spreading of *Shen Dao Xue*, the exportable soteriology of the missionaries could successfully enter Chinese churches. Strong's soteriology contained two parts, the first part is Christology and the second part is the Reconciliation of Man to God. Strong's christology was discussed in the previous chapter. The second part of Strong's soteriology in *Systematic Theology*, which is the application of redemption through the work of the Holy Spirit, comprises three sections. The first section is the Application of Christ's Redemption in its Preparation which includes Election and Calling. The second section is the Application of Christ's Redemption in its Actual Beginning which includes Union with Christ, Regeneration, Conversion, and Justification. The third section is the Application of Christ's Redemption in its Continuation which includes Sanctification and Perseverance. These three stages of redemption substantially influenced Jia's soteriology, and could reflect how Jia mimicked and hybridized the exportable soteriology. We will discuss the Work of the Holy Spirit, the Doctrine of Election, and Sanctification, as they could particularly reflect the mimicry and hybridity of Jia's soteriology.

5.1.1 The Work of the Holy Spirit

In the exportable soteriology, Strong contended that the application of Christ's redemption could be achieved through the work of the Holy Spirit.²⁸⁶ However, Strong neglected the discussion of the Holy Spirit in his soteriology.

5.1.1.1 The Ambiguity of the Holy Spirit

Strong systematically discussed the redemption of the Christ in his soteriology, in which there were three stages; preparation, beginning and continuation.²⁸⁷ In the preparation of Christ's redemption, Strong discussed the doctrine of election and calling.²⁸⁸ In the beginning of Christ's redemption, four processes were involved, they were; union with Christ, regeneration, conversion and justification. In the continuation of Christ's redemption, Strong discussed sanctification and perseverance. Although Strong contended that the application of Christ's redemption was done through the work of the Holy Spirit, it was clear that Strong placed emphasis on the importance of God or Christ in his discussion, rather than the work of the Holy Spirit. We will discuss the contradiction in the following paragraphs.

The work of the Holy Spirit was neglected by Strong when he developed the doctrines

²⁸⁶ The title of the chapter is 'The Reconciliation of Man to God, or the Application of Redemption through the Work of the Holy Spirit'. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 777.

²⁸⁷ Strong's *Systematic Theology* could be regarded as the standard reference in the missionary enterprise. It was not only the major reference of Jia's *Shen Dao Xue*, but also of Hayes' *Systematic Theology*. Hayes repeated these three processes in his theological discourse when he wrote his *Systematic Theology* in 1931. See Hayes, *Systematic Theology*, 546. It should be noted that Hayes was Jia's teacher and colleague in seminaries. Compared with Strong's soteriology, Hodge's soteriology became insignificant in the exportable theology of the missionaries. A number of topics discussed in Hodge's soteriology were not mentioned in Jia's soteriology, except regeneration, justification, sanctification. The topics not discussed by Jia were the Law, the Word of God, the Sacraments, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Lord's Prayer. See Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3, 3-258, and Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 495-608. In addition, Hodges' soteriology was less systematic than Strong's. Hodges' soteriology had discussed the application of the work of the Holy Spirit and the actual salvation of the people of God, but he did not divide the application of Christ's redemption into the three processes of preparation, beginning and continuation. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3, 3-258.

²⁸⁸ He wrote, 'Calling is that act of God by which men are invited to accept, by faith, the salvation provided by Christ'. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 791.

of election and calling. Strong did not specify what exactly the work of the Holy Spirit was in Christ's redemption. He mentioned the work of the Holy Spirit just once, in his discussion of the proof of and objections to the doctrine of election, and then he did not refer to it in the remaining parts.²⁸⁹ Although Strong linked the doctrines of election and calling to the work of the Holy Spirit in his soteriology, it is difficult for us to find out how important the work of the Holy Spirit was.

In addition, Strong focused on the union with Christ in the actual beginning and in the continuation of the application of Christ's redemption, to the extent that the work of the Holy Spirit became insignificant. In the beginning and the continuation of the application of Christ's redemption, Strong treated of union with Christ, regeneration, conversion (including repentance and faith) and justification, in which union with Christ was the core, and the work of the Holy Spirit was nearly irrelevant. For Strong, the Christian who could have union with Christ was interpenetrated and energized by the spirit of Christ, not by the Holy Spirit.²⁹⁰

According to Strong, union with Christ could result in regeneration, conversion (repentance and faith), justification, sanctification and perseverance. The theme of Strong's discussion was union with Christ, and the role of the Holy Spirit was

²⁸⁹ The only discussion as to the Holy Spirit was the definition of election. Strong wrote, 'The eternal act of God, by which in his sovereign pleasure, and on account of no foreseen merit in them, he chooses certain out of the number of sinful men to be the recipients of the special grace of *his Spirit*, and so to be made voluntary partakers of Christ's salvation'. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 779. As for the discussion of calling, Strong contended that the Holy Spirit gave rise to the call to all men and the elect: 'Calling is an act of God by which men are invited to accept, by faith, and the salvation provided by Christ'. There are two kinds of calling in the Scriptures: general and special. The general call was for all men through 'God's providence, word, and *Spirit*,' and 'the special call of the *Holy Spirit*' was for the elect. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 791. In the remaining parts, Strong did not refer to the work of the Holy Spirit again. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 779-90.

²⁹⁰ Strong asserted, 'The human spirit with its own individuality and personal distinctness was interpenetrated and energized by the spirit of Christ, and the spirit was made inscrutably but indissolubly one with Him, and that human become a member and partaker of that regenerated, believing, and justified humanity.' Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 795.

insignificant.²⁹¹ Strong devoted a total of seventy-eight pages to the discussion of regeneration, conversion, justification, sanctification and perseverance, but the words ‘Holy Spirit’ appear only seven times.²⁹² It is clear that Strong in this part did not focus on the study of the Holy Spirit.

The work of the Holy Spirit in Strong’s soteriology is obscure. Strong put emphasis on union with Christ in the beginning and continuation of Christ’s redemption, and explained its effects on humans. The importance of Christ was still the theme of Strong’s soteriology and the work of the Holy Spirit was not the focus, although Strong affirmed at the beginning of his discussion that the application of Christ’s redemption was done through the work of the Holy Spirit. In short, Strong omitted discussion of the Holy Spirit in his soteriology.

It was seen that Pneumatology was absent from the exportable theology of the missionaries. The study of the Holy Spirit did not structurally appear in the theologies

²⁹¹ Strong argued that union with Christ involved a change in the dominant affection of the soul. Christ’s entrance into the soul could make a new creature who could rule his disposition, which before was sinful, but then became holy. Strong regarded this change as regeneration. In addition, union with Christ involved a new exercise of the soul’s powers in repentance and faith. Faith was the act of the soul, by which ‘Christ was received under the operation of God’. This new exercise of the soul’s powers was the human side of regeneration. Strong called this conversion, in which repentance and faith were involved. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 804. Besides, Strong argued that union with Christ gave the legal standing and rights of Christ to believers. Because Christ’s union with humans involved atonement, the believer’s union with Christ involved justification. The redeemed human was entitled to take for his own all that Christ was, and all that Christ had done, because ‘the human had within him that new life of humanity which suffered in Christ’s death and rose from the grave in Christ’s resurrection’. Also, Strong affirmed that ‘union with Christ secured to the believer the continuously transforming, assimilating power of Christ’s life’. Firstly, it was for the soul. Secondly, it was for the body. Both were consecrated in the present, and in the future, and were raised up in the likeness of Christ’s glorified body. This continuous influence was exerted in the present life, Strong called it sanctification, and on the human side, perseverance. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 804-05, 809-86.

²⁹² For instance, Strong regarded the work of the Holy Spirit as an efficient cause of regeneration. However, Strong still stated that ‘in ascribing to the Holy Spirit the authorship of regeneration, we do not affirm that the divine Spirit accomplishes his work without any accompanying instrumentality. We simply assert that the power which regenerates is the power of God.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 818. The core of Strong’s discussion was the power of God, in which he did not explain the work of Holy Spirit. See Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 809-86.

of Strong, Hodge and Hayes.²⁹³ In contrast, Jia embedded a pneumatology in his soteriology, which could be regarded as a differentiation from the colonial mimicry. As mentioned, Bhabha regarded the ‘small difference’ as the most significant subversive elements in the process of mimicry. In this regard, Jia’s pneumatology became the subversive element in his soteriology. As for Jia’s mimic soteriology regarding the Holy Spirit, we will discuss it in sub-section 5.2.1 below.

5.1.2 The Doctrine of Election

The doctrine of election was a part of the preparation of Christ’s redemption. It appears in Strong’s *Systematic Theology*, but not in Hodge’s work. Theology on this topic was translated into the Chinese language in the missionary enterprise during the 1920s-30s, as both Jia and Hayes included the doctrine in their Chinese theological works published in 1925 and in 1931 respectively. The colonizer’s messages in the doctrine of election can be decoded using the postcolonial perspective, in which Chinese Christians had to accept the doctrine as part of the truth, even though it justified the privileges of the colonizers.

5.1.2.1 The Privileges of the Elect

Strong highlighted the privileges of the elect in the doctrine of election. According to Strong, election was the eternal act of God, and it was purely derived from his sovereign pleasure, not from the foreseen merit of humans. God chose certain individuals out of the number of sinful men to be the recipients of the special grace of His Spirit, they could become the ‘voluntary partakers of Christ’s salvation’.²⁹⁴ In

²⁹³ See Strong, *Systematic Theology*; Hodge, *Systematic Theology*; Hayes, *Systematic Theology*.

²⁹⁴ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 779. And Strong stated that ‘Scriptures forbid us to find the reasons for election in the moral action of man, but referred us merely to the sovereign and mercy of God’. Ibid.

addition, Strong argued that ‘God has a sovereign right to bestow more grace upon one subject than upon another’, and ‘God has been pleased to exercise this right in dealing with men’.²⁹⁵ According to Strong, the elect were not only the voluntary partakers of Christ’s salvation, but also more grace was bestowed upon one subject than upon another. Based on God’s sovereignty, Strong could justify the uneven distribution of grace among humans – God was pleased to see someone who might have more grace than others while He exercised his sovereignty over humans.²⁹⁶

One might argue that with only a certain group of people whom God elected, the act of election was partial to the elected. Strong argued that the partiality was invalid because there was nothing in men that could determine God’s choice of one rather than another, and God’s election was exercising the free choice of a wise and sovereign will, in ways and for reasons that were inscrutable to humans.²⁹⁷ Those who denied the possibility of such a choice denied God’s personality and wisdom. Strong raised the example of Israel, which God selected to be the recipient of special temporal gifts.²⁹⁸ For Strong, the doctrine of election was founded on the free will and the sovereignty of God.²⁹⁹

²⁹⁵ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 779.

²⁹⁶ Strong argued that the doctrine of election was derived from Scripture. Strong stated that ‘Scripture passages directly or indirectly support the doctrine of a particular election of individual men to salvation’.²⁹⁶ Strong developed a total of twelve arguments to support the doctrine of election, in which he cited a number of biblical verses. For details, see Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 779-83. As for the elect, Strong argued that God’s purpose was to save certain individuals only in his salvific plan. With the declaration of God’s foreknowledge, these certain individuals were the objects of God’s special attention and care, and their names were written in the Lamb’s book of life. The Father gave them to the Son to be his peculiar possession. They were allotted to be the disciples of God’s servants, and they were the recipients of a special call from God. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 780-82. As for the grace of God, Strong argued that the choice of election was due wholly to God. The elect were born into God’s kingdom, not by virtue of man’s will, but of God’s will. And repentance, faith, holiness and good works were bestowed on the elect as the gifts of God. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 780-82. In sum, we could conclude from Strong’s arguments: God elected a certain group of men for salvation, and the choice of election was due wholly to God.

²⁹⁷ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 787.

²⁹⁸ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 786.

²⁹⁹ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 787.

5.1.1.2 The Privileges of the Colonizers

According to Strong, those who were chosen by God had a number of privileges. These privileges were especially significant in the colonial discourse. Initially, in Strong's words, the elect were 'certain out of the number of sinful men [chosen] to be the recipients of the special grace of the Holy Spirit, and so to be made voluntary partakers of Christ's salvation'. But God's election would have extra meaning in the colonial context of Chinese Christians. As mentioned above, missionaries could be regarded as colonizers in the missionary enterprise. Through the sovereign pleasure of God, both Western Christians and Chinese Christians were elected. However, in practice tensions existed between the missionaries and Chinese church workers in Chinese churches, and Chinese church workers were commonly exploited by the Western missionaries.³⁰⁰ From the Chinese Christians' point of view, those Western Christians who dominated the Chinese churches were regarded as the elect who received special temporal gifts and more grace than Chinese Christians. They were the 'Israelites' of Christianity, because they were the privileged group in Chinese churches. The Western Christians had a double identity; they were both the colonizers and the preachers of the Gospels. God chose the Western Christians as his representatives to evangelize Chinese people, but they 'came with the Bible in one hand and the conqueror's sword in the other'.³⁰¹ Chinese Christians could not understand God's choice, but in fact evangelization and colonization were intimately connected in history. Chinese Christians were taught they had to accept that God's choice was 'inscrutable to humans'.³⁰² According to the missionaries' doctrine of

³⁰⁰ See Shang-jie Song, *Wo Di Jian Zheng*, 116; Ming-Dao Wang, *Wu Shi Nian Lai*, 77-78; Li-Gong Yu, *Ye Jin Tian Ming*, 284.

³⁰¹ This statement is derived from Swami Vivekananda, the Indian saint, in his thundrous speech at the first Parliament of Religions, held in Chicago. *The Missionary Review of the World* 17 (12), 1894, p. 882, cited in Sugirtharajah, *The Postcolonial Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 15.

³⁰² This was also my experience in a colonial context. I was educated and grew up in a British colony, Hong Kong. As a teenager, I studied in a school founded by the Anglican Church, and there started to

election, God willed the uneven distribution of grace among nations. For the Chinese Christians, to challenge God's preference for the Western Christians was to deny God's personality and wisdom, they had to learn that God's sovereignty could determine human fate. While Chinese Christians could accept the fact that God deliberately bestowed more grace on the Western Christians than others, Chinese Christians could accept the legitimacy of Western colonization in their country. In the first half of the twentieth century, the missionaries continued to teach the doctrine of election in their enterprise in China.³⁰³

In sum, the missionaries' doctrine of election might carry a colonial message in a context where the colonizer was privileged. Jia responded not only by referring to these privileges in his mimic soteriology, but also by emphasizing that the purpose of election was the humility of the elect. Jia developed a new direction which had not appeared in the exportable doctrine of the missionaries. The humility which Jia emphasized was the 'difference' in the mimic doctrine of election. Bhabha regarded the 'small difference' as the most significant subversive elements in the process of mimicry, thus humility might characterize subversiveness. As for Jia's mimicry in response to the doctrine of election, we will discuss it in sub-section 5.2.2.

know Christianity. However, I was confused by some questions: Why were Christianity and colonization intimately connected? Why did Hong Kong Chinese have to learn English? Why did God choose the Western Christians to preach the gospels to Chinese people, not vice versa? Why was God partial to the Western countries? Was it because they had converted to the Christian faith prior to the Chinese? All these questions hindered me for years in converting to Christianity. I argue that Chinese Christians in Jia's context would have had the same experience as mine.

³⁰³ For instance, W.M. Hayes, Jia's teacher and colleague in seminaries, who published his *Systematic Theology* in 1931, still held the view of election, and emphasized that election was derived from God's sovereignty. However, Hayes no longer referred to the privileges of the elected group, such as receiving more special grace, or being the objects of God's special attention, the disciples of God's servants, and the recipients of special call of God in his work. See W.M. Hayes, *Systematic Theology* (Shanghai: Christian Literature Society, 1931), 456-60.

5.1.3 Sanctification

5.1.3.1 The Work of God

Both Strong and Hodge contended that sanctification was not derived from the sinners, but was the work of God. According to Strong, sanctification was a work of God which persisted in the whole lives of believers. Strong defined sanctification as ‘the continuous operation of the Holy Spirit, by which the holy disposition imparted in regeneration is maintained and strengthened’.³⁰⁴ Hodge defined sanctification as ‘the work of God’s free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and live unto righteousness’.³⁰⁵ Hodge contended that sanctification was a grace which God bestowed on sinners, and God could bestow this influence on any sinner, to one sinner rather than another, and to one more than to another, which was a matter of God’s favour. No one personally on the ground of anything he had done, had the right to claim this divine influence.³⁰⁶ In sum, both Strong and Hodge contended that humans could not achieve sanctification by themselves, this was only a work of God.

5.1.3.2 The Objection to Perfectionism

Both Strong and Hodge argued that sanctification was a work in progress,³⁰⁷ in which

³⁰⁴ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 869. And Strong cited Galatians 5:17, James 4:5, and Ephesians 4:22-23 to argue that such continuous operation lasted through the lives of Christians.

³⁰⁵ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 213.

³⁰⁶ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 213. The uneven distribution of God’s grace was justified in Hodge’s soteriology.

³⁰⁷ To interpret sanctification, Strong linked it with regeneration in his explanation. Strong contended that ‘although in regeneration the governing disposition of the soul is made holy, there still remain tendencies to evil which are unsubdued.’ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 869. Strong argued that the believers would have these two opposing principles which ‘lasted through their lives’, Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 870. And in this conflict the Christian, through increasing faith, more fully and consciously, could approach Christ, and ‘thus progressively to make conquest of the remaining sinfulness of his nature.’ Ibid. Likewise, Hodge adopted the concept of justification to explain sanctification. For Hodge, justification was a transient act, but sanctification was a work in progress. Justification was a forensic act, in which God acted as a judge, whereas sanctification was an effect due to divine efficiency. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 213. Besides, justification could change the relation of the sinner to the justice of God, and sanctification involved a change of the human’s character. Justification was founded on what Christ had done for believers, and sanctification was the effect of

the Christian could perfect his or her sanctification only after this life. Strong and Hodge objected to the view of perfectionism which held that the Christian might, in this life, become perfectly free from sin. For Strong, sanctification was ‘never completed in this life’,³⁰⁸ and both the soul and the body of the believer were completed in the life to come, the former at death, and the latter at the resurrection.³⁰⁹ Strong argued that perfectionism was contradicted by Scripture. He stated clearly that ‘the Scriptures never assert or imply that Christians might in this life live without sin’,³¹⁰ and perfectionism was ‘disapproved by the testimony of Christian experience’.³¹¹

Also, Hodge acutely pointed out the danger of perfectionism – that humans could achieve sanctification only when they were given a lower standard of the law of God, and continued to receive the pardoning mercy of God.³¹² Hodge argued that such perfection in fact was not perfection in the sight of God.³¹³ And it was wrong to hold

what Christ did in the believers. Justification is complete, while sanctification was progressive, more complete in some than in others, they might not be the same to each other. Ibid. According to Strong and Hodge, sanctification was a continuing process, in which the character of sinful humans was sanctified.

³⁰⁸ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 874.

³⁰⁹ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 874.

³¹⁰ Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 878. Strong presented several arguments. Firstly, he relied on 1 Kings 8:46, Eccl 7:20 and 1 John 1:8 to argue that the Scriptures distinctly denied the possibility of a human who could live on earth without sin. Secondly, the most perfect characters of Scripture, such as Noah, Abraham, Job, David and Peter, had the record of committing sin. Thirdly, the apostolic admonitions to the Christians and Hebrews showed that no such state of complete sanctification had been generally attained by the Christians of the first century. Fourthly, Strong argued that the word ‘perfect’ should be applied to spiritual conditions already attained. It could fairly be held to signify only a relative perfection, and was equivalent to sincere piety or maturity of Christian judgment. Fifthly, the declaration ‘you were sanctified’ in 1 Corinthians 6:11, and the designation ‘saints’ in 1 Corinthians 1:2, which applied to early believers, were, as the whole epistle shows, expressive of a holiness existing in germ and anticipation. Strong argued that ‘the expressions deriving their meaning not so much from what these early believers were, as from what Christ was, to whom they were united by faith’. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 880. Besides, the party feeling, selfishness and immorality which appeared among the members of the Corinthian church were evidence to show that they were far from a state of entire sanctification. Ibid.

³¹¹ He even regarded perfectionism as a ‘spiritual pride’, and asserted that those Christians who were more spiritually advanced and more attained in holiness would be more aware that apathy, ingratitude and unbelief remained in their lives. Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 880.

³¹² Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 258.

³¹³ Hodge stated that ‘these theories all agreed in teaching that the law of God had been lowered in so

a view that ‘a man is perfect whose acts and shortcomings need expiation and the pardoning mercy of God’.³¹⁴ For Hodge, it might be safely assumed that ‘no man living had ever seen a fellow-man whom, even in the imperfect light in which a man reveals himself to his fellows, he deems perfect’.³¹⁵ If the law of God could be relaxed in its demands to suit the state of its subjects, then ‘there was no limit to be assigned to its condescension’.³¹⁶ In sum, Hodge asserted that sometimes perfectionism was not far from antinomianism, which was exactly its danger.³¹⁷

The exportable soteriology of the missionaries held that Christians might not perfect sanctification in this life. According to Strong and Hodge, it was wrong to uphold the doctrine of perfectionism. However, Jia held the opposite view, and tried to justify perfectionism in his mimic soteriology. We will discuss this in sub-section 5.2.3.

5.1.4 Conclusion

This section has focused on three points of the exportable soteriology: firstly, although the work of the Holy Spirit was mentioned, the study of the Holy Spirit was neglected.

far that its demands were satisfied by a less degree of obedience than was required of Adam, or of man in his normal state’. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 258. To demonstrate the fallacy of perfectionism, Hodge introduced Pelagianism, the Romish theory, the Arminian theory, and the Oberlin theory. Hodge found that all four of these theories had two common features: humans could achieve sanctification in this life; and they could obey the law of God perfectly. Pelagius inferred that a man (even among the heathen) might live from birth to death free from all sin, although he did not assert that any man ever had so lived, and when humans converted, he might live without sin and obey the law perfectly. Romanists argued that by the infusion of grace in justification as effected by or in baptism, everything of the nature of sin was removed from the soul, and the law might be and often is perfectly obeyed by the children of God in this life. Humans might not only do all that the law requires, but may even go beyond its demands. The Arminians argued that perfection was attainable in this life, and it was declared to be complete conformity to the law, including freedom from sin. According to the Oberlin theory, perfection did not imply that humans loved God as the saints did in heaven, but merely that they loved Him as far as practicable with our present powers. And the law did not require that humans should love God as they might do, but the perfect obedience is the believers’ own natural ability. As free moral agents, humans were able to be and to do all that the law could justly demand. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 250-58.

³¹⁴ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 258.

³¹⁵ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 258.

³¹⁶ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 258.

³¹⁷ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 258.

Secondly, the doctrine of election appeared in the exportable soteriology of the missionaries, in which the colonial message was embedded, and it can be decoded through a postcolonial perspective. Thirdly, according to Strong and Hodge, no Christian could perfect sanctification in this life, and it was wrong to uphold perfectionism. We will discuss Jia's mimicry and hybridity in response to the exportable soteriology below.

5.2 The Mimicry of Jia's Soteriology

Jia's soteriology was a mimicry of the exportable soteriology of missionaries, in which sameness and differentiation were found in the mimic repetition. Jia's soteriology was constructed when the sameness of the colonizer slid into the otherness, and traces of the colonizer were partly found in the midst of Jia's soteriology so that the soteriology of the colonized, as a 'part-object of the metonymy', was only partly the same as that of the colonizer. Jia's soteriology featured the colonial mimicry which Bhabha defined as 'a difference that is almost the same, but not quite'.³¹⁸ The mimic sameness embedded in Jia's soteriology could reveal the attraction of the colonial discourse and his submissiveness in the missionary enterprise. On the other hand, the mimic difference embedded in Jia's soteriology could reflect the repulsion of the colonial discourse and his subversiveness in the missionary enterprise. Examples of mimicry in Jia's soteriology could be found in his writings on the work of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of election, and sanctification. We will investigate the sameness and the differentiation between missionaries' soteriology and Jia's mimic soteriology, by which the hidden ambivalence of Jia soteriology could be discovered.

³¹⁸ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86.

5.2.1 The Work of the Holy Spirit

Compared with Strong's soteriology, Jia focused on the work of the Holy Spirit in his soteriology. He re-organized Strong's content, and put it under a new title: 'The Achievement of the Holy Spirit', which included election, calling, regeneration, conversion, justification and sanctification.³¹⁹ Jia introduced pneumatology into his soteriology, and this was in contrast to his main references.³²⁰ Jia's pneumatology might be regarded as an amendment to the missionaries' soteriology which neglected the importance of the work of the Holy Spirit. Jia emphasized the work of the Holy Spirit in relation to Christ's redemption in his mimic soteriology.

5.2.1.1 The Study of the Holy Spirit

Jia introduced his pneumatology by discussing the person of the Holy Spirit, the work of the Spirit, the image of the Holy Spirit, the revelation of the Holy Spirit, and the dispensations of the Holy Spirit. Compared with Strong, Jia particularly emphasized the status of the Holy Spirit in relation to the work of Christ. According to Jia, the Trinitarian God had a salvific plan for humans, and the work of the Holy Spirit was involved in this plan.³²¹ Jia emphasized the importance of the work of the Holy Spirit. He stated: 'Although there was the preparation of the Holy Father and the achievement of the Holy Son, it is necessary for believers to have the application of the work of the Holy Spirit so that salvation can be perfected on them.'³²²

In regard to the person of the Holy Spirit, Jia argued that the three persons of God had

³¹⁹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 504-90.

³²⁰ The study of pneumatology did not appear in the theological works of Strong, Hodge or Hayes.

³²¹ Jia wrote, 'The salvation of God can be divided into three parts: the Holy Father prepares the salvation, the Holy Son achieves the salvation, and the Holy Spirit perfects the salvation.' Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 495.

³²² Jia wrote, 'The birth of Christ represents the Holy Father, He does the work which the Holy Father wants to achieve; the Holy Spirit comes down to represent the Holy Son, and he does the work which the Holy Son wants to perfect.' Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 495.

equal status, and the Holy Spirit was the representation of Christ.³²³ Jia identified the Holy Spirit as the representation of Jesus Christ, and proposed that the Spirit would complete the work that Jesus has not yet completed. Jia pointed out that the Comforter actually was the Helper to believers. Jesus Christ was the Comforter of believers before he went up to the heaven. After that, there was another Helper who could provide infinite assistance to believers, and ‘might abide with believers forever’.³²⁴ Jia asserted that the Holy Spirit was one of the persons of God, and he carried on the salvific work of Jesus Christ.

As to the image of the Holy Spirit, Jia did not discuss this in detail, but just listed all the possible images mentioned in the Bible. They included oil, water, wind, flame, dove, seal and testament.³²⁵ Jia could have made this list easily by referring to a biblical concordance, and his purpose was merely to demonstrate a fact that the sign of the Holy Spirit actually appears in the Bible.

According to Jia, the Bible reveals that the Holy Spirit had performed many works for humans, which included ‘giving men wisdom, coming on men, helping men, teaching men, guiding men to understand the truth, leading men to turn to Jesus, praying for men, and grieving for men’.³²⁶ He also asserted that the Holy Spirit could spiritualize humans,³²⁷ and that ‘men’s conversion, regeneration, justification, sanctification, and so forth are all the graceful achievement of the Holy Spirit’.³²⁸ The work of the Holy

³²³ Jia made his argument by quoting John 14: 12-16 and 16:7, in which Jesus said he left the disciples, and the Comforter would come. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 497.

³²⁴ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 498.

³²⁵ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 500.

³²⁶ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 499.

³²⁷ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 500.

³²⁸ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 499

Spirit had appeared in the exportable soteriology,³²⁹ but Jia put it under a similar but different heading, ‘the Achievement of the Holy Spirit’, instead of Strong’s ‘the Work of the Holy Spirit’.

5.2.1.2 The Holy Spirit and Dispensationalism

As mentioned, Jia held the view of dispensationalism. It was not surprising to him that the revelation of the Holy Spirit was embedded in dispensations. Jia divided up the revelation of the Holy Spirit into two dispensations; the Old Testament dispensation and the New Testament dispensation. Jia contended that those who lived in the Old Testament dispensation might not fully understand the Trinitarian God and their understanding of the Holy Spirit was correct only in part.³³⁰ Although Jia did not discuss his arguments in detail, he asserted that the Holy Spirit practically revealed itself in the Old Testament dispensation, and those who lived in that dispensation could understand the Holy Spirit to a certain extent.

In the New Testament dispensation, Jia also listed a number of verses of the New Testament which referred to the Holy Spirit.³³¹ These verses were derived from the sayings of Jesus and Paul. Jia did not explain these verses in detail, and he simply repeated the surface meaning of the verses.³³² Jia aimed at showing the revelation of

³²⁹ See Strong, *Systematic Theology*, 809-86.

³³⁰ Jia contended, ‘Those who lived in the dispensation of the Old Testament attributed human’s ability to the presence of the Holy Spirit, and the morality of humans to the achievement of the Holy Spirit; the evil behaviour of humans would cause grief to the Holy Spirit; the piety, righteousness, obedience, conversion, work and prayer of humans were all related to the Holy Spirit; the Holy Spirit not only came to some particular people, but also to ordinary people.’ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 501.

³³¹ See Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 501-02

³³² For instance, Jia quoted Matthew 12:31 to explain the teaching of Jesus in regard to the Holy Spirit: ‘There will be no forgiveness for evil words against the Spirit’. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 502. Jia simply re-phrased the wording of the verse, and added no extra information. Another example was 1 Corinthians 12:11, Jia wrote that ‘the faith, healing, miracle, prophets’ word, and testing the spirits, etc. are all sourced from the Holy Spirit.’ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 503. Again Jia repeated the wording of the quoted verse, and added no explanation there. In addition, Jia contended that other than the biblical verses he quoted, there were some other parts of the Bible which discussed the truth and achievement

the Holy Spirit in the New Testament dispensation by providing the relevant biblical verses and giving the least explanation.

In addition, Jia argued that there was a particular dispensation of the Holy Spirit. He discussed this dispensation through two perspectives; the time and the need. Firstly, Jia explained when the dispensation began. Although Jia understood that the Holy Spirit was the eternal God and He existed before the creation of world, he still contended that the dispensation of the Holy Spirit ranged from the Pentecost to the second coming of Christ. This was because the achievement of the Holy Spirit in salvation was particularly obvious in this period.³³³ Secondly, Jia explained how the need of humans was related to the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. According to Jia, Jesus Christ perfected the work of God, and the work of the Holy Spirit perfected the work of Jesus Christ. Jia wrote, ‘it was necessary for humans to have the salvation which God prepared for them, then Christ achieved the salvific work, and the Holy Spirit succeeded it’.³³⁴ In other words, the Holy Spirit could testify and perfect the work of Christ. By applying dispensationalism, Jia could demonstrate that the Holy Spirit was indispensable in the process of salvation, and was as essential as the other two persons of God.

Although Jia provided a rather simple pneumatology in his soteriology, he did highlight the importance of the Holy Spirit in the Bible. This might reflect the neglect of the exportable soteriology, like the soteriologies of Strong, Hodge and Hayes, in which the discussion of the Holy Spirit was nearly absent.

of the Holy Spirit. However, Jia did not demonstrate where they were. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue*, 503.

³³³ Another two dispensations were: from the creation of the world to the birth of Jesus was regarded as the dispensation of the Holy Father; and from the birth of Jesus to his ascension to heaven was regarded as the dispensation of the Holy Son. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 503-04. Jia held the same view in his last theological work, written in 1945. See Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 179.

³³⁴ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 504.

Similarly to Strong's soteriology, Jia emphasized the relation between redemption and the work of the Holy Spirit. He mimicked Strong's content, but put it under a new title, 'The Achievement of the Holy Spirit', which included election, calling, regeneration, conversion, justification, and sanctification.³³⁵ This was sameness with the colonizer sliding into the otherness, and the character of the colonizer could be found in the midst of the colonized. However, there was also differentiation in Jia's mimic repetition, as Jia put emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in his soteriology. Strong introduced the work of the Holy Spirit at the beginning of his soteriology in *Systematic Theology*, but he did not discuss it. Instead, Jia highlighted pneumatology, although it was absent from the exportable soteriology. In this regard, Jia made a differentiation during the process of mimic repetition. Thus sameness and difference both appeared in Jia's mimic soteriology, and this could tally with the definition of Bhabha's mimicry, i.e., 'a difference that is almost the same, but not quite', in which the colonized, the part-object of the metonymy, was only partly same as the colonizer.

5.2.2 The Doctrine of Election

In regard to the doctrine of election, Jia mimicked Strong's arguments and summarized them into a few points. He emphasized that election was derived from God's sovereignty: if there were no selection by God, no one could have salvation. Election was based on God's foreknowledge of persons, which represented God's good will, not God's partiality.³³⁶ The elect was the peculiar possession of Christ, whom the Holy Father gave to the Holy Son, and the names of the elect were written in the Lamb's book of life. Those who were chosen by God would have salvation, receive repentance, be sanctified and be in union with Christ.³³⁷ Although Jia

³³⁵ See Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 504-920.

³³⁶ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 507-08.

³³⁷ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 507-08.

constructed the doctrine of election by adopting some of Strong's arguments, it was clear that Jia no longer highlighted the privileges of the elect in the doctrine of election, which could be interpreted as a colonial discourse regarding the Chinese Christians.

5.2.2.1 The Humility of the Elect

According to Jia, there was a purpose to the doctrine of election, which was to make the elect humble.³³⁸ Jia emphasized that the elect could have salvation only through faith and grace, not through the conduct of the elect themselves. Faith and grace were solely derived from God.³³⁹ Therefore it was not those people who chose God, but God chose them, and ordained them. Jia wrote, 'all our achievements and works were done by the grace of God'.³⁴⁰ Thus, the elect should overcome the law of sin and keep their minds under control, 'they should not puff themselves up',³⁴¹ because what they had achieved was with the help of God's 'right hand, and his holy arm'.³⁴² Jia argued that the elect should humble themselves and admire the wonder of God's salvation, and they should use Paul's words in Romans 11:33-36 for their personal praise to God.

Jia still emphasized that election was derived from God's sovereignty, but he no longer mentioned the privileges of the elect. As mentioned above, such privileges

³³⁸ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 516. In addition, Jia argued that humility was the foundation of all virtues, and it was an important character of Christians. Jia wrote, 'A Christian's behaviour should start with humility, go on with humility, and finish with humility.... Humility is the summation of all virtues. It is the flowing water on the sea and in a river, which never fills up oneself. It is the grace of God, it is the gate of the heaven, and it is the medium of peace among people. And it is so important in spirituality.' Yu-ming Jia, *Ling Xiu Ri Ke* [Daily Devotional Guide] (Hong Kong: Chinese Literature Service, 1962), 255. See also, Yu-ming Jia, *Ji Du Sheng Ji* [The Life and Teaching of Jesus] (Hong Kong: The Bellman House, 1990), 128-32.

³³⁹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 516.

³⁴⁰ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 516. Jia cited Paul's words in 1 Corinthians 15:10 to support his argument, 'But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace which was bestowed upon me'.

³⁴¹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 516.

³⁴² Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 516.

would engender another meaning in a colonial context: God preferred to give more grace to the Western Christians than the Chinese Christians. Jia did not mention the privileges of the elect, but emphasized the importance of humility which had not appeared in the missionaries' doctrine of election. This contrast, in a colonial context, might reflect Jia's view that those who were privileged, i.e., the Western Christians, should not exploit the Chinese people and puff themselves up, because the achievements of the Western Christians were purely due to the grace of God. What they should learn was to humble themselves in Chinese churches. Jia highlighted that the purpose of the doctrine of election was to emphasize the humility of the elect, even though they received more grace from God.³⁴³

Similarly to Strong's point of view, Jia emphasized that election was derived from God's sovereignty, and he summarized Strong's arguments in his mimic doctrine of election. Strong's arguments were the framework for Jia to study the doctrine of election. In this regard, the sameness of the colonizer was found sliding into the otherness, such 'sameness' could be seen in the midst of the colonized. However, there was also 'difference' in Jia's mimic repetition, because Jia deleted the privileges of the elect and emphasized the humility in the doctrine of election, which was different to the colonizer's doctrine. The issue of humility did not appear in the exportable theology of the missionaries, it was unique to the theology of the colonized. Thus difference and sameness both appeared in Jia's mimic doctrine of election, which might tally with the definition of Bhabha's mimicry, i.e., 'a difference that is almost the same, but not quite', in which the colonized, the part-object of the metonymy, was only partly the same as the colonizer.

³⁴³ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 516.

5.2.3 Sanctification

5.2.3.1 The Sameness of Mimic Repetition

Jia held the same view as Hodge as to the holiness of the law of God. He highlighted the holiness of the law of God, and emphasized that the sinful humans would not fulfil the righteousness of the law of God.³⁴⁴ Similarly to Hodge's criticism against the theories of perfectionism,³⁴⁵ Jia also focused on the meaning of the law of God, and pointed out that the law was the knowledge of sin. Jia agreed that it was difficult to explain the meaning of the law of God, if humans would have achieved sanctification by themselves. Although humans might have a good mind, still they might not have the power to do what was right. By the deeds of the law, no humans could be justified in the sight of God. Jia asked 'if humans could not fulfil the righteousness of the law, how could they sanctify themselves before God?'³⁴⁶ Jia believed that Christians were still being contaminated by sin in this life.³⁴⁷ Jia could have held the same view as the colonizers, but in fact he did not agree with Strong and Hodge in this regard. We will discuss Jia's argument below.

5.2.3.2 The Perfection of the Sanctification

With reference to the exportable soteriology, Jia held a different view in his mimic

³⁴⁴ Jia held the view that Christians 'still sometimes had tendencies to evil, which were unsubdued', although the governing disposition of Christians' souls were made holy in the stage of regeneration. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 588.

³⁴⁵ Hodge argued that humans could not achieve sanctification unless they could be given a lower standard of the law of God and continue to receive the pardoning mercy of God. Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 258.

³⁴⁶ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 588.

³⁴⁷ Discussing perfectionism, Jia made a total of five points by mimicking Strong's argument. Jia showed that the Scriptures never assert or imply that Christians might live without sin in this life. He adopted biblical verses, such as 1 Kings 8:46, Eccl 7:20 and 1 John 1:8, as supplied by Strong, to argue that the Scriptures distinctly denied that humans could live on earth without sin. Jia also listed the most perfect characters of Scripture, such as Noah, Abraham, Job, David and Peter, who had the record of committing sin. Jia also applied the apostolic admonitions to the Christians and Hebrews to argue that no such state of complete sanctification had been generally attained by the Christians of the first century. Jia mentioned that the original meaning of the word 'perfect' should be 'growing up', not related to 'innocent'. All these points had appeared in Strong's argument. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 588.

sanctification. He argued that every Christian could perfect sanctification in this life, and the theories which objected to perfectionism misunderstood the meaning of sanctification. Jia's view of perfectionism became a differentiation in the mimic repetition, and also the denied knowledge of the dominant discourse. Jia's perfectionism contained the character of Bhabha's 'difference, alteration and displacement', which were regarded as the subversive elements in colonial discourse.

Jia was a perfectionist who held the view that the Christian, in this life, might be perfectly sanctified.³⁴⁸ Although he supported Strong's arguments objecting to perfectionism, Jia also stated that the view that 'sanctification is never completed in this life' was 'misleading to Christians',³⁴⁹ and 'every Christian can achieve sanctification'.³⁵⁰ This reveals the ambivalence of his mimic theology. Jia asserted that it was incorrect for Christians to hold the view that they could not be perfectly sanctified in this life. Jia's view was the exact opposite of the exportable soteriology. Although Jia mimicked the missionaries' theology which objected to perfectionism, he aimed at developing his own view which was entirely different from the exportable theology.³⁵¹ Jia argued that those who objected to perfectionism had not experienced the life of higher Christians.³⁵² Jia wrote that 'the higher Christians lived in the

³⁴⁸ Jia, *Wan Quan Jia Fa*, 215; Jia, *Wu Shi Er Ling Cheng Jiang Ti*, 59; Jia, *Shen Dao Xue*, 590; *Ling Xiu Ri Ke*, 55; Yu-ming Jia, *Li Wei Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Leviticus] (Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub., 1933), 88; Yu-ming Jia, *Luo Ma Shu Jiang Yi* [Commentary on Romans] (Hong Kong: The Bellman House, 1965), 102.

³⁴⁹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 590.

³⁵⁰ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 590.

³⁵¹ Firstly, Jia quoted 1 Corinthians 6:11, 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and 1 John 3:9 to argue that Christians could be perfectly sanctified in this life. Secondly, he contended that those Christians who objected to perfectionism actually misunderstood the meaning of sanctification. Jia adopted John 13:10 to interpret the meaning of sanctification, arguing that 'Christians were sanctified by their baptism in the Lord.' As Christians still lived in the secular world, it was difficult for them not to be contaminated. Jia's interpretation was that although the feet of Christians were contaminated, their holiness as such would not be affected, and when they washed their feet, they were clean all over. Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 589.

³⁵² Guo argued that the theological ideas of Jia were influenced by the High Life Movement, which held the view of perfectionism. For details of this movement, see W.E. Boardman, *The Higher Christian Life* (London: Garland, 1984). Calvinist theologians were strongly critical of it. Guo,

family of the Holy Father, they had freedom and happiness, and were free from the law of God. The lust of the flesh could not control them.³⁵³ Jia argued that Christians could become higher Christians and might have perfect sanctification in this life.³⁵⁴ Christians sometimes committed errors in their lives, but they also had repentance in their hearts at the same time. Thus the errors might have positive effects on them. And it was incorrect to presume that sanctification could only take place after the Christian died in the world.³⁵⁵ By quoting 1 Corinthians 7:14, Jia contended that even a child could be sanctified because his parents had been sanctified. Jia persisted this view subsequently, in his final theological work, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, written in 1945, perfectionism was still the theme of his theology.³⁵⁶

Jia emphasized the importance of the Law and its meaning to sinners, similarly to Hodge's view. Jia also summarized Strong's argument on sanctification, although Strong objected to perfectionism. These are examples of sameness with the colonizer sliding into the otherness, and such sameness could be seen in the midst of the colonized. Nevertheless, Jia practically demonstrates his own view in his theology, which was totally different from the missionaries. Jia did not refute the missionaries' arguments, but he simply made an ambiguous comment. Jia wrote, 'these arguments only focused on some biblical verses, but there are other verses supporting perfectionism'. Jia held a view of perfectionism which was the opposite of the

'Salvation and Life: A Reflection on Chia Yu Ming's Christocentric Theology,' 86.

³⁵³ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 589.

³⁵⁴ For Jia, the higher Christian life is derived from the Bible. See Yu-ming Jia, *Fei Li Bi Shu Jiang Yi* [Exposition of Philippians] (Taipei: Gan lan ji jin, 1994), 1.

³⁵⁵ Jia, *Wu Shi Er Ling Cheng Jiang Ti*, 59.

³⁵⁶ See Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 211-260. Jia tried to give the counterargument to support perfectionism, but he did not make it persuasive. Firstly, he only adopted the surface meaning of the biblical verses, in which his interpretation was totally free from literary context. Secondly, Jia made a contradictory argument, in which sanctification and contamination existed simultaneously in believers. However, Jia regarded them as sanctified. Thirdly, Jia adopted a subjective personal experience to justify his argument, instead of an objective discussion. As for the third point, Jia further developed the theology of life to strength the perfectionism in the life of Higher Christians. We will discuss this in detail in Section 5.3 of the thesis.

colonizer's theological discourse. Strong, Hodge and Hayes clearly objected to perfectionism. This reveals the difference in Jia's mimic repetition, as Jia's sanctification was distinct from the colonizers' view. Thus difference and sameness both appear in Jia's mimic theology on sanctification, in which the colonized, the part-object of the metonymy, was only partly the same as the colonizer. This might tally with the definition of Bhabha's mimicry: a difference that is almost the same, but not quite.

5.2.4 Conclusion

Jia constructed his soteriology by mimicking the exportable soteriology of the missionaries, in which sameness and differentiation occur together in regard to the work of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of election and sanctification. Although sameness with the colonizers is found sliding into the discourse of the colonized, there are still a number of mimic differences. In his mimic soteriology, Jia supplemented a new topic, pneumatology, which was not in the exportable soteriology. He also linked the Holy Spirit to dispensationalism which was regarded as an inerrant doctrine in Chinese conservative churches during the first half of the twentieth century. In addition, Jia omitted discussion of the privileges of the elect in his soteriology, instead he emphasized the importance of Christians' humility. Jia justified perfectionism with reference to sanctification, on which the missionaries obviously disagreed. Thus the soteriology of colonized, as a 'part-object of the metonymy', was only partly the same as that of the colonizer, and traces of the colonizer were partly found in the midst of the colonized's discourse. Jia's soteriology featured the colonial mimicry which Bhabha defined as 'a difference that is almost the same, but not quite'.³⁵⁷

³⁵⁷ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 86.

5.3 The Hybridity of Jia's Soteriology

In this section we will focus on some areas of Jia's soteriology which are 'quite different' from the exportable soteriology. According to Bhabha, the colonized could adopt mimicry as a strategy of protecting themselves while they were confronted with the colonizer. The colonized could make use of this strategy to fracture the colonial discourse and to undertake anti-colonial resistance. This strategy was 'exactly like the technique of camouflage practiced in human warfare'.³⁵⁸ Jia's mimicry could be regarded as Bhabha's camouflage strategy against the colonizer. Jia was able to fracture the colonial discourse, and undertake anti-colonial resistance by constructing his soteriology as 'not quite the same' as the colonial discourse. Jia's soteriology could be regarded as a subversive discourse, as Bhabha argued that colonial resistance was not necessarily 'an oppositional act of political intention',³⁵⁹ but even a 'small difference, slight alteration and displacement' could often be the most significant elements in the process of subversion.³⁶⁰ By adopting this non-oppositional strategy, Jia developed a theological discourse – the theology of life in his soteriology. The theology of life may be regarded as the 'difference' or 'alteration' in the colonial discourse, so that Jia's soteriology becomes a kind of subversive discourse.

In addition, hybridization resulted in a 'newness' which could enter the world, and could 'make differences into sameness, and sameness into difference' in colonial discourse.³⁶¹ Jia constructed his soteriology by adding his own theology and some other Western theological thoughts.³⁶² This was a 'newness' which entered the Chinese churches during the first half of the twentieth century. Through the

³⁵⁸ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 85.

³⁵⁹ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 110.

³⁶⁰ Bhabha, 'Translator translated,' 82.

³⁶¹ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 33.

³⁶² As mentioned, Jia embedded the theological thoughts of W.E. Boardman in his soteriology.

combination of various theological ideas in one soteriology, Jia made the missionaries' soteriology 'no longer the same', and his soteriology is 'no longer simply different' from the missionaries' soteriology. Besides, hybridity could be regarded as an anti-colonial resistance strategy which estranged the basis of colonial authority, especially when the 'denied knowledge' entered upon the dominant discourse. As mentioned above, Jia held the view of perfectionism firmly in his own theology. Perfectionism could be regarded as the denied knowledge in the colonial discourse, because the missionaries objected to perfectionism in their theologies. Jia embedded such 'denied knowledge' in his soteriology, so that the discourse of colonial authority lost its univocal grip on meaning and found itself open to the trace of other theological languages. With perfectionism, Jia introduced the Theology of Life in his soteriology, which included the three stages of life. In the following paragraphs, we will demonstrate the hybridity of Jia's soteriology and discuss how Jia embedded the theology of life in his hybrid soteriology.

5.3.1 The Newness – The Theology of Life

Jia developed an idea of 'life' in his theological discourse, which Guo regarded as the Theology of Life.³⁶³ Jia argued that 'the life is the spiritual life, the eternal life, the life in Christ, and the life on earth and in heaven'.³⁶⁴ He emphasized that believers might have the life of the spirit, and this was the uniqueness of Christianity. He wrote, 'The life is Jesus Christ, and the essence of Christianity is this life of the spirit'.³⁶⁵ In Jia's theology, life and Christ were interchangeable.³⁶⁶ Jia argued that humans had two kinds of life: the life of the body and the life of the spirit. Jia held the view that

³⁶³ It is called 'Sheng Meng Shen Xue' (生命神學) in Chinese. Guo, 'Jiu En Yu Sheng Ming [Salvation and Life: A Reflection on Chia Yu Ming's Christocentric Theology],' 68.

³⁶⁴ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 609.

³⁶⁵ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 723.

³⁶⁶ Jia, *Fei Li Bi Shu Jiang Yi* [Exposition of Philippians], 1, 100.

the body of the Christian could survive only when the soul was attached inside the body. The soul motivated the body and controlled the senses and intentions.³⁶⁷ Jia asserted that the life of the body completely depends on the function of the soul, and the foundation of the body was derived from the soul: ‘according to Bible, the life of human body is based on the soul’.³⁶⁸

5.3.1.1 The Life of the Spirit

Jia emphasized that humans are unique, as they possess the spirit, and the spirit is precious to them. After God breathed into Adam the breath of life, man became a living spirit.³⁶⁹ This living spirit was derived from the living God, as God begot the man. The life of the spirit of God passed to humans, so humans have the life of the spirit.³⁷⁰ Jia contended that in the beginning of the creation of world, humans could communicate with God, and could obtain intelligence, reason and morals.³⁷¹ With perfect spirituality, humans could be absolutely free from barriers in communication with God. In this stage, the human is a combination of spirit, soul and body, and has the life of the body and the life of the spirit.

Jia further explained the life of the spirit in regard to the creation of humans. Jia contended that when God created Adam, humans had ‘the spirit’ and ‘the life of the spirit’, but there was difference between ‘the spirit’ and ‘the life of the spirit’. After humans committed sin in Eden, they lost the life of the spirit because their sin made

³⁶⁷ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 278.

³⁶⁸ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 284.

³⁶⁹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 277.

³⁷⁰ The ‘life of the spirit’ in Chinese is ‘Lin Sheng Ming’ (靈生命). Jia wrote, ‘The life of the [human] spirit comes from the life of [God’s] spirit, God breathed into the human nose the spirit of God, which means He offers humans a life of the spirit. Practically speaking, it is the life of the spirit moving into the human, the human becomes a living human with the life of the spirit. The life of human spirit comes from the life of the spirit, and the human is begotten by God.’ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 9.

³⁷¹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 279.

the life of the spirit dead.³⁷² As a result, the human's spirit does not have vitality nowadays. Jia believed that the human spirit could survive even if humans lost the life of the spirit. Jia wrote, 'although a human may lose the life of the spirit, he still may have a spirit... Adam lost the life of the spirit, and was separated from the eternity of God. Adam lost the life of the spirit, but his soul and spirit survived.'³⁷³ This human spirit does not work properly, and it cannot communicate intimately with God.

According to Jia, sin and the loss of the life of the spirit are a vicious cycle. Adam sinned in Eden, so humans lost the life of the spirit. If humans lost the life of the spirit, they sinned more.³⁷⁴ Humans may have the mind to do the right things, but not the ability of doing them. Consequently, humans became the slaves of sin. Without the life of the spirit, humans could not know God, and they would go to the hell of eternal death. For Jia, Christians could recover the life of the spirit only by obtaining the salvation of Christ, by which Jia linked the life of the spirit to his soteriology. We will discuss this linkage in the following paragraphs.

5.3.1.2 The Life of the Spirit and Salvation

According to Jia, humans would continue to sin as they lost the life of the spirit. Without the life of the spirit, humans were not able to save themselves from sin, and they would be dead eternally. Jia argued that the salvation of Christ was the only solution for humans.³⁷⁵ In Jia's soteriology, the aim of salvation was to recover life.

³⁷² Jia wrote, 'Once humans committed sin, the source of the spirit was cut off... The life of the human's spirit completely depends on the source of God's spirit. If the source is cut off, the human's spirit will immediately be in darkness.' Jia, *Wan Quan Jia Fa*, 161.

³⁷³ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 285.

³⁷⁴ Jia wrote, 'after humans were expelled from Eden, the being of the human spirit became faded... Their bodies were spoiled, and their hearts and eyes were somnolent. Their spiritual vitality was lost completely, and they will be dead in sin eventually.' Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 302.

³⁷⁵ Jia wrote: 'In the eternal will of God, the human who was dead in sin can be brought back to life through the salvation of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. A human may recover his life in Christ, and connect to the source of the life of the spirit eternally. Then the human's life, which belongs to the

Jia argued that those who had salvation would have life, and those who did not have salvation would definitely not have life. It is noteworthy that Jia placed the emphasis on the life of the spirit, to the extent that it was more important than Christ's salvation.³⁷⁶

Jia argued that Christ could recover 'the life of the spirit', because Christ himself was the life of the spirit. He wrote, 'the life of the spirit is exactly Jesus himself, and this life is in the Word, and in the Son of God, Jesus Christ. Those who have the life of the Son of God will have life.'³⁷⁷ Jia further affirmed that Christ could offer life to humans due to the principle that only life can beget life. Christ himself was the life of the spirit; therefore he could beget the life of the spirit.³⁷⁸

For Jia, the union of Christians and Christ was the greatest mystery, and it was the essence of the life of the spirit; thus Christians could deeply experience this life.³⁷⁹ Jia mimicked Strong's expression 'union with Christ' to develop his theology of life. Jia wrote, 'If men obtain the life of the spirit, they obtain the life of the spirit of Christ, which means our spirit and Christ's spirit become in union. This unified being, involving Christ and his life, was embedded in the human's spirit.'³⁸⁰ Through the union with humans, Christ offered new life to humans, and could get rid of the human's sin. Thus humans could obtain this respectable spirit, and they could recover

life of the spirit, can reveal God's life.' Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 609.

³⁷⁶ Jia wrote: 'The essential need of humans is not the grace of Christ, the help of Christ, or even the salvation of Christ, but the life of Christ, i.e., the life of the spirit of Christ...for those who have this life are the vital Christians; otherwise they are still dead in sin.' Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 614.

³⁷⁷ Jia, *Wan Quan Jia Fa*, 211.

³⁷⁸ Jia stated, 'the life is not derived from education, not from self-cultivation and not from imitation, but from begetting. Life is derived from life, and the life of the spirit must be derived from the life of the spirit. If it is not derived from the source of Jesus Christ, no one can obtain the life of the spirit.' Jia, *Wan Quan Jia Fa*, 211.

³⁷⁹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 646.

³⁸⁰ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 652.

spiritual communication with God.

By mimicking the concept of the union with Christ, Jia coined the term ‘Christ man’³⁸¹ in his theology to describe the Christian devoted to Christ. The ‘Christ man’ is a Christian inside whose heart Christ may live, and whose life ‘is Christ’. Jia wrote, ‘We live not for Christ, and we are not like Christ, but “we live are Christ”[sic]’.³⁸² A ‘Christ man’ had the life of the spirit, not only because of his faith and self-sacrifice, but also because ‘the stream of life’ attached to his soul. If the sinful body was dead, the stream of the life of Christ could flow inside him. Jia wrote, ‘When the Christian and Jesus die together, the sinful body is destroyed, the old stream of life derived from Adam would terminate, then the new stream of life could flow to him eternally’.³⁸³ Jia innovated the concepts of ‘Christ man’ and the stream of life in his soteriology by mimicking the exportable soteriology of the missionaries. Jia successfully linked the ‘Christ man’ to the union with Christ. According to Jia, the Christian who could be in ‘union with Christ’ would become a ‘Christ man’.³⁸⁴

Through the perspective of hybridity, the theology of life in Jia’s soteriology may be regarded as the ‘newness’ that occurs in the process of hybridity. According to Bhabha, the hybrid subject could negotiate in the ‘third space’, which was ‘neither one culture nor the other but something else besides’.³⁸⁵ It could ‘make differences into sameness, and sameness into difference’ in colonial discourse.³⁸⁶ Jia’s

³⁸¹ ‘Christ man’ in Chinese is ‘Ji Duo Rue’ (基督人).

³⁸² Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 627.

³⁸³ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 620.

³⁸⁴ Jia, *Wu Shi Er Ling Cheng Jiang Ti*, 109. Jia also defined the ‘Christ man’ as a result of preaching the Gospel. Yu-ming Jia, *Chuang Shi Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Genesis] (Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub. Society, 1935), 95.

³⁸⁵ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 28.

³⁸⁶ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 33.

soteriology was neither simply the missionaries' exportable soteriology, nor his own authentic one, but a hybrid discourse which made 'newness', i.e., the theology of life, enter the Chinese churches during the 1920s. Jia not only incorporated 'the life of the spirit', 'the stream of life' and 'Christ man' in his theology of life, but he also adopted the concept of 'union with Christ' which had appeared in the exportable soteriology. The newness of Jia's hybrid soteriology was derived from the hybridization of these theological ideas. The newness appeared when the 'union of Christ' of the colonizers was no longer the same, and also the theology of 'life' of the colonized was not simply different from the colonizer's discourse. Jia's soteriology had features that were partly the same as and partly different from the exportable soteriology, which could 'make differences into sameness, and sameness into difference'.³⁸⁷

5.3.2 The Denied Knowledge - The More Abundant Life

With his theology of life which included the concepts of 'Christ man', 'union with Christ' and 'the life of the spirit', Jia further affirmed that humans could get rid of sin, and could fully recover spiritual communication with God in this life.³⁸⁸ Jia argued that humans could be perfectly sanctified in this life through three stages; the life, the abundant life, and the more abundant life. As mentioned above, Jia's perfectionist view was exactly opposite to the missionaries' theology, as the missionaries objected to perfectionism in the process of sanctification. Thus the perfectionism inscribed in Jia's soteriology became the 'denied knowledge' of the colonizers' theology. According to Bhabha, the denied knowledge could enter upon the dominant discourse and estrange the basis of the colonial authority, while hybridization took place in the

³⁸⁷ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 26.

³⁸⁸ Yu-ming Jia, *Xi Bo Lai Shu Jiang Yi* [Exposition of Hebrews] (Taipei: Gan lan ji jin, 1926, reprinted 1994), 147.

third space.³⁸⁹ Jia's perfectionism possessed the character of Bhabha's denied knowledge. In the following paragraphs, we will discuss the denied knowledge inscribed in Jia's soteriology, i.e., Jia's view of perfectionism in regard to the three stages of life.

5.3.2.1 The Three Stages of Life

According to Jia, those who obtained the new life might not necessarily have salvation, they might just reach the starting point of salvation. With John 10:10, Jia devised three stages in the development of spirit life: the life, the abundant life, and the more abundant life.³⁹⁰ Jia contended that the stage of life was an initial step, in which the human obtained life from lifelessness. Jia argued that Christians should not only stay in the stage of life, but they had to try their best to achieve the abundant life.³⁹¹ Jia depicted those who had achieved the stage of 'life' as staying in the Court of the House of the Lord.³⁹² Jesus Christ was not an external saviour to these Christians, but a 'life' in the human's heart. He not only saved them from sin, but also lived in their hearts. Because Jesus was the way, the truth, and the 'life', no one could obtain the life other than through Christ. Jia wrote, 'If we need to recover the life of the spirit, we need the second Adam, i.e., Jesus Christ. We convert to Christ by the faith, and then we have the new life.'³⁹³ However, the spirit is barely saved in the stage of life, and this was only the beginning.³⁹⁴

³⁸⁹ Young, *Colonial Desire*, 114.

³⁹⁰ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 212-16; Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 490; See Jia, *Wu Shi Er Ling Cheng Jiang Ti*, 207; Jia, *Ling Xiu Ri Ke*, 54; Yu-ming Jia, *Shi Tu Chuan Dao Mo Fan* [The Model of Apostles' Preaching] (Taipei: Heavenly People Depot, 1967), 1.

³⁹¹ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 213; Yu-ming Jia, *Chu Ai Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Exodus] (Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub. Society, 1933), 97.

³⁹² Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 490.

³⁹³ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 212.

³⁹⁴ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 213.

In the stage of the abundant life, Christians not only have life, but also the abundant life of Jesus. Jia depicted those who had achieved this stage as staying in the Holy Place.³⁹⁵ Those Christians who had the abundant life had presented their bodies as a living sacrifice to God. They were full of the Spirit, offered themselves to Jesus to determine their lives, and were no longer themselves.³⁹⁶ They were like Christ, because ‘their reason was spiritualized, and their souls were baptized spiritually’.³⁹⁷ Jesus was in their hearts from the inside to the outside, and they would be transformed accordingly. Jia emphasized that an abundant life had more advancement than mere life.

In the stage of the more abundant life, those Christians who could reach the Most Holy Place and stand in front of God had past through the veil. They achieved perfect salvation, and became ‘Christ men’ through the victory of Christ.³⁹⁸ Because they crucified themselves with Christ and destroyed their sinful bodies, they had salvation completely. Jia wrote, ‘This is what Paul said in Scripture: a perfect man with the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, going towards the mark for the prize of God, and those who lived [in the world] was the Christ man’.³⁹⁹ Jia argued that the ‘Christ man’ could be the actual life of a real Christian, and real Christians could make it and should make it in this life.⁴⁰⁰ If Christians could not experience perfect salvation, Christ would not satisfy their incompleteness. Christians had to move on to the perfect salvation, and obtained the more abundant life.⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁵ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 490; Yu-ming Jia, *Chu Ai Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Exodus] (Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub. Society, 1933), 97.

³⁹⁶ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 214.

³⁹⁷ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 490.

³⁹⁸ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 491; *Chu Ai Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Exodus], 97.

³⁹⁹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 491. Jia does not mention the source of the biblical verses here. Jia’s quotation appears to be a combination of biblical phrases. I would contend that the quotation was Jia’s biblical interpretation, rather than a direct quotation of some biblical verses.

⁴⁰⁰ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1962), 492.

⁴⁰¹ Jia wrote, ‘Those Christians who have the life were only sanctified by his status; those Christians

Jia encouraged all Chinese Christians to strive for the more abundant life, as he believed that every Christian could make it, and they could perfect their sanctification in this life. Jia wrote, ‘Only when humans experience the perfect salvation of God, will they have the more abundant life’.⁴⁰² Jia argued that Christians could achieve this before the end of this earthly life.

5.3.2.2 Perfectionism and the More Abundant Life

Jia caused the denied knowledge to enter upon the dominant colonial discourse through hybridization. Because the missionaries objected to perfectionism, Jia’s perfectionist view could be regarded as a ‘denied knowledge’ in the dominant discourse. He asserted the validity of perfectionism by developing the three stages of life in his discussion of sanctification, in which he coined the term ‘the more abundant life’. According to Bhabha, the denied knowledge could estrange the basis of the authority of the colonizers. By introducing perfectionism in the three stages of life, Jia could challenge the missionaries’ theology which objected to perfectionism. The discourse of colonial authority thus lost its univocal grip on meaning and found itself open to the trace of other theological languages, by which Jia successfully turned the dominated discursive conditions into the grounds of intervention. In this regard, Jia’s theology could be regarded as subversion in colonial discourse. Bhabha contended that the ‘difference, alteration, and displacement’ which took place in the colonial discourse were often the most significant elements in the process of subversion. Jia’s perfectionism and three stages of life featured these elements.

who have the abundant life were sanctified in their lives; those Christians who have the more abundant life achieved the perfect sanctification.’ Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 215.

⁴⁰² Jia, *Wan Quan Jiu Fa*, 214. See also Jia, *Xi Bo Lai Shu Jiang Yi* [Exposition of Hebrews], 147. According to Jia, there is a new communication between God and human, which is ‘Xin Shen Jiao’ (新神交) in Chinese.

Through the perspective of colonial hybridity, the denied knowledge embedded in Jia's soteriology could be discovered, and it resulted in subversion of the missionaries' theology.

5.3.3 Conclusion

Jia adopted the exportable soteriology of the missionaries to develop his own soteriology, in which he innovated some theological ideas: the life of the spirit, 'Christ man' and 'the more abundant life'. Jia caused a 'newness' to enter upon the colonial discourse by combining his innovative ideas with the exportable soteriology. This newness is an important character of hybridity, and it was found in Jia's soteriology. In addition, Jia made the denied knowledge enter upon the colonial discourse in the process of hybridization, in which he asserted the validity of perfectionism and constructed the 'three stages of life' in the discourse of sanctification. The perfectionist view may be regarded as the 'denied knowledge' in the dominant discourse. Jia did not conform to the missionaries who objected to perfectionism. According to Bhabha, the 'difference, alteration, and displacement' which appeared in the colonial discourse were often the most significant elements in the process of subversion. With perfectionism and the 'three stages of life', Jia's hybrid soteriology could become subversive to the exportable soteriology of the missionaries.

5.4 Concluding Remark

The ambivalence of Jia's soteriology was revealed through Bhabha's postcolonial perspective. Jia adopted the exportable soteriology of the missionaries as his major

reference in constructing his own soteriology, in which mimic repetition can be found in regard to the work of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of election, and sanctification. Jia was not intent on objecting to the exportable soteriology, even though he held the opposite view in some cases.⁴⁰³ This reflects his attraction to the dominant discourse and the submissiveness of Jia's soteriology in the missionary enterprise.

According to Bhabha, Jia's hybrid soteriology could challenge the univocal grip on meaning of the colonizer's soteriology and estrange the colonial authority of the missionaries. The newness – the theology of life, and the denied knowledge – the three stages of life in Jia's hybrid soteriology could be regarded as an operational resistance against the colonial discourse. They reflect the repulsion of the dominant discourse and the subversiveness of Jia's soteriology.

Jia's soteriology was not simply entirely opposed to the colonizer but appears to be 'complicit' and 'resistant' regarding the colonial discourse. Jia's soteriology was supposed to imitate the missionaries' discourse, which might result in a stabilizing effect on the missionary enterprise. However, as mentioned, the mimicry and the hybridity of Jia's soteriology also created a 'destabilizing effect' on the colonial discourse, especially when Jia's soteriology became an alternative to the missionaries' exportable soteriology for Chinese Christians. Jia's soteriology could be regarded as a challenge to the exportable soteriology of the missionaries, as it was prevalent among Chinese Christians during the first half of the twentieth century.

According to Bhabha, colonial ambivalence could bring disorder to the absolute

⁴⁰³ As mentioned above, there is plenty of evidence to show that Jia maintained a friendly relationship with the missionaries when he worked in their seminaries.

authority of colonial domination, as it 'enabled a form of subversion, founded on the undecidability that turns the discursive conditions of dominance into the grounds of intervention'.⁴⁰⁴ Bhabha's argument could characterize Jia's soteriology with reference to the co-existence of its submissiveness and subversiveness. This co-existence was ambivalent in itself.

As mentioned above, the binary discourse was not adequate for studying Jia's ecclesiology and christology. Such inadequacy appears again in relation to Jia's soteriology. Some elements of Jia's soteriology which were concealed in binary language can now be seen through the postcolonial perspective. These elements include; subversiveness, anti-colonial resistance, ambivalence, mimicry, hybridity and newness, which may cross over both sides of the binary divide, and create commonality as a result. The binary discourse becomes hopelessly blurred.

⁴⁰⁴ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 112.

CHAPTER 6

JIA'S THEOLOGY COMPARED WITH THAT OF T.C. CHAO

This chapter aims to reveal the uniqueness of Jia's theology by comparing it with that of T.C. Chao, viewing both through postcolonial perspectives. Chao has been selected on the basis of the following criteria: first, he is the key representative of the thought of the liberal wing of the Chinese Church, he proposes his own distinctive position and theory for the Chinese Church; second, his ideas played a prominent role in the Protestant Church and were influential among Christians of the time; third, his theology may still be having an effect on the Chinese Church today; fourth, the postcolonial concepts of ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity are found in his theology, which becomes the contact point with the present study.⁴⁰⁵ Chao's background and significance in the Chinese Church will be demonstrated below:

6.1 Introduction of T.C. Chao⁴⁰⁶

T.C. Chao (1888–1979) was regarded as theologian, philosopher, religionist, poet and educationist in China. Chao received a traditional education in China when he was young, and was awarded his Bachelor of Arts degree at Dong Wu University in Soochow in 1910. After graduation, he became a school teacher in Dong Wu Middle

⁴⁰⁵ Shui-man Kwan adopted the theology of T.C. Chao as an example of illustrating postcolonial theories in his PhD thesis, which revealed that ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity were embedded in the liberal Chinese theology. See Shui-man Kwan, *Collaboration as Alternative Mode of Anti-colonialist Resistance – A Postcolonial Rethinking of the Asia-West Binarism Inscribed in the Asian Theological Movement* (PhD thesis, CUHK, 1999), 196-259.

⁴⁰⁶ According to the official Pinyin Romanization adopted in China, Chao's name should be spelled Zhao Ze-Chen. However, Chao himself used the form, Tzu-Ch'en Chao, and usually published internationally by the name T.C. Chao. Hence the latter form is used in the thesis.

School and then went to study in the United States, receiving the degrees of Master of Arts and Bachelor of Divinity in 1916 and 1917 respectively. In 1926, Chao left Dong Wu University, where he had taught sociology and religion since 1917, and joined the faculty of Yenching University. He was the Dean of the School of Religion, and much of his time was spent teaching, writing and preaching.⁴⁰⁷ Chao was, for almost three decades, the leading proponent of Christianity on college campuses and among the better educated in China.

As a church leader, Chao participated in the work of the Chinese National Christian Council from 1922, and published a great number of theological articles and some monographs in response to the social context. Consequently, he soon became widely known throughout China. Chao was a well-known writer and authored a number of books, including *Ji Du Jiao Zhe Xue* [Christian Philosophy] (1925), *Ye Su Chuan* [The Biography of Jesus](1935), *Ji Du Jiao Jin Jie* [Interpretation of Christianity] (1947), *Sheng Bao Luo Chuan* [The Biography of St. Paul] (1948), *Shen Xue Si Jiang* [Four Talks on Theology] (1948) and so on. Chao's fame was not confined to Chinese churches. His articles and essays written in Chinese were published in *The Chinese Recorder* and international missionary journals. Today Chao's thought still attracts the attention of researchers.

6.2 The Content of the Works of T.C. Chao

We will focus on the ecclesiology, christology and soteriology of Chao's theology, and divide it into two periods: earlier and later. The ecclesiology of Chao is connected

⁴⁰⁷ See Rong-hong Lin, *Qu Gao He Gua: Zhao Zi Chen De Sheng Ping Ji Shen Xue* [The Life and Thought of Chao Tzu-ch'en] (Hong Kong: China Graduate School of Theology, 1994), 1-42.

with Chinese nationalism, his christology is connected to the divinity of Christ, and his soteriology is connected with a particular form of salvation. These will be discussed below.

6.2.1 Chao's Ecclesiology

6.2.1.1 Chao's Earlier Ecclesiology and Chinese Nationalism

Chinese nationalism was embedded in Chao's earlier ecclesiology. In the 1920s, the governance of Chinese churches generally was still dominated by Western missionaries. Chao struggled for the independence of Chinese churches, and he argued that 'the time is come, [if we] do not have an independent Chinese Church, we cannot preach Christianity and cannot establish the kingdom of heaven'.⁴⁰⁸ Chinese Christians had to set up their own churches, so that 'Chinese Christians could experience their lives with Chinese customs'⁴⁰⁹ in their own churches. Chao asserted that Chinese churches were merely extensions of Western churches, serving as their 'preaching points' in China.⁴¹⁰ Chinese churches had to be indigenized as soon as possible.⁴¹¹ Regarding Chao's thought in the 1920s, Lin commented that Chao's response was intimately connected to his sense of nationalism and the anti-Christian movement in the 1920s.⁴¹²

With regard to nationalism, Chao focused on the separation between Chinese churches

⁴⁰⁸ T.C. Chao, 'Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian [My Opinions on the Creation of the Chinese Church],' *Zhen Guang* [True Light] 26:6 (Jun 1927), in *Er Shi Shi Ji Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Wen Ti* [The Problems of Chinese Christianity in the Twentieth Century], ed. Yu-ming Shao (Taipei: Zheng zhong, 1980), 549.

⁴⁰⁹ Chao, 'Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian [My Opinions on the Creation of the Chinese Church],' 549.

⁴¹⁰ Chao, 'Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian [My Opinions on the Creation of the Chinese Church],' 548.

⁴¹¹ T.C. Chao, 'Ben Se Jiao Huai Di Shang Que [The Problems of the Indigenous Church],' *Qing Nan* [Youth] 76 (10/1924), 9.

⁴¹² Lin, *Qu Gao He Gua: Zhao Zi Chen De Sheng Ping Ji Shen Xue* [The Life and Thought of Chao Tzu-ch'en], 114.

and Western churches. He argued that Chinese churches had to be independent from Western churches, which was the prerequisite of indigenization, so that Chinese churches could cease suffering from the manipulation of imperialism.⁴¹³ In other words, Chao wanted to accomplish the target of the ‘three-self’ church, and he challenged the influence of Western churches over Chinese churches. Chao, like Jia, also put emphasis on the issues of ‘three-self’. Both of them held the same view that the dominance of the missionaries in Chinese churches was an obstacle to developing the Chinese Church. They affirmed that Chinese churches had to detach themselves from the missionaries and the Western churches.

Chao thought that the Chinese Church had to be independent with reference to its organization, which was sourced from the West, but he also contended that all Christians who live in the world believe ‘in God together, in Jesus together, and strive to establish the kingdom of God together’.⁴¹⁴ Although they were in different locations, they had the same God. For Chao, there were two meanings of ‘church’: the world church and individual churches, international and national respectively. All true Christians living in the world were members of the world church, while they had their own organizations and systems. These Christians of different nations might have a common spiritual fellowship, in spite of their different nations, organizations and systems. Chao also contended that the spirituality and the practical issues of the Church could be discussed separately. Chao wrote, ‘Religious systems vary in different times and places, but spiritual lives may have silent consensus (among them).

⁴¹³ Chao stated, ‘In regard to the financial issue, only Chinese Christians [should] provide the source of the indigenized church; in regard to the governance, only Chinese Christians handle it; in regard to the organization, it only suits the intelligence of Chinese Christians, in regard to theology, it is adjusted freely only by the Chinese traditional thoughts. If we cannot achieve these targets, the indigenized Chinese Church cannot be perfect.’ Chao, ‘Ben Se Jiao Huai Di Shang Que [The Problems of the Indigenous Church],’ 9.

⁴¹⁴ Chao, ‘Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian [My Opinions on the Creation of the Chinese Church],’ 548.

The churches in the world are not a constant system with a hierarchy, so there is no dispute on the issue of sovereignty among the churches.⁴¹⁵ Accordingly, churches should be independent from each other, and no church should intervene in the sovereignty of another church, but they are in spiritual unity. Thus Chao, like Jia, held the view of a world church and local churches. True Christians could be united spiritually, and churches should be independent from each other in the world.

In this regard, it is noteworthy that Chao was opposed to Christian denominations. He argued that Chinese churches should be separated from their denominations: ‘Every denomination council will fade away naturally, because there will not be denominations in Chinese Christianity, and their councils will be terminated. If these councils were our Christianity, the life of our Christianity would not be long.’⁴¹⁶ For Chao, denominations were the obstacle to developing the Chinese churches. The Chinese Church would be an independent and autonomous organization which was free from denominations. This Chinese Church would give up Western traditions and preserve the truth of Chinese culture combined with the essence of Christianity. As a result, Chinese Christians could reveal their spiritual vitality. It should be noted that both Jia and Chao held the same view with regard to nationalism: Chinese churches had to achieve the target of the ‘three-self’, and the influence of the Western churches which was the symbol of colonialism in Chinese churches had to be terminated. Chao, like Jia, demonstrated his subversive position in relation to the Western denominations.

⁴¹⁵ Chao, ‘Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian’ [My Opinions on the Creation of the Chinese Church], 548.

⁴¹⁶ T.C. Chao, ‘Jing Zhi Quan Guo Zhong Guo Ji Du Tu Shu [A Letter Respectfully Submitted to All Chinese Christians],’ *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 2/4 (March 1927), 91.

In addition, Chao realized that the fundamental issue of the indigenous Chinese Church was sovereignty. As mentioned above, the governance of Chinese churches was in hands of the Western missionaries. Chao observed that some Chinese churches gained their sovereignty and ceased to rely on the financial support of the Western church; however, they faced financial difficulties, the congregations could not run their churches by themselves, and some churches finally closed.⁴¹⁷ In response to the actual situation of Chinese churches, Chao realized that a Chinese Church in collaboration with Western churches could be a solution to this practical problem. Although ‘we have to realize that in the contemporary Chinese churches, the sovereignty has to be handed over to Chinese Christians’,⁴¹⁸ nevertheless, Chinese Christians had to take into consideration the financial issue of their churches. Chinese Christians in practice could not run their churches by themselves due to insufficient financial support, therefore the Western churches had to continue to support them. Chao argued that the Western churches had a moral responsibility to offer assistance, ‘helping those who are insufficient [in financial means], and enabling them to develop a kingdom which is founded upon [both] Chinese Christians and Western Christians.’⁴¹⁹ Chao, like Jia, was a leader with a practical mind, so he would not encourage all Chinese churches to leave the denominations at once. In this regard, Chao’s argument reflected an ambivalence, which appears between the sense of nationalism and the practical problem of the governance of Chinese churches. He definitely did not want the influence of the Western churches to continue in Chinese churches, but he had to accept the fact that Chinese churches could not detach themselves from the Western churches all at once.

⁴¹⁷ Chao, ‘Jing Zhi Quan Guo Zhong Guo Ji Du Tu Shu [A Letter Respectfully Submitted to All Chinese Christians],’ 88.

⁴¹⁸ Chao, ‘Jing Zhi Quan Guo Zhong Guo Ji Du Tu Shu [A Letter Respectfully Submitted to All Chinese Christians],’ 88.

⁴¹⁹ Chao, ‘Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian [My Opinions on the Creation of the Chinese Church],’ 549.

Nevertheless, Chao set a bottom line in regard to the collaboration between Chinese and Western Christians: Chinese Christians had to lead the collaboration, and the role of the Western Christians in Chinese churches should be in second place. He warned that if the Western Christians wanted to control the Chinese churches by their financial contributions, 'Chinese Christians will [leave and] establish their own churches, and finally the missionaries' churches will close in return.'⁴²⁰ According to Chao, after Chinese Christians resumed the sovereignty of Chinese churches in practice, they could replace the role of the Western missionaries. The missionaries could only have second place in the governance of Chinese churches. Chao added that the Western missionaries should be regarded as 'friendship workers' in Chinese churches.⁴²¹ For the purpose of serving God, Chao asserted, there was no difference between Chinese Christians and Western Christians, and there was no hierarchy among them.⁴²² Although the Western missionaries would no longer hold important posts in Chinese churches, they could still have membership of them. As church members, they might still continue to actualize their mission.

Chao, like Jia, took into consideration the practical issues of Chinese churches, so that an ambivalence appeared in his argument. However, unlike Jia, Chao set a bottom line in some cases that the sovereignty of Chinese churches had to be resumed even at the cost of losing the financial support of the Western churches. Jia considered the sovereignty of Chinese churches as desirable, but he preferred a compromise between the two parties, rather than the threat of separation. In comparison with Jia, Chao demonstrated a more strongly subversive view against the influence of the Western

⁴²⁰ Chao, 'Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian [My Opinions on the Creation of the Chinese Church],' 550.

⁴²¹ Chao, 'Zhong guo ren di jiao hui yi shi [The Church Awareness of Chinese People],' *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 1/10 (October 1927), 281.

⁴²² Chao, *Jing Zhi Quan Guo Zhong Guo Ji Du Tu Shu* [A Letter Respectfully Submitted to All Chinese Christians], 72.

churches.

6.2.1.2 Chao's Later Ecclesiology and Chinese Nationalism

In the 1940s, Chao shifted the focus of his ecclesiology. He no longer put emphasis on the functions of the Church, but on the essence of the Church, and he tried to define the meaning of 'church'. Chao's *Ji Du Jiao Jiao Hui De Yi Yi* [The Meaning of the Church in Christianity] was published in 1948, in which he focused on the essence of the Church through the perspective of the Holy Trinity. Chao wrote, 'God reveals the reality of Himself in Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ gathered the Christians, and they formed the Church because they trust and worship Him. Therefore, the establishment of the Church relies on God, and not on the human.'⁴²³ Accordingly, the Church was not a human society, but was derived from God. Christ came to the human world, revealing God, perfecting salvation, leading humans to walk on the way that Jesus had prepared, possessing the new life, and this is the Church of Christ. Therefore, if there were no Christ, there would be no Church. In addition, Chao highlighted the Holy Spirit in the Church. He wrote, 'the spirit of God which stayed in Christ was the Church's life, meaning, unity and the power of development'.⁴²⁴ If the Holy Spirit were not present in a church, it would just be an ordinary building. According to Chao, humanity was saved by the works of the Holy Spirit, and the life or death of the Church totally depends on the actions of the Trinitarian God.

Incarnation was at the foundation of Chao's ecclesiology. Chao contended that the Church is the body of Christ, which is the extension of incarnation; those who left

⁴²³ T.C. Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jiao Hui De Yi Yi* [The Meaning of the Church in Christianity] (Shanghai: Shanghai Youth Association, 1948), 2.

⁴²⁴ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jiao Hui De Yi Yi* [The Meaning of Church in Christianity] (Shanghai: Shanghai Youth Association, 1948), 3.

Christ could not obtain salvation, and those who left the Church also could not obtain salvation.⁴²⁵ Chao wrote, ‘the Church is an ever living and extending Incarnation, in which God is in Jesus Christ’.⁴²⁶ Previously, Chao did not accept the concept of incarnation; however, he changed his views and it became the foundation of his ecclesiology in the 1940s.

In addition, Chao also focused on the issue of the ecumenical movement. Lin thought that ‘[Chao] started his ecclesiology with indigenization, then developed his ecumenical view’ in the 1940s.⁴²⁷ Chao held a positive view of the ecumenical movement. He thought that the denominations are inherent in religion; if there are no different denominations, the religion is not alive.⁴²⁸ Nevertheless, the different denominations had to be involved in the same faith: ‘Each denomination holds the Bible, has the same Lord, the same faith, the same Baptism, the same God, and an incarnated Holy Son, Jesus’.⁴²⁹ Chao believed that the ecumenical movement was the action and the will of God. He wrote, ‘the ecumenical movement in Christianity is the interactions between different churches.... All the works are the will of God. God reveals churches, and he certainly will fulfil his will finally.’⁴³⁰ For actualizing the will of God, Chao contended that indigenization had contributed to the local Chinese churches, which was the beginning of the ecumenical movement. All the churches in the world are the extension of incarnation; if Christ’s body extended over the whole world, the ecumenical movement was indispensable. Thus Chao held very positive

⁴²⁵ Chao, ‘Revelation,’ in *The Authority of the Faith - The Madras Series: Presenting Papers based upon the Meeting of the International Missionary Council, at Tambaram, Madras, India, December 12th to 29th, 1938. Vol. 1*, ed. International Missionary Council (New York: International Missionary Council, 1939), 54.

⁴²⁶ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jiao Hui De Yi Yi* [The Meaning of the Church in Christianity], 4.

⁴²⁷ Rong-hong Lin, *Qu Gao He Gua: Zhao Zi Chen De Sheng Ping Ji Shen Xue* [The Life and Thought of Chao Tzu-ch’en], 264.

⁴²⁸ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jiao Hui De Yi Yi* [The Meaning of the Church in Christianity], 14.

⁴²⁹ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jiao Hui De Yi Yi* [The Meaning of the Church in Christianity], 14.

⁴³⁰ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jiao Hui De Yi Yi* [The Meaning of the Church in Christianity], 30-31.

views on the ecumenical movement.

Chao no longer focused on Chinese nationalism in his later ecclesiology, and his focus had shifted to the essence of the Church and the ecumenical movement. Jia mainly developed his own ecclesiology in the 1920s. Also he was not interested in Chinese nationalism with reference to his ecclesiology during the 1940s.⁴³¹

6.2.2 Chao's Christology

6.2.2.1 Chao's Earlier Christology and the Divinity of Christ

Before the 1940s, Chao constructed his christology by adopting a humanized approach.⁴³² Gluer stated that 'Personality is the core of Chao's Christology; and the contribution of Jesus to human salvation is completely based on his theological doctrine of man'.⁴³³ Chao, unlike Jia who put emphasis on Christ's two natures, focused on Jesus' personalized humanity and divinity, by which he developed his personalized christology. Chao wrote, '[If] Jesus attracts me, it is not because he is God or the Son of God. Honestly speaking, my attention and interest are that he is absolutely human.'⁴³⁴ According to Chao, Jesus was a man who entered the secular world and was like us, but the difference was that His personality was better than ours. Chao wrote, 'Jesus and we are same in entering the secular world.... He, like us, not only has physical needs, but also His psychological condition is the same as ours.'⁴³⁵

It can be seen that Christ's divinity was insignificant in Chao's christology.

⁴³¹ See Jia's *Wan Quan Jia Fa*, which was published in 1945.

⁴³² For comparison with Jia's christology, we only focused on two christologies which were constructed within the period of the 1920s to 1930s. Chao's humanized christology was amended in the 1940s.

⁴³³ Winfried Gluer, *Zhao Zi Chen De Shen Xue Si Xiang* [The Theology of T.C. Chao from 1918 to 1956], trans. Joe Dunn (Hong Kong: Chinese Christian Literature Council, 1998), 143-154.

⁴³⁴ T.C. Chao, 'Jesus and the Reality of God,' *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 7/5 (1933), 5.

⁴³⁵ Young Wen, *Zhao Zi-chen Wen Ji I* [A Memorial Collection of Mr T.C. Chao's Work I] (Beijing: Shang wu yin shu guan, 2003), 120.

Chao thought that Jesus was endowed with both humanity and divinity, but they are only one nature, rather than two⁴³⁶ because Jesus Christ and God are united in one.⁴³⁷ This was the exact opposite of Jia's argument as to the two natures of Christ. Chao's idea fitted the Confucian concept of 'humankind and nature', in which the purpose of life was to be 'at one with God'. Christianity could help Confucianism actualize this idea because Christ, being a man, has given a model for humans to reach the highest point, i.e., being 'at one with God'. Chao said, 'Jesus teaches us to reach for the highest goal that has been revealed to us, namely God – personality.'⁴³⁸ Chao made linkage between Confucianism and Christology. In contrast, Jia's Christology was purely derived from the orthodox doctrine.

In addition, unlike Jia who claimed that Jesus Christ is God, Chao did not clearly admit that Jesus is God, although Jesus was endowed with divinity. Chao contended that Christianity would become polytheism if Jesus were God. As to the thought of Confucius, 'nature' was interpreted as God, and 'nature and humankind' could be united, by which Jesus, being a human being, could possess divinity. Chao regarded Jesus as a part of God, and Jesus' significance is that the quantity of divinity he possessed is more than that of the ordinary human.⁴³⁹

Besides, Chao was more interested in the historical Jesus than the identity of Christ with reference to Jesus' humanity. Chao put emphasis on the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, and considered that many Chinese became Christians because of the

⁴³⁶ T.C. Chao, 'Wo De Zong Jiao Jing Yan [My Religious Experience],' *Sheng Ming* [Life], 4/3 (1923), 14

⁴³⁷ T.C. Chao, 'Geng da di gong zue [The Greater Work],' *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 6/6 (March 1926), 2.

⁴³⁸ T.C. Chao, 'Ji du jiao yu zhong guo wen huan [Christianity and Chinese Culture],' *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 2/9-10 (June 1927), 255.

⁴³⁹ Wen, *Zhao Zi-chen Wen Ji I* [A Memorial Collection of Mr T.C. Chao's Work I], 127.

personality of Jesus, and not that of Christ.⁴⁴⁰ In Chao's christology Jesus and Christ were discussed separately. Such a separation would not appear in Jia's theology.

6.2.2.2 Chao's Later Christology and the Divinity of Christ

In the 1940s, there were fundamental changes in Chao's christology in regard to Jesus' humanity and divinity. With reference to the doctrine of God, Chao completed his *Cheng Shen Lun* (Word Becomes Flesh) in 1943.⁴⁴¹ Chao wrote, 'for the salvation of humans, God became flesh through Jesus Christ, which is the core of Christian dogma'.⁴⁴² Thus Chao accepted the doctrine of the incarnation. Humans, being fallen in sin, were unable to reach God by themselves, therefore God had to become flesh among humans. Because of the love of God, Jesus came into the world in person to save humanity.⁴⁴³ Previously, Chao had mainly focused on the humanity of Jesus, in which Jesus was like an ordinary man who tried to achieve divinity by his own effort, and his Jesus was not endowed with divinity. However, Chao changed his previous view, and contended that Christ becomes absolutely man, and absolutely God, because both humanity and divinity are united in the person of Jesus by incarnation.

In addition, Chao believed that Jesus, as a human dwelling on earth, did not commit any sin in his whole life, which proves that he possesses divinity.⁴⁴⁴ Jesus' lack of sin is based on the fact that Jesus and God could keep an abiding and free communication

⁴⁴⁰ Chao wrote, 'The more associations between God and Jesus Christ we make, the further He departs from them. By studying the Synoptic Gospels, today we are still able to learn from the historical Jesus. The reason why we and many Chinese become Christians is because of knowing Jesus, not because of knowing Christ.' T.C. Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Zhe Xue* [Christian Philosophy] (Soo Chow: Chung-hua chi-tu-chao wen-she, 1926), 247-248.

⁴⁴¹ 'Cheng Shen Lun' was collected in Chao's *Ji Du Jiao Jin Jie* [Interpretation of Christianity] (Hong Kong: Ji du jiao fu qiao, 1955, reprinted), which was written in 1943 before his experience of imprisonment by the Japanese, and was first published in 1947 after the Sino-Japanese war.

⁴⁴² T.C. Chao, 'Cheng Shen Lun [Word Becomes Flesh],' in *Jin Dai Hua Ren Ji Du Jiao Wen Xian* [Source Book of Modern Chinese Theology], ed. Rong-hong Lin (Hong Kong: China Graduate School of Theology, 1986), 176-77.

⁴⁴³ Chao, 'Cheng shen lun [Word Becomes Flesh],' 176-77.

⁴⁴⁴ Chao, 'Cheng shen lun [Word Becomes Flesh],' 182.

between them; therefore, there can have been no sin in his life.⁴⁴⁵ Although Jesus faced temptation as humans did, he did not have the intention of committing sin. It was clear that in the Bible Jesus did not confess any sin in his prayers.

Although Chao still regarded Jesus as an ordinary man, he insisted that Jesus was unique and distinct from ordinary humans as he gathered the best elements of his spiritual heritage and revealed them perfectly. Chao explained, ‘Jesus gathered in himself the best elements of his spiritual heritage and expressed them fully, not as new elements entirely unknown before, but as new elements grouped together in one supremely holy and beautiful character’.⁴⁴⁶ In other words, Jesus is the supreme morality in the universe as God. In this later period, the uniqueness of Jesus is found in Chao’s christology, which moved towards a more traditional christology.

Chao also changed his theory of ‘man become God’ to ‘God become man’. Chao’s *Ji Du Jiao Jin Jie* [Interpretation of Christianity], completed in 1943, demonstrated that he still held the view of ‘man become God’. However, in Chao’s later book, *Shen Xue Si Jiang* [Four Talks on Theology], completed in 1948, he supported the traditional christology: ‘God become man’, which means ‘Word became flesh’ aimed to bring out the salvation for sinful man. Chao wrote, ‘Humans are sinners, who are incapable of reaching salvation, but only God can save them from sin’.⁴⁴⁷ Chao demonstrated that he now agreed with the traditional christology. As a result, the gap between Chao’s christology and Jia’s christology was narrowed

⁴⁴⁵ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jin Jie* [Interpretation of Christianity], 121.

⁴⁴⁶ Chao, ‘Revelation,’ 50.

⁴⁴⁷ Chao, *Shen Xue Si Jiang* [Four Talks on Theology] (2nd ed, Hong Kong: Ji du jiao fu qiao, 1955), 55.

Compared with his earlier period, Chao's later christology became more traditional, and there was a smaller discrepancy between Chao's later christology and Jia's christology, with reference to Christ's divinity, 'God become man', and incarnation.

6.2.3 Chao's Soteriology

6.2.3.1 Chao's Earlier Soteriology and Salvation

According to Chao, humankind's sin and salvation are intimately relevant to the human personality. 'Sin' is the elimination of personality, and God's salvation is a recovery of the personality. Chao contended that humans had to strive to extend their personality in order to obtain salvation.⁴⁴⁸ God has given humankind love and freedom, however, humankind departed from the path of love and fell into sin. Chao added, 'Without love, man separated from God, and this is "sin". Mankind's selfishness is "sin". "Sin" is losing the source of happiness, i.e., the love of God.'⁴⁴⁹ The 'sin' of humankind is the loss of personality, and especially lack of 'love'. As humankind has sinned, it needs to be saved.

In connection to salvation and personality, Chao emphasized that Jesus is a saviour of personality. Jesus saves humanity through his lofty personality – love, and he also sets a perfect example of love for humans to follow. Jesus' salvation can be achieved by following him. Christ has shown us, by his example, how our lives should be lived so

⁴⁴⁸ Chao wrote, 'Because of God's love, He creates humanity and saves humanity. Salvation will not constrain the freedom and the personality of humanity but positively strives to extend humanity's personality and freedom.... The Saviour and the sages were the examples of saving humanity through human love. They made great things through human personality.' Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Zhe Xue* [Christian Philosophy], in Young Wen, *Zhao Zi-chen Wen Ji I* (A Memorial Collection of Mr T.C. Chao's Work I), 132-133.

⁴⁴⁹ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Zhe Xue* [Christian Philosophy], in Young Wen, *Zhao Zi-chen Wen Ji I* (A Memorial Collection of Mr T.C. Chao's Work I), 157.

that we may accomplish the purpose of our existence, i.e., a perfect life of love.⁴⁵⁰ The human can be saved if he follows the example of Christ and His love, so that the human may regain his personality. Chao wrote, ‘All in all, we realize Jesus’ life, trust his way, and appreciate his personality, make our effort to move forward and to cooperate with God. All these are the way of salvation.’⁴⁵¹ By following the lofty personality – the perfect love, humankind could be saved.

For Chao, the human can save themselves by their own will, but only if they decide to follow Jesus’ example; and salvation is achieved through the cooperation of God and humankind. In this regard, Jia would not agree with Chao. Jia focused on knowledge of the works, the life and the living of Christ, because they were the preparations of salvation. For Jia, humans were definitely unable to save themselves by their own efforts, and salvation was merely an act of God. Personality was beyond the boundary of Jia’s theological discussion.

Based on his own interpretation of sin and salvation, Chao did not agree with the legalistic or traditional interpretation of Christ’s role in salvation, which he regarded as ‘mechanical interpretations’ of salvation. Chao criticized:

Many Western theologians created the term of Redemption, or Atonement or Governmental Theory to demonstrate ‘salvation’; none of them can perfectly describe the actual meaning of ‘salvation’. All the concepts of salvation created in the past are too mechanical for humanity.⁴⁵²

⁴⁵⁰ Chao wrote, ‘The salvation of Jesus completely teaches humanity to strive for self-saving by the loving life of God... If one repents, changes, and strives for humanity by following Jesus’ steps, he will be saved. The ground for the self-saving of humanity is endowed with freedom; therefore, self-saving can be done by taking Jesus as a model.’ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Zhe Xue* [Christian Philosophy], in *Zhao Zi-chen Wen Ji I* (A Memorial Collection of Mr T.C. Chao’s Work I), 142.

⁴⁵¹ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Zhe Xue* [Christian Philosophy], in *Zhao Zi-chen Wen Ji I* (A Memorial Collection of Mr T.C. Chao’s Work I), 137-238.

⁴⁵² Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Zhe Xue* [Christian Philosophy], in *Zhao Zi-chen Wen Ji I* (A Memorial Collection of Mr T.C. Chao’s Work I), 259-260.

In regard to the salvation of Jesus, Chao's concept could be a breakthrough for the Western tradition. However, it is noteworthy that Jia's salvific concept was derived from the soteriology which Chao regarded as 'too mechanical for humanity'.

In addition, Chao contended that the saving role of Christ has two aspects. Firstly, by dying on the cross, Christ has revealed the love of God and His great personality to us. Secondly, Christ's death reminded us of the purpose and the meaning of our lives.⁴⁵³ For Chao, salvation is the re-establishment, or the 'integration' of personality, and Christ was called the 'saviour of our personality'.⁴⁵⁴ In contrast, Jia contended that the foundation of salvation was Jesus' works which included the incarnation, birth, death, burial, ascension to heaven and second coming of Christ. It was seen above that Jia did not focus on personality in relation to the salvation of Jesus.

6.2.3.2 Chao's Later Soteriology and Salvation

Chao changed his views of salvation in the 1940s. In his later period, Chao reflected deeply on sin, and accepted that both original sin and actual transgression are found within humankind.⁴⁵⁵ Chao contended that humans cannot overcome sin, which makes Jesus Christ offer his salvation. By Christ's incarnation, humans can conquer sin, and then achieve perfection of personality. Chao added that a sinful human could become a saint with a new humanity, who could develop the kingdom of God through

⁴⁵³ Chao said, 'Christ has revealed the meaning of our lives through his death. Because of Christ's death, we understand the meaning of life, and may attain the integration of our personality. We cannot understand God, if there is no Christ's life and death. We will not have the foundation for our lives – the integration of personality, if there is no understanding of God. Without this foundation, life is meaningless.' Chao, 'The Death of Jesus', *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Life and Truth], 2/15 (November 1927), 426.

⁴⁵⁴ Chao, 'Wo De Zong Jiao Jing Yan [My Religious Experience],' 13.

⁴⁵⁵ Chao wrote, 'According to the Bible and the church traditions, two [types of] sins – original sin and actual transgressions – are mentioned. Original sin is derived from the sinful nature which is inherited from [our] ancestors; actual transgressions are the sins committed by individual persons.' Chao *Ji Du Jiao Jin Jie* [Interpretation of Christianity], 126.

Jesus Christ.⁴⁵⁶

In Chao's earlier period, he thought that humankind can strive for a good personality and they are able to 'be' Jesus, as sin is just like a bad habit or absence of personality. However, Chao changed this view in his later period. He recognized the inability of humanity and accepted the doctrine of original sin. He admitted that the cause of human suffering was a consequence of sin in human hearts.⁴⁵⁷ Sin not only brings suffering to the world, but also causes damage of the image of God in humankind. In this regard, Jesus' salvation is necessary and worthwhile for humanity due to the human suffering and humans' inability of self-saving. In this period, Chao, like Jia, accepted the inability of humanity and the doctrine of original sin.

As for the effort required of individual humans, Chao maintained that Jesus' salvation is a grace but the moral effort of humankind remains indispensable. Previously, he regarded salvation as being acquired through self-discipline by following the example of Jesus Christ. However, Chao, in his later period, changed his view and believed that salvation is an act of God alone due to human's inability of self-saving in response to sin. Chao argued that if the relationship between God and mankind is broken, humankind cannot restore it by its own effort alone.⁴⁵⁸ Given this inability of humankind, God takes the initiative to offer salvation. Through the life of Jesus Christ, God perfectly reveals to us his behaviour and his great personality, i.e., love. The peak of Jesus' love is that he allows himself to be crucified on the cross to achieve

⁴⁵⁶ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jin Jie* [Interpretation of Christianity], 87.

⁴⁵⁷ Chao, *Ji Du Jiao Jin Jie* [Interpretation of Christianity], 126.

⁴⁵⁸ Chao explained that the sinful human is cut off from the source of life; it is like a branch that is cut away from a tree, and it is not possible for the branch to unite with the tree again. Chao, 'Zao Zi Cheng Bo Shi Yan Jiang Lu [Collection of the Speeches of Dr T.C. Chao],' in *Er Shi Shi Ji Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Wen Ti* [The Problems of Chinese Christianity in the Twentieth Century], ed. Yu-ming Shao (Taipei: Zheng zhong, 1980), 112.

salvation.⁴⁵⁹ In Chao's later period, he emphasized that salvation is the result of the divine initiative, and humans can actually respond to it passively. This is different from his previous view that human effort is able to achieve salvation. Chao, like Jia, accepted that salvation is an act of God alone.

Compared with his earlier period, Chao's later soteriology became more traditional. In terms of the inability of self-saving, original sin, and divine initiative, there was a smaller discrepancy between Chao's later soteriology and Jia's soteriology.

6.3 The Uniqueness of Jia's Theology

Having undertaken the above research, this section attempts to point to the uniqueness of Jia's theology as compared with Chao through the postcolonial perspective.

6.3.1 The Ambivalent Ecclesiologies

Ambivalence commonly appears with regard to Chinese churches in terms of Chinese nationalism. In the 1920s, the sense of Chinese nationalism appeared in the ecclesiology of both Jia and Chao.⁴⁶⁰ Jia was engaged in the union movement of Chinese churches, and promoted the establishment of the Sinicized Church, and Chao promoted the indigenization of Chinese churches. They both argued that Chinese churches had to struggle for their independence; Chinese Christians had to restore the sovereignty of Chinese churches and aimed at achieving the 'three-self'. The influence of the Western missionaries was regarded as a mode of imperialism. The

⁴⁵⁹ Chao, 'Zao Zi Cheng Bo Shi Yan Jiang Lu [Collection of the Speeches of Dr T.C. Chao],' 113-14.

⁴⁶⁰ Although Chao continued to develop his ecclesiology until the 1940s, Jia constructed his ecclesiology mainly in the 1920s. We will focus on the discussion with reference to their common period.

councils of denominations were actually an obstacle to developing the Sinicized Church or an indigenized Chinese Church. Their arguments radically demonstrate their subversive position towards the Western churches. Nevertheless, both Jia and Chao were concerned about the practical situation of Chinese churches, especially the financial issue. They did not encourage the Chinese churches to become independent of the Western churches all at once, because they understood that Chinese churches were commonly unable to achieve financial independence. A practical ambivalence was reflected in their ecclesiologies.

Jia maintained that Chinese Christians should respect the councils of the Western denominations, because the councils had their own characters and values in Chinese churches.⁴⁶¹ Chao contended that the Western churches should cooperate with Chinese churches, because the Western churches had the moral responsibility to offer the assistance.⁴⁶² The arguments of both reflected an ambivalence between the sense of nationalism and the practical problem of Chinese churches. On the one hand, Chinese Christians struggled for ecclesiastical independence; on the other hand, they needed to maintain a formal relationship with the Western churches due to their financial difficulties.

In postcolonial discourse, ambivalence reveals that colonial subjects are engaged in irresolvable tensions between desire and derision simultaneously, as the colonized is not simply entirely opposed to the colonizer but appears to be complicit and resistant in the colonial discourse. In this regard, Jia's ecclesiology and Chao's ecclesiology are examples of ambivalence in terms of church independence and financial assistance.

⁴⁶¹ Jia, *Shen Dao Xue* (1971), 690.

⁴⁶² Chao, 'Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian [My Opinions on the Creation of the Chinese Church]', 549.

Jia and Chao are regarded as representatives of the conservative and the liberal factions of Chinese Christianity respectively. The above discussion shows that the ambivalence embedded in Jia's ecclesiology appeared not only in the conservative wing, but also generally existed in Chinese churches.

It is noteworthy that in regard to the struggle for ecclesiastical independence, Chao adopted a more radical approach than Jia. Chao seriously reminded the missionaries that if the Western Christians sought to control the Chinese churches by their financial contributions, Chinese Christians would establish their own churches, so that the missionaries' churches would close finally.⁴⁶³ Such threatening words did not appear in Jia's ecclesiology. Jia, who attached himself to the missionary enterprise, still preferred a moderate approach in struggling for the independence of Chinese churches.

6.3.2 The Mimic Christologies

Jia and Chao held very different views of the divinity of Christ, but their christologies were both constructed by mimicry. In discussing the divinity of Christ, Jia's christology was so conservative that his mimic repetition was particularly obvious; he mainly repeated the exportable doctrine of missionaries. According to the orthodox doctrine of the conservative missionaries, Jesus Christ is God, in which Christ's divinity cannot be amended, added to or deleted, or negotiated. The missionaries held the authority of interpreting the doctrine, and left no place for negotiation with Chinese Christians. As mentioned above, if Jia had discussed the divinity of Christ in his christology, any variation from the orthodox doctrine might engender suspicion of

⁴⁶³Chao, 'Zhong Guo Ren Di Jiao Hui Yi Shi [The Church Awareness of Chinese People],' 281.

‘Chinese heresy’. As a result, it was best for Jia just to repeat the dominant discourse of Christ’s divinity, and not to bear the risk of challenging the inviolable doctrine and the authority. As for the divinity of Christ, Jia’s discussion was mainly derived from mimic repetition of the orthodox doctrine which the conservative missionaries were holding fast. In contrast, Christ’s divinity was not necessarily important in Chao’s earlier christology. Chao adopted a humanized approach to interpret the divinity of Christ, and Jesus was regarded as an ordinary man. Through the humanized approach, Chao did not admit that Jesus is God, and he proposed that Jesus had only one nature although he was endowed with both humanity and divinity. The divinity of Jesus Christ was blurred in Chao’s earlier christology.

It is clear that Chao’s humanized Christ contrasted sharply with Jia’s orthodox Christ, and substantial differences existed between the two christologies.⁴⁶⁴ However, they still had a common nature, mimicry, which will be discussed as follows.

Although Jia’s christology, which featured substantial mimic sameness, was very different from Chao’s earlier christology, it can be noted that Chao’s christology was also a mimic work of the exportable theologies. Kwan has demonstrated that Western theologies were important references for Chao’s ‘Jesuology or christology’. Chao made efforts towards the indigenization of Chinese Christianity, which could be regarded as a subversive response to the missionaries, and Chao’s theological discourse was ‘highly mimetic’ of the theology of the missionaries.⁴⁶⁵ Kwan also concluded that a kind of anti-colonial resistance which was derived from the

⁴⁶⁴ Chao’s later Christology became more traditional, the works of Jia and Chao were less contrasting as a result. We mainly focused on Chao’s previous Christology.

⁴⁶⁵ Shui-man Kwan, *Collaboration as an Alternative Mode of Anti-colonialist Resistance*, 258.

Confucian worldview was embedded in Chao's christology.⁴⁶⁶ Accordingly, Chao's christology was actually a mimic theological discourse.

From the postcolonial perspective, mimicry occurred in the above christologies, although there were a lot of differences in content between them. Accordingly, anti-colonial resistance embedded in mimicry would also appear in these christologies. Mimic christologies were significant among Chinese Christians, as Jia and Chao represented the conservative and the liberal wings respectively. Mimicry became an indispensable process of constructing Chinese theology, and Jia's christology could be regarded as typical of the conservative wing of Chinese churches.

6.3.3 The Hybrid Soteriologies

Although there were differences between Jia's soteriology and Chao's soteriology, hybridization occurred in both, and the newness as to salvation was created in the process.

In Jia's soteriology, salvation was intimately connected to the theology of life which was regarded as the 'newness' engendered through the process of hybridization. For Jia, the aim of salvation was to recover 'life', and he argued that those who had salvation would have this life. Jia's soteriology was neither simply the missionaries' exportable soteriology, nor his own authentic soteriology, but it was a hybrid one that caused 'newness', in the form of the theology of life, enter the Chinese churches during the 1920s. Jia not only invented the concepts of 'the life of the spirit', 'the stream of life', and 'Christ man' in his theology of life, but also hybridized the

⁴⁶⁶ Shui-man Kwan, *Collaboration as an Alternative Mode of Anti-colonialist Resistance*, 258-59.

concept of ‘union with Christ’ which had appeared in the exportable soteriology. The newness of Jia’s soteriology was created through the hybridization between different theological ideas. Some of Jia’s theological ideas were unprecedented in the dominant discourse.

In Chao’s earlier soteriology, humankind’s sin and salvation are relevant to the human personality. Sin is the elimination of personality, and God’s salvation is a recovery of personality. For salvation, Chao contended that humankind had to make effort to extend its personality. Chao emphasized that Jesus is a saviour of personality, and He saves humanity through his lofty personality – love. Also, He sets a perfect example of love for humans to follow, by which salvation can be achieved. Only if humankind decided to follow Jesus’ example could salvation be achieved through the cooperation of God and mankind. In this regard, Chao embedded Confucianism in his soteriology, in which God and humankind share a common innate nature, and humankind can strive for a good personality. Chao held the view that a human is able to ‘be’ Jesus as sin is just as a bad habit or absence of personality. Chao interpreted salvation by a rather humanized approach, and he embedded the aspects of Confucianism in his soteriology. According to Kwan, Confucianism and the recovery of personality in Chao’s soteriology resulted in ‘a condition of hybridity – a Christianity that is not satisfactory to the Western world, neither is it purely Chinese’.⁴⁶⁷ The relevance of personality and salvation could be regarded as a newness created in the process of hybridization. In Chao’s hybrid soteriology, personality and salvation were intimately connected, making a new interpretation of salvation with Confucian elements.

According to Bhabha, the hybrid subject can negotiate in the ‘third space’, which is

⁴⁶⁷ Shui-man Kwan, *Collaboration as an Alternative Mode of Anti-colonialist Resistance*, 259.

‘neither one culture nor the other but something else besides’.⁴⁶⁸ This results in a newness which appears in the process of hybridization. Newness was created in the above hybrid soteriologies. On the one hand, the newness of Jia’s hybrid soteriology was the theology of life which included the ‘life of the spirit’, ‘the stream of life’, ‘Christ man’ and ‘union with Christ’. These concepts, apart from ‘union of Christ’, were authentic in Jia’s soteriology, because they were not derived from the missionaries’ exportable theologies. On the other hand, Chao applied Confucianism to construct his hybrid soteriology, in which the humanized Christ, the perfect personality, the elimination and recovery of personality, and the saviour of personality could be all regarded as the newness created in the hybridization. Confucianism was a foundation of Chinese cultures and values. In applying the doctrine of salvation which was derived from Western theologies, Chao made efforts to achieve the purpose of cultural accommodation.

It is noteworthy that Jia created some new terms in his hybrid soteriology, including: ‘the life of the spirit’, ‘the stream of life’, and ‘Christ man’, which were unprecedented in his time. In contrast, Chao put emphasis on the personality of Jesus, and the integration of theological ideas and Chinese cultures in his hybrid soteriology. Chao’s attempts inspired the development of Chinese theology, but he did not intend to embed new terminology in his discourse. Jia enriched his hybrid soteriology by inventing some theological terminologies. Hybridization took place both in Jia’s soteriology and Chao’s soteriology, and newness as to salvation appeared in both hybrid soteriologies respectively. The contents of the doctrine of salvation in these two soteriologies were enriched accordingly.

⁴⁶⁸ Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 28.

6.4 Concluding Remarks

The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate the uniqueness of Jia's theology using the postcolonial perspective. The first part focused on and evaluated the content of C.T. Chao's theology, and the second part demonstrated the uniqueness and the commonality of the two Christian thinkers from a postcolonial perspective. It is seen that ambivalence occurred in both ecclesiologies, mimicry existed in both christologies, and the hybridity was revealed in both soteriologies. As to ambivalence, the approach of Jia's ecclesiology is that of a moderate, and his works were more submissive than those of Chao. As for mimicry, the mimic sameness in Jia's christology was particularly strong. Chao's humanized Christ contrasted sharply with Jia's orthodox Christ, even though Chao's christology as such was also a mimic product. With reference to hybridity, Jia's soteriology was enriched by a number of theological concepts: 'the life of the spirit', 'the stream of life', and 'Christ man'. Jia innovated these concepts in his hybrid soteriology, which were new to Chinese Christians, and unseen in the dominant discourse. In this regard, Chao did not intend to create new theological terms in his hybrid soteriology.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

We began our task of investigating Jia's theology from a postcolonial perspective. The theoretical framework of this thesis is based on Bhabha's analysis of the complicated relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. I have argued that Bhabha's views regarding the ambivalence of the colonial subject, and also the inherent complexity and ambiguity in the relationship between the colonizer and the colonized can provide us with a better understating of the Chinese theology which was constructed within a complex interaction between the missionaries and the Chinese Christian thinkers. This research analysed three areas of Jia's theology – christology, ecclesiology and soteriology – with Homi Bhabha's three conceptions of ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity. My argument is that the ambiguity and uncertainties inherent in Jia's theology fit well within the postcolonial conceptions of Bhabha. This research has demonstrated that both submissiveness and subversiveness appear in Jia's theology, although these two conceptions are literally antonymous to each other. Such ambivalence or ambiguity is regarded as a paradoxical co-existence in referring to Jia's theology.

In Jia's ecclesiology, Chinese nationalism and the Sinicized Church were highlighted in the process of hybridization. They were denied knowledge and newness respectively, in accordance with the postcolonial theories, and were subversive to the colonial discourse. On the other hand, the submissiveness of Jia's ecclesiology can be seen in terms of the exportable ecclesiology with reference to the definition of

‘church’, the organization of the church, and the council of churches, in which mimic sameness was also clearly seen.

Jia’s christology was expected to imitate the orthodox doctrine, so that mimic sameness would generate stabilizing effects on the missionary enterprise. In this regard, Jia’s christology revealed its submissiveness to the dominant discourse. However, Jia embedded newness in the form of dispensationalism in his own christology so that subversiveness took place. Jia’s christology became a hybrid theological discourse whose mimic differentiations engendered a ‘destabilizing effect’ in the colonial discourse, especially when Jia’s christology became an alternative for Chinese Christians, other than the missionaries’ exportable christology. Thus, Jia’s hybrid christology reveals its subversiveness.

In Jia’s soteriology, mimic sameness was obviously seen in regard to the work of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of election, and sanctification, which can reveal its submissiveness. However, Jia developed newness – the theology of life –, and denied knowledge – the perfectionism of sanctification – in the process of hybridization. According to Bhabha, even a small difference may become an operational resistance against the dominant discourse. In this sense, Jia’s hybrid soteriology is regarded as a subversive discourse.

By comparing T.C. Chao’s theology, the uniqueness of Jia’s theology can be seen accordingly. As to ambivalence, the sense of nationalism appearing in Jia’s ecclesiology is regarded as moderate compared with that of the liberal wing, although the subversiveness of Jia’s ecclesiology remains concrete. As for mimicry, the mimic sameness in Jia’s christology was particularly strong, while Jia’s mimic orthodox

Christ contrasted sharply with Chao's humanized Christ. With reference to hybridity, Jia's soteriology which contained a number of theological concepts could be regarded as an authentic theological work with a hybrid newness. These theological terms were innovative to Chinese Christians, and unprecedented in the dominant discourse.

By a close reading of Jia's theological works, especially those from the 1920s, it is shown that he adopted a double, ambiguous and even contradictory position with regard to his theological stance. It is suggested that the very presence of tensions and uncertainties which permeates Jia's writings and utterances should warn us against a monolithic, static and unchanging reading of his theological discourse, and the conservative/liberal or fundamental/modernist binary discourse is seen as inadequate to read the theology of Jia.

To avoid a monolithic, static and unchanging reading of Jia's theology, the focus of this thesis has been on the issues of ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity, the key concepts in postcolonial theory and discourse, and the power they release may well be seen as 'the characteristic feature and contribution of the post-colonial'.⁴⁶⁹ In the previous chapters, I have adopted Bhabha's concepts which question essentialist models of identity that rely on the simple either/or binary of colonizer/colonized. Bhabha emphasizes the similarities and the borrowings, the simultaneous attraction and repulsion, attachment and detachment, which can characterize the complex and multi-layered relationship between the two sides of the colonial divide, and which has been demonstrated in Jia's theology. I agree with Bhabha that 'historical becoming is

⁴⁶⁹ Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, eds., *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (London: Routledge, 1995), 183.

constituted not as a dialectic between first and third person but as an effect of the *ambivalent* condition of the borderline proximity – the first-in-the-third/the one-in-the-other'.⁴⁷⁰ Bhabha also believes that the hybrid and in-between subject position, which consists of an interweaving between the colonizer and the colonized, can best accommodate the development, duality and presence of opposite views which are recurrent characteristics in Jia's theological discourse. Nevertheless, I do not mean that Bhabha provides us with final and irrefutable answers to the complex questions of Jia's political and theological discourse. I argue that Bhabha's views on the hybrid nature of colonial subjects can enhance our understanding of Jia's theology with reference to his ecclesiology, christology and soteriology.

Having compared Jia's theology with Chao's theology, we can see their similarities by using Bhabha's notions. However, I maintain that the theologies of Jia and Chao are very different in terms of their contents. According to Bhabha, ambiguity or ambivalence is not only a feature of colonial discourse, but is also a category covering all those who have been colonized. Bhabha's postcolonial theories appear to construct a 'universalizing category'. Jia's theology is regarded as submissiveness/subversiveness, ambiguity, complexity, contradiction, attraction/repulsion, ambivalent, hybridized.... It is noted that all these conceptions can be found in the universalizing category of the hybridity of all cultures, in which the otherness of the colonized is no longer unique or distinctive after hybridizing. The different colonized are integrated and 'naturalized' within one category. The comparison between Jia and Chao can be seen as example of this thesis. It results in disorientation of the colonized, which may raise a question: Is re-positioning

⁴⁷⁰ Homi Bhabha, 'Editor's Introduction: Minority Maneuvers and Unsettled Negotiations', in *Critical Inquiry*, 23:3, Front Lines/Border Posts (Spring 1997), 434.

necessary for the colonized and their discourse? For Bhabha, binary language is unimportant in the (post)colonial discourse. However, a binary system definitely has an advantage: Jia's theology is safely 'naturalized' in the sphere of the conservatives or the fundamentalists, so that his distinctiveness is not blurred. By moving beyond the boundary of the binary system and applying postcolonial theories, Jia's theology becomes ambiguous and less unique than before.

I argue that it is more productive and fruitful to attend to the internal tensions and contradictions inherent in Jia's theology than simply to make any laudatory or uncritical comment on it. In other words, I suggest that the contradictory, varied and uncertain contents which appear in Jia's theology cannot be defined by using over-simplified labels, such as traditional, conservative, fundamentalist or the so-called 'Chinese-official-approved'.

In the light of postcolonial theories, some problems will be discovered in the colonial context accordingly. For instance, we have revealed the subversiveness of Jia's theology. But the next question is: To what extent was there tension between the colonizers and the colonized? It may not be possible to find the answer by merely using postcolonial concepts. In this regard, it is seen that Bhabha's views can bring us theoretical insight, but unavoidably the exploration raises some practical questions which most likely cannot be answered by the same theories. To study the above issue, we need to undertake a deeper historical investigation. I suggest that further research is needed in regard to the biography of Jia, so that a full picture can be seen by interweaving his life, oral history, utterances, anecdotes and writings. As far as I know, some of Jia's students are still alive; they can provide important information concerning the relationship between Jia and the missionaries. Such information

certainly could substantiate the study of Jia's theology with reference to the postcolonial theories.⁴⁷¹

Previous studies have neglected the hierarchical context of Jia's theology, and restrained Jia's theology within the binary language. However, this thesis can explore the ambivalence, i.e., submissiveness/subversiveness, which has been hidden in Jia's theology. It is unprecedented in the study of Jia's theology. The current study may help us to discover a new perspective to interpret Jia's theology, so that we may achieve a better understanding of Jia's theology. And we can move closer to the original of Jia's theology than before.

In addition, this thesis can provide the possibility of shifting the paradigm in studying Chinese theology. The current study demonstrates the ambivalence of Jia's theology; I contend that the ambivalence was also embedded in the theologies of other Chinese theologians, such as Shang-jie Song, Ming-Dao Wang, and Watchman Nee, and the methodology and theories applying in the current study can be a suitable tool for studying their theologies. These Chinese theologians were the key figures of Chinese Protestants in Jia's time, and their backgrounds were similar to that of Jia. Previous studies on their theologies have always been confined to the spectrum of systematic theology, investigating and analysing their key theological thoughts and their connections only. Thus, I suggest that further research is needed in regard to the theologies of these Chinese theologians by applying the postcolonial theories and the current methodology, so that the content of Chinese theology which will no longer be blurred by discursive domination. And this direction of research

⁴⁷¹ I interviewed Jia's friend, Li-gong Yu, to collect first-hand information on Jia's biography. In March 2009, Yu wrote me a letter containing information about Jia's life. Yu passed away in March 2010.

can embark on a paradigm shift for studying Chinese theology.

The current study provides a better understanding of the context of Chinese Christians, especially during the 1920s. Although there were a lot of controversies between the liberals and the conservatives in the Chinese churches, which included the interpretation of the Bible, the interpretation of the doctrines, and the cultural accommodation, their commonality, i.e., the Chinese nationalism appearing in their subversive theological discourses could cross over these two wings. It was seen that both the liberals and the conservatives made effort to produce anti-colonialist resistance in the missionaries' enterprises, even though their theological stances were very different. In this regard, they were at the same front line, instead of opposing each other. Besides, the Chinese Christians were condemned as the slaves of the Western Countries; however, it should be noted that those Chinese Christians, like Jia, who worked in missionaries' enterprises appeared to be 'complicit' and 'resistant' in the colonial discourse. For those who condemned the Chinese Christians actually neglected the subversiveness of the Chinese Christians who were attached in the missionaries' enterprises. For Jia, his mimicry could be regarded as Bhabha's 'technique of camouflage',⁴⁷² by which Jia might protect himself from being criticized by the missionaries when his theological discourse opposed that of the colonizer. So that he could safely develop his theology with subversiveness, and he could also work in the colonizer's enterprise for decades.

Finally I hope that this thesis has shown how some basic issues of postcolonialism – the ambivalence, mimicry and hybridity of the colonial subjects – can enrich our understanding of Chinese theology, such as that of Yu-ming Jia.

⁴⁷² Bhabha, *The Location of Culture*, 85.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY CHINESE SOURCES

Chao, C.T. "Ben Se Jiao Huai Di Shang Que [The Problems of Indigenous Church]." *Qing Nan* [Youth], 76(1924), 8-14. 趙紫宸。〈本色教會的商榷〉

_____. "Cheng Shen Lun [Word becomes flesh]." In *Jin Dai Hua Ren Ji Du Jiao Wen Xian* [Source book of modern Chinese theology]. Edited by Rong-hong Lin. Hong Kong: China Graduate School of Theology, 1986. 〈成身論〉

_____. "Geng Da Di Gong Zue [The Greater Work]." *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 6/6 (Mar 1926), 1-10. 〈更大的工作〉

_____. "Ji Du Jiao Yu Zhong Guo Wen Hua [Christianity and Chinese Culture]." *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 2/9-10 (Jun 1927), 247-260. 〈基督教與中國文化〉

_____. "Jing Zhi Quan Guo Zhong Guo Ji Du Tu Shu [A Letter Respectfully Submitted to All Chinese Christians]." *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 2/4 (Mar 1927), 81-93. 〈敬致全國中國基督徒書〉

_____. "Wo De Zong Jiao Jing Yan [My Religion Experience]." *Sheng Ming* [Life], 4/3 (1923), 1-16. 〈我的宗教經驗〉

_____. "Wo Dui Yu Chuan Zao Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Huai Di Ji Ge Yi Jian [My Opinions on the Creation of Chinese Church]." *Zhen Guang* [True Light], 26:6 (Jun 1927), 1-13. 〈我對於創造中國基督教會的幾個意見〉

_____. "Zao Zi Cheng Bo Shi Yan Jiang Lu [The Collection of Dr. Chao, Tzu-ch'en Speech]." In *Er Shi Shi Ji Zhong Guo Jidu Jiao Wen Ti* [The Problems of Chinese Christianity in the 20th Century]. Ed. by Yu-ming Shao. Taipei: Zheng zhong, 1980. 〈趙紫宸博士演講錄〉

_____. "Zhong Guo Ren Di Jiao Hui Yi Shi [The Church Awareness of Chinese People]." *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 1/10 (Oct 1927), 276-83. 〈中國人的教會意識〉

_____. *Ji Du Jiao Jiao Hui De Yi Yi* [The Meaning of Church in Christianity]. Shanghai: Shanghai Youth Association, 1948. 〈基督教教會的意義〉

_____. *Ji Du Jiao Jin Jie* [Interpretation of Christianity]. Hong Kong: Ji du jiao fu

qiao, 1955. 〈基督教進解〉

_____. *Ji Du Jiao Zhe Xue* [Christian Philosophy]. Soo Chow: Chung-hua chi-tu-chao wen-she, 1926. 〈基督教哲學〉

_____. *Shen Xue Si Jiang* [Four Talks on Theology]. Hong Kong: Ji du jiao fu qiao, 1955. 〈神學四講〉

Chen, Jin-rong. "Lun Bu Dao Yu Shandong [Mission Work in Shantung Province]." *The Theological Quarterly of the Nanking School of Theology*. 5/3 (Sept 1919), 1-20. 陳金庸。〈論佈道於山東〉

Jia, Yu-ming. *Chuang Shi Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Genesis]. Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub. Society, 1935. 《創世記之福音》

_____. "Chuang Shi Ji Zhi Yan Jiu [Studies in Genesis]." *Nanking Theological Seminary Quarterly* Vol.3/1 (Apr 1917), 1-29. 《創世記之研究》

_____. *Chu Ai Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Exodus]. Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub. Society, 1933. 《出埃及記之福音》

_____. *Fei Li Bi Shu Jiang Yi* [Exposition of Philippians]. Taipei: Gan lan ji jin, 1994; the original print, 1928. 《腓立比書講義》

_____. *Jiao Mu Xue* [The Study of Ministry]. Nanking: Spiritual Light, 1926. 《教牧學》

_____. *Ji Du Sheng Ji* [The Life and Teaching of Jesus]. Hong Kong: The Bellman House, 1990; the original print, 1921. 《基督聖蹟》

_____. *Li Wei Ji Zhi Fu Yin* [The Gospel in Leviticus]. Nanking: Spiritual Light Pub., 1933. 《利未記之福音》

_____. *Ling Xiu Ri Ke* [Daily Devotional Guide]. Hong Kong: Chinese Literature

Service, 1962. 《靈修日課》.

_____. *Luo Ma Shu Jiang Yi* [Commentary of Romans]. Hong Kong: The Bellman House, 1965). 《羅馬書講義》

_____. *Shen Dao Xue*, [The Study of Divinity, Vol. 1-10]. Taipei: Shao nian gui zhu she, 1971. 《神道學》

_____. *Shen Dao Xue*, [The Study of Divinity, Vol. 1-3]. Taipei: Christian Evangelistic Mission, 1962. 《神道學》

_____. *Sheng Jin Yao Yee* [The Essential Meaning of Bible, Vol.1-5]. Hong Kong: Bellman House, 5th ed., 1982. 《聖經要義 1-5 冊》

_____. *Sheng Jing Yao Yee* [The Essential Meaning of Bible, Vol. 1-4]. Hong Kong: Hong Dao, 1959. 《聖經要義 1-4 冊》

_____. *Shi Tu Chuan Dao Mo Fan* [The Model of Apostles' Preaching]. Taipei: Heavenly People Depot, 1967; the original print, 1926. 《使徒傳道模範》

_____. "Jin Ri Zhi Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui [Today The Church of Christ in China]." *Nanking Theological Seminary Quarterly* 8 (Apr 1922), 22-32. 賈玉銘。〈今日之中華基督教會〉

_____. *Wan Quan Jiu Fa* [The Prefect Salvation]. Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1987. 《完全救法》

_____. *Wu Shi Er Ling Cheng Jiang Ti* [Fifty-Two Topics Concerning the Spiritual Life]. Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1990. 《五十二靈程講題》

_____. *Xi Bo Lai Shu Jiang Yi* [Exposition of Hebrews]. Taipei: Gan lan ji jin, 1994; the original print, 1926. 《希伯來書講義》

_____. *Xin Bian Huo* [A New Differentiation of the Doubt]. Nanjing: Spiritual Light, 1925. 《新辨惑》

_____. *Yi Sai Ya Shu Jiang Yi* [Exposition of Isaiah]. Taipei: Gan lan ji jin, 1994. 《以賽亞書講義》

_____. “*Yi Fu Suo Jiang Yi* [The Lecture of Ephesians].” Hong Kong: Tian Dao, 1986; the original print, 1926. 《以弗所講義》

_____. “Zhong Guo Jiao Hui Tong Yi Zhi Yu Bei [The Preparation of the Unification of Chinese Churches].” *Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui Nian Jian* [China Church Year Book 1, 1914]. Taipei: Zhongguo jiao hui yan jiu zhong xin, 1983. 〈中國教會統一之預備〉.

_____. “Zhong Hua Quan Guo Zhang Lao Hui Lian He Zong Hui Zhi Cheng Li [The Establishment of the National Association of Chinese Presbyterian Churches].” *Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui Nian Jian* [China Church Year Book 1, 1914]. Taipei: Zhongguo jiao hui yan jiu zhong xin, 1983. 〈中華全國長老會聯合總會之成立〉.

Li, Dao-fei. “Ji Nan Shan Dong Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui Gai Kuang [The Situation of Shandong China Church of Christ].” In *Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui Nian Jian* [China Church Year Book 7, 1924]. Taipei: Zhongguo jiao hui yan jiu zhong xin, 1983. 李道輝。〈濟南山東中華基督教會概況〉

Tian yue. “Reverend Jia Yu-Ming – the record of latter part of his life.” *China and the Gospel* 6 (May-June 1995), 17-20.

Young, Wen. *Zhao Zi-chen Wen Ji I* [A Memorial Collection of Mr. Chao’s Work I]. Beijing: Shang wu yin shu guan, 2003.

Zhang, Yung-xun. “Nan Jing Jin Ling Shen Xue Shi Mu Ji [The Beginning and the end of Nanjing Jinglin theology].” *Zhong Hua Ji Du Jiao Hui Nian Jian* [China Church Year Book 2, 1915]. Taipei: Zhongguo jiao hui yan jiu zhong xin, 1983. 張永訓。〈南京金陵神學始末記〉

PRIMARY ENGLISH SOURCES

A.R. Kepler, "What is the Church of Christ in China." *The Chinese Recorder* Vol. 58/1 (Jan 1927), 27-32.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *Post-Colonial Studies - The Key Concepts*. London & New York: Routledge, 2007.

American Presbyterian Mission. *Records of the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries of China, held at Shanghai, May 7-20, 1870*. Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1890.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Bhabha, Homi. "Editor's Introduction: Minority Maneuvers and Unsettled Negotiations." *Critical Inquiry* 23:3, Front Lines/Border Posts (Spring 1997), 431-459.

_____. "Translator translated: W.J.T. Mitchell talks with Homi Bhabha." *Artforum* 33/7 (1995), 80-84.

_____. *The Location of Culture*. London & New York: Routledge, 1994.

Burt, E. W. "Report of Shantung Federation Conference, Sept, 1907." *The Chinese Recorder* Vol.39/5 (May 1908), 282.

Chao, C.T.. "Jesus and the Reality of God." *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Truth and Life], 7/5 (1933), 1-10.

_____. "The Death of Jesus." *Zhen Li Yu Sheng Ming* [Life and Truth], 2/15 (Nov 1927), 426.

_____. "Revelation." In *The Authority of the Faith - The Madra Series: Presenting Papers Based Upon The Meeting of the International Missionary Council, at Tambaram, Madras, India, December 12th to 29th, 1938*. Vol. 1. Edited by International Missionary Council. New York: International Missionary Council, 1939.

Chinese Educational Commission. *Christian Education in China: A Study Made by an Education Commission Representing the Mission Boards and Societies Conducting Works in China*. New York: Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1922.

DuBose, Lucile. "The Church in China: Suggested Plans for the Study Class." *Presbyterian Survey* 19/12 (1929), 735-37.

Executive Committee of the League of Chinese Churches. "To the Constituency of the League of Christian Churches," *The China Fundamentalist IV* 1 (1931), 19-22.

Gibson, J. Campbell. "Presbyterian Union – and A Sequel." *The China Mission Year Book, 1918*. Shanghai: Christian Literature Society for China, 1910-1925.

_____. "The Chinese Church." *Records of Chinese Centenary Missionary Conference, at Shanghai, April 25-May 8, 1907*. Shanghai: Centenary Conference Committee, 1907.

Hanson, P.O. "Shantung Federal Council." *The Chinese Recorder* Vol. 45/11 (Nov 1914), 726-27.

Hayes, W. M. *Systematic Theology*. Shanghai: Christian Literature Society, 1931.

Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology*. New York: Scribner, 1899.

Hopkins, Martin. "The Present Situation in North Kiangsu." *The Presbyterian Survey* (Feb 1929), 89-90.

Latourette, Kenneth S. *A History of Christian Missions in China*. London: Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge, 1929.

Lee, Y.L.. "The Anti-Christian Movement in Canton." *Chinese Recorder* Vol. 56/4 (Apr 1925), 220-226.

"List of Delegates to the Conference," *The Chinese Recorder* Vol.44/2 (Feb 1913), 237-39.

McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester & New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Papastergiadis, Nikos. "Tracing hybridity in theory." In *Debating Cultural Hybridity: Multi-Cultural Identities and the Politics of Anti-Racism*. Ed. P Werbner & T Modood. London & New Jersey: Zed Books, 1997.

Presbyterian Mission. *The Records of the General Conference of Protestant Missionaries of China, held at Shanghai, May 10-24, 1877*. Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press, 1878.

Price, Frank. "The Church of Christ in China." *Presbyterian Survey* 18/2(1928), 83.

_____. Introduction to *Shen Dao Xue* [The Study of Divinity], by Yu-ming Jia. Taipei: Christian Evangelist Group, 1962.

Richardson, D. W. Appreciation to *Ji Du Sheng Ji* [The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ], by Yu-ming Jia. Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1990.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1993.

Sakamoto, Rumi. "Japan, hybridity and the creation of colonialist discourse." *Theory, Culture and Society* 13/3 (1996), 113-128.

Schlesinger, Arthur. "The Missionary Enterprise and Theories of Imperialism." In *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America*. Ed. by John Fairbank. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Segovia, Fernando. "Interpreting beyond Borders: Postcolonial Studies and Diasporic Studies in Biblical Criticism." In *Interpreting beyond Borders*. Ed. Fernando Segovia. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Strong, Augustus Hopkins. *Systematic Theology*. Valley Forge, PA: Judson, 1907.

Sugirtharajah, R.S. *Asian Biblical Hermeneutics and Postcolonialism: Contesting the Interpretations*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1998.

_____. *The Postcolonial Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire – Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London & New York: Routledge, 1995.

_____. *Post-colonialism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP, 2003.

_____. *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

_____. *White Mythologies: Writing History and the West*. London & New York: Routledge, 2004.

SECONDARY CHINESE SOURCES

Chen, Wen-ying. "Fo Jiao Jing Lu Bian Zhuan Ji Qi Dui Han Yi Fo Jing Chuan Bo De Zuo Yong [The Catalogue of Buddhist Classics and Its Influences to the Spreading of Translated Chinese Buddhist Classics]." *Journal of Henan Normal University* 34 (Jul 07), 139-41. 陳文英。〈佛教經錄編撰及其對漢譯佛經傳播的作用〉

Chen, Yi-cheng. "Rev. Chia Yu-ming and China Devotional Seminary in Sichuan." *Nanjing Theological Review*. 11(Feb 1990), 103-105. 陳以誠。〈賈玉銘與中國基督教靈修學院在四川〉

Fu, Xian-wei. "Zhong Guo Jiao Hui: Xin Ling Xiu, Xin Tiao Zhan [China church –

New Leaders, New Challenges].” Document on-line. Available from *Christian Times* website (http://christiantimes.org.hk/Common/Reader/News/ShowNews.jsp?Nid=49736&Pid=5&Version=0&Cid=220&Charset=big5_hkscs). Accessed 25th Feb 2009. 傅先偉。〈中國教會——新領袖、新挑戰〉

Gluer, Winfried. *Zhao Zi Chen De Shen Xue Si Xiang* [Die Theologische Arbeit T.C. Chao's In Der Zeit Von 1918 Bis 1956]. Trans. by Joe Dunn. Hong Kong: Chinese Christian Literature Council, 1998. 古愛華。《趙紫宸的神學思想》

Guo, Wei-lian. *Fan Dui He Yi? : Jia Yu Ming, Ji Yao Zhu Yi Yu He Yi Yun Dong De Jiu Jie* [Advocating Separatism? Chia Yu Ming, Fundamentalists and their Difficulties in Chinese Church Union Movement]. Hong Kong: Tien Dao Pub. House, 2002. 郭偉聯。《反對合一? 賈玉銘, 基要主義與合一運動的糾結》

_____. “Jiu En Yu Sheng Ming: Jia Yu Ming Yi Ji Du Wei Zhong Xin De Shen Xue Lun Shu [Salvation and Life: A Reflection on Chia Yu Ming's Christocentric Theology].” *Journal of China Graduate School of Theology* 34 (Jan 2003), 55-93. 〈救恩與生命：賈玉銘以基督為中心的神學論述〉

_____. “Ling Yi Yu Zheng Jie Jia Yu Ming Shi Jing Fang Fa Chu Tan [Spiritual Meaning and Right Interpretation: The Hermeneutical Approaches of Chia Yu Ming].” *Jian Dao* 7/1 (1997), 191-233. 〈靈意與正解：賈玉銘釋經方法初探〉

Hou, Hong-tang. “Tian Ren He Yi Guan Zao Qi Fa Sheng Li Cheng [Developing Process of Early View of Unanimity of Heaven and Man].” *Journal of Anqing Teachers College* 19 (Oct 2000), 78-83. 侯宏堂。〈天人合一觀早期發生歷程〉

Liang, Jia-lin. “Hua Ren Shi Dai Lun Zhe Dui Qian Xi Nian Guo Du De Li Jie [Millennial Kingdom in the Eyes of Chinese Dispensationalists].” In *Millennium: Perspectives in the Chinese Context*. Ed. Shao-guang Deng. Hong Kong: Lutheran Theological Seminary, 2000. 梁家麟。〈華人時代論者對千禧年國度的理解〉

_____. *Pai Huai Yu Ye Ru Zhi Jian* [In between Confucius and Christianity]. Taipei: Yu zhou guang, 1997. 《徘徊於耶儒之間》

Lin, Hua-guo, “Ye tan jin dai zhong guo ban zhi min di hua yu ban feng jian hua zhi jian de guan xi – Li shi yue ‘liang zhong qu xiang’ lun zhi yi [Relationship between Semi colonization and Semi feudalization in Modern China: A Further Discussion of Li Shiyue's Theme of Two Tendencies].” *Journal of Peking University -Humanities and Social Sciences* 36 /4(1994), 43-48. 林華國。〈也談近代中國半殖民地化與半封建化之間的關係——李時岳“兩種趨向”論質疑〉

Lin, Rong-hong. *Zhong Hua Shen Xue Wu Shi Nian, 1900-1949* [A Half-Century of Chinese Theology 1900-1949]. Hong Kong: China Graduate School of Theology, 1998. 林榮洪。《中華神學五十年, 1900-1949》

_____. *Qu Gao He Gua: Zhao Zi Chen De Sheng Ping Ji Shen Xue* [The Life and Thought of Chao Tzu-ch'en]. Hong Kong: China Graduate School of Theology, 1994. 《曲高和寡：趙紫宸的生平及神學》

Min, Li. "Dao Jiao Shen Sheng Lun Ji Qi Dui Zhong Guo Wen Hua De Ying Xiang [The Deity of Daoism and its Influences to Chinese Culture]." *China Religion* (Jul 08), 60-61. 閔麗。《道教神聖論及其對中國文化的影響》

Shi, Chang-yu. "Feng Shen Yan Yi : Zheng Zhi Zong Jiao Yu Yi [Romance of Enfeoffment of Deities – The Meaning with Politics and Religion]." *Dong Yue Tribune* 25 (May 2004), 71-77. 石昌渝。《封神演義—政治宗教寓意》

Song, Shang-jie. *Wo Di Jian Zheng* [My Testimony]. Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1982. 宋尚節。《我的見証》

Wang, Hui and Hui Wu. "Lun Zhou Dai Shen Quan Chong Bai De Yan Bian Yu Tian Ren He Yi [A Study of God-man and Theocracy in Zhou Dynasty]." *Journal of Shanxi Normal University* 27 (Dec 98), 82-90. 王暉。 吳海。〈論周代神權崇拜的演變與天人合一觀〉

Wang, Ming-Dao. *Wu Shi Nian Lai* [Fifty Years]. Hong Kong: Bellman House, 1971. 王明道。《五十年來》

Xing, Fu-zeng. *Xun Suo Ji du Jiao De Du Te Xing: Zhao Zi Chen Shen Xue Lun Ji* [In Search of the Uniqueness of Christianity: Essays on T.C. Chao's Theology]. Hong Kong: Alliance Bible Seminary, 2003. 邢福增。《尋索基督教的獨特性：趙紫宸神學論集》

_____. *Zhong Guo Ji Yao Zhu Yi Zhe De Shi Jian Yu Kun Jing Chen Chong Gui De Shen Xue Xi Xiang Yu Shi Dai* [Praxis and Predicament of a Chinese Fundamentalist: Chen Chong-gui (Marcus Cheng)'s Theological Thought And His Time]. Hong Kong: Alliance Bible Seminary, 2001. 《中國基要主義者的實踐與困境：陳崇桂的神學與思想與時代》

Xu, Guang and Jian-ying Fan. "Zhong guo jin dai shi liang ban hai shi san ban [Is Modern China Two Half Or Three Half?]." *History Monthly* 2 (1996), 109-110. 徐光。 樊劍英。〈中國近代是兩半還是三半〉

Yao, Wei-qun. "Fo Jiao Yu Ji Du Jiao Shen Guan De Bi Jiao [A Comparison in the Conception of Deity Between Buddhism and Christianity]." *Journal of Shanxi Normal University* 33 (Mar 04), 31-36. 姚衛群。〈佛教與基督教神觀的比較〉

Yu, Li-gong. Friend of Yu-ming Jia. A private letter to author, 17th Mar, 2009.

_____. *Ye Jin Tian Ming* [Dawn Breaks: the Impacts of Gospel in China]. Berkeley CA: M. Leekung Yu, 1998. 于力工。《夜盡天明》

Zha, Shi-jie. *Zhong Guo Ji Du Jiao Ren Wu Xiao Zhuan* [Concise Biographies of Important Chinese Christians]. Taipei: China Evangelical Seminary Press, 1983. 查時傑。《中國基督教人物小傳》

Zhang, Ji-yu. "Zhong Shi Dao Jing Yan Du Chuan Yang Dao Jiao Wen Hua [The Importance of the Study of Daoist Classics and the spread of the Daoist Culture]." *China Taoism* 1 (2002), 11-13. 張繼禹。〈重視道經研讀-傳揚道教文化〉

Zhang, Xue-li. "In Memory of Rev. Chia Yu-Ming." *Jin Ling Shen Xue Zhi* [Jinling Theological Review] 8 (Apr/1988), 59. 張學理。〈懷念賈玉銘牧師〉

Zhao, Jun-Ying. *Man Tan Wu Shi Nian Lai Zhong Guo De Jiao Hui Yu Zheng Zhi* [A Talk on Church and Politics of China in the Past 50 years]. Taipei: Chinese for Christ, Inc. ministries, 1981. 趙君影。《漫談五十年來中國的教會與政治》

Zhao, Zhang-chao. "Feng Shen Yan Yi Shen Wang He Yi Guan Lun Xi [On the Sense of God and King in Collaboration in *Romance of Enfeoffment of Deities*]." *Journal of Tianjian University* 13 (Jun 2001), 90-94. 趙章超。〈封神演義——神王合一觀論析〉

Zheng, S L. "Dr Jia Yu-Ming whom I know." In *Asian Christians You Should Know: Short, Vivid Biographies of Some Outstanding Asians*. Ed. Y.L. Liu. Hong Kong: Christian Witness Press, 1967. 鄭遂藍。〈我所認識的賈玉銘博士〉

SECONDARY ENGLISH SOURCES

Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Boardman, W.E. *The Higher Christian Life*. London: Garland, 1984.

Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John (1:49)*. Trans. William Pringle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1950. On-line. Available at Center for Reformed Theology and Apologetics website (<http://www.reformed.org/books/index.html>).

Access on 29th April, 2009.

_____. *Institutes of the Christian Religion: Book 2, Ch 16, Section 1*. Trans. Henry Beveridge. On-line. Available at Center for Reformed Theology and Apologetics website (<http://www.reformed.org/books/index.html>). Access on 29th April, 2009.

Chafer, Lewis S. *Systematic Theology*. Dallas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1948.

Cliff, Norman H. *A History of the Protestant Movement in Shandong Province, China, 1859-1951*. PhD Thesis. University of Buckingham, 1994.

Corbett, Charles Hodge. *Shantung Christian University – Cheeloo*. New York: United Board for Christian Colleges in China, 1955.

Edmondson, Stephen. *Calvin's Christology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Fowler, Jeaneane D., and Merv Fowler. *Chinese Religious: Beliefs and Practices*. Portland, Oregon: Sussex Academic Press, 2008.

Fussner, F.. *The Historical Revolution, English Historical Writing and Thought 1580-1640*. London: Routledge, 1962.

Kwan, Shui-man. "Collaboration as Alternative Mode of Anti-colonialist Resistance – A Postcolonial Rethinking of the Asia-West Binarism Inscribed in the Asian Theological Movement." PhD Thesis, CUHK, 1999.

Lacan, Jacques. *Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. London: The Hogarth Press and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1977.

Lienhard, Marc. *Luther: Witness to Jesus Christ*. Trans. Edwin Robertson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1982.

Lin, Rong-hong. *Chinese Theology in Construction*. Pasadena, Calif.: W. Carey Library, 1983.

Luther, Martin. *Select Works of Martin Luther*. Trans. Henry Cole. London: Simpkin & Marshall, 1826.

Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006

McGrath, Alister. *A Life of John Calvin: A Study in the Shaping of Western Culture*. Cambridge, Mass: Blackwell, 1990.

Petras, James. "Past, Present and Future of China: From Semi-colony to world Power." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 36 /4 (2006), 423-441.

Scofield, C.I. *The Scofield Reference Bible*. New York: Oxford University, 1909.

Segundo, Juan Luis. *The Liberation of Theology*. Trans. John Drury. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976.

“*Submissiveness*.” Document on-line. Available from *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* website (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=79398&dict=CALD>). Accessed 25th April, 2009.

“*Subversiveness*.” Document on-line. Available from *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary* website (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=79543&dict=CALD>). Accessed 25th April, 2009.

The Central Executive Committee of the Publicity Department. *Dr Sun Yat-Sen: His Life and Achievements*. Shanghai: Shanghai Mercury, 1927.

West, Philip. *Yenching University And Sino-Western Relations, 1916-1952*. Cambridge, Mass.; London: Harvard U Press, 1976.

Yao, Kevin Xiyi. *The Fundamentalist Movement among Protestant Missionaries in China, 1920-1937*. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2003.