

view, but has been frequently expressed, among others in recent times, by Hobhouse and Ginsberg. The field of social anthropology, unlike many fields of natural science, is common to the anthropologist and to the moral philosopher. It is unsatisfactory that the sociologist, in which term the social anthropologist is included, should often be the person who knows the facts best and yet should be self-debarred from making judgments on them. It is even more unsatisfactory that the moral philosopher, who is the person best fitted to make judgments, should do so, as often happens, without an adequate knowledge of social theory and fact. The answer would seem to be that the sociologist should also be a moral philosopher and that, as such, he should have a set of definite beliefs and values in terms of which he evaluates the facts he studies as a sociologist. He must make, and keep apart, two different kinds of judgment within the same field: a judgment on the significance of social facts to scientific theory and a judgment on their significance to moral theory. It is as important, perhaps more important, that the moral philosopher should be conversant with the conclusions of the social sciences, since, as I have already said, the validity of a judgment depends in part on a knowledge of the facts. Moral judgments which are couched in very general terms, and are not specific applications to particular cases, tend to be ineffective guides to conduct, and if specific judgments are to be made full knowledge of the particular cases is essential. As it is unlikely that social anthropologists, with one or two exceptions, will study Catholic moral philosophy, a bridge can only be built between the two disciplines by some Catholic moral philosophers studying social anthropology.

E. E. EVANS-PRITCHARD,

*Professor of Social Anthropology
in the University of Oxford.*

MISSIOLOGY

ACCORDING to Father Rommerskirchen (*Guide des Missions Catholiques* 1937, p. 165) we owe the word 'missiology' to the French—the term 'missiologie' having been popularised by Père Charles, S.J. German Catholics, under the inspiration of Professor Schmidlin, have preferred to use the word 'Missionswissenschaft' and it is perhaps unfortunate that English speaking Catholics did not follow their example and talk of the study or science of missions, rather than the clumsy and pretentious 'missiology'.

Granted, however, that the term is in common use, the purpose of this essay is to attempt to explain its meaning. The explana-

tion is really quite simple. Missiology is the scientific investigation and description of the history and conditions of the apostolic action of the Church in pagan countries. It is that part of Dogmatic Theology which provides us with a justification for what are termed Foreign Missions, and which discusses the 'mode' of missionary activity in relation to the data provided by the anthropologist, the historian of culture and other allied specialists. In so far as it is a self-conscious discipline Missiology is recent, but in principle, in its dogmatic foundations, it is part of the theological heritage of the Church.

The Fathers and the great Scholastics dealt with its fundamental presuppositions as parts of the treatises on Providence and Faith. The discoveries of the 15th and 16th centuries, in that they revealed vast groups of persons ignorant of the Gospel, led to an extension of these treatises in relation to the problem of the salvation of the infidel. Lastly, in our own day the growth of the sciences of Anthropology and relevant discoveries in the fields of Comparative Religion and Psychology, have led to the accumulation of a vast mass of data which demands theological interpretation and application in practice. It is against this background that the pioneers, too numerous to mention, of Missiology have developed their discipline.

What then in briefest outline does this new discipline teach? The first question it attempts to answer is: What is the missionary motive? True, all missionary work is based on the authority of Christ; as the Apostles were sent, so is the missionary, and the text, 'Going therefore teach ye all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost' (*Mt.* 28, 19), sums up the apostolic mission of the Church. The Incarnation of the Word and the consequent breaking down of the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile (*Ephesians* 2, 14) resolved the tension in the faith of Israel between the doctrine of the Creator and the mission of the Jews as the chosen people (cf. De Lubac *Le Fondement Théologique des Missions*. Paris 1946, pp. 11-51). In the Incarnation the Way is revealed to mankind (*Jn* 14, 16) and all things are made new (*Jn* 3, 8). By the Son of God, then, the missionary is sent. Yet are not all Christians, all priests, sent in this sense? Why, on this basis, asks Père Charles (*Missiologie*, Louvain, 1938), should they go far afield? Should not their witness to Christ, which is their apostolic duty (cf. *Acts* 1, 8, etc.) be exercised among the pagans and post-Christians of their own country? It is true that the Church must teach 'all nations', but what is it that specifies, as it were, a Foreign Missionary? Simply this: The Church is the Body of Christ, a visible *koinonia* which bears witness to her Head.

It is the task of the Foreign Missionary to establish in pagan countries that visible Body, that it, through the Sacraments, through the full life of the Christian community, may bear witness to Christ. In other words, with St Paul, the missionary 'plants', as God's 'coadjutor' (I Cor. 3), the seed which is the Body of Christ. Two important conclusions follow from this. First, the activity of the missionary is in essence not distinct from the apostolic activity of the Church. Foreign Missions are the inevitable result of the existence of the Church as bearing witness to the one Saviour; they are no mere luxury of prosperous times. If Christ is *Kurios*, then the Church, his Bride, must bear witness to him before all nations.

This granted, it also follows that missionary activity is not spiritual colonisation; the missionary does not bear witness to any country or culture, but simply to Christ. Thus the task of the foreign missionary is to establish a native Church—the Church, let us say, in China, which will bear witness in union with the Universal Church of which it is a part.

This planting of a native Church, this repudiation of the universal validity of European modes of expression, is obviously dependent on a further series of presuppositions, and raises further questions. For we are at once presented with a dilemma. Either, as Luther seems to have held, the pagan world is pagan as a punishment for its sins—is in fact a reprobate and devilish world which must be repudiated in all its manifestations; or the pagan or non-Christian world in fact possesses all the religious values that Christianity proclaims; Christianity is merely that mode of belief which is the concomitant of Western classical culture. Or, slightly more subtle, it gives a somewhat more perfect expression to a religious attitude which is basically the same throughout the world, among what Heiler would call the baptised and the unbaptised Christians.

Obviously neither of these views can be refuted here. It can only be pointed out that the second is destructive of historic Christianity, and, as the Barthian, Dr Kraemar (*The Christian Message in a non-Christian World*. London, 1938), proves at length, is based on a radical misunderstanding of what Christianity is, on a perversion of the apostolic preaching.

If it be accepted that Christ is unique, in that he is the second Adam in whom all things are recapitulated, that he is the *Salvator mundi*, then how are we to avoid the former position of condemnation? Must we, with Dr Kraemar, regard the 'religions' as inverted forms of idolatry, based on man's presumption in the face of the unknown, as radically opposed to Biblical realism?

Dr Kraemar is no doubt right in his assertion that we cannot pick

out isolated and superficially similar doctrines from the Eastern religions and show that they contain a *praeparatio evangelii*, without realising that these doctrines only have meaning within an organised and coherent system of life which may give them a very different connotation from the one they receive in a Christian setting. This may be admitted, but when Dr Kraemar, if I do not do him an injustice, claims that these systems are 'discontinuous' with Revelation, a caveat must be entered.

Comparative Religion may not provide us with a criterion of truth, but at least it does draw our attention to certain data which cannot be dismissed unless one is prepared to regard all human experience as corrupt.¹ The life, the prayer, the experience of the Eastern mystic², of the African savage,³ far more than any speculative doctrine, render the Calvinist and Jansenist position intolerable. As St Augustine wrote, 'In all religions some truths are to be found. And these truths in all religions are really Christian'.

The roots of the question are, however, deeper. The Catholic doctrine of man has always refused to admit a total corruption of human nature, and in consequence the Church condemns the Jansenist propositions that all the acts of infidels are sinful (*Denzinger* 1025), a decision which confirms the Alexandrian patristic tradition that the heritage of Greece was positive rather than negative. Further, the maxim of the Scholastics—expressive of the teaching of the Gospels—*Facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam*—is reinforced by the condemnation of the propositions that pagans do not receive any influx (of grace) from Jesus Christ (*Denzinger* 1295), and that outside the (visible) Church no grace is given (*Denzinger* 1379). The whole position receives authoritative sanction in the Allocution *Singulari quadam* of 1854 and the Encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerore* of 1863. In these documents Pius IX teaches that those who are invincibly ignorant of the true religion are free from fault before God—and who, he continues, shall presume to define the limits of this ignorance? (*Denzinger* 1647). Such persons, if they lead a true and honest life, can by the help of grace attain eternal life (*Denzinger* 1677). Such is the position of the teaching Church. Many explanations have been employed by theologians to justify her position, but for these the reader must be content to be referred to L. Capéran's classic work, *Le problème du salut des Infidèles*.⁴ Here we can do no more

1 Cf. the works of Father Schmidt. One does not have to accept his somewhat arbitrary theories to appreciate the mass of data he has accumulated; see also Otto Karrer, *Religions of Mankind*, London, 1936, for a readable summary.

2 Cf. E. Underhill in *Essays Catholic and Missionary*, London, 1928.

3 Cf. *The Church and Primitive Peoples*, by D. W. T. Shropshire, C.R., London, 1938.

4 Also invaluable is Harent's article, *Infidèles (Salut de)* in the *Dict. Theol. Cath.*

than note that Dr Kraemar's criticism that the Catholic theologians over-emphasise the part played by the natural man, may indeed be true of some minor writers, but examination shows that the emphasis of the great theologians, following St Thomas, and indeed of the Council of Trent, has always been on Grace. It must also be remarked that Cardinal Billot's theory regarding the immature moral and religious state of the primitive, involving as he believed, a capacity for natural beatitude only, is to the mind of the writer incompatible with anthropological evidence, irreconcilable with the Epistle to the Romans and with Patristic tradition. Against the same objection clothed in secular garments the Church has protested in our own day in her condemnation of racism and of the attempt to discriminate between the various families of the human race. The Church, as Benedict XV taught, is not tied to any one culture (*A.A.S.* 1917, p. 530).

Such are the fundamental principles of missiology, but the question at once arises, what of practice? Have not the missionaries been ruthless exterminators of custom and native civilization; have they not acted as the intelligence service of imperialist expansion; in short, is the Church only the religion of the conqueror?

The answer to this question would require a comprehensive history of missions, but a few points can be made. The honest missiologist would be the first to admit that mistakes had been made—cardinal errors of conduct and judgment on the part of individuals have compromised for centuries the preaching of the Gospel. At the same time he would assert that these errors have served to point the way to the discovery of true principles, and must be seen against the background of the creative effort of the Church as a whole.

A critical study of the history of missions shows that, in almost every case, the errors are due to a perversion of Catholic teaching by heretical influences, or a viewpoint unconsciously coloured by secular values. A few concrete instances will illustrate the point.

(1) The question of a native priesthood did not emerge as a debatable issue until quite late, not in fact, until the 16th century. The expansion of the Spanish and Portuguese empires and the problems of colonial administration on an imperial basis, led to the rise of a party which decried the culture of the American Indian or even denied his rationality in order that they might make free with his rights. The local government in the Spanish colonies was only too often concerned to degrade the position of the Indian and with this object the clerical state was closed to them in the Councils of Mexico (1555) and Lima (1591). This tendency was fought by a group of great Dominicans both in the theoretic and practical fields, while

Pius V, appealing to the example of the Apostolic Church, demanded that no obstacle should be put in the way of the formation of a native clergy. The struggle was long and bitter, but of fundamental importance, as a practical example of the equality of all men in Christ. Time and time again Rome had to intervene to promote the work and to protect it against secular influences. The ruin of the infant Church of Japan was attributed to the lack of a native clergy, and in 1659 Mgr Ingoli, secretary of the newly founded Congregation of Propaganda, complained that the Portuguese bishops in the East did not want to ordain a native clergy.⁵ In its instruction of 1660 to the first Vicars Apostolic, sent out to try to combat the stagnation caused by the Portuguese policy, Propaganda insisted that the principal motive for their work was to be the training of young natives for the priesthood as the most important means of establishing in a pagan country the Christian religion.⁶ The strong opposition of a colonial clergy, part and parcel as they were of a bureaucratic system, was deplorable but understandable. Far more difficult to comprehend is the attitude of those heroic but narrow men, true missionaries, who opposed the ordination of natives.

The 17th century missionary in the East, remembering the example of the early Church and the ideals of such Medievals as John of Monte Corvino, had no difficulties on the subject and the century had seen half-caste bishops in Nanking and in Siam, while in Tonking in 1700 there were 45 native priests.

But the influence of Jansenism grew steadily, affecting the outlook of even such men as Bossuet, and in 1709 we find the missionaries at Maçao opposing the ordination of Chinese on the grounds that they were a vicious race unworthy of the honour of the priesthood. Their view that all pagans were idolatrous—a very doubtful statement from an anthropological point of view—and that they were thus members of a reprobate race, blighted missionary work, not only in China, but in India and elsewhere, so that in the 19th century a bishop at Pondicherry could thank God that he had never laid hands on a black man 'incapable of virtue' as the race was. Shocking though the statement is, and perhaps unique in its brutality, it must be admitted that the attitude of the average French missionary in the 19th century was one of condescension towards the native, who, even if he were judged worthy of the priesthood must remain content with a subordinate position. Pope after Pope—notably Gregory XVI and Leo XIII—fought this tendency and our own day has seen it finally condemned in the pronouncements of Benedict XV and Pius

5 Cf. Georges Goyau, *Missions and Missionaries*, London, 1932.

6 Cf. *Le Societé des Missions-Etrangères*, Paris, 1923.

XI. The 'native clergy is not to be trained in order to assist the foreign missionary in humbler offices. . . . Since the Church of God is Catholic and cannot be a stranger to any nation or tribe, it is proper that out of every people should be drawn sacred ministers to be teachers of the Divine Law and leaders in the way of salvation for their own countrymen'; when these exist 'the missionaries have successfully accomplished their task and the Church has been thoroughly well founded'.⁷ In this connection, Benedict XV deplored the fact that there are groups of native Christians who have had the Faith for centuries and who have not yet produced bishops or priests.⁸ Great though the spiritual difficulties may be, this latter condition is a sign of what I have called spiritual colonization. In the concrete it is perhaps far more significant to remember that today flourishing native churches are growing up all over the world and that already many parts of China and India are off the leading strings.

(2) In order to understand more fully the attitude of those who opposed the Papal and Apostolic teaching on this matter, it is necessary to consider a further question, that of customs—or the problem of adaptation. Quite clearly, from the principles that have been stated, adaptation cannot mean any compromise with regard to the unique character of Christian revelation; it will rather be, as Father de Menasse, O.P. points out, a work of the translation of the Gospel into native thought-forms and the creation of a culture and temporal life inspired by Christ. It is, in fact, just a name for the process by which the Incarnate Word, working through the Church, transforms and spiritualises the cultural and human data. Neither rejecting the given as evil or irrelevant, nor compromising Christian truth by a facile eclecticism.

This was well understood in the early Church and we find Gregory the Great writing to Mellitus that temples should be turned to the service of the true God so that people 'may the more familiarly resort to the places to which they have been accustomed', and that by gradual development pagan customs should be purified and baptised (Bede, *Ecclesiastical History*, I. 30). This acceptance of the cultural background of the non-Christian as a field to be transformed by the Gospel is based on the recognition that the unknown God latent in their religion is the God revealed in Christ (cf. *Acts* 17-23); and imperfect and even corrupt though their understanding may be, it yet provides a basis for the cathartic and apostolic action of the Church.

In spite of the distortion of view introduced by the romanticism

⁷ Encyclical: *Maximum Illud.*, 1919, C.T.S., pp. 10-11.

⁸ Cf. also *Rerum Ecclesiae*, pp. 15-21.

of Chateaubriand and the justifiable reaction from the 'noble savage' myth of Rousseau, which allied itself to the conviction of Western superiority induced by the technical achievements of the 19th century, the Church has ever refused to identify herself with any one culture. Individuals, even great men like Mgr Duchesne, may have regarded the civilisations of the East as anti-human monstrosities, but the saner view has always prevailed. The missionary, wrote Pius XI, holds his sublime commission 'not from Governments, but from our blessed Lord' (Letter *Ab Ipsis*, 1926). It is this truth that missiology strives to protect by pointing out the underlying principles of missionary work and underlining view points which tend to compromise these principles.

IAN HISLOP, O.P.

MOBILITY AND PROPERTY

THE idea of this article was suggested by an anthropological lecture on two aboriginal peoples of the Pacific.

Two peoples, the Andamanese Islanders and the Tikopia, have lived within boating distance of each other for countless generations. The one is semi-nomadic, hunting and fishing. The other is, or was, agricultural. In the first the communal element in the ownership of property is very marked. In the second the private or personal ownership was far more marked.

From this arises a thought. Is it possible that the question of the balance of individual with communal or social rights in the ownership and use of property is not a matter of industrialism, nor of atheism, but chiefly of mobility or immobility of social occupation?

One can follow the idea in many fields: for instance in the Catholic Middle Ages. As the peoples of Europe began to settle, but were yet uncertain and largely mobile and pastoral, they developed the system called feudalism. Feudalism was a kind of socialism, in the sense that the prince, the owner and the employer all three coincided in the person of the feudal lord. All lands were held in trust from him. He was the government. He was the employer in so far as there was an employer outside the subsistence economy of the people who held tenures on his land.

As the people became more and more settled, agricultural, less and less mobile, in the later Middle Ages and Reformation period, absolute individual tenure of land outside any further responsibility to an overlord became more and more common. The squirearchies appeared, and more and more independent farmers.

But in the peoples who did not immobilise, the Celtic clans for