

PRELUDE TO IRONY

The Princeton Theology and the Practice of
American Presbyterian Missions in Northern Siam, 1867-1880
Herbert R. Swanson

A Dissertation submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
The Melbourne College of Divinity

2003

Electronic 2012

Table of Contents

- I. [Abstract](#)
- II. [List of Illustrations and Tables](#)
- III. [Introduction](#)
- IV. [Explanatory Notes and List of Abbreviations](#)
- V. [Chapter One: The Historical and Cultural Settings of the Laos Mission](#)
 - A. [The History Context](#)
 - B. [The Theological Context](#)
 - C. [Conclusion](#)
- VI. [Chapter Two: The Princeton Connection](#)
 - A. [The Personal Connection](#)
 - B. [The Theological Connection](#)
 - C. [Conclusion](#)
- VII. [Chapter Three: The Princeton System of Doctrines and Meanings](#)
 - A. [Theological Foundations](#)
 - B. [Theological Strands](#)
 - C. [Conclusion](#)
- VIII. [Chapter Four: Theology, Ideology, and Evangelism](#)
 - A. [Baconian Evangelism](#)
 - B. [Baconian Medicine](#)
 - C. [Conclusion](#)
- IX. [Chapter Five: Theology, Ideology, and the Church](#)
 - A. [Martyr's Blood](#)
 - B. [Interregnum](#)
 - C. [Edict of Religious Toleration](#)
 - D. [Conclusion](#)
- X. [Chapter Six: Theology, Ideology, and Education](#)
 - A. [Church Education](#)
 - B. [Formal Education](#)
 - C. [Printing and Literature Distribution](#)
 - D. [Conclusion](#)
- XI. [Conclusion](#)
- XII. [Appendices](#)
 - A. [Appendix I: Text of the Edict of Religious Toleration](#)
 - B. [Appendix II: Map and General Tables](#)
- XIII. [Bibliography](#)

Abstract

Protestant Christianity first arrived in northern Siam in 1867, when the Rev. Daniel and Sophia McGilvary, American Presbyterian missionaries, moved their family to Chiang Mai, the chief city of the region, and founded a new mission, known as the "Laos Mission. After a brief period of evangelistic success, the mission experienced a period of persecution and repression that severely limited its growth. It only slowly managed to establish itself on a permanent basis in a process that lasted until roughly 1880. In the course of its work, the mission failed to contextualize its message and methods, with the apparent result that only a relatively small number of northern Thais converted to Christianity. This study investigates the reasons behind the Laos Mission's rejection of contextualization. Its thesis is that the mission drew on a "system of meanings and doctrines" to shape its work, which system led it to shun contextualization, and that the writings of the Princeton circle of theologians help demonstrate the relationship of that system to missionary behavior and strategies. The Princeton Theology was related to the Laos Mission in two ways. First, the two leading members of the mission both graduated from Princeton Seminary, and their records reveal generally close parallels with their mentors at Princeton. Second, the other pioneer members of the mission did not show such direct parallels, but their work and writings indicate that they shared Princeton's orthodox evangelical theological and ideological orientation.

After discussing the historical background of the Laos Mission ([Chapter I](#)) and its relationship to the Princeton Theology ([Chapter II](#)), the dissertation outlines the system of doctrines and meanings shared by the missionaries and Princeton theologians ([Chapter III](#)). That system begins with a set of assumed theological principles drawn from Reformed confessionalism and Common Sense Philosophy, which principles informed their piety and led them to emphasize the apologetical defense of their faith. Their shared system of doctrines and meanings was a closed, dualistic system that drew clear boundaries between truth and falsehood, faith and impiety, and Christianity and heathenism. It was a "scholastic" system that utilized an epistemological approach to establish its own ability to know God and the truth. A survey of the history of the mission's evangelistic and medical work ([Chapter IV](#)), work with its converts ([Chapter V](#)), and educational activities ([Chapter VI](#)) confirms the thesis of the dissertation. The Laos Mission carried out its work on the basis of a closed system of doctrines and meanings that encouraged it to preserve the Western, alien form and content of the Christian faith it brought with it from the United States.

List of Illustrations and Tables

List of Illustrations

[Figure 1](#) Map of Modern Day Thailand and Its Northern Region

List of Tables

[Table 2.1](#) Years of Missionary Service in the Laos Mission, 1867-1880

[Table 2.2](#) Relationship of the Princeton Theology to the Members of the Laos Mission

[Table A.1](#) Stations of the Laos Mission

[Table A.2](#) Membership Statistics the Laos Missions's Churches 1869-1880

Introduction

In April 1867, the Rev. Daniel and Sophia McGilvary, American Presbyterian missionaries, arrived in the city of Chiang Mai, northern Siam, to establish the "Laos Mission"[1] and thus initiate the Christian evangelization of the northern Thai people. Chiang Mai was the chief city of Siam's northern tributary states and heir to a long, honorable cultural tradition of its own, one stretching back several centuries to the days of the Lan Na Kingdom.[2] The McGilvarys took with them a large assortment of bags, boxes, and cases containing nearly all of the goods and supplies that they would need for many months to come. They also carried along a good deal of "mental baggage" that included their American and Presbyterian worldview, values, beliefs, and attitudes; it is that mental baggage and that of their colleagues in the Laos Mission that concerns us here.

In amongst the mental baggage the McGilvarys and those who followed them took with them to Chiang Mai was a contradiction, a paradox that has puzzled at least some scholars and church dignitaries for nearly a century. The Presbyterians moved to Chiang Mai with the intention of converting the northern Thai to Christianity, but they carried out that task in a way that emphasized the differences and strangeness of their faith. They believed that the eternal fate of the northern Thai depended on converting them to the Protestant faith, and yet the missionaries preserved and even emphasized the alien nature of their message. Why? Maen Pongudom points out, moreover, that the attitudes and strategies used by the Laos Mission also stand in sharp contrast to those of the early church, which frequently embraced its cultural contexts rather than rejecting them.[3] It seems so commonplace in our day of cross-cultural advertising, thus, that one shapes messages to fit contexts that we cannot but term a message that eschews and even defies its cultural context as paradoxical, contradictory, and enigmatic - whether by the standards of ancient ecclesiastical or modern commercial practices.

These questions concerning missionary policies and behavior in northern Siam call attention not only to the Presbyterian missionaries' mental baggage itself, but also and most especially the cognitive sources of that baggage. The missionaries evidently acted on the basis of certain ideas and attitudes that shaped their practice of missions. It is the purpose of this study to explore those cognitive sources of missionary behavior in northern Siam and discover the link between missionary thought and behavior that emerged from them, a link that has remained unclear in spite of the work of several scholars described below. It is not even clear what those sources might be. To anticipate our thesis, this study will argue that missionary praxis in northern Siam grew out of the missionaries' "system of doctrines and meanings," which system they brought with them from the United States.

The question before us in this study, then, is that of the Presbyterian missionary practice of missions in northern Siam. Kosuke Koyama's brief, winsome 1967 article entitled, "Aristotelian Pepper and Buddhist Salt," reflects on the anti-contextual enigma implied in the manner of the founding of the Laos Mission. Writing an "open letter" to the long-deceased Dr. McGilvary, Koyama explains to him that McGilvary's spiritual and intellectual influence still suffused the churches of the North, and he asks, "I have become, then, curious to know whether your audience understood your preaching or not, if you will pardon me for asking." Koyama,

himself a missionary in Chiang Mai, asks because, "In my ministry here today I am forced to see how thoroughly strange and unrealistic-how 'western'-is the Christian vocabulary to the ears of my Thai neighbors!" In the face of the strangeness of the missionary message, he adds, northern Thai Christians had flavored missionary religion with heavy doses of their own local cultures, which fact only compounds his puzzlement concerning the way in which the missionaries originally presented their message.[4] Why did the Presbyterians present Christianity in a strange, unrealistic way that had to be reinterpreted culturally? Why introduce the Christian message in forms and ways that were overtly alien to the northern Thai and made reception of that message extremely difficult even when reinterpreted?

Others have asked similar questions, well before Koyama. It was no secret that the people of Siam generally found in Protestantism a distinctly uninteresting and unpopular religious system. Few of them, relative to the size of the population, converted. The missionaries in the North frequently blamed the small number of converts on the character flaws of the northern Thai themselves and the supposedly negative influence of Buddhism on them.[5] Secular scholars, when they consider the matter at all, point to a number of discrete historical factors.[6] The majority of commentators have focused, however, on precisely the point raised by Koyama: missionary Christianity was "packaged" in a manner profoundly alien to the life and thought of the northern Thai people. Writing in 1928, Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, the Minister of the Interior and a leading voice in the Thai government, argued that it was the nineteenth-century missionaries' aggressive, negative attitudes towards Buddhism that led to their failure to interest the Thai people generally in Christianity.[7] They found the missionary message too alien, too antagonizing. A 1931 report to the American Presbyterian Mission in Siam agreed. It stated bluntly that Presbyterians had introduced Christianity into Siam as a "Western cultural system" intent on "de-nationalizing" and "de-culturalizing" those who converted to Christianity. The report concluded, "The Siamese Church cannot grow either outwardly or inwardly until it begins upon a definite program of acculturalization." And, again, "The Church cannot grow until it becomes a part of the life of the people." [8] A prominent leader of the Thai Church before World War II, the Rev. Pluang Sudikham, expressed similar sentiments. He criticized the predominantly Presbyterian foreign missionaries for the way they introduced Christianity into Siam, for their attacks on Buddhism, and for the difficult situation in which Thai Christians found themselves as a result. People generally considered it "un-Thai," he lamented, to convert to Christianity.[9]

Maen Pongudom's groundbreaking dissertation on Presbyterian missionary apologetics in Thailand agrees with Pluang that negative missionary attitudes concerning Buddhism had a substantial negative impact on their introduction of the Christian faith into Siam.[10] He attributes those attitudes to the missionaries' assumption that the Thai people, as "heathens," lived in darkness and despair and consequently showed almost no interest in actually studying Buddhism, let alone the religious condition of the Thai people. Maen concludes that the Presbyterians met with only very limited success in their evangelistic endeavors because they were ignorant of the religion and religious life of the nation. They were ignorant because they chose to be ignorant, believing that a vast gulf stands between Christianity and Buddhism; they intended only to destroy Buddhism, not understand it.[11]

Philip Hughes argues along lines that complement and expand on Maen's thesis. Looking at Presbyterian missionary evangelism in northern Siam as a communication process, he argues that the missionaries' message of sin and forgiveness through Christ "...has not been heard as Good News by most northern Thai people. What they have heard has sounded to them like some strange, foreign ideas." [12] The Presbyterian missionaries in northern Siam, Hughes observes, communicated the Christian message by portraying northern Thai society as evil, removing their converts from the larger society, and forbidding them from having anything to do with indigenous religious life.[13] As a part of the total communication process, they attempted to

introduce an entirely new religion based on the "forms and patterns they knew in their home churches in the West." The result was a church that appeared and sounded markedly Western and foreign, and, while some northern Thais accepted this new religion in spite of its foreign nature, most did not.[14] The missionaries failed, Hughes concludes, to communicate their message in culturally appropriate ways that the northern Thai could understand and accept. They failed to persuade the northern Thai that Christianity is the answer to their problems. The people found the missionaries' analysis of their own life-situation unconvincing because the Christian message failed to start with their own worldview.[15]

Maen and Hughes point to three important lessons for the study of early Presbyterian missionary work in northern Siam: First, the study of missionary apologetical proclamation has to start with the missionaries themselves. The answer to the question of why so few northern Thais converted to Christianity must focus on the Laos Mission's work rather than some supposed defect in the northern Thai people themselves, such as claimed by some missionaries (above). Second, the key to understanding missionary strategies and methods in northern Siam will not be found on the field; whatever it was that caused the missionaries to behave as they did was something they brought with them from the United States. Third, missionary thinking provides an important key to missionary behavior. Two more recent studies, one in Thai history and the other in northern Thai missionary history underscore this third point. Tongchai Winichakul's study of "mapping" in historical Siam demonstrates how Western conceptions of boundaries and space have influenced modern Thailand's understanding of Thai space.[16] My own investigation into the influence of Western dualism on northern Thai missions suggests the power fundamental Western conceptions had on missionary thinking.[17] If one wants to understand, in sum, why the Laos Mission conducted its evangelism in a way that seems to have been counter-productive, turning our attention to the American sources of missionary thinking offers a hopeful avenue for further study.

Investigating the sources of missionary thought, however, faces one serious obstacle; the records of the Laos Mission do not clearly reveal the nature of those sources. Mission records contain a great deal of religious language, most of it not particularly insightful and certainly not systematic, but they do not provide overt links to particular schools of theology or ways of thinking. Michael Coleman's study of nineteenth-century Presbyterian missionary attitudes towards Native Americans deals with records of the same type as those of the Laos Mission and wrestles with the same problem of how to establish links between missionary thought and behavior. Coleman attributes missionary attitudes to the "Princeton Theology," a highly influential, conservative nineteenth-century American Presbyterian theology most fully articulated by a series of theologians at Princeton Theological Seminary.[18] He points out, however, that the theology he finds in Presbyterian missionary records is a "stripped-down" or a "simplified" version of the Princeton system, which the missionaries themselves alluded to only haphazardly and infrequently. Those records do not contain the full, carefully thought out dogmatic theology of the Princeton circle of theologians.[19]

Given these limitations in the missionary record, one is left with the question of how to move from documents recording missionary behavior to the sources of their thinking and, finally, to that behavior itself. Historians in many fields of study in recent decades have shown more and more interest in the links between thought and action, seeing in those links an opportunity to gain a sharper understanding of the course of history itself. They have come to realize that words and concepts do not amount to simple, transparent expressions of reality; they are, rather, artifacts of culture that have a powerful influence on virtually every facet of human existence. Words and ideas frequently contain deeper levels of meaning that lie hidden beneath our overt use of language. At that deeper, semi-hidden level, they both interpret and shape experiences according to precepts that are generally little understood by the people who hold

them.[20] The widely used shorthand term for these systems of overt as well as covert meaning is "ideology." Having lost most of its Marxist connotations, "ideology" has become an organizing concept for studying the connection between belief and behavior, between rhetoric and reality. Ideologies, in contrast to formal thought systems, mobilize emotions, structure opinions, and play a key role in determining aversions, enthusiasms, commitments, and prejudices. They comprise "value orientations." The concept of ideology has allowed historians to see thinking as a social activity and to appropriate the view of Weber and Berger that meanings are socially constructed.[21] Ideology, in sum, is a social phenomenon. It is the systems of meanings, the clusters of thought that groups of people share and express in many different ways, not the least important of which are patterns of behavior. The vast majority of people and their cultures, however, are not even aware of the fact that reality in its most meaningful part is socially constructed. They consider their own systems of beliefs and values to be a part of the very structure of reality itself and, frequently, to be divinely inspired. Sociologists call this process of transformation, "reification," the social process of converting socially constructed ideas into ideologies.[22]

Ideologies tend to be both obscure and powerful, their power being a function of their obscurity. Coleman did not avail himself of the concept of ideology, but his sense that an obscure form of the Princeton Theology lies at the heart of missionary thinking hints at and assumes an ideological link between the Princeton Theology and Presbyterian missionary ideology. A similar hint appears in the records of the Laos Mission, which habitually use religious language and theological concepts to describe and analyze even the most mundane events in a form strikingly similar to what historians call ideology. If we are correct in linking Princeton to missionary ideology, insights gained from the Princeton Theology may well provide an important window on the sources of missionary behavior in northern Siam. Such insights will help us to clarify what is otherwise obscure.

One cannot argue, however, that the Princeton Theology caused the members of the Laos Mission to behave in certain ways. Such an argument would be extremely difficult to prove and entail endless difficulties in trying to tie specific doctrines to specific actions. The value of the Princeton Theology for understanding the work of the Laos Mission lies, rather, in the possibility that Princeton articulated in systematic fashion a line of theological reflection that parallels missionary behavior and thus helps us to understand the general nature of missionary thought, which was less articulate and systematic. The Princeton circle's voluminous writings, that is, potentially clarify and give order to what is unclear and lacking order in the Laos Mission's records so that one can use Princeton to "unpack" the otherwise obscure ideological sources of missionary behavior in northern Siam. To that end, this dissertation explores the links between the Princeton Theology and Presbyterian missionary behavior in several steps. Chapter One provides background information necessary to understanding the situation of the mission and its historical and theological contexts. Chapter Two demonstrates that clear parallels exist between Princeton's theology and missionary thinking. Chapter Three describes in some detail key theological concepts in the Princeton Theology that help us understand the mission's thought and subsequent behavior. Chapters Four through Six study a series of important events in the formation of the Laos Mission from the perspective of those concepts with an eye to demonstrating the relationship between missionary thought and their practice of missions.

The study of the Laos Mission's thought and behavior in light of the Princeton Theology requires one important conceptual adjustment. However ideological the mission's records may appear in some respects, they are at least as theological as they are ideological. With this observation in mind, we will generally use the phrase "system of doctrines and meanings" in place of the term ideology because it is impossible to separate the mission's (covert) ideological from its (overt) theological expression in any meaningful way. One might argue that, to a degree,

the Laos Mission's system of doctrines and meanings was theological in content and ideological in form, but even this observation involves making difficult distinctions between what is "content" and what is "form" and how form influences content and vice versa. In practice, the mission expressed its theology ideologically and its ideology theologically to the extent that they formed one system of theological doctrines and ideological meanings. That is to say, the Laos Mission's behavior was not based entirely on a semi-covert, unconscious system of meanings; it was also informed quite consciously by the missionaries' theological system of doctrines, hence the phrase "system of doctrines and meanings," also frequently rendered as "system of meanings and doctrines."

The crucial period in Laos Mission history for the study of its system of doctrines and meanings is the mission's pioneer era, 1867-1880. There are several reasons for selecting this historical period. First, the evidential record for that era is itself rich in sources that are particularly reflective of missionary thought. Second, during those years the mission passed through a series of significant events that left an indelible mark on its later development, making the connection between the mission's system of meanings and doctrines and its behavior clearly discernible. Third, the mission's cognitive system was in and of itself notably resistant to change, which is to say that its initial structure remained influential throughout the history of the mission. Finally, the mission's weak, almost inconsequential administrative structures created a sense of inertia in the mission's later years that reinforced and highlighted the significance of its pioneer era.[23]

This dissertation argues, then, that *the Princeton Theology provides substantial insights into the system of doctrines and meanings of the Laos Mission, which system comprised a key source of missionary behavior in northern Siam during the years from 1867 to 1880*. To make its case, the dissertation uses two sets of primary data. The first set is the records of the Laos Mission, primarily up to 1880. The second set is the theological writings of the Princeton circle of theologians, emphasizing the period before the American Civil War.

The motivation for this study was the perception that, if successful, it will contribute to a better understanding of the origins and development of the former Presbyterian churches of northern Thailand that today belong to the Church of Christ in Thailand. The goal is to carry the lines of academic investigation begun by Maen in the 1970s and Hughes and myself in the 1980s an important step further. It has become clear, furthermore, that this dissertation also offers insights into the ways in which Western missionaries introduced Western theology and ideology into an Asian church setting, background insights potentially useful to the development of Thai and Asian contextual theologies. It affords historians of Thailand, more generally, with an increased understanding of the ideologies that contributed to Presbyterian missionary modernization, an important secondary agent of nineteenth-century Thai social change. This study also provides insights for those studying the role of the Laos Mission in Bangkok's moves to integrate its northern dependencies into the Siamese state. From the view point of American Presbyterian Church history and the study of nineteenth-century American evangelicalism, furthermore, this dissertation sheds light on the ways in which American religious ideology and theology influenced the thinking and behavior of "typical" adherents. The central focus of our attention, however, will remain steadily on the role missionary systems of doctrines and meanings played in the formation of the church in northern Siam.

In light of this central focus, it should be noted, briefly, what this dissertation is not about as well as what it is about. It is *not* a comparative study relating Presbyterian work in other fields to that in northern Siam. The purpose of this dissertation, as stated before, is to investigate Presbyterian missionary behavior specifically in northern Siam, a subject sufficiently broad, complex, and important to deserve investigation in its own right. The lack of comparable

investigations of other Asian Presbyterian fields, furthermore, renders the use of comparative data problematic and questionable. This study is also *not* an exercise in missionary biography. Biographical material, such as is available, has been utilized only as it contributes to the dissertation's main lines of argument. This dissertation, again, is *not* a narrative history of the Laos Mission and it is *not* an institutional history of the mission, which means that many "interesting" details of that mission's history and its institutional development are included here only as they are relevant to our thesis. This work is *not* about the northern Thai church; it *is* about the Laos Mission. It is *not* about what has happened since 1880, and later developments are mentioned only as they shed light on the mission's pioneer era.

I would like to express my deepest thanks to a number of people who have assisted me in the successful completion of this dissertation; all of them have been instrumental in improving the quality of my work. Dr. Philip J. Hughes, my advisor, has taken time from an extremely busy schedule to assist me in every phase of the research and writing process. His encouragement and advice have kept me on a straight course. Dr. Harold Pidwell, former Dean of the Melbourne College of Divinity, and the other members of the MCD staff have been most helpful and responsive. Dr. Don Swearer and Peter Wallace shared their comments on and advice regarding an earlier draft of this study. Ed Zehner provided important editorial comments and advice on the overall structure of the dissertation; John Olson, Marilyn Olson, Bryan Green, and Neela Swanson helped proofread the final draft.

I also owe a debt of thanks to the staffs at the Payap University Archives, Speer Library, Princeton Theological Seminary, and Hutchins Library, Berea College, for their timely assistance. My colleagues at the Office of History, Church of Christ in Thailand, deserve thanks as well for their patience with a "boss" who for many months seemed more concerned with his dissertation than his other duties.

My wife, Warunee, merits special thanks in all things for her love, patience, and wise counsel; she also helped proofread the final draft. I would like to dedicate this dissertation and all that has gone into it to Dad and Mom, Roland and Ruth Swanson. It is as much the fruit of their lives as of my own.

Finally, and as required by the Melbourne College of Divinity, I affirm that the form and contents of this dissertation represent the original thinking of the author unless otherwise specified in the text and/or footnotes.

Herbert R. Swanson
Ban Dok Daeng
February 2003

Notes

[1] In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, northern Siam was known in Bangkok as "Laos" and the people as the "Lao-hence the name "Laos Mission," also called the North Laos Mission.

[2] Historical Thailand is referred to by its previous official name of "Siam," and the northern Thai region is, thus, termed "northern Siam." The people of that region are here called "northern Thai." See Chapter One for a brief history of the Lan Na Kingdom.

[3] "Apologetics and Missionary Proclamation Exemplified by American Presbyterian Missionaries to Thailand (1828-1978), Early Church Apologists: Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and the Venerable Buddhadasa Bhikku, A Thai Buddhist Monk-Apologist" (Ph.D. diss., University of Otago, 1979), 398ff. Compare Ferguson's observation that Christianity proved itself more adept at adapting Greek philosophy to its needs than

- any of its "pagan rivals." Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1987), 488-89. See also Bernhard Lohse, *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*, rev. ed., trans. F. Ernest Stoeffler (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 41-2.
- [4] Kosuke Koyama, "Aristotelian Pepper and Buddhist Salt," *Practical Anthropology* 14, 3 (May-June 1967), 98, 99.
- [5] See Robert E. Speer, Dwight H. Day, and David Bovaird, *Report of Deputation* (New York: Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1916), 85.
- [6] See, for example, Graham S. Fordham, "Protestant Christianity and the Transformation of Northern Thai Culture: Ritual Practice, Belief and Kinship" (Ph.D. diss., University of Adelaide, 1991); Charles F. Keyes, "Being Protestant Christians in Southeast Asian Worlds," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 27, 2 (September 1996): 287; and Charles F. Keyes, "Why the Thai Are Not Christians: Buddhist and Christian Conversion in Thailand," in *Conversion to Christianity: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives on a Great Transformation*, ed. Robert W. Hefner (Berkeley: University of California, 1993), 277.
- [7] Prince Damrong, "Introduction," in *Historical Sketch of Protestant Missions in Siam 1828-1928*, ed., George Bradley McFarland (Bangkok: Bangkok Times Press, 1928), 13. See also Kenneth Wells, *History of Protestant Work in Thailand 1828-1958* (Bangkok: Church of Christ in Thailand, 1958), 3.
- [8] Carl C. Zimmerman and Bertha B. McFarland, "Report on Siam," 1931, photocopy, Research Papers of Maen Pongudom, Payap University Archives.
- [9] Cited in Prasit Pongudom, *prawatisat saphakrischaknaiprathetthai* [History of the Church of Christ in Thailand] (Chiang Mai: Archives Unit, Church of Christ in Thailand, 1984), 43.
- [10] Maen, "Apologetics and Missionary Proclamation," 38, 143.
- [11] Maen, "Apologetics and Missionary Proclamation," 46, 63ff, 144-46.
- [12] Philip J. Hughes, *Proclamation and Response: A Study of the History of the Christian Faith in Northern Thailand* (Chiang Mai: The Manuscript Division, Payap College, 1982), 54.
- [13] Philip J. Hughes, "The Assimilation of Christianity in the Thai Culture," *Religion* 14 (1984), 325.
- [14] Philip J. Hughes, "Christianity and Culture: A Case Study in Northern Thailand" (Th.D. diss., South East Asia Graduate School of Theology, 1983), 102.
- [15] Hughes, *Proclamation and Response*, 56.
- [16] Tongchai Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-body of a Nation* (Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books, 1994).
- [17] Herbert R. Swanson, "This Heathen People: The Cognitive Sources of American Missionary Westernizing Activities in Northern Siam, 1867-1889," (M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1987).
- [18] For Princeton's influence, see, for example, Mark A. Noll, "The Princeton Review," *Westminster Journal of Theology* (hereafter cited as WJT) 50, 2 (Fall 1988): 289; Ernest R. Sandeen, "The Princeton Theology: One Source of Biblical Literalism in American Protestantism" *Church History* (hereafter cited as CH) 31, 3 (September 1962): 308; and, Lefferts A. Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment: Archibald Alexander and the Founding of Princeton Theological Seminary* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1983), ix-x.
- [19] Michael Coleman, *Presbyterian Missionary Attitudes toward American Indians, 1837-1893* (Jackson, Mississippi: University of Mississippi Press, 1985), 34-7, 45, 120. See also John Crosby Brown Webster, "The Christian Community and Change in North India: a History of the Punjab and North India Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. 1834-1914" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1971), esp. 46ff.

[20] William J. Bouwsma, "From History of Ideas to History of Meaning," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 12, 2 (Autumn 1981): 279-91; John E. Toews, "Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience," *American Historical Review* (hereafter cited as AHR) 92 (1987): 879-907; and Joyce Appleby, "The Power of History," AHR 103, 1 (February 1998): 8-9; see also Dorothy Ross, "The New and Newer Histories: Social Theory and Historiography in an American Key," in *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*, eds. Anthony Molho and Gordon S. Wood, 85-106 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).

[21] Appleby, "The Power of History," 6-7; and Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr. *A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis* (New York: Free Press, 1969), 137-38.

[22] Peter Berger and Stanley Pullberg, "Reification and the Sociological Critique of Consciousness," *History and Theory* 4, 2 (1965): 196-211; and Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1966), 106-08.

[23] Herbert R. Swanson, *Khrischak Muang Nua: A Study in Northern Thai Church History* (Bangkok: Chuan Press, 1984), 37-8, 71-3, 89.

CHAPTER ONE

The Historical and Cultural Settings of the Laos Mission

Outline of the Chapter

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [The Historical Context](#)
 - 2.1 [The Founding of the Laos Mission](#)
 - 2.2 [The North](#)
 - 2.3 [The Presbyterians](#)
3. [The Theological Context](#)
 - 3.1 [Reformed Confessionalism](#)
 - 3.2 [Common Sense Philosophy](#)
 - 3.3 [Evangelicalism](#)
 - 3.4 [Conclusion](#)
4. [Conclusion](#)
5. [Notes](#)

Introduction

The question before us in this dissertation concerns the Laos Mission's practice of missions during its pioneer period, 1867-1880. Why, most particularly, did it use strategies and methods that proved ineffective evangelistically? The question itself is relatively simple, but the answer involves a complex set of historical and ideological-theological contexts that require some description before it can be addressed directly. The immediate historical context included the pre-history of the Laos Mission, the history of northern Siam, and the history of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. (PCUSA). The larger theological and ideological context also comprised three key elements: Reformed confessionalism, Scottish Common Sense Philosophy, and American evangelicalism. It was from within this complex, interlocking set of contexts that the Laos Mission created its early mission program.

The Historical Context

The Laos Mission, when founded in April 1867, stood at the confluence of three historical streams. The first of these included both the early history of Protestant missions in Siam and the particular sequence of events that led to the founding of the Laos Mission itself. The second historical stream comprised the rich and varied history of the northern Thai principalities, including most especially Chiang Mai—a history that has still received less scholarly attention than it deserves. The final historical stream, the history of American Presbyterianism, flowed into the North from halfway around the globe and, for that reason, is not usually understood to be relevant to the world of central and northern Siam. It was.

The Founding of the Laos Mission

Three dates stand out as defining moments in the pre-history of the Laos Mission. In 1567, the first two Christian missionaries, Catholic Dominicans, reached the city of Ayutthaya and

thereby initiated formal Christian missions in what is now modern-day Thailand.[1] In 1828, two representatives of the London Missionary Society (LMS) arrived in Bangkok, marking the advent of the Protestant missionary movement in Siam.[2] Just twelve years later, in 1840, the American Presbyterians landed their first missionary couple, the Rev. William and Seignoria Buell, in Bangkok. By the 1860s, the Presbyterians had established themselves as the dominant Protestant missionary presence in Siam, a role they continued to play until after the Second World War.

Of these three dates, the first is the least relevant to this study. Missionary Protestantism and Catholicism in Siam evinced highly antagonistic attitudes towards each other and went their separate ways with a minimum of contact.[3] The arrival of the first Protestant missionaries in 1828 was much more significant. Although the LMS remained for only a brief period, representatives of two other mission agencies, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) and the American Baptist Foreign Missionary Union (ABFMU), arrived in the 1830s and put Protestant missions in Siam on a permanent footing. Bertha McFarland points out that the early Presbyterians depended on the assistance and support of these other two missions to the point that the Presbyterian Siam Mission could be seen as a branch grafted onto their efforts.[4] All three of these early Protestant missions, including the Presbyterians, worked under serious disadvantages, particularly climate, travel, and official opposition to their stated goal of evangelizing the Thai people. Eventually, both the American Board and the Baptists withdrew from Siam to pursue work in China. The Presbyterians also nearly left, but the accession of King Mongkut to the throne in 1851 brought a beneficial reversal of government policy towards Christian missions.[5] By the 1860s, the Presbyterians were firmly established in Bangkok and had begun their expansion into the hinterlands.

From the very beginning, the Protestant missionaries hoped to establish mission stations beyond the confines of Bangkok itself, but Thai government policies and the realities of working in Siam prevented them from doing so until after 1860. They focused most of these early hopes for expansion on Siam's northern interior.[6] Dr. Dan Beach Bradley, the leading Protestant missionary in Siam during the nineteenth century, took the first concrete steps towards founding a northern Siam mission. He developed contacts with northern princes visiting Bangkok,[7] including the Prince of Chiang Mai, Chao Kawilorot, and he also visited resettled Laotians from northeastern Siam, who were living near Phet Buri, south of Bangkok. These experiences led him in 1860 and 1861 to propose to his sending board, the American Missionary Association (AMA), that they fund the establishment of a "Laos Mission." The AMA responded sympathetically, but it did not have the financial resources to undertake such a project and turned down his request.[8]

Although Bradley himself did not found a mission among the northern Thai, his daughter, Sophia, and her Presbyterian missionary husband, the Rev. Daniel McGilvary, caught his vision and made it a reality. Through the good offices of Dr. Bradley, McGilvary established his own contacts both with the northern princes, again particularly Chao Kawilorot of Chiang Mai, and the Laotian war captives of Phet Buri.[9] Repeated invitations from a government official in Phet Buri eventually led the McGilvays and another missionary couple to found the Phet Buri Station in June 1861.[10] McGilvary later stated that his most pleasant memories of Phet Buri "cluster about scenes in Lao villages." He affirmed that, "My labours among them increased the desire, already awakened in me, to reach the home of the race." [11] He took another important step in that direction when his classmate at Princeton Seminary, the Rev. Jonathan Wilson, joined him on an exploratory trip of northern Siam, reaching Chiang Mai on 7 January 1864. The city impressed McGilvary as being neat and regular, progressive, and law-abiding, and the people seemed to him more sincerely religious than the central Thai. He assessed Chao Kawilorot's rule as firm but not tyrannical, and he felt well satisfied with what he saw in Chiang Mai. The prospect of a Laos Mission excited him more than ever. He believed that the Presbyterian

missionaries had received a special, providential "call" to occupy Chiang Mai, and he all but begged the church in America to see that the present moment, 1864, was "God's time" and God's time was the best time for action. A whole nation, a race depended on that action.[12]

Mission time proved to be slower than God's time. Sophia McGilvary fell ill. The Siam Mission found itself shorthanded, a common experience in its early years. Financial resources were slim. It even appeared that the McGilvays would not be involved in the opening of a station in Chiang Mai because of the shortage of personnel in the Siam Mission. All of this caused McGilvary some discouragement, but by July 1866 prospects for the proposed northern mission improved. It was clear that the McGilvays were the only ones available for the North, McGilvary's spirits lifted, and, as Sophia put it, the "old desire has returned and taken possession of Daniel." [13]

After years of waiting, when the opportunity came at the end of August 1866 to open the new mission in Chiang Mai, it came with a rush. Chao Kawilorot, the Prince of Chiang Mai, was in Bangkok at that time on what appeared to be an extended visit, and McGilvary had planned to go up to Bangkok one day to get Kawilorot's official permission for a mission to Chiang Mai. He saw no need to hurry. The matter that brought Kawilorot to Bangkok, however, was settled more quickly than expected, and he planned to return to Chiang Mai much sooner than anticipated.[14] When that news reached Phet Buri at the end of August, it set McGilvary in motion. He rushed to Bangkok, a two-day trip, where he arrived on Tuesday evening, 28 August 1866, and lodged with his in-laws, the Bradleys.[15] They agreed that evening that the McGilvays should go to Chiang Mai, and Dr. Bradley accompanied McGilvary when he went to see Chao Kawilorot the next morning. The Prince stated he felt quite willing to have the McGilvays move to Chiang Mai and offered them both land and timber for a house. That same Wednesday, in the evening, McGilvary met with a hastily called session of the Siam Mission and received formal permission to withdraw from Phet Buri and establish a new station in Chiang Mai. He next consulted with the U.S. Consul in Bangkok, who consented to write a formal letter requesting the Bangkok government's permission for the McGilvary family to take up residence in Chiang Mai.[16] Obtaining that permission proved to be the most difficult hurdle of all. A high government representative first visited Chao Kawilorot on Saturday, 8 September 1866-with McGilvary and others in tow-to ascertain his feelings officially, and then the government had to process the paperwork before everything was official. Finally, however, the Bangkok government gave permission for the McGilvays to move to Chiang Mai.[17] All that remained was the trip upriver to Chiang Mai. The McGilvays left Bangkok on 3 January 1867. Plans called for the Wilsons to leave the following dry season.[18] Bradley's vision and McGilvary's "old desire" for a northern mission was about to become a reality.

The North

Northern Siam in 1867, when the McGilvays first arrived, was divided into five tributary states, each known by the name of its chief city and separated from its sister states by mountains and forest. The mountainous geography of the region allowed each of the states-Chiang Mai, Lamphun, Lampang, Phrae, and Nan-to enjoy considerable independence from the Bangkok government and each other. The people were mostly rural peasants, who cultivated rice, engaged in some trade, and enjoyed a degree of personal freedom because of a scarcity of labor.[19]

Although something of a backwater in the 1860s, Chiang Mai and the other cities of the North had a proud tradition that dated back some six hundred years. Recorded history began in the region in the eighth century when the Mon first introduced "higher" civilization, their capital and cultural center being Haripunjaya, the modern Lamphun. The northern Thai appeared in the region at some time in about the twelfth century.[20] They belonged to the great family of Tai

peoples that has since spread itself from Ahom in northeast India through parts of Burma and southern China to modern day Thailand, Laos, and northern Vietnam. Little is known about the early history of the Tai, including the northern Thai, before the thirteenth century. They seem to have been an upland people living in small city-states (*muang*) on the fringes of the great Southeast Asian empires of their day. They were already Theravada Buddhists who had religious links with Sinhalese Buddhism. During the thirteenth century, a group of Tai states emerged including, prominently, the Kingdom of Lan Na (*lan na* meaning "a million rice fields"), founded by King Mangrai beginning in 1259 when he became king of Chiang Saen. Mangrai created a large unified state through the conquest of his neighbors, culminating in the capture of Haripunjaya in 1281. In 1296, he began construction of his *chiang mai*, his "New City," which became the capital of the Lan Na Kingdom.[21] Later generations revered him as a great lawgiver and the author of the *mangraisat*, the laws of Mangrai.[22]

After Mangrai died in 1317, the Lan Na Kingdom experienced dizzying rounds of advance and decline, at times reaching the heights of cultural renaissance while at other times succumbing to political turmoil.[23] The kingdom went into permanent decline after King Mueang Kao's death in 1526, partly because of the failings of the rulers who followed him and partly because of the rising power of Burma. The Burmese successfully captured Chiang Mai in 1558, ending Lan Na independence. The region entered into more than two centuries of chaos as increasingly harsh Burmese rule led to numerous revolts, to the point that by the early eighteenth century political, social, and economic dislocation rendered the Lan Na cultural heritage a shadow of its former greatness.[24] For much of the eighteenth century a reduced Chiang Mai state retained a semblance of independence, although the rest of the northern Thai states remained firmly under Burmese control. Chiang Mai and Lampang finally won permanent freedom from Burma in 1776 with the aid of King Taksin of Siam; but it was not until 1804 that northern Thai forces finally evicted the Burmese permanently from all five northern states.[25]

With the defeat of the Burmese by the combined forces of the North and Bangkok, the five states became semi-independent tributaries (*prathetsarat*) of Siam, and one man, Chao Kawila of Lampang, emerged as the dominant political power in the North. He became the Prince of Chiang Mai and with his six brothers, known collectively as the "Seven Princes," directly ruled Chiang Mai, Lamphun, and Lampang. The Seven Princes initiated a period of restoration under Kawila's leadership that included, notably, raids on and wars with neighboring peoples with the aim of "importing" captive populations into the North to re-populate its depleted countryside. In this new era, family and personal rather than bureaucratic relationships ruled northern Thai life, and local leaders and the common people enjoyed a large measure of independence and security. For the next century the clan of the Seven Princes dominated northern Thai politics and provided the region with badly needed stability.[26]

Nineteenth-century northern Thai society was a hierarchical society based on patron-client relationships and divided into four large classes: rulers (*chao*), peasants (*phrai*), slaves and subject peoples, and the monkhood. These classes, other than the monks, appear to have also been somewhat loosely defined. Every *phrai*, in any event, owed allegiance and free labor, corvée, to one *chao* or another on a regular basis. Members of the families of the Seven Princes occupied the higher ranks of the *chao* in several of the states.[27] By the 1860s, the five northern Thai tributary states had for some fifty years or more enjoyed a measure of peace, cultural resurgence, and economic growth.[28] They maintained extensive relations with other regions, and northern Thai traders evidently ranged far and wide across that larger region. They had also begun to experience the first tremors of the even greater economic, political, and social changes to come, and the Bangkok government was beginning to take a more active hand in the appointing of the northern princes-even for Chiang Mai. British lumbermen began to move into the North more aggressively, bringing with them important economic changes. The Presbyterian

missionaries in the 1860s and 1870s were themselves heralds of and participants in these great changes that have been variously labeled by historians as the "modernization," "Westernization," "centralization," "Siamese-ization," or even "bureaucratization" of northern Siam.

When the McGilvary family arrived in Chiang Mai in April 1867, then, they found the city in a stable, perhaps even prosperous condition. The relatively benign political system of interlocking personal relationships dominated by the extended families of the Seven Princes was still in effect, and Chao Kawilorot, the son of Chao Kawila, ruled the city with a strong hand.[29] On hindsight, it is clear that the city had already entered a new period in its history, one that would see it fully incorporated into the Siamese nation-state. The combination of local stability and the increasing influence of Bangkok allowed them to surf the waves of repression they sometimes experienced from the Chiang Mai government and to establish themselves, by 1880, as permanent fixtures.

The Presbyterians

The Laos Mission was an American Presbyterian mission, representing a theological and institutional tradition that historians trace back to the Protestant Reformation in Switzerland, particularly but not exclusively to the work and thought of John Calvin (1509-1564). The "Reformed" tradition of Calvin and others soon spread into several other parts of Europe, most notably France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Britain, and in the course of things it flowed through these nations into colonial America. English Puritanism, Scottish Presbyterianism, and Scotch-Irish Presbyterianism formed the dominant sources of the colonial American Presbyterian Church.[30] Churches of a Presbyterian persuasion began to appear on Long Island in the 1640s, and by 1700, a growing number of such congregations, made up of New England as well as British immigrants, were scattered across the Middle Colonies and into the upper South. Under the leadership of the Rev. Francis Makemie, these churches formed the Presbytery in 1706 and then in 1716 reorganized themselves as the General Synod, comprising three presbyteries.

During the 1720s, the Presbyterians entered a period of increasing tension that found its clergy divided into several factions over a number of related issues. Those issues included whether or not clergy had to "subscribe" formally to the Westminster Confession of Faith, the rights of the Synod to control who preached in the local churches, the educational and spiritual qualifications for the clergy, and the role of the laity in church life. By the 1730s, these disputes were taking place in the context of a controversial colonial revivalist movement in which certain Presbyterian clergy played a key role in the Middle Colonies. Matters came to a head in the early 1740s when a faction of revivalist, or "New Side," Presbyterians withdrew from the Synod to be joined in 1745 by another group of churches to form the Synod of New York. The "Old Side" retained control of what became known as the Synod of Philadelphia. The two Synods reunited in 1758 as the Synod of New York and Philadelphia.[31] In the midst of these events, New Side leaders founded the College of New Jersey (Princeton University) in 1746; the college struggled under a succession of presidents until it finally achieved stability under the Rev. John Witherspoon (1723-1794), a widely known and respected Scottish pastor who became the college's president in 1768. Witherspoon proved to be a moderating influence among American Presbyterians and became the most singly prominent Presbyterian leader in the later colonial era.[32]

In spite of the many difficulties colonial Presbyterians experienced in the last three decades of the eighteenth century due to the American Revolution (1776-1781) and its aftermath, the Presbyterian Church emerged from that century as the largest and most influential American religious body outside of New England. In 1789, it reconstituted the Synod as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (PCUSA), comprising four

synods and 16 presbyteries. The Presbyterians lost their numerical preeminence in the early decades of the nineteenth century for a number of reasons including PCUSA's general coolness toward "hot" revivalism and its failure to provide adequate pastoral oversight for frontier churches. Even so, the denomination did grow rapidly,[33] strengthened its institutional structures, and in 1812 took an important step towards increasing the number of trained clergy by founding Princeton Theological Seminary.

The nineteenth century brought new tensions, ones that would fundamentally influence the Laos Mission itself. Early in the century, the PCUSA had developed an alliance in frontier regions with the New England Congregationalists, a relationship that threatened to shift the theological demographics of the denomination away from the traditionalist "Old School" toward the theologically somewhat more innovative "New School." The PCUSA's reliance on a set of national, non-denominational voluntary associations controlled by the Congregationalist-New School "alliance" to carry out various ecclesiastical outreach and educational functions reinforced Old School fears of a growing trend in theological laxity. Those associations included the ABCFM, the American Sunday School Union, the American Education Society, the American Home Missionary Society, and numerous other national, state, and local associations. By the 1830s, the Old School was up in arms over these perceived dangers to the theological orthodoxy and purity of the PCUSA; and after some years of theological tension and agitation it obtained a majority in the 1837 General Assembly, abrogated cooperation with the Congregationalists, and voted to excise four New School-dominated synods. Other presbyteries and local churches joined with the exiled synods to form a New School General Assembly, which claimed to be the legitimate PCUSA. After 1837, thus, there were two Presbyterian denominations each using the name of PCUSA.[34] Among the most important acts of the 1837 Old School General Assembly, after it expelled the New School, was the formation of a new Board of Foreign Missions as one of several major agencies of the church.[35] The Siam Mission and Laos Mission were both agencies of the Old School church and board.

For the next quarter of a century the Old and New School churches went their separate ways while the vast, sad crisis over slavery increasingly dominated the United States' national agenda. The issue split most of the major Protestant denominations as well as the whole of society, but the Old School General Assembly preserved its unity until the Civil War broke out in 1861, at which time its southern synods and presbyteries left to form the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.[36] That split would last for more than a century. Even as the American Civil War drove Northern and Southern Presbyterians apart, however, the passage of time slowly brought the northern Old School and New School churches closer together. The theological issues that so concerned the Old School proved to be of no lasting consequence, and as the New School Church developed its own structures it became increasingly similar to the Old School in form. In 1862, the two denominations opened talks on their future relations, which discussions culminated in their reunion in 1869.[37]

The founding of the Laos Mission in 1867, then, took place in a brief period of calm when the denominational storms of the past were dying away in irrelevancy while the later nineteenth-century controversies over the nature of Scripture and Darwinian evolution had yet to break out in full force. It is well to recall, however, that all nine of the mission's pioneer members were products of that earlier era when being "Old School" was filled with deep, potent meaning. Even though the Old School reunited with the New School just two years after the McGilvays reached Chiang Mai, in important measure the Laos Mission remained a child of that earlier era. It was Old School.

The Theological Context

The Princeton Theology was also Old School Presbyterian. It was somewhat more moderate and even broadminded than Old School "radicals" might have wished, but by the time McGilvary and Wilson had graduated from Princeton Seminary in 1856, their mentors' theology had gained wide currency throughout the Old School, including its seminaries, colleges, and churches. It had become, indeed, one of the most influential American theologies.[38]

As its name suggests, the Princeton Theology was created by a succession of professors at Princeton Seminary. Noll identifies three men as standing in the first rank of the Princetonians, namely Archibald Alexander (1772-1851), Charles Hodge (1797-1878), and Benjamin B. Warfield (1851-1921). In the second rank, he places A. A. Hodge (1823-1886) as preeminent, along with James W. Alexander (1804-1859), Joseph A. Alexander (1809-1860), Lyman Atwater (1813-1883), William H. Green (1825-1900), and J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937).[39] Noll's list could well be augmented with a third rank by adding the names of a large number of others, many of them Princeton Seminary graduates, who taught the Princeton orthodoxy in Presbyterian seminaries and colleges throughout the United States. Emerging with the founding of Princeton Seminary in 1812, the Princeton Theology can be said to have come to its end in 1929 with the reorganization of the seminary and the consequent withdrawal of a number of orthodox professors and students under the leadership of Machen.[40]

The Princeton theologians taught an eclectic theological system pieced together from a diverse range of intellectual sources, the mere enumeration of which reads like a who's who of Western philosophical and theological thought. Bouwsma's warning that any attempt to identify the sources of Calvin's thought would be all but fruitless applies with equal force to the Princetonians as well.[41] Still, it is possible to identify three major strands in their thought, these being: first, Reformed confessional theology, also known as Reformed orthodoxy or scholasticism; second, Scottish Enlightenment Common Sense Philosophy; and, finally, American evangelicalism. Some commentators add a fourth strand, a commitment to the Bible, but the biblical emphasis was itself a key element in both the Reformed and evangelical traditions.[42] Princeton, in sum, was confessional, commonsensical, and evangelical.

Reformed Confessionalism

If there was a dominant strand in Princeton's theology, it was what has until recently been known almost universally as "Calvinism." Scholars of the history of theology have come to realize that John Calvin (1509-1564) was only one of several important architects of the Reformed theological tradition and prefer thus to use broader, perhaps less tainted terms.[43] In his survey of Reformed history, González has identified several predecessors to Calvin, notably Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), and a succession of key theologians after Calvin who transformed the thinking of the earlier Reformers into Reformed confessionalism, including Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499-1562), Jerome Zanchi (1516-1590), Theodore Beza (1519-1605), and Zacharias Ursinus (1534-1583). Central to the process of giving birth to this new movement was the amalgamation of the federal theology of Heinrich Bullinger (1504-1575) with that of Calvin.[44] Donnelly points to the importance of Martyr and Zanchi, Italian Reformed converts trained in Thomistic scholasticism, who contributed significantly to shifting Reformed thought away from Calvin and Luther's more christocentric and biblical theologies towards "a revival of philosophical theology for apologetic ends." [45] To this mix of thinkers and thoughts, Bullinger, meanwhile, contributed an emphasis on "federal" or "covenantal" theology, which provided further impetus to the emergence of a distinctive Reformed confessionalism that affirmed that God makes covenants with humanity and is faithful in keeping those covenants.[46]

Since the Princetonians, especially Hodge, are frequently described as being the last of the Reformed "scholastic" theologians, we would do well here to pause long enough to flesh out

what it meant to be Reformed and scholastic, or confessional, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Drawing most especially on Thomas Aquinas' medieval scholasticism, Reformed confessionalism shared with him a deep concern with theological method and the construction of logically consistent, coherent theological systems. Reformed theologians understood theology to be a scientific enterprise that relied upon fundamental principles as the building blocks of its system while placing a great deal of trust in the human mind's ability to achieve a rational knowledge of God through intense speculative inquiry into metaphysical questions having to do with divine nature and will. Reformed confessionalism, thus, gave a large place to reason that tended to emphasize formal doctrine, sometimes at the expense of personal piety.[47] Reformed confessionalism also tended, consequently, to divest the Bible of its historical moorings and turn it into a body of unchanging divine truths necessary to the construction of a rational, methodical, and scientific explanation and defense of the Christian faith. Its practitioners feared ignorance as being the real cause of sin and put forward education as the best way to inculcate faith. Reformed confessionalism paid particular attention to the question of predestination.[48] Phillips makes it clear that Reformed confessionalism majored, as it were, in epistemological issues-in questions of knowledge-and especially sought to discover not only what is known about God and reality but also the sources or causes of that knowledge. Phillips writes, "Indeed among the Reformed scholastics there is a new emphasis upon a formal analysis of theological knowledge. The whole sphere of theological knowledge was subjected to a new and sustained examination of its ontological and epistemological principles." [49]

The Reformed search for a clear, defensible, and exclusive theology proved to be an intensely controversial enterprise as various theological school's argued over how best to express the Reformed faith. These conflicts generated repeated formal confessional statements prepared by councils seeking to define the content and limits of acceptable Reformed doctrine. Among those confessions, the brief statement of Reformed confessional beliefs issued by the Synod of Dort (1619), in the white heat of debate with the followers of Jacob Arminius (1560-1609), proved to be a classic reformulation of Reformed confessionalism. The Arminians advocated a more moderate form of Reformed faith that seemed to make salvation dependent in part on human faith, and the Synod of Dort intended to correct their dangerous theological tendencies with a clear orthodox statement of acceptable Reformed doctrine. That statement described five tenets of the faith as central, incontrovertible Christian truth. They included: first, God's free, unconditional election of the saved; second, the efficacy of Christ's atonement was limited only to the elect; third, because of Adam's fall from grace (Genesis 3) humanity is totally depraved, that is corrupt and helpless; fourth, God alone graciously regenerates humanity, which cannot resist or reject divine grace; and fifth, once elected to salvation, the elect cannot fall away from grace.[50] McGrath cautions, however, that it is impossible to summarize the broad range of Reformed thought in one confession; it is the "scholastic approach" to theology as especially employed by the later generations of Reformed thinkers that most aptly defines Reformed confessionalism.[51] While McGrath is correct, Reformed theologians from Calvin down to the Princetonians did share a number of theological concerns and concentrated on several common issues. They all emphasized divine sovereignty. They held that humanity is completely depraved and unable to work out its own salvation. The origin of human sin in Adam concerned them mightily, and they labored endlessly over the mechanics of God's grace, particularly the absolute division between those God chose for eternal life and those left to their deserved fate of eternal punishment-the infamous question of predestination. Approaches, emphases, and conclusions could and did differ radically, but these core concerns persisted.

The Princeton theologians were Reformed scholastics in their methodology: they had a clearly apologetical agenda; they approached theology rationally, methodologically, and systematically; they focused on epistemological issues; they affirmed that theology is a scientific, academic enterprise; and they usually had a limited sense of history. Some two

hundred years, however, stood between them and the classical era of Reformed confessionalism, which lasted until nearly the end of the seventeenth century. Princeton had direct recourse to that era through the writings of the key figures in Reformed theology, most especially Francis Turretin (1623-1687), whose ponderous tome, *Institutio theologiae electicae*, was the seminary's basic theological text until the 1870s. Equally important sources of influence were the two main channels of British Reformed thought by which later generations of Presbyterians brought the Reformed faith to North America, English Puritanism and Scottish Presbyterianism. Although widely influenced by the larger Reformed confessional movement, many of the Scottish and English sources of American Reformed thought drew on the federal conception of theology, mentioned above.[52] They also made greater room for the more affective side of Reformed piety, allowing them a warmer piety than seemed to be generally the case among the European Reformed scholastics.[53]

If the Princetonians were Reformed scholastics, it remains also true that they shared in the Reformed genius for re-inventing ample portions of its theological systems in new contexts. Kennedy insists, consequently, that Hodge was not an "Old Calvinist" in the seventeenth century sense of that term. Eighteenth-century Enlightenment rationalism, nineteenth-century American evangelicalism, and the democratic "spirit of America" all played their parts in transforming the old confessionalism into Hodge's nineteenth-century American version of it.[54] There was, that is, more than one piece to Princeton's pie.

Common Sense Philosophy

Princeton stood heir, on the one hand, to a Reformed confessional and medieval scholastic past, and, on the other hand, it was born out of the intellectual and religious ferment of the scientific revolution and the Enlightenment. An illustrious succession of thinkers and experimenters, from Copernicus (1473-1543) to Newton (1642-1727), gave birth to modern Western science and, in the process, gradually removed the Earth from the center of the universe, humanity from the apex of creation, and ghostly beings from a meaningful place in daily life. Although the early scientists were mostly Christians engaged in the exploration of God's created order, their discoveries posed new issues for theology and philosophy; one of the most important of those issues was epistemology, the problem of the origins and nature of human knowledge.[55]

The particular chain of thinkers that eventually led to Princeton began with Rene Descartes (1596-1650), who typified the issues facing Christian philosophers in adjusting traditional Western understanding to scientific learning. Descartes sought to integrate the older, "idealistic" worldview with its belief in God and the human soul into the emerging "realist" scientific understanding of the physical world. He desired an absolutely certain knowledge of reality based on the model of mathematics with its precise demonstrations, definition of terms, and axioms, and he employed radical doubt to reach his goal. Descartes doubted everything, and out of that skepticism discovered, first, that he himself, the doubter, must be thinking since doubt is a form of thought, which implies that there must be a doubter. He, therefore, must exist (his famous *cogito ergo sum*). He also reasoned that he could not himself have conceived of a perfect Deity unless God had first planted the idea in his thinking. God, therefore, must also exist. This much was not difficult because Descartes held that true reality is spiritual, interior reality. What proved difficult was to cross over the vast chasm he perceived between his mind and his body with the same math-like certainty and precision. His radical mind-body dualism eventually left him no recourse but to affirm that he could be sure that the physical world is real only because of his faith that the good Creator of all reality would not mislead us on this point. Our divinely given "innate knowledge" of exterior realities is for that reason trustworthy.

Thilly and Wood conclude their discussion of Descartes by pinning on him two hefty labels. He was, they argue, a *dogmatist* who believed that we can obtain sure knowledge through the exercise of reason. He was also a *realist*. He believed in the real existence of the physical world precisely because of his dogmatic trust in human reason.[56]

Descartes foreshadowed important themes that quietly, almost imperceptibly suffused Princeton Seminary's instruction of students like McGilvary and Wilson: faith in and defense of an absolutely secure knowledge of reality; emphasis on exploring and trusting human consciousness; mind-body dualism; and even the concept of "innate knowledge." In some ways, the most important of these themes is the paradigm shift that gave final consideration not to inherited sources of authority but to interior human consciousness. That paradigm shift became standard fare for those who followed Descartes, beginning with Locke.

John Locke (1632-1704) rejected Descartes' innate ideas but retained the vast Cartesian gulf between mind and body. Across that gulf he threw a frail bridge of "intuitive knowledge," knowledge that cannot be proven and yet is the irresistible and self-evident ground of all certain human knowledge. Intuitive knowledge alone, Locke argued, assures us of our own self-existence, and reason based on intuition is the source of our secure knowledge of God. As for the physical world, Locke affirmed its existence as more of a matter of faith than anything else; it seems real, feels real, involves pain, and so, he reasoned, it must be real. We know the world through sensation and reflection. Knowledge of the physical world is indirect and only probable, however, since it and all of our knowledge is composed of "ideas" about reality rather than direct contact with reality. Because of the limitations on human knowing, we can never be sure if our ideas of external objects are a true analog of those objects or not, although Locke did insist that the physical world is real. All we can be sure of is the existence of ourselves and of God, and Locke shared Descartes' sense that the cognitive and spiritual is more immediately real to us than the physical. Allen states of Locke's contribution to the epistemological debates of early modern Europe that, "Locke's work, with its stress on probability, was a balanced position between scepticism and certainty." [57] Events proved it a precarious balance at best.

Locke made important adjustments to Descartes that reappeared in the Princeton Theology. He especially replaced innate ideas with intuitive knowledge, bringing philosophy one step closer to Princeton's Enlightenment concept of "first principles." Both Princeton and Locke also treated metaphysical and physical realities as being analogous to each other. Our consciousness, that is, is the ultimate source of our knowledge, and what we discover within that consciousness parallels the world that exists outside of us; inner and outer realities can be described and discussed in a similar fashion. Locke presaged Princeton's belief that we can obtain a working, if limited, knowledge of God by enlarging to an infinite degree certain characteristics of human experience, such as power to omnipotence and knowledge to omniscience. The analogy between human consciousness and other realities would prove to be a potent weapon in Princeton's arsenal of divinity.

George Berkeley (1685-1753) built on Locke's assertions that all we know are ideas and that secure knowledge is found only in human consciousness. He concluded that we cannot be sure that there is a physical world; indeed, in a crusade against materialism and atheism, Berkeley proposed to do away with the existence of matter entirely. To speak of an object as existing when there is no mind to perceive it is to speak in meaningless abstractions; qualities such as color, sound, and weight only reside in the mind of the person perceiving them. Berkeley went on, however, to account for the apparent solidity, coherence, and orderliness of physical reality by arguing that God has benevolently placed all of this in us as ideas to the end that we might lead orderly lives. All that is securely left to humanity is the divine gift of ideas.

Locke surveyed the Cartesian canyon between mind and body with God above and avowed the reality of all three-mind, body, and God. Berkeley stood at the same precipice and claimed that there is no canyon at all, only mind and God. David Hume (1711-1776) took his own look and decided that while it is common sense to think that God exists and the body is real there is no way of proving either because all we can know is our own ideas, not any realities beyond them. Thilly and Wood state,

Hume's view is empirical: our knowledge has its source in experience; it is positivistic: our knowledge is limited to the world of phenomena; it is agnostic: we know nothing of ultimates, substances, causes, soul, ego, external world, universe; it is humanistic: the human mental world is the only legitimate sphere of science and inquiry.[58]

Hume denied that humans can know whether what we perceive as cause and effect is real; all we know with certainty is that two events are normally, in our experience or way of thinking, associated with each other. We have no means to prove that they are necessarily associated or will continue to be associated with each other in the future. Hume denied that humanity could know anything of the nature of God, even if God exists; human knowing is too frail and uncertain to attain knowledge of things divine. He scornfully rejected arguments from an imperfect "creation" to a perfect "Creator".

Hume put the Christian theological enterprise at incredible risk. Howe observes that, "Since patristic times, Western thinkers had engaged in metaphysical speculation. With Hume, the enterprise had led to bankruptcy. Men could know nothing about ultimate reality." [59] The consequences for modern science were equally dire. Bozeman states of Hume's philosophy, "Thus the manifest premise of the scientific movement, that there is an actual 'system of bodies' governed by causal relations and accessible to the inquiring mind, had ceased to be philosophically intelligible." [60] One must emphasize that what was at stake in Hume, to use the language of philosophy, was epistemology not ontology. Hume simply wanted to demonstrate that it is untenable to think we can gain knowledge of the existence of God and physical reality by the exercise of human reason. Grave points out that, "Hume's scepticism was provisional; it is where reason would leave us, but where reason leaves us, Nature takes over imperatively." [61] Hume, in any event, represented an incalculable threat to the alliance of faith and science, one that had to be answered. The Scottish philosophers of Common Sense stepped forward to take up that challenge and provide that answer.

A Scottish cleric and professor, Thomas Reid (1710-1796), is frequently credited with founding Common Sense Philosophy and, in any event, stands as a chief architect in the development of the moderate, Scottish Enlightenment answer to Hume. As convinced of the grand gap between mental and physical realities as any of those who went before, Reid and his compatriots came to a different conclusion about it. [62] First, Reid denied that all we can know are ideas or that we even have "ideas" in the sense meant by Locke. He studied his own mind and found nothing in it that stood between his consciousness of other realities and those realities themselves; he failed to discover, that is, a third entity called "ideas". [63] Second, he affirmed the every day common sense of common people; what they know to be true is so immediate and so entirely convincing to them that they do not stop to consider the possibility of denying that reality. Causes have effects. The physical world is real. No one questions these and many other "first principles" of human knowing. It is absurd to do so. Reid ridiculed Hume for doubting the existence of physical reality while continuing to write on tables rather than thin air and to walk through doors rather than walls. All human languages, furthermore, reflect these first principles, which shows that they are truly inherent in universal human consciousness and, thus, gives further proof of their divine origin.

Reid did not think he could *prove* that the physical world is real in a philosophical sense, but he did think that the very construction of human consciousness affirmed its reality as being commonsensical. Agreeing with his predecessors that God exists, Reid argued that God would not have created senses in us that lied about reality; the very fact of our unquestioning, immediate, and overwhelming belief in what we sense shows that God has given us the ability to know the world as it actually exists. We, thus, truly know external objects and their qualities because they simply "arise from innate principles of mind." Our assurance that our knowledge of those objects is reliable requires "no justification because they are evident in themselves without the use of reasoning." [64] Still, humanity does not have an innate knowledge of the principles by which it acquires knowledge and must carefully study human consciousness for them, according to the "inductive method" of research that Reid believed was first proposed by Francis Bacon (1561-1626). The Baconian approach to knowledge was a circumspect one that proceeded from a comprehensive gathering of facts through a discrete arrangement of the facts to a considered estimation of their lessons. The result was a philosophy that gave enthusiastic support to the study of the natural sciences, trusted the senses, affirmed the reality of the physical world, and yet kept a tight reign on the scientific method and shunned abstraction. It celebrated facts and took the Newtonian world to be God's world. [65]

At the last, Reid departed from Hume over the epistemological question of whether humanity can know God or not. Hume felt skeptical that we can know God or the existence of anything supposedly created by God; we have to live by common sense *as if* the unknowable God does exist and *as if* our senses are reliable regarding an otherwise unknowable world. Reid disagreed profoundly on what can only be termed metaphysical and theological grounds. He affirmed, beyond any possibility of empirical verification, that all of reality, even that which is unobserved, is what we judge it to be by the principles of common sense because he believed in a Divine Creator who, as we have noted already, created it "the way it is." The result is what some philosophers term Reid's "providential naturalism." [66]

Common Sense Philosophy had an immense impact on the United States. It dominated academic instruction, particularly in higher education, to the extent that Hoveler concludes, "the Scottish thinkers were familiar to five generations of American college students. Indeed they dominated American academic thought for almost a century." On a larger scale, Hovenkamp finds that "the Scottish Realist method of understanding the world became practically identified with the evangelical point of view." [67] Since the publication in 1955 of Ahlstrom's groundbreaking article on Common Sense Philosophy's impact on American theology, the particular impact of Scotland on Princeton has become one of the grand, commonplace facts of the study of the Princeton Theology. The evidence for that relationship was always in plain view in the Princeton circle's theological literature-at times exquisitely and overtly so, such as in a series of articles written for the Princeton Review by Samuel Tyler, an amateur Baconian philosopher and widely appreciated Princeton fellow-traveler. [68] The Princeton professors and their students were counted in the first rank of those who most enthusiastically and systematically embraced this Scottish Enlightenment import. [69]

Evangelicalism

Antebellum American Protestant evangelicalism emerged as a dominant force in nineteenth-century American religious life; the word "evangelical" itself, however, designates a creature of such grand diversity and plurality as almost to defy definition. If one seeks to understand what it meant to be an American evangelical before 1860, however, at least three broad themes commend themselves as central to the evangelical experience. First, theologically, evangelicals were moving away from America's colonial Reformed heritage with its emphasis on predestination and election towards a more Arminian understanding of conversion and salvation.

God's wrath and awful majesty remained, but individual sinners could do more toward their own salvation. Second, in terms of personal faith, evangelicalism encouraged a warm-hearted, personal piety based on a simple acceptance of the Bible as God's perfect Word. Finally, logistically, evangelicals looked to revivalism as their chief engine for winning the unconverted to faith and renewing the flagging spirits of the faithful. Antebellum evangelicals were, thus, religious activists immersed in the democratic temper of their age.[70] Although not always listed as a key attribute of evangelicalism, most evangelical Protestants displayed a sharp antipathy to Catholicism to the extent that Wolffe concludes that, "anti-Catholicism was very deeply rooted in evangelical identity and ideology. It was not a mere negative prejudice but an impulse at the heart of the movement's spiritual aspirations and religious activity." [71]

Filling in the details of this broadly drawn definition leads one into all manner of difficulties, because it was in the details, the implications, and the nuances that American evangelicals differed from each other-sometimes bitterly. There were three large camps or ways of filling in those details, which we might typify as being respectively orthodox, radical, and black evangelicalism.[72] Princeton was a stalwart member of evangelicalism's orthodox wing, which, according to Johnson, accounted for roughly one-fifth of all antebellum evangelicals and included Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Low Church Episcopalians, and English-speaking Reformed groups. Orthodox evangelicals tended to be middle and upper class people socially, normally residing in towns and cities; their locus of economic and political power was in the Northeast. They exercised considerable social influence and often sought to extend their conception of religious and social order into American society generally by using voluntary associations. Orthodox evangelicals held education in high regard and demanded a well-trained clergy. Johnson writes,

Worship was dignified, restrained, and controlled. By nineteenth-century standards, local formalist [orthodox] congregations were complex institutions with a host of organizations ranging from missionary societies to Sunday Schools and choirs, each emphasizing its own version of self-discipline and self-improvement.[73]

Orthodox evangelicalism, in sum, was marked by an emphasis on revivalism, commitment to moral reform, reliance on interdenominational agencies, and a deep concern for missions.[74]

Over the course of the antebellum era there was also a gradual blending and convergence of the radical and orthodox wings of evangelicalism so that by 1850 the orthodox had taken over many of the radicals' revivalist techniques and put them to use in ways acceptable to the middle class. The radicals, meanwhile, had become less radical and more concerned about such things as a learned clergy, education, decorous worship, theological complexities, grand edifices, and propriety in behavior and dress.[75] If Cross is correct, the more extreme tendencies of the radical party to engage in a misguided, judgmental, and irresponsible "ultraism" contained the seeds of its own destruction and could not be sustained over the long run.[76] Which is to say that by the time that the future members of the Laos Mission were coming of age, entering school, and attending seminary a milder revivalist evangelicalism had become standard fare for most of the nation's Protestants. The strength of that evangelicalism's impact on Princeton and the Old School was augmented by the fact that Common Sense Philosophy itself had a wide influence among evangelicals of many stripes and sizes, an influence unique among the English-speaking nations of the North Atlantic for its breadth and depth.[77]

It is hardly startling, then, to insist that the Princeton professors and their entourage of students and sympathizers were evangelical; nearly all American Protestants of their day fit that description. The fact remains an important one, however, because it serves to distinguish the Princetonians from earlier forms of Reformed confessionalism and to highlight the importance of

non-confessional influences on the Princeton Theology. In spite of the undeniable influence of Reformed confessionalism, that is, the Princeton Theology was an indigenous American theology, responsive to the cultural and religious forces of its national context. Princeton's views on revivalism, predestination, and voluntary agencies provide important examples.

Some twenty years ago, Hoffecker wrote a book that corrected, in his estimation, a long-standing misunderstanding of Princeton, namely that it was *against* revivalism and warm-hearted evangelical piety. He cites substantial evidence demonstrating that the key Princetonians held revivals in considerable esteem and emphasized the importance of deeply felt religious experiences to the Christian life, particularly in conversion. They discouraged only the emotional excesses of radical evangelical revivalism, fearing that such excesses were the result of manipulation by evangelists rather than the work of the Holy Spirit. Emotional revivalism, furthermore, often violated the Pauline injunction that all things be conducted in a decent, orderly manner.[78] Although it appears at times that the evidence he cites disproves Hoffecker's argument almost as much as it proves it and that strong strains of rationality undeniably suffuse much of Princeton's literature, the scholarly consensus remains that in the main he is correct. The Princetonians did allow an important place for piety. One recalls, for example, Hodge's well-known little book, *The Way of Life*, published by the American Sunday School Union as an articulate rendering of a broadly evangelical piety.[79] Princetonian sermons could often ring with the warm syllables of that piety, reminding us that colonial Presbyterians played a key role in the introduction and spread of revivalist practices and in the post-Revolutionary era continued to avail themselves of those methods.[80] Still, even Princeton's sermons and pious tracts give vent to the subtle, orthodox counterpoint of reason and intellect; the heart was important to Princeton but it never dominated the mind. Sixteenth-century continental theology was at least as much home to the professors as was nineteenth-century American piety-and almost certainly more so. Thus, for example, Hodge structured his exposition of the *The Way of Life* according to a traditional rendering of the Reformed understanding of the "order of salvation," the *ordo salutis*-namely as call, justification and adoption, sanctification, and glorification.[81]

Hodge's views on predestination, the grand dame of Reformed orthodox theology, highlight the intricate interplay of confessionalism and pietism contained in the Princeton literature. Kennedy argues that unlike his orthodox ancestors or even other Old School theologians, Hodge concerned himself more with the human role in salvation and with the kindly role of divine providence in human affairs than he did with the stern orthodox doctrines of predestination, election, and reprobation. He seemed inclined towards a greater role for natural theology; Kennedy labels Hodge's discussion of predestination in his *Systematic Theology* as being "commonplace" and lacking in details. He claims that the good doctor had little fondness for the harsher doctrines of his Reformed heritage.[82] Kennedy writes, "[Hodge] lived in the great day of American revivalism and foreign missions, and he shared the concern that sinners come to salvation. His theology is anthropocentric and soteriocentric; his teaching on man and sin is mostly aimed at providing a context for salvation." [83] Hodge, it should be added, further softened the grim image of Calvinism by arguing that the vast majority of humanity would face the last days and final judgment as saved Christians and that even the unbaptized will receive the rewards of eternal life if they die in their infancy.[84] While later scholars frequently point to the transforming power Common Sense Philosophy had over Princeton's confessionalism, it is apparent that the more diffuse but still powerful influence of evangelicalism could also cut close to the core of that great tradition.

Briefly, it should be noted that the Princetonians and their larger Old School constituency fully involved themselves in the campaigns for social and religious control waged by orthodox evangelicalism's battery of antebellum voluntary societies. As we have seen, in 1837 the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. split over participation in the ecumenical voluntary agencies that

had become the primary mission arm of orthodox evangelicalism. The reasons given then were largely theological, having to do with the New School's supposedly close association to New England's Arminian tendencies. The Old School, however, did not abstain from channeling evangelical activism through voluntary agencies; it simply wanted to control any agencies that had influence in the Presbyterian Church.[85]

To one degree or another, Princeton shared thus in the piety, theology, and folkways of American evangelicalism, particularly of the orthodox strain. This evangelical mix was not without its subtleties as well, for sprinkled in amongst it all was a happy, zestful dash of romanticism, the aesthetic and intellectual movement that supposedly rejected reason for emotion and intuition and valued self-expression and discovery over traditional authority. Romantics majored in inspiration; they loved creativity. They rejected the Enlightenment and above all, again, they held no truck with reason-or so the scholars describe them..[86] All of this romantic enthusiasm and emotionalism does sound, as Hoveler suggests, like the radical evangelicals and their rejection of old systems of authority, activist enthusiasm for all manner of reforms, and emphasis on religious experience over reason.[87] The general drift of scholarly treatment of Princeton and romanticism has been to emphasize the distance and differences between them as if the professors' apparently rigid orthodoxy was a medium poisonous to romanticism's free spirit. Moorhead's handling of J. A. Alexander, for example, contrasts the "early" Alexander-a creative, almost playful thinker of romantic inclinations before he became a full-time professor at Princeton Seminary-with the repressive scholasticism of his later years..[88] The actual situation was more complex, however, than Moorhead's simplistic scenario allows. In the vast, bubbling cauldron of antebellum religious thought, it was impossible to separate the various schools so neatly. Romanticism itself was diffuse and certain varieties could be as conservative as Princeton, if in a romantic rather than confessional manner. At the same time, the movement shared in other key elements of its day including most especially a great deal of influence from Common Sense Philosophy.[89] It would have been more surprising than not if a hint of evangelical romanticism had failed to find its way into the Princeton Theology, which it did-in the way natural beauty could touch the Princetonians, in the way they sometimes discussed role of the heart in understanding God, in their concept of beauty, in the role they thought intuition played in perceiving heavenly themes, in their tendency to hold an optimistic appraisal of the mind's ability to grasp the divine, and in their trust of the common sense of the common people.[90]

One of the other "markers" of nineteenth-century American evangelicalism was a profound emphasis on the authority of the Bible that sometimes verged on bibliolatry. It is so entirely obvious that the Princetonians cherished the Bible and gave it a central place in all of their works that the matter hardly needs elaboration; one example will suffice. In his 1851 inaugural discourse to the assembled Princeton Seminary community, William H. Green sounded the clarion call for defense of the Bible against the looming clouds of German scholarship's skeptical mistreatment of the Scriptures. Green, in the course of his lecture, described the Bible as being "the tower of our defense," and avowed that a thousand previous cases demonstrated how it is always finally, triumphantly, and fully vindicated.[91] The Bible, he wrote, is "the only source of saving knowledge; the only guide to the favour of God, and holiness and heaven; which alone speaks of the atonement by the blood of the cross, and whose faithful proclamation is accompanied by the renewing energy of the Holy Ghost." Green avowed that, "We wish nothing to remain among our tenets which the word of God, honestly expounded, will not sanction." [92] Some scholars have argued that such sentiments were still expressions of an "arid scholasticism" quite out of keeping with antebellum evangelicalism's view of the Scriptures, but Balmer's survey of contemporary conservative Protestant discussions of the meaning of the Bible suggests otherwise. He concludes that Princeton's doctrine of the Bible was neither "unique nor

innovative" and that "a broad range of nineteenth-century theologians in many different denominational groupings did in fact share similar views on the subject." [93]

As conservative, or orthodox evangelicals, Old School Presbyterians largely expressed their evangelicalism in muted tones. They were moderately revivalist instead of blatantly so. They favored a warm-hearted rather than hot-hearted piety. They spiced their faith with only a light sprinkling of romanticism in place of the shakers' full of romantic enthusiasm favored by the more radical evangelical denominations. By the time the Laos Mission was established in 1867, however, evangelicalism in the United States had found a common level, one that Old School Presbyterians shared in and felt comfortable with.

Conclusion

Finding discrepancies and illogical contradictions in the great theological house that Princeton built has become something of a cottage industry among scholars. Ahlstrom supposes that Princeton destroyed the dynamic vitality of its Reformed orthodox faith by subjecting it to the enervating, naive humanism of Common Sense thought. Sandeen agrees. Princeton's attempt to bend the mystical and the spiritual on the rack of "the methodology of Newton" produced, he claims, "a wooden, mechanical discipline as well as a rigorously logical one." Princeton dealt primarily with externals rather than the inner life. Loetscher, writing in the train of Hoffecker's primal dissent against the idea that Princeton rejected evangelical piety, still discerns a gap between Princeton's pietism and Common Sense rationalism. Although he assures us that the two did not contradict one other, he feels that Princetonians such as Alexander never found a way to blend the two into a workable synthesis. [94] Meyer, taking a different tack across the same breeze, suggests that Alexander's Enlightenment orientation encouraged him to expect humans to be able to live moral lives while his Reformed heritage assured him it was impossible for them to do so. Alexander, he claims, failed to solve this dilemma. Taylor, coming in from still another angle, finds in Princeton's biblical scholarship an inherent tension between its commitment to "Reformed confessionalism" and its admiration of objective scientific and historical research. [95]

Giving due weight to these and other inconsistencies, paradoxes, and contradictions within Princeton's great synthesis, one is still left feeling something akin to awe at the persistent way in which Princeton wove the strands of Reformed confessionalism, Common Sense Philosophy, evangelical piety, and that hint of romanticism into a single tapestry. Say what the critics will, it was a theological system that a not inconsequential number of nineteenth-century Americans accepted as their own, among them some of the nation's most well educated and theologically articulate professors, college presidents, preachers, and local lay leaders and members. Daniel McGilvary, as one minor example, chose Princeton Seminary because of the quality of its faculty. [96] Standing within the culture and the ethos of its time and place, the Princeton synthesis made sense and had a great influence, particularly among more conservative and middle class evangelicals. It was orthodox *and* reasonable, reasonable *and* pious, and, finally, pious *and* orthodox. Wherever one turns in the literature of Princeton, one is struck by how all three strands weave in and around each other to form one Reformed, commonsensical, and evangelical theological system, so that, whatever its logical inconsistencies, a great number of nineteenth-century American Protestants found in it the terms and ideas they needed to express their own personal faith.

Conclusion

These six historical and theological contexts, then, comprise the setting within which the Laos Mission conducted its work. They include, historically, the events leading up to the founding of the mission itself, northern Thai history, and the history of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. The key components of the theological context are Reformed confessionalism, Common Sense Philosophy, and evangelicalism. The stage, in sum, is now well set, and it is time to introduce the actresses and actors, whose lives and thinking we will pursue throughout the rest of the course of this dissertation, namely the nine pioneer members of the Laos Mission.

Notes

Abbreviations:

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AP	<i>American Presbyterians</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
BRPR	<i>Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
JAH	<i>Journal of American History</i>
JER	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of Presbyterian History</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Social History</i>
NCP	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian</i>
NCP NS	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian New Series</i>
LN	<i>Laos News</i>
PQPR	<i>Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review</i>
SCJ	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>
WJT	<i>Westminster Journal of Theology</i>
WWW	<i>Women's Work for Women</i>

[1] For the history of early Catholic missions, see, Surachai Chumsirphan, "The Great Role of Jean-Louise Vey, Apostolic Vicar of Siam (1875-1909), in the Church History of Thailand During the Reformation Period of King Rama V, The Great (1868-1910), " (Ph.D. diss., Pontificate Universitatis Gregorianae, 1990), 69-96.

[2] Standard introductions to Protestant church and missionary history in Thailand include: McFarland, *Historical Sketch*; and Wells, *History of Protestant Work*. For the history of the London Missionary Society's brief efforts in Siam, see Kennon Breazeale, "English Missionaries Among the Thai," in *Anuson Walter Vella*, ed. Ronald D. Renard (Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1986), 208-28.

[3] For a contemporary description of the tensions between Catholic and Protestant missionaries, see John Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam*. vol. 1 (1857; reprint, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1977), 335.

[4] Bertha McFarland, "The Work of the Presbyterian Mission 1840-1860," in McFarland, *Historical Sketch*, 38.

[5] McFarland, "Work of the Presbyterian Mission," 44. For Mongkut's relationship to the missionaries see Donald C. Lord, *Mo Bradley and Thailand* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1969), 165ff.

[6] See Breazeale, "English Missionaries," 220; Buell to Lowrie, 10 September 1840 and 5 December 1840, v. 1, Records of the Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church USA, microfilm copy at the Payap University Archives (Here after cited as BFM); and House to Lowrie, 6 October 1854, v. 2, BFM.

[7] The northern Thai patron class was known by the general term of *chao*. The chief ruler of each of the northern states was termed *chao luang* (primary lord or, possibly, lord of the capitol) or *chao muang* (lord of the city and state). These terms are frequently translated as "prince," in acknowledgment of the dependency status of the northern states.

[8] Whipple to Bradley, 2 July 1861, Papers of Dan Beach Bradley, at the Oberlin College Archives, microfilm copy at the Payap College Archives; and McGilvary to Executive Committee, 10 February 1864, v. 2, BFM. For Bradley's contacts with the northern princes, see the Journal of Dan Beach Bradley, at the Oberlin College Archives, microfilm copy at the Payap College Archives, 20 October 1859, 21 October 1859, and 4 December 1859. For his visits to Phet Buri, see Bradley Journal, 27 November 1859; 29 November 1859; and 30 November 1859; and Bradley to Whipple, 6 December 1859, Records of the American Missionary Association, at the Amistad Research Center, Dillard University, New Orleans, USA, microfilm copy at the Payap University Archives.

[9] Daniel McGilvary, *Half Century Among the Siamese and Lao: An Autobiography* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1912), 57.

[10] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 50-3.

[11] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 58.

[12] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 63-4; McGilvary, "Chieng Mai Trip," *North Carolina Presbyterian* (hereafter cited as NCP) 9 (24 October 1866): 1; McGilvary, "Chieng Mai Trip," NCP 9 (31 October 1866): 1; McGilvary to Executive Committee, 10 February 1864, v. 2, BFM; and McGilvary to Lowrie, 13 February 1864, v. 2, BFM.

[13] McGilvary to Irving, 28 July 1866, v. 3, BFM; and Sophia McGilvary to Evander McGilvary, extracts, 10 August 1866, NCP 10 (25 September 1867): 1.

[14] McGilvary, "The New Mission among the Laos," excerpts of a letter, *Foreign Missionary* (Hereafter cited as FM) 25, 8 (January 1867): 215-16.

[15] Journal of Dan Beach Bradley, 28 August 1866.

[16] Bradley's journal does not entirely confirm this "official" chronology taken from McGilvary's own writings. Bradley makes no mention of going to visit Chao Kawilorot on Wednesday, 29 August 1866, which he almost certainly would have done. He also recorded two visits to the American Consul, Mr. Hood, one on August 30th and the second on the 31st. On both occasions, Hood flew into a great rage over petty matters directly related to McGilvary's request. He refused to give assistance to McGilvary both times. Journal of Dan Beach Bradley, 29 - 31 August 1866. Bradley's journal does not reveal how the matter was resolved, but it does help explain why McGilvary felt that securing permission from all parties involved was due to the providential intervention of God.

[17] Journal of Dan Beach Bradley, 8 September 1866.

[18] N. A. McDonald to Irving, 10 September 1866, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson to Irving, 20 October 1866, v. 3, BFM.

[19] Ratanaphorn Sethakul, "Political, Social, and Economic Changes in the Northern States of Thailand Resulting from the Chiang Mai Treaties of 1874 and 1883" (Ph.D. diss. Northern Illinois University, 1989), 12-3; and, McGilvary, "The New Mission among the Laos," excerpts of a letter, FM 25 (January 1867): 215-16.

[20] Hans Penth, "*khwambenma khonglannathai*" ["The Lan Na Thai Past"], in *lannathai* [Lan Na Thai], ed. Thiu Wichaikhatakhia (Chiang Mai: Chiang Mai Province, n.d.), 4-11.

[21] David K. Wyatt, *Thailand: A Short History* (Bangkok: Thai Watana Panich, 1984), 31, 36-9, 44-50.

[22] See *The Laws of King Mangrai (Mangrayathammasart)*, ed. and trans. Aroonrut Wichienkeeo and Gehan Wijeyewardene (Canberra: Australian National University, 1986).

[23] Wyatt, *Thailand*, 74-81.

[24] Sarasawadee Ongsakun, *prawatisat lanna* [Lan Na History], (Chiang Mai: Chiang Mai University, B.E. 2529 [1986]), 39-46; and Wyatt, *Thailand*, 118-20.

[25] Wyatt, *Thailand*, 123-24, 133ff.

[26] Ratanaphorn, "Chiang Mai Treaties," 24; Sarasawadee, *Lan Na History*, 53ff.; and Rujaya Abhakorn, "Changes in the Administrative System of Northern Siam, 1884-1933," in *Changes in Northern Thailand and the Shan States 1886-1940*, ed. Prakai Nontawasee (Singapore: Southeast Asian Studies Program, 1988), 66-7.

[27] Nigel J. Brailey, "The Origins of the Siamese Forward Movement in Western Laos, 1850-92" (Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1968), 26ff; and Ratanaphorn, "Chiang Mai Treaties," 30-2.

[28] Brailey, "Siamese Forward Movement," 24.

[29] Brailey, "Siamese Forward Movement," 118-19; and Sarasawadee, *Lan Na History*, 56.

[30] See Leonard J. Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition: A Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949), 15. The term "Scotch-Irish" refers to the Ulster Scots.

[31] Until recently Trinterud, *American Tradition*, 38ff. has been the standard treatment of these events. Over the last twenty years, however, revisionist historians have questioned many aspects of his interpretation. See Elizabeth A. Ingersoll, "Francis Alison: American 'Philosophe,' 1705-1779" (Ph.D. diss., University of Delaware, 1974), Elizabeth I. Nybakken, "New Light on the Old Side: Irish Influences on Colonial Presbyterianism," *Journal of American History* (Hereafter cited as JAH) 68, 4 (March 1982): 813-32; Marilyn J. Westerkamp, *Triumph of the Laity: Scots-Irish Piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); and Janet Fishburn, "Gilbert Tennent, Established 'Dissenter'" CH 63, 1 (March 1994): 31-49. See also Milton J. Coalter, *Gilbert Tennent, Son of Thunder: A Case Study of Continental Pietism's Impact on the First Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986) and Bryan F. Le Beau, *Jonathan Dickinson and the Formative Years of American Presbyterianism* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1997), 106.

[32] Randall Balmer, and John R. Fitzmier, *The Presbyterians* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1993), 33. For a brief biography of Witherspoon, see Martha Lou Lemmon Stohlman, *John Witherspoon: Parson, Politician, Patriot* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976).

[33] Finke and Stark point out that of the three major churches in the colonial era-Congregational, Presbyterian, and Anglican-only the Presbyterians continued to grow significantly in the post-Revolutionary era, actually keeping pace with population growth although not with the overall increase in church membership. In the period 1776-1850, Presbyterian membership dwindled from 19% to 11.6% of total American church membership. Roger Finke and Rodney Stark, *The Churching of America, 1776-1990: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 55, 56.

[34] See Lefferts A. Loetscher, *A Brief History of the Presbyterians*. 4th ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 92ff; and Raleigh Don Scovel, "Orthodoxy in Princeton: A Social and Intellectual History of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1812-1860" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1970), 216ff.

[35] Earl R. MacCormac, "The Transition from Voluntary Missionary Society to the Church as a Missionary Organization among the American Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Methodists" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1961), 172ff; Earl R. MacCormac, "Mission and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837," CH 32 (March 1963): 32-45; and Marjorie Barnhart, "From Elisha Swift to Walter Lowrie: The Background of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions," *Journal of Presbyterian History* (Hereafter cited as JPH) 65 (Summer 1987): 85-96.

[36] Thompson, *Presbyterian Churches*, 150ff.

[37] Lewis G. Vander Velde, *The Presbyterian Churches and the Federal Union 1861-1869* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), 479ff.

[38] Jack B. Rogers, and Donald K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979), 275-78.

[39] Mark A. Noll, "The Princeton Theology," in *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*, ed. David F. Wells (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1997), 16-7.

[40] For the history of the theological controversy that led to the reorganization of Princeton Seminary, see Bradley J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[41] W. J. Bouwsma, *John Calvin: A Sixteenth Century Portrait* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 2. Compare McCoy and Baker's comments on the origins of Reformed federalism. Charles S. McCoy and J. Wayne Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 11.

[42] See Raleigh Don Scovel, "Orthodoxy in Princeton: A Social and Intellectual History of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1812-1860" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1970), 58-9; and Noll, "Princeton Theology," 18-24.

[43] Alister E. McGrath, *Reformed Thought: An Introduction* (2d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993), 8-9. See also Alister E. McGrath, *A Life of John Calvin: A Study in the Shaping of Western Culture* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 202ff; and McCoy and Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism*, 17. Princeton itself was aware of the problems involved in the term "Calvinism." Lyman Atwater once noted that Charles Hodge seldom used the term. Atwater himself preferred the term "catholic Calvinism" as a way to show that the tradition drew on many more theological sources than just Calvin. See Lyman Atwater, "Calvinism in Doctrine and Life," *PQPR* 4, 1 (January 1875): 73-106. The question of labels for "Calvinism" is complicated by the fact that the terms "scholasticism" and "orthodoxy" are tainted with a sense of irrelevance, rationalism, and even lifelessness. The term "Reformed confessionalism" seems the most value-free one available and is generally used in this dissertation. See, Peter J. Wallace, "The Foundations of Reformed Biblical Theology: The Development of Old Testament Theology at Old Princeton, 1812-1932" (On-line article at: <http://www.nd.edu/~pwallace>); and Mark A. Noll, "The Princeton Theology."

[44] Justo L. González, *A History of Christian Thought*, vol. 3 (rev. ed., Nashville: Abingdon, 1987), 168-74.

[45] Donnelly, John Patrick. "Italian Influences on the Development of Calvinist Scholasticism," *Sixteenth Century Journal* (Hereafter cited as SCJ 7), 1 (April 1976): 101. See also Christopher J. Burchill, "Girolamo Zanchi: Portrait of A Reformed Theologian and His Work," *SCJ* 15, 2 (1984): 186.

[46] McCoy and Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism*, 12.

[47] Concerning Reformed and Puritan views on the primacy of reasonable religion, see John von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 68-71; McGrath, *Reformation Thought*, 120; and Martin I. Klauber, "Reason, Revelation, and Cartesianism: Louis Tronchin and Enlightened Orthodoxy in Late Seventeenth-Century Geneva" *CH* 59, 3 (September 1990): 338.

[48] See Ian Breward, "Introduction," in *The Work of William Perkins*, ed. Ian Breward (Appleford, Abingdon, Berkshire, England: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1970), 19; Donnelly, "Italian Influences," 82-3; David A. Weir, *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 69-70; and Rogers and McKim, *Authority and Interpretation*, 185-86.

[49] Timothy Ross Phillips, "Francis Turretin's Idea of Theology and its Bearing Upon His doctrine of Scripture" (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1986), 72.

[50] William C. Placher, *A History of Christian Theology: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), 226-27. These five points are often summarized with the mnemonic, TULIP: Total depravity, Unconditional election, Limited atonement, Irresistible grace, Perseverance of the saints. See McGrath, *Calvin*, 217.

[51] McGrath, *Calvin*, 207.

[52] González, *Christian Thought*, 291ff.

[53] Breward, Perkins, 29; and von Rohr, *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*, 88. For an excellent description of the sources and impact of Scottish evangelical piety on American Presbyterianism, see Leigh Eric Schmidt, *Holy Fairs: Scottish Communion and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).

[54] Earl William Kennedy, "An Historical Analysis of Charles Hodge's Doctrines of Sin and Particular Grace" (Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1968), 355.

[55] The following discussion of Descartes, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume is based upon Diogenes Allen, *Philosophy for Understanding Theology* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 171ff; and Frank Thilly and Ledger Wood, *A History of Philosophy*, 3d ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957), 302ff. See also W. Andrew Hoffer and Gary Scott Smith, eds., *Building a Christian World View*, vol. 1, *God, Man, and Knowledge* (Philipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1986). For the impact of scientific thought directly on colonial American philosophy, see Elizabeth Flower and Murray G. Murphey, *A History of Philosophy in America*, vol. I (New York: Capricorn Books, 1977), 61ff.

[56] Thilly and Wood, *History of Philosophy*, 314.

[57] Allen, *Philosophy for Understanding Theology*, 184.M/p>

[58] Thilly and Wood, *History of Philosophy*, 368.

[59] Daniel Walker Howe, *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861* (Middle-town, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1988), 28-9. See also Flower and Murphey, *Philosophy in America*, 243-44.

[60] Theodore Dwight Bozeman, *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977), 8.

[61] S. A. Grave, *The Scottish Philosophy of Common Sense* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), 64.

[62] Cumins attributes Reid's mind-body dualism to the influence of Descartes and notes the important impact this division had on his epistemology. Reid, he contends, argued that humans obtain their knowledge in two distinct ways, physically through perception and mentally through consciousness. Philip D. Cumins, "Reid's Realism" *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 12, 3 (July 1974): 321-22.

[63] Reid's attack on the "theory of ideas" was more sophisticated and complex than this brief summary suggests. Beanblossom has summarized a number of Reid's objections to that theory in four key points: First, Reid claimed that he could think thoughts that were unlike the philosophical meaning of "ideas". Second, the theory claims we can only have ideas of things that exist; but according to commonsense thinking that is not true. Third, the theory of ideas leads only to skepticism concerning human perception and memory. Fourth, Reid claims he can account for perception and mistakes in memory without having recourse to the theory of ideas. Ronald E. Beanblossom, "Introduction," in *Thomas Reid's Inquiry and Essays*, ed. Ronald E. Beanblossom and Keith Lehrer (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983), xix.

[64] Keith Lehrer, *Thomas Reid* (1989, reprint. London: Routledge, 1999), 8.

[65] Bozeman, *Protestants in an Age of Science*, 21. For a concise description of the Baconian inductive method by a member of the "Princeton circle," see Samuel Tyler, "The Baconian Philosophy," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review* (Hereafter cited as BRPR) 12, 3 (July 1840): 362-63; and Samuel Tyler, "Baconian Philosophy," BRPR 15, 4 (October 1843): 479-506.

[66] Grave, *Scottish Philosophy*, 100-04; and Knud Haakonssen, "Reid's Philosophy," in *Thomas Reid, Practical Ethics*, ed. Knud Haakonssen (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 38.

[67] J. David Hoveler, Jr, *James McCosh and the Scottish Intellectual Tradition: From Glasgow to Princeton* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), 4; and Herbert Hovenkamp, *Science and Religion in America, 1800-1860* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978), 10.

[68] See Tyler, "The Baconian Philosophy"; Tyler, "Baconian Philosophy"; Samuel Tyler, "Psychology," BRPR 15, 2 (April 1843): 227-50; and Samuel Tyler, "Sir William Hamilton and his Philosophy," BRPR 27, 4 (October 1855): 553-600.

[69] Sydney E. Ahlstrom, "The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology" CH 24(1955): 257-72. For a detailed theological explication of that relationship, see James L. McAllister, Jr., "The Nature of Religious Knowledge in the Thought of Charles Hodge" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1957); and, more recently, Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*. The Scottish link was largely ignored by early studies of Princeton in particular and American Calvinism generally. See especially, William Adams Brown, "Changes in the Theology of American Presbyterians," *American Journal of Theology* 10, 3 (July 1906): 387-411; William Adams Brown, "The Old Theology and the New," *Harvard Theological Review* 4, 1 (January 1911): 1-24; and Ralph John Danhof, *Charles Hodge as a Dogmatician* (Goes, Netherlands: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1929).

[70] Based on Donald W. Dayton, *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage* (1976; reprint. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 138; and Hoveler, *James McCosh*, 95.

[71] John Wolffe, "Anti-Catholicism and Evangelical Identity in Britain and the United States, 1830-1860," in *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1900*, ed. Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 184.

[72] Taken from Curtis D. Johnson, *Evangelicals and the Road to Civil War* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1993), 7-8. Johnson uses the terms "formalist," "anti-formalist," and "African-American." He notes that this is an idealized classification, the boundaries between classes being often unclear and showing considerable overlap.

[73] Johnson, *Road to Civil War*, 7, 13.

[74] George M. Marsden, *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), x-xi, 13-5.

[75] Nathan O. Hatch, *The Democratization of American Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 193ff.

[76] Whitney R. Cross, *The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1950), 355-56.

[77] Mark A. Noll, "Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought," *American Quarterly* (Hereafter cited as AQ) 37 (Summer 1985): 217, 226; and Michael Gauvreau, "The Empire of Evangelicalism: Varieties of Common Sense in Scotland, Canada, and the United States," in *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1900*, ed. Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 236. Hirrel argues that their shared commitment to common sense provided an important bridge specifically between New School and Old School Presbyterians and concludes, "New School and Old School Calvinists had more in common than they may have realized." Leo P. Hirrel, *Children of Wrath: New School Calvinism and Antebellum Reform* (Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1998), 44.

[78] Andrew W. Hoffer, *Piety and the Princeton Theologians: Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, and Benjamin Warfield* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1981), 20-4, 72.

[79] Charles Hodge, *The Way of Life*, ed. Mark Noll (New York: Paulist Press, 1987). First published in 1841.

[80] See, as one example, James W. Alexander, *Discourses on Common Topics of Christian Faith and Practice*, 2nd. ed. (New York: Scribner, 1858), esp. 245-61, "The Inwardness of True Religion," a sermon delivered 9 April 1854.

[81] See von Rohr, *Covenant of Grace*, 87.

[82] Kennedy, "Hodge's Doctrines of Sin and Particular Grace," 229-38.

[83] Kennedy, "Hodge's Doctrines of Sin and Particular Grace," 233-34.

[84] Kennedy, "Hodge's Doctrines of Sin and Particular Grace," 248, 261; and Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3 (New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1872), 557-58.

[85] See Elwyn A. Smith, "The Forming of a Modern American Denomination" CH 31, 1 (March 1962): 90.

[86] See *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan, 1967) s. v. "Romanticism"; *The Dictionary of Philosophy*, ed. Dagobert D. Runes (New York: Philosophical Library, n.d.), s. v. "Romanticism"; and esp. Terry Tastard, "Theology and Spirituality in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," in *Companion Encyclopedia of Theology*, ed. Peter Byrne and Leslie Houlden, (London: Routledge, 1995), 597. For a fuller description of romanticism in the American context, see Walter H. Conser, Jr. *God and the Natural World: Religion and Science in Antebellum America* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1993), 25ff; and Merle Curti, *Human Nature in American Thought* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980), 147-85.

[87] Hoveler, *James McCosh*, 67-8.

[88] James H. Moorhead, "Joseph Addison Alexander: Common Sense, Romanticism and Biblical Criticism at Princeton," JPH 53, 1 (Spring 1975): 51-65. See also, James Hastings Nichols' chapter on Hodge, in *Romanticism in American Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

[89] See Lawrence Buell, *New England Literary Culture: From Revolution Through Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 44; Lawrence Buell, *Literary Transcendentalism: Style and Vision in the American Renaissance* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1973), 64-5; and Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 345.

[90] Hoffercker, *Piety and the Princeton Theologians*, 16-7; and Kennedy, "Hodge's Doctrines of Sin and Particular Grace," 165ff. For a fascinating and ingenious synthesis of Princeton rationality and the romantic spirit see Samuel Tyler, "Cosmos, by A. Von Humboldt," BRPR 24, 3 (July 1852): 382-97. Tyler argues that God has created the world to be both beautiful and useful so that it can sustain and speak to the whole of human nature. The unspoken message to the Princeton faithful was that within the compass of the one divine Creation a person can be both a rational and a romantic inductive, orthodox Baconian evangelical.

[91] William Henry Green, "Inaugural Discourse," in *Discourses at the Inauguration of the Rev. William Henry Green as Professor of Biblical and Oriental Literature in The Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J.* (Philadelphia: C. Sherman, Printer, 1851), 41, 42.

[92] Green, "Inaugural Discourse," 46, 62.

[93] Randall H. Balmer, "The Princetonians and Scripture: A Reconsideration" WJT 44, 2 (Fall 1982): 364.

[94] Ahlstrom, "Scottish Philosophy," 268-69; Ernest R. Sandeen, "The Princeton Theology: One Source of Biblical Literalism in American Protestantism." CH 31 (September 1962): 310; and Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 68, 98, 168-69.

[95] D. H. Meyer, *The Instructed Conscience: The Shaping of the American National Ethic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972), 55-6; and Marion Ann Taylor, *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School (1812-1929)* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992), 9, 45, 107, 142-44.

CHAPTER TWO

The Princeton Connection

Outline of the Chapter

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [The Personal Connection](#)
 - 2.1. [Introduction](#)
 - 2.2. [The Princetonians](#)
 - 2.3. [The Evangelicals](#)
 - 2.4. [The Outcast](#)
 - 2.5. [Conclusion](#)
3. [The Theological Connection](#)
 - 3.1. [Introduction](#)
 - 3.2. [God](#)
 - 3.3. [Heathenism](#)
 - 3.4. [Conversion](#)
 - 3.5. [Conclusion](#)
4. [Conclusion](#)
5. [Notes](#)

Introduction

When the pioneer members of the Laos Mission arrived in Chiang Mai in the years up to 1880, they stepped into a social and historical world as unlike the United States as nearly anywhere in the world. They faced the one central question of how to best communicate the Christian message in their new situation. In spite of the cultural gap between themselves and the northern Thai, they chose to treat the people of northern Siam as if they were essentially the same as people in the United States. To us, that decision seems ill conceived. Why did it seem wise and proper to them? The answer to this question, we proposed in the Introduction, lies potentially in the system of meanings and doctrines the missionaries took with them, a system that seems to have been influenced by and reflected in the Princeton Theology. The question is, was there a theological and ideological link between Princeton and Chiang Mai? The records of the Laos Mission, when read in light of the writings of the Princeton theologians, suggest that a connection between the seminary and mission did exist. It was both a personal and a theological connection.

The Personal Connection

Introduction

The link between the Princeton Theology and the work of the Laos Mission lay, first, in the missionaries themselves. In the years between 1867 and 1880, there were only nine members of the mission: three couples, the Rev. Daniel and Sophia McGilvary, the Rev. Jonathan and Kate Wilson, and Dr. Marion and Sarah Cheek; and three single individuals, Dr. Charles

Vrooman, Edna Cole, and Mary Campbell. The McGilvays, originally members of the Siam Mission, arrived in Chiang Mai in April 1867. The Wilsons, also members of the Siam Mission, reached the city in February 1868. Dr. Vrooman, a physician, first entered the city in January 1872, and his replacement, Dr. Cheek landed in Chiang Mai in March 1875. Cheek returned to Bangkok the following year to marry Sarah Bradley, Sophia McGilvary's stepsister, and the couple returned to Chiang Mai sometime in 1876, the exact date not being recorded. The last two missionaries to arrive in this period, Cole and Campbell, reached Chiang Mai in April 1879. These nine individuals represent three general theological orientations. McGilvary and Wilson were Princetonians; Cheek was at least partially one as well. All five women in the mission have clear links to orthodox evangelicalism and there is some evidence to suggest a direct Old School Presbyterian connection. It is not correct, however, to term them "Princetonians." Vrooman, as we will see shortly, stood alone and on the outside.

The Princetonians

The Laos Mission was not merely a collection of nine undifferentiated individuals, and the influence of the Princeton Theology cannot be measured by simply counting heads. Some heads mattered more than others. As Table 2.1 (below) indicates, only the McGilvays and the Wilsons served the mission in its pioneer era for an appreciable length of time and in any case Daniel McGilvary stood well above his colleagues in prestige and influence. His vision, initiative, and persistence played a large role in the creation of the mission in the first place, and as will be seen he set the tone for and initiated much of its program. His clear roots in Princeton count for a great deal in establishing that theology's theological and ideological impact on the Laos Mission. Wilson just as clearly occupied the number two position in the mission, and although he did not possess McGilvary's leadership skills he was no less of a "Princeton man" for that. These Princeton connections, in and of themselves, suggest that the Princeton Theology played a potentially important role in mission life. McGilvary's Old School and Princeton credentials are particularly important for an added reason. His correspondence with the Board contains occasional comments on the theological orthodoxy of his colleagues, orthodoxy meaning a theology compatible with Princeton. Leaving Wilson aside for the moment, we turn here to a brief theological biography of Daniel McGilvary (1828-1911).

McGilvary's Old School credentials are impressive. He was raised in a North Carolinian hotbed of conservative, Old School, Scottish immigrant Presbyterianism and into a pious family and a solid, Scottish congregation, the Buffalo Church. As a child, his days were filled with the exercises of Presbyterian piety and the lessons of a Presbyterian education; by the age of ten or so he had memorized all 107 questions and answers of the Shorter Catechism, no mean feat for someone much older than ten. The tiny library that he read at home contained religious books and periodicals that were mostly published in Philadelphia. He witnessed, year after year, the impressive sacred rites and social camaraderie of the "Buffalo Communion," a carryover from Scotland and Ulster of a communion ritual of an intensely evangelical brand of Presbyterianism. The event lasted for at least four days or more at a time and was attended by celebrants coming from up to forty miles away. Before becoming a missionary, McGilvary served as a local church elder, attended Princeton Seminary, and briefly served two Old School Presbyterian congregations as a pastor.[1]

Table 2.1
Years of Missionary Service in the Laos Mission, 1867-1880

Name	Chiang Mai	Furlough	Chiang Mai	Total in Chiang Mai
D. McGilvary	1867-1873	1873-1875	1874-1880	11
S. McGilvary	1867-1873	1873-1875	1875-1879	10
J. Wilson	1868-1876	1876-1879	1879-1880	9
K. Wilson	1868-1876	1876-1877	-	8
Vrooman	1872-1873	-	-	1
M. Cheek	1875-1880	-	-	5
S. Cheek	1876-1880	-	-	4
Campbell	1879-1880	-	-	1
Cole	1879-1880	-	-	1

Sources: BFM and Eakin Papers biographical files

The records of the Laos Mission demonstrate that Princeton significantly influenced McGilvary's thinking, he valued the theology he learned there, and he cherished his memories of his seminary professors. The evidence is as follows:

(1) During his examination for licensure before Orange Presbytery, McGilvary responded to one question by quoting fully and correctly two answers to questions in the Shorter Catechism, and one of his examiners remarked that he was "right on the Catechism." McGilvary comments, "In those days to be 'right on the Catechism' would atone for many failures in Hodge or Turretin." [2] The phrase "Hodge or Turretin," is significant; Charles Hodge was the dean of the Princeton theologians. Francis Turretin (1623-1687) represented the culmination of the continental Reformed confessionalism, and his ponderous Latin work on systematic theology was Princeton Seminary's standard text in theology for some sixty years. Both McGilvary and Wilson had to master its contents in order to graduate. Only a Presbyterian already somewhat familiar with Princeton would make a passing comment like this one.

(2) When it came time for McGilvary to choose a seminary to attend, he selected Princeton, because of the good reputation of Drs. Hodge and Alexander. [3]

(3) During the trip out to Siam in 1858, McGilvary and Wilson had occasion to counsel a young sailor troubled by his lack of faith. They gave him a copy of Flavel's *Christ Knocking at the Door* because they knew that Dr. Archibald Alexander, the founding father of Princeton Seminary, as a troubled young man had found deep meaning in this sermon. John Flavel (1630?-1691) was an English Presbyterian Puritan who had been widely read by colonial Presbyterians, and McGilvary remembered correctly that Flavel's sermon had brought comfort and joy to Alexander.[4] The presence of this small book in Wilson or McGilvary's baggage plus McGilvary's knowledge of Alexander's religious experience suggest a comfortable familiarity with things Princeton as well as Presbyterian.

(4) Soon after his arrival in Chiang Mai, McGilvary forwarded a brief article entitled, "Brethren, Pray for us," to the *Foreign Missionary*. In that article, he quotes his former professor at Princeton, J. Addison Alexander, to the effect that Paul's injunction to the Thessalonian Christians to pray for him (I Thessalonians 5:25) almost amounts to a commandment.[5] In this one instance, at least, McGilvary made a direct connection between what he learned at Princeton and his prayerful behavior as a missionary.

(5) In an 1872 letter to the Board, McGilvary responded to the news that it might not continue to send the *Princeton Review* out to the mission with the statement that he "would not like to forfeit the pleasure of its perusal." [6] The *Princeton Review* was a key forum for the dissemination of the Princeton Theology, edited by Charles Hodge himself. McGilvary, apparently, enjoyed reading it regularly.

(6) In 1874, McGilvary visited the Orthodox Congregational Theological Seminary in Hartford, Connecticut, and commented favorably on the fact that the professors were "all Orthodox men to the handle." He singled out one of them for special comment, writing, "Dr. Childs is a Princeton man, and interprets and teaches the Bible and the Shorter Catechism just as Drs. Hodge, Dabney or Plummer would." While he observed that the rest of the faculty all came "square up" to the accepted measures of Calvinist orthodoxy, it is notable that he singled out for special attention the one man from Princeton-and that he equated other Presbyterian theologians who were not directly linked to Princeton with Hodge.[7]

(7) The following year, 1875, McGilvary commended Dr. Cheek, newly arrived in Chiang Mai, as being a man who loved the Bible and Charles Hodge's theology.[8] Although this is a passing comment, it is again striking that McGilvary would equate the Bible and Hodge so intimately-or, for that matter, speak of someone "loving" Hodge's theology as if it were an object of evangelical piety.

(8) In his autobiography, McGilvary tells the story of how white ants once attacked his library "evidently not at all deterred by the learned discussions and deep thought of Dr. Joseph A. Alexander's *Commentary on Isaiah*." [9] J. A. Alexander, as we have mentioned previously, was one of his professors at Princeton.

These passing comments, when taken together, provide substantial, if still circumstantial evidence that Daniel McGilvary took Hodge, the Alexanders, Turretin, and the Westminster Standards as authoritative benchmarks for his own theology, and he assumed those standards as his own so completely that he felt little need to call them to attention. The theological contents of McGilvary's letters and papers, furthermore, are so entirely like what a Princetonian would write that it is impossible to believe the matter purely coincidental, particularly in light of the fact that his fairly extensive correspondence and other writings contain no such passing references unrelated to Princeton similar those cited above. McGilvary's views on revivalism provide an important case in point.

While still a youth, McGilvary attended a Methodist church for a time and experienced the white heat of an emotional, radical evangelical revival. It was an event that might suggest influences on his life apart from Princeton and the Old School. In Chapter One, we saw that Princeton took a cool and thoughtful stance on revivals; it was not against them, but it disdained what it believed to be the emotional excesses of radical, frontier revivalism. After his father died when McGilvary was thirteen, he moved to Pittsboro, North Carolina, where with relatives he went to the local Methodist church. He relates how, on one occasion, a Methodist revivalist of "considerable reputation" stirred the Pittsboro congregation into "great excitement and not little confusion-exhortation, singing, and prayer going on all at once." McGilvary himself remained somewhat aloof from the proceedings and did not share in the intense conversion experience some of his friends felt; of his own conversion, he writes, "One night, in a quiet hour at home, the grounds and method of a sinner's acceptance of Christ became clear to me, and He became my Lord." He gently criticized the Pittsboro revival with its exhortations to repent and believe as lacking "clear and definite instruction regarding the plan of salvation, or the offices and work of Christ." [10] How very like the Old School! Daniel failed to take part in the emotional upheaval of a Methodist revival but converted quietly, at home, and after things had become clear in his mind.

Subsequent events demonstrated how closely McGilvary adhered to Princeton's views on revivalism. In the last days of his pastorate in two rural North Carolina Presbyterian churches in 1858, he invited a guest preacher to preach at a communion service and at an evening service prior to the Sunday celebration of the sacrament. This preacher made a strong impression on the congregation, and McGilvary later reported that at the evening service there was a "deep seriousness throughout the congregation" that led to a desire to hold further services, which subsequently led to a series of evening meetings and a period of revival. [11] In his contemporary comments on the event, McGilvary emphasized the solemn, still nature of the evening prayer meetings; there was no excitement, no shouting, and seldom any sighing or calling aloud. Only the speakers' voices broke the silence; McGilvary insisted that a "spirit of prayer" prevailed throughout the revival, which spirit was most clearly seen in the congregations' quiet, intense attention during the services. He felt that this profoundly quiet spirit confirmed that the revival was truly God's work and not contrived by any human agency. [12] McGilvary's observations call to mind Archibald Alexander's warning that emotional revivalism only stirred up "feelings which belong almost entirely to our animal nature" and did not lead to a true "sincerity of love" or the true "character of God" at all. Alexander felt that such revivalism could end up being merely "an idol of our own imagination." [13] Had he still lived, he would have fully approved of the deeply quiet and thoughtful revival in McGilvary's churches.

McGilvary's views on science provide a second key instance of how he sounded and acted like a Princetonian. Princeton Seminary valued the inductive, or Baconian, scientific method and believed that science and theology complimented each other as vessels of divine truth. Hodge and his colleagues had a special fondness for natural science, so long as it was discrete in its methodology and respectful of the voice of its sister science, theology. [14] McGilvary shared both that fondness and those concerns. When he died in 1911, a colleague recalled that McGilvary gave place to none "in reverence for the truths of science" and in his respect "for the discoveries of research." McGilvary, he writes, "took pleasure in speaking and teaching the people of the revelations of science with which he kept in close touch for one living on the very borders of civilization." That colleague also noted, however, that McGilvary had no patience "for the advanced theories and acrimonious statements of criticism." [15] He was "unmoved and unannoyed" with "advanced theories and iconoclastic speculations of extreme criticism." One could hardly wish for a more clear statement of Princeton's own love for true science and its fear of false science.

Daniel McGilvary thought about revivalism like a Princetonian. He thought about science like a Princetonian. And he thought about theology like Princeton. One example, the seat of and the remedy for sin, will suffice here to reinforce the point that McGilvary articulated views on a variety of theological subjects remarkably similar to those of the Princeton theologians.

Charles Hodge believed that the human soul is a single entity comprised of heart and mind and that sin resides in the heart, the very depths of the soul. Sin, he felt, is an evil corruption of the heart. Hodge went on to state that regeneration of the heart and the whole soul requires knowledge of the truth—a knowledge that is objective and biblical—and it also requires the work of the Holy Spirit to make the truth effectual. Knowledge alone, without the Holy Spirit, cannot reach or change the heart. Those who learn the truth, acknowledge the wickedness of their heart, and feel the presence of the Spirit thereby experience regeneration and conversion, by which they obtain spiritual discernment and illumination. Their hearts are changed, their souls renewed.[16] The process of conversion, at its simplest then, involves the Holy Spirit energizing objective theological information aimed at reaching and changing the human heart.

McGilvary knew this process well. While he does not state his views as systematically and fully as Hodge, his correspondence emphasizes the wickedness of the human heart, and he evidently felt that the conditions of "heathenism" in Siam made it even more difficult for the northern Thai people to submit to the "humbling doctrines of the Gospel." Regeneration, according to McGilvary, involves a process of enlightenment by which truth works through the mind to affect a clear change of heart.[17] He summarized the whole process as follows,

God by His external providence may throw a man within reach of instruction but neither that providence nor that instruction will reach the heart unless the Holy Spirit attend it. It is not the force of logic, the power of arguments nor the eloquence of appeal, which leads men to the Saviour...God who commanded the light to shine out of the darkness must shine into the heart to give light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.[18]

Whether according to McGilvary or Hodge, the steps of regeneration are precisely the same: objective knowledge (instruction), the energizing attendance of the Spirit, and a changed heart.

One can multiply the examples of parallels between the precepts taught at Princeton and those articulated by Daniel McGilvary. Both, for example, had an intense commitment to the missionary cause.[19] Or, again, both exhibited a certain pattern of broad-minded and closed-minded attitudes that can be almost confusing at times. Hodge, for example, defied the common evangelical wisdom of his day by asserting the validity of Catholic baptism. Scovel states, "The Princeton group shared the anti-Catholic bias that pervaded almost all Protestant denominations in America, but they stopped short of identifying the Catholic Church or the Pope with Anti-Christ." [20] In this and other instances, the Princetonians began with a certain narrowness of mind and unpacked from it a broader view of things in a way that could contradict the thinking of more rigid evangelicals. So it was with McGilvary, who, attended the controversial World Parliament of Religions held in 1893 in Chicago. He later criticized those evangelicals who stood aloof from the event or were openly hostile to it. He admitted that, at first, the idea of participating on an equal footing with representatives from many other faiths shocked him as it did many others, but he concluded that it was a good idea because it afforded American Protestants with an excellent opportunity to present a strong Christian message to the best, most earnest adherents of other religions.[21] Both Princeton and McGilvary could be broad and closed-minded all in one stroke.

Daniel McGilvary never explicitly called himself a "Princetonian," and he probably would have thought it presumptuous to make such a claim, but he did consider himself an orthodox Calvinist who found strength and meaning in that system of doctrines.[22] Given his upbringing as an Old School Presbyterian, the three years he spent at Princeton Seminary, the wide influence that seminary had in his denomination, his own passing expressions of admiration for the professors at Princeton, and the several carbon-copy parallels between their thinking and his—given all of this, it is impossible to see McGilvary as anything less than a faithful son of Princeton who equated Calvinist orthodoxy with Hodge and company. There is one more given. Given his importance to the Laos Mission, it is a matter of serious consequence to the life and work of the Laos Mission that Daniel McGilvary articulated his faith in the accents of Turretin's Geneva and Reid's Edinburgh.

Would that we could give so thorough a portrait of Jonathan Wilson's views on Princeton, or even be as sure of it as we are of McGilvary's version. Wilson (1830-1911), unfortunately, did not write an autobiography or conduct as prolific a correspondence as McGilvary, but what we do know about the man suggests that Princeton loomed large in his thinking as well. Born in western Pennsylvania, one of the strongest centers of the Presbyterian Church, Wilson himself later attested to the importance of his home church, the Bethlehem Church, in his personal development.[23] Schmidt makes it clear that the Scottish and Ulster churches of western Pennsylvania and North Carolina shared the same immigrant Presbyterian culture, and we can only surmise that Wilson as a boy may also have been as impressed by the rites of the old Scottish communion festivals as was McGilvary.[24] Pennsylvania Presbyterians, in any event, knew Princeton quite well, a relationship illustrated by the fact that seven other Pennsylvanians entered Princeton Seminary with him in 1853, including a classmate from Jefferson College. The eight Pennsylvanians comprised nearly one-fourth of Wilson and McGilvary's class, which numbered 31. Some 29 students from Pennsylvania, furthermore, enrolled in the seminary for the 1853-54 school year, out of a total student body of 108.[25] After spending some time studying in the homes of two Presbyterian ministers, Wilson attended a church-related academy and then entered Jefferson College in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania. Upon graduating from Jefferson in 1851, he taught at Blair's Hall, Fagg Manor, Pennsylvania, for two years. Both Jefferson College and Blair's Hall had strong connections with William Tennet's "Log College," an eighteenth-century attempt to provide Presbyterian churches with American-trained clergy. The Synod of Virginia founded Jefferson College in 1802, and for a time the school served frontier Presbyterian churches as an important agency for training clergy. Blair's Hall shared a similar history, with many of its graduates going into teaching or the ordained ministry.[26] Wilson graduated from Princeton Seminary in 1856, and after graduation he worked for a year as a Presbyterian missionary to the Choctaw Indians of Oklahoma, teaching at the Spencer Academy.[27]

Wilson's letters and papers also contain clear traces of Princeton. He too, for example, shared in its love of science. One of his colleagues remembered, "Father Wilson was a poet and his name will always suggest to us the songs of Zion; but in theology and in natural science also he was a deep thinker. His Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia was studied and marked page by page showing no superficial reading." [28] Wilson himself proposed the use of both science and medicine as ways to undermine northern Thai confidence in "the muttering of charms and the incantations of the spirit-doctor." [29] In 1894, he had occasion to comment on the burning issue of biblical inerrancy, an issue that in 1893 had exploded on the floor of the Presbyterian General Assembly during the famous Briggs heresy trial. Wilson voiced himself in full support of the orthodox views championed by Princeton Seminary and admonished the Board of Foreign Missions to send to northern Siam only missionaries who rejected Higher Criticism.[30] Although we can speak with less certainty about his other theological views, they do seem to be well within Princeton's parameters, his views on heart and mind, for example, not being discernibly different from those described above for Hodge and McGilvary. The heart is wicked.

The way to reach it is through the mind with the aid of the Spirit.[31] He also supported the cause of evangelical revivalism, commenting in 1858 how happy he was to hear about the progress of revivals in the United States and elsewhere that year and how he trusted God would not pass by Siam either.[32]

The records we have leave us with no reason to doubt and every reason to assume that Jonathan Wilson was as much a child of Princeton as was McGilvary. This is not to say, however, that he was quite the exact duplicate that McGilvary seems to have been-for Wilson had what might be termed a "proto-romantic" streak or romantic-like inclination in him that appears to have cut a deeper channel than was usual for Princetonians.[33] Scovel has charged the good professors with being men of a bland, conventional piety who lived happily settled middle class lives. They were not prepared, he argues, to struggle with deeper tensions and anxieties, and he characterizes them as having limited religious experience and insists that the word "conventional" is an apt summary of their religious mentality and spirituality.[34] His description, probably not entirely fair in any event, certainly does not fit Wilson-or McGilvary for that matter. In Wilson's case, death had been a constant companion over the years, taking from him two wives and three children during his missionary career. Those deaths touched a deep, emotional core in him that flowed through his life in a mix of sorrow, joy, anger, and faith that eventually found expression in the lyrics of the hundreds of hymns he translated into northern Thai, including some he wrote himself. Hints of his romantic inclinations are also found in the flowery language of his tearful, emotional letters to the Board as one loved-one after another died.[35] It was in his hymns, however, that his colleagues most clearly saw the more poetical, semi-romantic side of his nature. Just after his death one of them wrote, "Dr. Jonathan Wilson was born with a poetic nature, but it was only after more than a life time of service had been given to other lines of missionary work that he began to put into permanent form the songs that had for years been thrilling his soul." [36] Wilson lived on the furthest frontiers of American Presbyterianism and cannot be written off as merely another bland, conventional Princetonian living a comfortable middle class life in central New Jersey. His romantic inclinations, however, still blended well with Princeton's scholasticism. Even as he advocated the joy of singing, thus, he mixed in with it the necessities of the mind, writing at one point, "May God grant us grace, not only to sing with the spirit and with the understanding, but also to teach with all wisdom, with all meekness and with all earnestness." [37]

The title "Princetonian" might be applied, possibly, to only one other pioneer member of the Laos Mission, Dr. Marion Cheek (1852-1895). Cheek arrived in Chiang Mai in March 1875 and for a time in the 1880s exerted some influence on the life of the mission, but for the period under study here Cheek was still a young, inexperienced missionary doctor finding his way into his work. He also made several trips down river to Bangkok, each of which took him away from Chiang Mai for months at a time.[38] We only have McGilvary's word for it, as already mentioned above, that Cheek loved the Bible and Charles Hodge's theology. He was not theologically trained, and his correspondence whether before or after 1880 contains nothing identifiably Princeton or even Old School. He did, however, write an article for a book published by the Board of Foreign Missions that shows that, at the very least, he shared the Old School's interest in science and Baconian induction. In that article, he contrasted northern Thai superstition and speculation to the Western medical methods of patient observation and intelligent experimentation.[39] What evidence we have, however, suggests that the Princeton Theology influenced Cheek only to a limited degree. McGilvary, at least, later complained to the Board that Cheek eliminated evangelism from his practice of medicine, something neither McGilvary nor his professors at Princeton could condone.[40]

The records of the Laos Mission indicate beyond any reasonable doubt that Princeton Seminary shaped the thinking of the two most influential figures in its early years, McGilvary

and Wilson. It possibly also had some minimal influence on Dr. Cheek, a minor figure before 1880. This leaves us with the remaining six members of the mission, five women and one man. The five women, interestingly enough, fall into a single category.

The Evangelicals

Although one catches the slightest hints of the Princeton Theology in the records of the mission's women, those records do not document a clear, direct link between the seminary and Chiang Mai. The mission's records do establish a connection between all five women and orthodox evangelicalism, although one must keep in mind that some of these individuals were born and raised after the distinction between orthodox and radical evangelicalism had lost much of its immediacy. In terms of the impact on the direction and administration of the Laos Mission up to 1880, however, the fact is that the mission's women had only a limited influence on its work. Cole and Campbell joined the mission at the very end of that era, in 1879. Sophia McGilvary and Kate Wilson arrived on the field as early as their husbands (see Table 2.1 above), but both of them gave birth to infants in 1868 and thereafter largely devoted themselves to raising their families. Kate Wilson also constantly struggled with ill health and generally could not contribute a great deal to the regular work of the mission. Sophia made a greater contribution, both in early evangelistic work and, later, in educational work, but in both cases her efforts were those of an assistant.[41] This is not to say that the two senior women were mere ciphers in the life of the Laos Mission, but it is apparent that in terms of theology and policy their voices were muted and complimented rather than contradicted the Princetonian theologies of their husbands.

Sophia Bradley McGilvary's (1839-1923) marriage to McGilvary may have raised some eyebrows in the "Board rooms" back in New York; she was born in Bangkok into a considerably different social and religious setting from that of her husband. Sophia's father, Dr. Dan Beach Bradley, grew up in the heart of the "burned-over district" of western New York, one of the key centers of the radical frontier revivalism of the Second Great Awakening.[42] He himself underwent a conversion experience in the white heat of those revivals and later adopted Finney's revivalist views on sinless perfection, which held that it is possible for humans to live free of sin, if they live the way Jesus did. The majority of orthodox evangelicals considered Finney's views outlandish and heretical, and Bradley had to withdraw from the mission he served, the ABCFM, because of them. His biographer notes that even his former mentor in New York City, Dr. Gardiner Spring, a Presbyterian minister with a revivalist background, rejected Bradley for having gone over to Finneyism. Sophia, thus, came from a New School, Finneyite background unacceptable to the Old School.[43]

McGilvary sought to reassure the members of the Board concerning his wife's theological legacy by explaining the truth of the situation to them, namely that Sophia was a woman of devoted piety who had been raised in a missionary family by the best of Christian parents. He stated of her family and father,

Their doctrinal views differed once considerably from our Old School standards-but one whose heart is so near right & who loves the Saviour & his cause so much as Dr. Bradley could not help from coming right. He possibly might not yet assent to some of our statements of doctrine but I've found him quite an orthodox Calvinist.[44]

There is little else we can say about Sophia's theology. She was raised in a pious, orthodox home and McGilvary, our theological barometer, felt no qualms about marrying her and into her family. The few records we have from her own hand add nothing to an understanding of her

doctrinal views, but so far as we can tell she seems to have generally shared in the larger American evangelical ideological orientation of which Princeton was a particular refinement.

As in the case of Sophia McGilvary, we also have relatively little information concerning the life and work of Kate Wilson (1833-1885), other than that she did some translation and writing and used her musical talents for the work of the mission. We can infer, however, something of her religious experience and, possibly, theological orientation from the fact that, when she left Chiang Mai permanently in 1876 because of illness, she moved to Oxford, Ohio, where she maintained a close association with the Western Female Seminary, located in that community. At those times when she was too ill to care for herself, she stayed at the seminary, and her children went to school there in what she called a "Christian environment." [45] Founded in 1853, the school grew out of a New England-based movement in women's education that went back into the 1820s and endeavored to promote Christian home life through training girls in a Christian environment. Helen Peabody, Western's founder, studied and taught at Mt. Holyoke Seminary in Massachusetts, one of the most influential institutions of the female seminary movement. Western emphasized domestic training, academic study, and Christian piety; students, as a rule, boarded at the school. The school also prided itself on the fact that between 1853 and 1880 forty-one of its graduates became missionaries. During the winter months of 1878, the school experienced a period of intense revival. [46] We can infer from Kate Wilson's long, close relationship with Western Female Seminary that she felt comfortable with the evangelical New England heritage of the school, a heritage grounded in the same orthodox wing of evangelicalism as the Presbyterian Old School.

Of the remaining three women, Sarah Bradley Cheek (1850-1933) might have exercised the most influence, but unfortunately, we know almost nothing about her role in the Laos Mission after she married Dr. Cheek in 1876, other than that she helped him as a translator. [47] We can only guess that her general religious orientation would have roughly approximated that of her stepsister, Sophia. Edna Cole (1855-1950) and Mary Campbell (1858-1881) were classmates and close friends at Western Female Seminary, Oxford, Ohio, where they graduated in 1878. During their last year, the school underwent its revival of 1878, mentioned above, which experience encouraged each of them to respond positively to a request from the Laos Mission for missionary teachers. They both had Presbyterian connections, Campbell's being the strongest. She came from Lexington, Kentucky, where her father served as a Presbyterian minister. Her father, furthermore, had attended Jefferson College, where he formed a close friendship with Jonathan Wilson. Edna Cole came from St. Louis and belonged to the Second Presbyterian Church there. [48] If we, again, turn to Daniel McGilvary for guidance, it appears that Western Seminary fell entirely within acceptable, orthodox parameters. He mentions in passing that he visited the school in 1880 while on furlough, surely partly to visit Kate Wilson and also to meet yet another student, Lizzie Westervelt, who was preparing for service with the Laos Mission. He noted with pleasure that the school was "pervaded by a deep religious righteousness." [49] Cole and Campbell's correspondence, additionally, suggests the kind of enthusiastic, pious, vaguely romantic orthodoxy that we would expect of missionaries who studied at Western and were acceptable to McGilvary: an abiding sense of trust in God's calling and a feeling of personal closeness to Jesus abounds. [50] Cole and Campbell did not arrive in Chiang Mai until 1879, at the very end of the period under study here, and played only a brief, minor role in the early history of the Laos Mission.

The Outcast

This leaves Dr. Charles Vrooman (1841-1882), the only pioneer member of the Laos Mission who failed to pass theological muster with McGilvary. In the very same letter to the Board in which he praised Cheek's love of the Bible and Hodge's theology, McGilvary wrote that

Vrooman had been a failure as a missionary because he lacked a strong foundation in religious orthodoxy, such as Cheek had.[51] Vrooman, a Canadian, trained at the Medical Department of the University of Michigan and arrived in Chiang Mai in April 1872. He stayed only for a short time, during which he suffered health problems and may also have experienced some interpersonal tensions with other members of the mission. He left Chiang Mai permanently in June 1873. McGilvary did not make clear the precise nature of Vrooman's theological failings, but in a letter to the Board, Dr. Samuel R. House of the Siam Mission complained of Vrooman that, "His doctrinal and denominational sympathies are all with the Wesleyan Church in which he was born and brought up." [52] It can be inferred from McGilvary and House's comments that Vrooman showed evidence of a Methodist Arminian piety, such as would be unacceptable to these committed Old School missionaries. He is, in any event, the exception that proves the rule in terms of the importance of Princeton to the study of Presbyterian missions in northern Siam.

Conclusion

If we were to total up Princeton's "scorecard" in Chiang Mai, it might look something like Table 2.2, below.

Table 2.2
Relationship of the Princeton Theology to the Members of the Laos Mission

Name	Importance to the Mission's Formation	Princeton Theology's Influence
D. McGilvary	Great	Great
J. Wilson	Great	Great
S. McGilvary	Moderate	Slight or None
K. Wilson	Moderate or Limited	Slight or None
M. Cheek	Limited	Moderate or Slight
S. Cheek	Slight or None	Slight or None
M. Campbell	Slight	Slight
S. Cole	Slight	Slight
C. Vrooman	Slight	None

This table is somewhat fanciful because we have so little information on the theological background of all the mission's members, except McGilvary and Wilson, but it does help to make several important points: First, Princeton's influence on the Laos Mission was by no means uniform. Second, that influence tended to be greatest over those with the most influence in the mission. Third, with the exception of Vrooman, Princeton seems to have had more sway among the men in the mission than the women, the men, again, being more influential. Finally, we can presume that the Princeton Theology did influence the formation of the Laos Mission, but it is still not at all clear what this presumption means or to what degree it is correct. We have not yet established, that is, a clear cognitive link between Princeton and Chiang Mai, however much the data contained in this section suggests that such a link must exist.

Another way to gain further insight into the ideological-theological relationship between the Princeton Theology and the formation of the Laos Mission is to look at the collective theology of the nine pioneer members of the mission and determine its congruence to the Princeton Theology. The greater that congruence, the more likely it is that Princeton influenced the Laos Mission's system of doctrines and meanings. What we are seeking to establish, in any event, is not so much the direct influence of the Princeton Theology per se on the Laos Mission as to discover whether or not the two shared a common or, at least, similar system of doctrines and meanings. The theological biographies of its early missionaries strongly suggests the possibility that they did have a common, or, at least, parallel system, and a comparison of Princeton's theological views with those of the members of the Laos Mission confirms the impression that a high degree of theological compatibility existed between the two.

The Theological Connection

Introduction

Assembling a cogent description of missionary theology in northern Siam up to 1880 is itself an exercise in Baconian induction, accomplished only by compiling many scattered, brief statements and passing comments, searching for major threads and cross-connections, and then seeking to give order to a theology that by its very nature seems to defy order. The result is a surprisingly rich, textured system of thought centered on the three themes of God, Heathenism, and Conversion-which were the mission's reworking of the traditional Reformed doctrines of Divine Sovereignty, Sin, and Salvation. The result is a system of religious thought wholly in keeping with Princeton.

God

The pioneer members of the Laos Mission affirmed, before all else and in all else, that God acts in human affairs and can be known through that activity. Much of what they wrote about God grew out of a heart-felt need to fathom divine activity, to the extent that epistemological issues weighed heavily in their thinking about God and the Christian faith. They expressed what they believed about God's active presence in human affairs in traditional Trinitarian terms, God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

The Father. The pioneer members of the Laos Mission centered their faith on the simplest of theological propositions: God acts. In an October 1876 letter to the Board, McGilvary observed that to that date the Laos Mission had experienced dizzying cycles of divine mercy and judgment, advance and decline, with one following the other so closely that the cycles mixed themselves into the same event. In an earlier article, he stated that those who had an honest, faithful attitude could plainly discern the workings of God's providence in this mélange of rapidly passing events.[53] Only rarely did the missionaries write that the God who acts is sovereign over the world, but that assumption suffused their theological reflections.[54] It informed, for example, their perception that God's divine justice held every person accountable for their sins. In a shipboard letter written while in route to Bangkok in 1858, McGilvary made it clear that the fact that all of the heathen stood under judgment was what motivated him to become a missionary in the first place. Nor were the missionaries excused from judgment, Wilson once sorrowfully speculating that perhaps God was using the deaths of his loved-ones to warn him to leave Siam.[55]

The pioneers of the Laos Mission more frequently looked upon God's sovereign relationship with them and the world in terms of grace, however, rather than as judgment and condemnation. When his two churches in North Carolina experienced a period of intense revival

before his departure for Siam, McGilvary praised God's "infinite goodness" for causing them to "witness unusual displays of his grace." [56] Wilson praised God's goodness when his daughter was born. McGilvary felt God's goodness in his calling to the mission field. Mary Campbell summed up the feelings of the members of the Laos Mission on these and many other occasions when she wrote that, "our Saviour has been so good to us, there is no room for gloom." [57] The missionaries experienced God's goodness, mercy, and providential care particularly in prayer, and the missionary literature points to numerous occasions when they felt God had answered their prayers. McGilvary once called God, the "Hearer of prayer," while Campbell marveled at "How wonderfully God answers prayer." [58] Indeed, even when individual members experienced "chastisements" in the guise of illness, obstacles, or even the death of a colleague or loved one, they still believed that God was acting the part of a stern but loving Father who used the rod of discipline to direct human behavior. In early 1873, for example, McGilvary met with "an old princess" in Lampang who had been going through serious family problems that she found difficult to reconcile with her devotion to making merit, merit which was supposed to free her from such problems. McGilvary wrote, "It was pleasant to be able to explain it as in all probability the fatherly strokes of her true and loving Father who I hope has purposes of mercy towards her." [59] Through it all, good times and bad, the pioneer members of the Laos Mission affirmed two simple principles regarding God's treatment of them: First, whatever happened was intended for good, whether or not they could discern that good. At a difficult stage in her first journey to Chiang Mai, Mary Campbell thus wrote, "What does it all mean? But we know it must mean love-the great wonderful love of God for us all." [60] Second, as McGilvary repeatedly affirmed, God "makes no mistakes." [61]

Their faith in an active, involved God encouraged the missionaries to discern God's will for them and God's intentions for their mission as a practical matter of knowing what to do and when to do it. Before finally deciding to become a missionary, McGilvary, for example, spent a full day in prayer and fasting, asking "for guidance." Many years later, when French authorities blocked his attempt to engage in evangelism among the Kamu tribal people of French Laos, he again turned to prayer for direction. [62] Wilson, we have seen, suffered the thought that God took his loved ones in death as a way of communicating divine will. In these and numerous other instances, the missionaries searched out events, the Bible, and their own hearts to try to discover what God intended them to do. Their concern with knowing God's will led the members of the Laos Mission to emphasize the importance of knowledge and study as the means for discerning that will. McGilvary, sounding very much like the Princetonian he was, claimed that the world can be converted to Christianity only through preaching and study of the Bible, arguing that just as faith is necessary to salvation so knowledge is necessary to faith. [63]

The Laos Mission obviously shared major elements of its understanding of God with all American evangelicals; that God is sovereign, just, and merciful was hardly news. [64] The Laos Mission's emphasis on epistemology, on the other hand, contained clear echoes of Princeton's Reformed confessionalism, which held that knowledge of God precedes faith. Factual knowledge of God's intentions is fundamental to carrying out one's Christian duty. Princeton also held that the understanding of God and God's divine, creative purposes is the axis upon which all of theology spins. [65] Hodge states, "This is a question which lies at the foundation of all religion. If God be to us an unknown God; if we know simply that he is, but not what he is, he cannot be to us the object of love or the ground of confidence. We cannot worship him or call upon him for help." His son, A. A. Hodge, argued that the fundamental questions of theology are ontological and epistemological, having to do with knowledge of divine reality and the revelation of God's will. [66] Taking into consideration the practical, opportunistic nature of missionary theology, there seems to have been little discernable difference, if any, between Chiang Mai and Princeton concerning the person and activity of God the Father. It is particularly striking how important the traditional Reformed concern for epistemology was to the members of the Laos Mission.

The Son. As a rule, the Laos Mission's first generation of missionaries drew little distinction between the Father and the Son. Although they accepted the doctrine of the Incarnation in a formal sense, they leaned so heavily toward Christ's divine nature as to leave little room for the sweaty, swarthy carpenter's son from Nazareth. McGilvary, early in his missionary career, thus referred to Jesus as "our gloriously exalted Saviour" who is "head over all things"; some fifty years later, he still thought of Christ as "the great sovereign of the universe" who has infinite merit with which to pardon the sins of humanity.[67] It even appears that the Laos Mission literature sometimes subsumes all of the Triune God in the Son, including both God's providential oversight of and the Holy Spirit's indwelling in humanity.[68] This was particularly true of Princeton's own sons, Wilson and McGilvary, who understood the formal distinctions between the Persons of the Trinity and still tended to affirm Christ's power and sovereignty as if he were the Sum Total of the Three. To that end, they occasionally used the term "Jehovah Jesus" for Christ, a term that explicitly links Jesus to the powerful Creator God of the Old Testament, who was the sovereign Lord, sinless, self-existent being, infinite and invisible Spirit, and the cause of all other beings.[69] Even when the missionaries did mention Jesus' humanity, they still placed it within the larger context of Christ's divine perfection and power. Edna Cole consoled a young, struggling student with the story of Jesus' life on earth, emphasizing that this same Jesus was now in heaven and could powerfully intercede for her. Many years later, McGilvary encouraged young Presbyterian missionaries to serve the poor by recalling that "Christ Himself was never so great as in His lowliest humiliation...It is the Lamb that was *slain* that is worthy of all glory and honor, dominion and power." [70] In the literature of the Laos Mission, Jesus' divine nature overwhelmed his humanity to the extent that the formal doctrine of the Incarnation all but disappeared.

The case is much the same in the work of the Princeton circle, although its members did acknowledge and maintain a formal balance between the divine and human natures of Jesus Christ. In actual fact, however, even Hodge's *Systematic Theology* devotes far more attention to Christ's divinity than his humanity, while Archibald Alexander could both affirm the doctrine of the two natures of Christ and still claim that "all who deny the deity of Christ, reject all the fundamental truths of the Christian religion" and those "who deny the divinity of the Saviour are to be considered as really unbelievers, as if they reject him altogether." [71] Hodge so strongly insisted on the divinity of Jesus that one of his former students and theological opponents, John W. Nevin, accused him of falling into the ancient heresy of Nestorianism, the belief that Jesus Christ had two distinct and separate natures. Nevin felt that Hodge's radical distinction between Christ's divine and human natures was "the reigning defect" of his theology.[72] As first year students, McGilvary and Wilson presumably heard Hodge share his views on Christ with the whole seminary community at the seminary's regular weekly Sunday afternoon conference of 4 September 1853-one of the very first conferences they would have attended. Dr. Hodge addressed that week's gathering on the topic, "Christ our Life" and described Christ as the creator, the object, and the end of each person's life. Christ saves us, delivers us from Satan's power, and is the author of our inward, spiritual lives. He concluded, "It is Christ for us to live. While others live for themselves; some for their country, some for mankind, the believer lives for Christ. It is the great end and design of his life to promote his glory and to advance his kingdom." [73] Sounding like McGilvary, above, James W. Alexander went so far as to suggest that we can most clearly see Christ's divinity in his human nature. He wrote, "In authority over tempests and evil spirits; in power to heal; in creative miracles; in searching of the heart; in amazing endurance, forgiveness and love; we behold more of God than all the universe reveals; and the point is, that it is revealed to man by man." Alexander also stated, "We may therefore affirm with confidence, that all the human character of Christ, as shown in his ministry on earth, is really a bright disclosure of the character of God, such as could be made only by the Incarnation." [74] William Henry Green, another of Wilson and McGilvary's instructors at Princeton, treated Christ as a grand "type" found throughout the Hebrew Scriptures and

particularly emphasized the way in which the characteristics ascribed to the Messiah all come together in the "wonderful person" of Jesus Christ.[75]

Princeton and Chiang Mai, in sum, agreed substantially in their Christology. Each gave formal assent to the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, while largely ignoring Christ's humanity or even seeing in it yet further affirmation of his divinity. They both gave their fullest, warmest attention to that divinity.

The Holy Spirit. Where the members of the Laos Mission in its pioneer era tended to meld their understanding of God the Father and God the Son into a single figure of divine power and glory, they generally distinguished more sharply the person and role of the Holy Spirit. They started, however with precisely the same affirmation, namely that God acts. As a general rule, the members of the Laos Mission found evidence of God's active presence in two places: when they examined external events and trends, they discerned God and Christ at work; but when they looked into the human heart, as we have already seen in McGilvary's case, they discovered the work of the Holy Spirit. McGilvary believed that God led him both providentially and spiritually, in external events and by the inner prompting of his heart.[76]

Although the missionaries could perceive the Holy Spirit in a moving worship service, in a deeply meaningful prayer, or in a revival, they most frequently associated the Holy Spirit with conversions. The Spirit, indeed, was the one and only cause of conversions. When the Laos Mission baptized its first convert, Wilson attributed the event to the Holy Spirit. Mary Campbell affirmed the presence of the Spirit in the lives of several of her students, who had declared their desire to receive baptism. She perceived "the quiet, deep working of the Spirit" in other students who had not yet come to that decision.[77] As McGilvary observed in 1875, fallen humanity needs mercy and pardon, "But till the Spirit of God enlightens the heart no one in the heathen or Christian lands feels this need. And the very light that is in the heathen has become darkness." [78] Even when McGilvary at times felt the burden of his missionary calling, he believed, "That sense of responsibility is itself the work of the Spirit, and it is his office to lead to Christ, to glorify Christ." [79] The work of the Spirit, then, is to bring people to the Saviour to the end that he might be glorified.

Missionary theology and psychology, thus, associated the work of the Holy Spirit with the inner workings of human nature, specifically the human heart. By this point, it will come as no surprise that the Spirit carried out precisely the same function in the Princeton Theology. Hewitt describes the Holy Spirit in Hodge's thought as being "the author of all truth and right knowledge" who provides "the necessary spiritual illumination for an appropriate response to God." Sin renders human nature blind, and humanity can be saved only through the "revelation of truth by the Holy Spirit." While the Princeton theologians made a distinction between conversion and regeneration that does not appear in the missionary correspondence and believed that conversion is a matter of personal choice, they retained a central role for the work of the Spirit in the larger work of regeneration. As Hewitt observes, "The sinner may and does respond to the truth when presented, but the presentation, to be effectual, must come from God in the person of the Holy Spirit." [80] The pioneer members of the Laos Mission may not have dwelt on the finer points of the process of regeneration and conversion, but they did express the same understanding of the underlying dynamic at work.

Conclusion. Princeton's theology was detailed, systematic, and precise. The Laos Mission's was sparse, practical, and opportunistic. Therein lies the most important difference between the two-for where Princeton worked out the implications of its theology in the details of its system, the Chiang Mai missionaries articulated those implications in programs, projects, and buildings more than in words, as we shall see in Chapters Four through Six. Both theologies

shared common doctrines concerning the triune God: God is active, powerful, just, and good. Jesus is divine. The Holy Spirit is essential to conversion. Knowledge leads to faith. Knowing God and God's will is crucial to right thinking-and to right acting. It will, obviously, become tedious if we keep making this same point over and over, but in the context of the study of the Laos Mission's system of meanings and doctrines, the fact of the important theological parallels between Princeton and Chiang Mai does bear some repeating. It is in those parallels that we hope to find explanations for missionary behavior, particularly in regards to the perplexing strategies they pursued in their evangelism.

Heathenism

Beginning with Calvin himself, Reformed confessionalism gave detailed attention to the question of human sin and worked out a radical exposé of depraved, rebellious, and totally corrupt human nature. We have already seen that Hodge and company gave a formal nod to its Reformed forebears in these matters but quietly distanced themselves from that tradition by taking a more optimistic view regarding the human situation. Hodge himself has been severely criticized by scholars for his naïvely optimistic appraisal of the ability of Christians to know God perfectly within the bounds of their human limitations.[81] It almost seems as if evangelical Princeton rendered the traditional Reformed doctrines of sin and election impotent.

The records of the Laos Mission, however, suggest that Princeton maintained the traditional, radical Reformed analysis of human depravity in its full force and for the bulk of humanity. Where the plight of the "heathen" received only occasional attention at Princeton, it dominated the theological thought of the missionaries. Edna Cole exclaimed in gloomy frustration, "Oh, these people are so bound by Satan's chains, so full of fear and superstition, that it is pitiable!"[82] McGilvary articulated this same theme of heathenism's pitiful bondage in a letter printed in the *Foreign Missionary* in 1869; he wrote,

As we look around on a scene that is well represented by Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones, and see a nation given to idolatry, and only two or three individuals to teach them the way of life, we would gather new courage and boldness in our request, and say, 'Now, we beseech you brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the perishing heathen's sake, and for ours, who are engaged in these strong outposts of Satan's kingdom, that you strive together with us in your prayers for us and the success of our labors.'[83]

The most potent symbol and consequence of the northern Thais' bondage was their idolatry, a matter McGilvary returned to frequently in his correspondence. Idolatry blinded the heathen. It lead them into the long-winded, vain repetitions long before condemned by Christ. Idolatry made them irreverent, just as it enslaved them to priest-craft.[84]

The other members of the mission agreed that the heathen are entirely depraved and without hope. Wilson, for example, once compared the heathen to angry and wicked wolves, while Mary Campbell described them as cruel and degraded.[85] In what appears to be something of a contradiction, the missionaries recognized that the northern Thai did display a number of admirable qualities. That recognition caused Kate Wilson to observe, in a bemused fashion, "To find the noble qualities of friendliness, kindness and gratitude amongst a people so morally degraded may seem contradictory, but it remains a fact." [86] Still, no particular factual contradictions of their system of doctrines and meanings could convince the pioneer members of the Laos Mission that their analysis of the heathen condition was incorrect. They were especially sensitive to what they considered to be heathen ignorance and superstition. Wilson herself described how the Laos Mission struggled to relieve suffering and misery during a malaria

epidemic and then went on to describe the ignorance, helplessness, and loneliness of the heathen. Cole argued that heathen ignorance rendered the northern Thai hardly fit for conversion because even after they became Christians they remained ignorant and dead. McGilvary summarized the matter of heathen superstition and ignorance most sharply when he stated that "the great want in heathen lands" was a sincere desire to know the truth.[87]

Hodge agreed with the Laos Missionaries entirely and would not have found their situation in Chiang Mai the least bit surprising. The sketch of the condition of first century heathenism contained in his commentary on Romans 1:18-32, indeed, seems very different from the slightly optimistic scholasticism described in the scholarly literature. He asserts there that the heathen in ancient times were vain, wicked, and foolish to the extent that these characteristics virtually defined their moral character. He writes with disdain, "Men cannot be *such* fools without being wicked." He calls them imbeciles, the evidence of the ruin of the human race. He takes special note of the "degradation and folly" of the heathen's religious beliefs, and lest we think he was more optimistic about contemporary heathenism, he states, "What Paul says of the ancient heathen is found to be true, in all its essential features, of those of our own day...Wherever men have existed there have they manifested themselves to be sinners, ungodly, and unrighteous, and consequently justly exposed to the wrath of God." When it comes to the heathen, Hodge's "noetic optimism" also vanishes as in a puff of smoke. He states, "The human intellect is as erring as the human heart. We can no more find truth than holiness when estranged from God..." He sums up the matter by stating that, "The punitive justice of God is an essential attribute of his nature. This attribute renders the punishment of sin necessary, and is the foundation of the need of a vicarious atonement, in order to the pardon of sinners." [88]

It is a measure of the congruity between Princeton and Chiang Mai that on in this instance the view from the field clarifies the perspective of the good professors at home. Sin, if it was heathen sin, was still an important issue for both, but the missionaries' experience in Chiang Mai made them more immediately sensitive to its effects. The missionaries, that is, were working out the implications of a theology distinctly similar to Princeton's in a context that highlighted certain elements of the Princeton Theology and, as we will see, muted others.

Conversion

The challenge the Laos Mission faced, given the condition of the heathen, was how to carry out God's plan for the salvation of the people of northern Siam. How could it make God's sovereignty over the North effective while bringing to an end the life-destroying darkness of heathenism? In a letter to the Board written in 1860, Wilson reported that the three Protestant missions in Bangkok were holding joint special services aimed at pointing particular participants to God. They had felt the presence of the Holy Spirit, appearing with an "enlightening power," in those services with the result that several individuals had given their hearts to Christ.[89] These comments highlight the three legs on which the missionary approach to the conversion of the heathen northern Thai stood: first, conversion required the divine intervention of God; second, God's intervention led to an enlightenment of the sinner through saving knowledge; and, third, the result was a change in the human heart.

Divine Intervention. This first theme, concerning the intervention of God, recalls the doctrines of God's sovereign lordship over the world and the essential role of the Holy Spirit in soul-winning, themes dealt with above. Other issues, however, are also involved, particularly having to do with such traditional Reformed doctrines as original sin, covenant, election, and redemption. Reformed theology, it will be recalled, worked out an elaborate federal schema that posited an original divine "covenant of works" with Adam and his posterity, which covenant was abrogated by Adam's rebellion and fall in the Garden. Sin, judgment, and damnation thus entered

the world. Federal theologians argued that God has subsequently and graciously established a second covenant, the "covenant of grace," by which the elect are redeemed through the sacrifice of Christ.[90] The Princeton professors were federal theologians, although as we have already seen their enthusiasm for the finer points of federal theology's emphasis on predestination had waned to a degree. The intricacies of Reformed federalism, in any event, had mostly dissipated by the time it reached the mission field, leaving behind an unambiguous certainty that God would bring salvation to northern Siam and a lack of clarity as to whether that salvation was intended for a chosen few or for the whole Laos nation. On the one hand, McGilvary affirmed that, according to the divine biblical promises, God "can and will gather in his own chosen ones." Wilson stated explicitly that God already had a chosen people in the North, and the missionaries' task was simply to locate them and tell them the story of salvation. Sophia McGilvary, in a published letter, called on her readers to pray for the northern Thai, particularly for "God's chosen people in North Laos." [91] On the other hand, the missionaries balanced their belief in the salvation of a particular, elect few with a strain of universalism quite out of keeping with classical federal thinking, which universalism was also based on what the missionaries took to be the divine promises of the Old Testament. They believed that those promises, in practice, assured the salvation of the whole northern Thai "nation." [92] The missionaries did not clarify what that national salvation meant in terms of the eternal fate of individual northern Thais. Missionary literature, otherwise, contains almost no evidence of a federal theology, although McGilvary did once affirmed that he gained strength from what he termed the great Calvinist doctrine that all of reality is structured by God's covenant.[93]

It appears, as best as we can tell from an admittedly sketchy record, that the pioneer members of the Laos Mission accepted Reformed federalism but did not place much emphasis on it. They believed that God would call only a chosen people in northern Siam, but they acted as if the chosen would include nearly all northern Thais. We have already seen that the Princetonians held a similar view of things, namely that while God determines who is saved and lost the Princetonians expected the bulk of the human race to receive God's grace. It is striking how much of their writings one can read without coming across the doctrines of election and predestination. As we have already seen, the seminary's professors constructed their Princeton Theology out of a number of major "blocks" of thought, and it is at such points as the question of who is saved, the chosen few or the larger masses of people, that we see them blending their confessionalism with their evangelicalism. That same blending process took place in Chiang Mai.

Heart and Mind. We have already dealt with the similarities between Princeton and McGilvary concerning the relationship of the heart, and the seat of sin, and the mind, as the channel for reaching the heart with saving knowledge. It is important to briefly recall that discussion in the context of the Laos Mission's views on conversion. McGilvary and company conducted their total program for the winning of northern Siam on two assumptions. First, the heart is the seat of piety and the theater of operation of the Holy Spirit in bringing people to Christ. Second, the mind is the most important avenue for reaching the heart. These assumptions, as we have already seen above, were Princeton to the core. They also lay nested in a set of simple doctrines that affirmed God's particular sovereignty over the human heart, the vile nature of the heart, and God's power to terminate Satan's stranglehold on it.[94] The members of the Laos Mission, thus, confidently affirmed that "all hearts are in God's hands," believing that God can change the hardest hearts.[95] They were also confident that the mind, meaning education, is the best way to approach the heart. Campbell may have pointed to the role of the mind and education as well as any member of the mission in a July 1880 letter in which she exclaimed of her students, "Oh, for a tongue to teach them more of the Saviour they have confessed, for they are such babes in their knowledge." [96]

Crucial knowledge, for the Laos Mission, came in two packages: the Bible and science—precisely what we would expect from a Baconian, Old School evangelical mission, as already described above. Biblical study lay at the core of Cole's instruction of her students in the girls' school and the mission's more general program for the training of its converts. Even before he moved to Chiang Mai, McGilvary asked the Board of Foreign Missions to support establishing a press there, arguing that the new mission's greatest need would be for the Bible, translated and printed in the language and script of the northern Thai people. More than a decade later, he argued that all of the progress the mission had made at that time in establishing Christianity in northern Siam was due to only two agencies, God and the study of God's word, the Bible.[97] Earlier in this chapter, we noted McGilvary and Wilson's interest in science; recalling his families' first months in Chiang Mai, McGilvary wrote, "But we were not merely teachers of religion, though primarily such. We could often, if not usually, better teach religion—or, at least could better lead up to it—by teaching geography or astronomy. A little globe that I had brought along was often my text." [98] He advocated the teaching of science in its role as a "handmaiden" of the Christian religion, because instruction in Western science initiated the process of tearing down the "gigantic systems of error" found in heathen countries; and he outlined the double process of evangelism we have described above, by which the mission had to first tear down the foundations of Buddhism-animism and then build up the edifice of Western Christianity in its place.[99] Science, thus, joined the Bible as being one of the key sources of knowledge the Laos Mission intended to communicate to the northern Thai in preparation for the saving work of God's Holy Spirit in the peoples' hearts.

Conclusion. Princeton's understanding of conversion and that of the Laos Mission were as closely parallel to each other as any of the other elements of their theologies, the key difference being the lack of theological details in the mission's records. Neither the professors nor the missionaries, for example, emphasized federal thought, but the professors still explained it while the missionaries largely ignored it. Princeton maintained a careful distinction between regeneration and conversion, one that also went missing in Chiang Mai. In spite of the fact, however, that the Laos Mission's records do not contain a systematic accounting of its members' theology, the parallels with Princeton are nonetheless striking. Both credited conversion to the work of the Spirit. They both believed that God had a chosen people in northern Siam, one that probably included most of the population. Both, again, looked to the mind as the best avenue to reach the heart. In all of these instances, the writings of the pioneer members of the Laos Mission echoed Princeton, however unsystematically.

Conclusion

Ends of chapters are happily chaotic with their multiple conclusions. The one just above brings the section of "Conversion" to its conclusion while the one below closes down the whole of this chapter. Here, in the middle of it all, our task is to recall briefly the larger set of parallels between the theologies of Princeton and the Laos Mission. Those parallels are pervasive when viewed from the mission's perspective; there seems to be no corner of theological reflection in which the pioneer members of the Laos Mission were truly creative or unique. Every major and minor theme in their doctrines have significant parallels in Princeton's books and articles, whether it be their views on the activity of God, the divine person of Christ, the role of the Holy Spirit, heathenism, or the nature of conversion. Which is to say that the Laos Mission shared in the remarkable conformity and consistency in theology that is one of the markers of the whole of the Princeton Theology, as the succession of Princeton theologians labored to preserve the theology Archibald Alexander introduced at the seminary in 1812 in its original form.[100] McGilvary, Wilson, and their colleagues in Chiang Mai did their small part to preserve the Princeton heritage. This does not mean that every one of them was a "product" of the Princeton Theology in a direct, overt manner. It does indicate, however, that the record of their theological

thinking is consistent with Princeton in general and in detail, and it contains nothing that would have fallen beyond the pale of acceptable orthodoxy as Alexander, Hodge, and their colleagues defined it.

Conclusion

The point just made in the above paragraph bears repeating in a still larger framework. In the light of the biographies of its nine pioneer members and the practical, opportunistic approach to doctrines contained in their correspondence and published writings, the conclusion is inescapable that the theology of the Laos Mission was typically Old School and closely akin to Princeton. In its own rough-cut and unsystematic way, the mission affirmed the grand themes of Reformed confessionalism, such as the sovereignty of God, the importance of knowledge of God, the depravity of the heathen, the role of the Spirit in salvation, the glory, dominion, and power of the Divine Christ, and the order of knowledge unto faith. Even in some of the details, such as the relationship of mind to heart and a skittishness about predestination, the Laos Nine bathed in the reflected, brighter, and more precise glory of the Princeton Theology. There were differences in emphasis, however, particularly having to do with the close attention that the mission gave to the condition of the heathen; but even here, as we have seen, Princeton agreed with the mission's analysis of that condition but did not feel the need to come back to it as frequently. It is safe to say that the "stripped-down" theology contained in records of the Laos Mission up to (and for long after) 1880 fell well within the parameters of Princeton.

The Laos Mission's kinship with Princeton Theology does not mean that the Princeton circle *caused* the mission's members to write, think, and behave as they did. The theological biographies of the pioneer members of the mission are too sketchy and diverse to make such a claim, as we have already seen, and the similarities between Princeton and American evangelicalism generally render the task of discerning explicit links between the Princeton Theology and the mission's behavior impossible. The distinct parallels between the two, on the other hand, are something more than a mere curiosity. They shared a system of meanings and doctrines that provides the student of the Laos Mission with access to a wealth of detailed data pertinent to missionary thinking. Where the records of the mission itself provide only disorganized glimpses of that system, the Princeton authors systematized it, defended it, and worked through its implications in debates running across several decades and in tomes upon articles upon sermons upon commentaries beyond counting. It is to a more detailed look at the Princeton literature and its system of doctrines and meanings that we now turn.

Notes

Abbreviations:

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AP	<i>American Presbyterians</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
BRPR	<i>Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
JAHA	<i>Journal of American History</i>
JER	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of Presbyterian History</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Social History</i>
NCP	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian</i>
NCP NS	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian New Series</i>

LN	<i>Laos News</i>
PQPR	<i>Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review</i>
SCJ	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>
WJT	<i>Westminster Journal of Theology</i>
WWW	<i>Women's Work for Women</i>

[1] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 20-3. For comments on Old School Presbyterianism in North Carolina, see Guion Griffis Johnson, *Ante-Bellum North Carolina: A Social History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1937), 36-41, 353. For a description of McGilvary's Highlander cultural and ecclesiastical heritage in North Carolina, see Cornelia Hudson, [Life of Daniel McGilvary], unpublished typescript, n.d., 1-7. For a history of his home church, see W. L. Lacy, "Buffalo Church: Centennial Address 1897," typescript copy, n.d.; For the history of one of the congregations he served as pastor, see John K. Roberts, *History of Union Presbyterian Church* (Carthage, North Carolina: Kelly Printing Co., 1910), esp. 16-7. And for a helpful description of the origins and importance of Scottish communion celebrations in the United States, see Schmidt, *Holy Fairs*, esp. 55ff, 65-6.

[2] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 21-2.

[3] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 33. The Alexander referred to here could be either Archibald Alexander, who had just recently died (1851) or J. Addison Alexander, his son and a member of the seminary faculty at the time McGilvary applied to study there.

[4] McGilvary, letter dated 31 May 1858, NCP 1, 35 (28 August 1858): 1. Concerning Flavel's influence on Alexander, see Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 22.

[5] McGilvary, undated letter, FM 28, 4 (September 1869): 8.

[6] McGilvary to Irving 27 September 1872, v. 3, BFM.

[7] McGilvary, letter dated 13 July 1874, NCP New Series 7, 344 (12 August 1874): 2. "Dr. Childs" was the Rev. Dr. Thomas S. Childs, a New England Presbyterian who graduated from Princeton Seminary in 1850 and subsequently served as a pastor and seminary and college instructor in Connecticut and Ohio. He published at least two articles in the *Princeton Review*. See *Encyclopedia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, ed. Alfred Nevin (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Encyclopaedia Publishing Co., 1884), s.v. "Childs, Thomas S., D.D."

[8] McGilvary to Lowrie, 8 November 1875, v. 3, BFM.

[9] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 179.

[10] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 27-8.

[11] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 41.

[12] Daniel McGilvary, "Revival in Moore County," NCP 1, 2 (8 January 1858): 1.

[13] Archibald Alexander, *Practical Sermons* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1850), 238, cf. 242. See also Charles Hodge, *Conference Papers* (New York: Scribner's, 1879), 338-39.

[14] See Charles Hodge, "The Unity of Mankind," BRPR 31, 1 (January 1859): 103-49; Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, 18ff; E. R. Craven, "The Inductive Sciences of Nature and the Bible." *Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review* (hereafter cited as PQPR) 6, 2 (October 1877): 673-88; Lyman Atwater, "Rationalism," BRPR 38, 3 (July 1866): 329-61; and Theodore Dwight Bozeman, "Inductive and Deductive Politics: Science and Society in Antebellum Presbyterian Thought," JAH 64, 3 (December 1977): 704-22.

[15] S. C. Peoples, "Rev. Daniel McGilvary, D.D. An Appreciation," LN 8, 4 (October 1911): 118.

[16] Charles Hodge, *Essays and Reviews* (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1857), 557ff, 567, 607-08; and Hodge, *Way of Life*, 53, 88-91, 105ff, 156-57, 207ff.

[17] McGilvary to Lowrie, 29 September 1858, v. 2, BFM; Daniel McGilvary to Orange Presbytery, 5 March 1859, NCP 2, 29 (16 July 1859): 1; Daniel McGilvary to the church & congregation of Carthage & Union, 1 September 1859, NCP 2, 51 (17 December 1859): 1; and Daniel McGilvary, "For the Family," NCP New Series 9, 427 (17 March 1876): 4.

[18] Daniel McGilvary, letter dated 31 May 1858, NCP 1, 35 (28 August 1858): 1.

[19] See David B. Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, vol. 1, *Faith and Learning 1812-1868* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1994), 187-88, 209.

[20] Scovel, "Orthodoxy," 275. See also Conkin, *Uneasy Center*, 228; Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 303-05; and, Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 64.

[21] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 370-71.

[22] See, for example, McGilvary's comment that it was the doctrines of Calvinism that sustained his family in their trying first months in Chiang Mai. McGilvary, "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. IV," NCP New Series 2, 80 (14 July 1869): 1.

[23] Wilson to Lowrie, 12 May 1880 and 23 July 1880, vol. 4, BFM.

[24] Schmidt, *Holy Fairs*, 65-6.

[25] *Catalogue of the Officers & Students of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, Princeton, New Jersey, 1853-54*. (New York: John F. Trow, 1853), 11, 13.>/p>

[26] "Jonathan Wilson," *Necrological Report [Princeton Seminary Bulletin]* (1912): 143-44; J. P. Wickersham, *A History of Education in Pennsylvania* (1886; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1969), 110-11, 400-03; Howard Miller, *The Revolutionary College: American Presbyterian Higher Education 1707-1837* (New York: New York University Press, 1976), 126-28, 187-88, 250; and Colin Brummitt Goodykoontz, *Home Missions on the American Frontier* (1939; reprint, New York: Octagon Books, 1971), 377-78.

[27] Daniel McGilvary, "Rev. Jonathan Wilson, D.D., An Appreciation," *Laos News* (Hereafter cited as LN) 8, 3 (July 1911): 78-81; and *Necrological Report*, 144.

[28] W. A. Briggs, "'Father Wilson,'" LN 8, 3 (July 1911): 83.

[29] Jonathan Wilson, undated letter, FM 31, 10 (March 1873): 307.

[30] Wilson to Speer, 12 June 1894, v. 11, BFM;. Concerning the Briggs Case, see Lefferts A. Loetscher, *The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church Since 1869* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954), 48ff; and Mark A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship, and the Bible in America* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), 11ff.

[31] See Wilson to Lowrie, 21 January 1860, v. 2, BFM; Jonathan Wilson, letter dated 7 February 1861, entitled "'Tokens of Encouragement' in Siam," FM 20, 2 (July 1861): 44; and Wilson to Rankin, 8 April 1862, v. 2, BFM. See also, Wilson, undated letter, FM 27, 10 (March 1869): 241.

[32] Wilson to Lowrie, 26 November 1858, v. 2, BFM.

[33] Given Koster's description of the romantic spirit in nineteenth-century America, it is clear that no true son of Princeton, Wilson included, can be considered a romantic in the formal sense of the term. The Princetonians would not have assigned primacy to nature over Scripture, for example, or emotion over reason. Still, that description suggests that the Princetonians could have shared some traits or inclinations with romanticism,

particularly in the love of nature and the valuation of emotion, without being romantics as such. Wilson is a case in point. See Donald N. Koster, *Transcendentalism in America* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975), 8.

[34] Scovel, "Orthodoxy," 1-4.

[35] See, for example, Wilson to Lowrie, 7 June 1860, v. 2, BFM; and Wilson to Lowrie, 7 February 1861, v. 2, BFM.

[36] James W. McKean, "Dr. Wilson's Laos Hymnal and its Value to the Laos Church," LN 8, 3 (July 1911): 82.

[37] Wilson, undated letter, FM 27, 10 (March 1869): 241.

[38] In the early 1880s, Cheek began to conduct private business affairs, and by 1886 he ceased all but nominal involvement in the mission to become a full-time businessman and teak trader. W. S. Bristowe, *Louis and the King of Siam* (London: Chaoot & Windus, 1976), 69-71.

[39] Marion Cheek, "Treatment of the Sick," *Siam and Laos as Seen by Our American Missionaries*, ed. Mary Backus (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1884), 511-24.

[40] McGilvary to Mitchell, 12 March 1886, vol. 5, BFM.

[41] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 77ff.

[42] The classic study of the Second Great Awakening in western New York State is Cross, *The Burned-Over District*. See also Paul E. Johnson, *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978); and Mary P. Ryan, *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

[43] Lord, *Mo Bradley*, 116-27, 129. On Finney and later American Revivalism, see William G. McLoughlin, Jr., *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham* (New York: Ronald Press, 1959). The Princeton theologians, as would be expected, had a generally negative view of Finney and his theology. See Scovel, "Orthodoxy in Princeton," 184-86.

[44] McGilvary to Lowrie, 17 October 1860, v. 2, BFM.

[45] K.M. Wilson to Lowrie, 24 August 1880, vol. 4, BFM; J.C.H., "Chieng Mai, Northern Siam," *Woman's Work for Woman* (Hereafter cited as WWW) 9 (April 1879): 136-8; and McGilvary, "Rev. Jonathan Wilson, D.D., An Appreciation," 78-81.

[46] "Annual Report of the Principal of the Western Female Seminary, 1871" (Oxford, Ohio: W.A. Powell, 1871); Olive Flower, *The History of Oxford College for Women 1830-1928* (Oxford, Ohio: Miami University Alumni Association, 1949), 51; *Memorial: Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Western Female Seminary* (Indianapolis: Carlton & Hollenbeck, 1881), 3-11, 222-23; and Helen Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell: A Brief Record of a Youthful Life* (Cincinnati: Silvis and Smith, 1881), 9-10. See also Leonard I. Sweet, "The Female Seminary Movement and Woman's Mission in Antebellum America," CH 54 (March 1985): 41-55.

[47] McGilvary to Irving, 12 August 1876, v. 3, BFM.

[48] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 12-3, 15. Cole went on to a distinguished, highly influential missionary career as the principal of Wattana Wittiya Academy in Bangkok. Mary Campbell's life came to a tragic end when she drowned in the Chao Phraya River on 8 February 1881.

[49] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 238; Daniel McGilvary, Letter, 29 April 1879, FM 38 (September 1879): 187; and, "Movements of Missionaries," FM 37 (November 1878): 185.

[50] See Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 17ff.

[51] McGilvary to Lowrie, 8 November 1875, v. 3, BFM.

[52] House to Irving, 12 August 1873, v. 3, BFM. For a description of tensions between American Calvinists and Methodists in this period see Gary Scott Smith, *The Seeds of Secularization: Calvinism, Culture, and Pluralism in America, 1870-1915* (St. Paul: Christian University Press, 1985), 26-8. In his autobiography, McGilvary remembered that Vrooman had attended "Dr. Cuyler's church in Brooklyn." McGilvary, *Half Century*, 149. Dr. Theodore Ledyard Cuyler graduated from Princeton College in 1841 and Princeton Seminary in 1846. He played a major role in the revival of 1858 in New York City as pastor of the Market Street Reformed Church. He then became pastor of the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, in 1860. Under his leadership, the Lafayette Avenue Church became one of the largest churches in the PCUSA. See *Encyclopedia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, s.v. "Culyer, Theodore Ledyard, D.D." Vrooman's association with Cuyler's church serves as a reminder that proximity to Princeton graduates does not necessarily imply influence.

[53] McGilvary to Irving, 9 October 1876, v.4, BFM; and McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," NCP New Series 7, 354 (21 October 1874): 4.

[54] See, for example, McGilvary to Lowrie, 4 February 1865, v. 3, BFM; Wilson, undated letter, FM 27, 10 (March 1869): 241; and C. W. Vrooman, letter dated, 6 February 1872, FM 31, 2 (July 1872): 52.

[55] McGilvary, letter dated 8 March 1858, NCP 1, 12 (19 March 1858): 2; and Wilson to Lowrie, 26 October 1861, v. 2, BFM.

[56] McGilvary, letter dated 19 March 1858, NCP 1, 34 (21 August 1858): 1.

[57] Wilson to Lowrie, 21 May 1859, v. 2, BFM; McGilvary to Wilson, 18 February 1860, v. 2, BFM; and Campbell, letter dated 18 March 1879, in Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 22.

[58] McGilvary, undated letter, FM 28, 4 (September 1869): 80-4; and Campbell, letter dated 26 March 1879, in Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 22. See also, Wilson to Lowrie, 7 June 1860, v. 2, BFM; and McGilvary, undated letter, FM 27, 10 (March 1869): 242.

[59] McGilvary to Irving, 28 February 1873, v. 3, BFM.

[60] Quoted in Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 20. Emphasis in the original.

[61] McGilvary to Mitchell, 9 December 1885, v. 5, BFM; and McGilvary to Mitchell, 2 September 1886, v. 5, BFM.

[62] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 40; and Lillian Johnson Curtis, *The Laos of North Siam* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1903). 305-08.

[63] Daniel McGilvary, "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. I," NCP New Series 2, 77 (23 June 1869): 1.

[64] For Princeton, see, Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, 406ff; and A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology* (1879; reprint, Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972), 149ff.

[65] See A. A. Hodge, *The Confession of Faith* (1869; reprint, London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1958), 84; and Conkin, *Uneasy Center*, 224.

[66] Charles Hodge, "Can God be Known?" BRPR 36, 1 (January 1864): 122; and A. A. Hodge, *Confession of Faith*, 17.

[67] McGilvary, letter dated 10 June 1858, NCP 1, 40 (2 October 1858): 2; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 174-75.

[68] Campbell to Parents, 4 January 1879, in Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 17; Campbell, letter dated 19 April 1879, WWW 9, 11 (November 1879): 389; and Campbell, letter dated 25 February 1879, in Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 20-1.

[69] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 81, 181-82; Wilson, letter dated 28 July 1870, FM, 29, 7 (December 1870): 186; Wilson to Lowrie, 21 January 1860, v. 2, BFM; and Wilson to Irving, 24 April 1872, v. 3, BFM. Compare Hodge's statement that the Jehovah of the Hebrew Scriptures and Jesus of the New Testament are the same divine person. Charles Hodge, "Christianity without Christ," PQPR 5, 18 (April 1876): 352.

[70] Cole, undated letter, WWW 11, 7 (July 1881): 224-26; and Daniel McGilvary, "The Consciousness of Divine Vocation," in *Counsel to New Missionaries: From Older Missionaries of the Presbyterian Church* (New York: Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., 1905), 9. Emphasis in the original.

[71] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, 483ff, vol. 2, 378ff; and Alexander, *Practical Sermons*, 91, 143.

[72] Cited in E. Brooks Holifield, "Mercersburg, Princeton, and the South: The Sacramental Controversy in the Nineteenth Century," JPH 54, 2 (Summer 1976): 244; and Nichols, *Romanticism*, 103-4. Hodge makes a formal distinction between the two natures, divine and human, and the one divine person of Christ. While he strives to maintain that Jesus was fully human, Hodge understands Christ to have been only temporarily human and only for the legal necessity of having to make restitution for Adam's original sin. For Hodge, the central problem of the Incarnation is explaining how God could become a man. Compare Schleiermacher's discussion of the Incarnation, in which he struggles with the question of how a man could also be God. Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith*, eds. H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), 380ff. The contrast between Schleiermacher and Hodge underscores Hodge's fundamental commitment to the divinity of Christ and more largely, to the doctrine of the sovereignty of God: if Jesus is God then his greatness and sovereignty must stand before all else. How God *could* become an actual man was a serious problem for Hodge and his colleagues.

[73] Hodge, *Conference Papers*, 54-5.

[74] Alexander, *Discourses*, 99, 103.

[75] William Henry Green, "The Matter of Prophecy," BRPR 34, 4 (October 1862): 568, 573.

[76] See McGilvary to Lowrie, 26 March 1863, v. 2, BFM.

[77] Wilson to Irving, 27 January 1867 [sic. 1869], v. 3, BFM; and Campbell, quoted in Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 32.

[78] McGilvary, "For the Family," 15 November 1875, NCP New Series 9, 427 (17 March 1876): 4.

[79] McGilvary to Lowrie, 15 June 1861, v. 2, BFM.

[80] Glenn A. Hewitt, *Regeneration and Morality: A Study of Charles Finney, Charles Hodge, John W. Nevin, and Horace Bushnell* (Brooklyn: Carlson, 1991), 60-1.

[81] See Danhof, *Dogmatician*, 187-88; McAllister, "Nature of Religious Knowledge," 307ff.; and Kennedy, "Sin and Grace," 165-66.

[82] Cole, undated letter, WWW 10, 11 (November 1880): 390.

[83] McGilvary, undated letter, FM 28, 4 (September 1869): 82. Emphasis in original. The biblical reference is to Ezekiel 37.

[84] McGilvary, letter dated 21 June 1858, NCP 1, 47 (20 November 1858): 1; McGilvary, letter dated 7 September 1858, NCP 2, 20 (14 May 1859): 1; and D. McGilvary, letter dated 10 October 1876, FM, 35, 9 (February 1877): 284.

[85] Wilson to Lowrie, 26 October 1861, v. 2, BFM; and Campbell, undated letter, WWW 9, 4 (April 1879): 336-37.

[86] Mrs. Wilson, "From Bangkok to Cheung Mai," *Siam and Laos*, 466.

[87] K. M. Wilson, "Shadows in Laos," WWW 14, 5 (May 1884): 149; Cole, undated letter, WWW 13, 3 (March 1883): 83-4; and McGilvary, undated letter, FM 28, 3 (August 1869): 59.

[88] Charles Hodge, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 1846), 36-41.

[89] Wilson to Lowrie, 21 January 1860, v. 2, BFM.

[90] See, Weir, *Origins of Federal Theology*; and McCoy and Baker, *Fountainhead of Federalism*.

[91] McGilvary, undated letter, FM 28, 3 (August 1869): 60; Wilson to Irving, 14 January 1880, v. 4, BFM; and Mrs. McGilvary, undated letter, WWW 8, 11 (November 1878): 310.

[92] See Wilson to Lowrie, 26 November 1858, v. 2, BFM; Wilson to Irving, 24 April 1872, v. 3, BFM; and McGilvary to Irving, 7 October 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[93] McGilvary to Irving, 18 January 1881, v. 4, BFM.

[94] McGilvary to Lowrie, 29 September 1858, v. 2, BFM; McGilvary to Orange Presbytery, 5 March 1859, NCP, 1; McGilvary, letter dated 21 June 1858, NCP, 1; and Cole, undated letter, WWW 12, 12 (December 1882): 411.

[95] Wilson to Rankin, 8 April 1862, v. 2, BFM; and McGilvary, "Blessed Are Ye that Sow Beside All Waters," NCP, 2, 19 (May 1859): 1.

[96] Campbell, letter dated 30 July 1880, in Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 32-3. See also, McGilvary to Lowrie, 9 October 1862, v. 2, BFM; McGilvary to Irving, 12 January 1869, v. 3, BFM; and McGilvary, letter dated 20 May 1863, entitled "Light Strokes and great Mercies at Petchaburi," FM 22, 6 (November 1863): 152-53.

[97] McGilvary to Lowrie, 10 May 1864, v. 2, BFM; and McGilvary to Irving, 6 March 1877, v. 4, BFM.

[98] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 79.

[99] McGilvary, "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. V," NCP New Series 2, 81 (21 July 1869): 1.

[100] See Loetscher, *The Broadening Church*, 23; Scovel, "Orthodoxy," 155; and Calhoun, Princeton Seminary, 346.

CHAPTER THREE

The Princeton System of Doctrines and Meanings

Outline of the Chapter

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [Theological Foundations](#)
 - 2.1. [Principles](#)
 - 2.2. [Piety](#)
 - 2.3. [In Defense of Orthodoxy and Reality](#)
3. [Theological Strands](#)
 - 3.1. [Boundaries](#)
 - 3.2. [Knowledge of God](#)
 - 3.3. [Truth](#)
 - 3.4. [Moderation](#)
4. [Conclusion](#)
5. [Notes](#)

Introduction

The nine pioneer members of the Laos Mission took a set of working principles and ideas with them to Chiang Mai that demonstrated striking, if roughly hewn, parallels to the Princeton Theology. While, as we saw in Chapter Two, it is impossible to gauge precisely the direct impact Princeton had on Chiang Mai, a number of impressions stand out. First, Princeton did, possibly, have some immediate influence on the Laos Mission through the persons of McGilvary and Wilson, most particularly McGilvary-the evident theological parallels and his passing, entirely unaffected references to the Princetonians and to Reformed confessionalism encouraging such a conclusion. Second, the theological expressions of the other early members of the mission and McGilvary's theological accreditation of some of them leave the strong impression that all but Vrooman shared Princeton's general theological orientation. Even Vrooman had some contact with Princeton, through the pastor of the church he attended in New York City. Third, apart from a few of McGilvary's theological comments, the missionary record does not contain the Princeton Theology as such, if by the "Princeton Theology" we mean the clearly articulated, self-conscious system of doctrines found in Archibald Alexander's *A Brief Outline of the Evidences of the Christian Religion*, Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, or A. A. Hodge's *Outlines of Theology*. The missionaries' writings do contain evidence of a Reformed confessional system of doctrines like Princeton, but such hints of Princeton do not in and of themselves constitute the Princeton Theology in a formal sense, even in the case of Dr. McGilvary.

The Laos Mission did not transport the full set of Princeton's system of doctrines to Chiang Mai, although strong traces of many of its doctrines remained. It did import a system of doctrines and meanings that it in all probability received partly from Princeton through McGilvary and Wilson and otherwise shared in varying degrees with the great majority of American evangelicals. The Princeton Theology is, thus, important to the study of Presbyterian missionary thought and behavior in northern Siam primarily and most importantly because it provides a wealth of well-organized, carefully written material from which to mine the system of meanings and doctrines shared by the members of the mission. These direct and indirect links

between Princeton and the Laos Mission are not merely a matter of curiosity. They offer, if the thesis of this dissertation is correct, "substantial insights into the system of doctrines and meanings of the Laos Mission, which system comprised a key source of missionary behavior in the years from 1867 to 1880." They help to explain, again if our thesis is correct, why the mission failed to present its message in ways that facilitated rather than obstructed that message's acceptance by the vast majority of northern Thais.

An appreciation of the system of theology taught at Princeton is thus important to our more focused understanding of the pattern of events in Chiang Mai and the missionary system of doctrines and meanings that subsumed those events. We cannot base that appreciation, however, on the tables of contents of the Princeton circle's major works. One must look to the less obvious ways in which the Princeton theologians structured their thinking as they created their tables of contents, wrote their articles in the *Princeton Review*, and taught their students at the seminary.

To anticipate what follows, we will see that Princeton operated from a set of theological principles, which it believed are revealed in the Bible and implanted in human consciousness. It held that the Holy Spirit uses these principles to inform the Christian mind concerning divine truth and enthuse the Christian heart with the power of that truth. The Princeton circle believed that its principles and the truth comes from God and must be absolutely distinguished from all that is evil, immoral, and false. They branded anything that contradicted their principles with the labels of impiety, heathenism, and, ultimately, Satan. The Princetonians claimed, in defense of their principles, that faithful Christians are able to know God and the truth, as opposed to infidels and heathens who know neither God nor truth. They assumed, once again, that any system of theology, philosophy, or morals that contradicted the Princeton Theology also contradicted divine truth. Taken as a package, this set of ideas amounted to a closed system of thought that purposefully, systematically eschewed even slight deviations from what it understood to be orthodox Calvinism. When removed to northern Siam, this closed theological system functioned, in effect, like an ideology, which encouraged the early members of the Laos Mission to take an antagonistic attitude towards northern Thai culture and religious consciousness. Their failure to shape their message to communicate effectively within the northern Thai context followed like night follows day.

Theological Foundations

Introduction

Old School Presbyterians, including the Princeton professors, found antebellum America a challenging and, in some ways, an aggravating venue for theological reflection. The Enlightenment's radical skeptics had already initiated a frontal assault on organized Christianity, charging it with the crimes of superstition, ignorance, and spiritual totalitarianism. Romanticism's devotees passionately joined the chorus of criticism, while in New England, supposedly orthodox Calvinists experimented with "new" theologies, which the New School was introducing into the Presbyterian Church itself and which the Old School believed shaded off into heresy. Emotional frontier revivalism, and German skepticism, meanwhile only added to the pressure felt by those who cherished Reformed orthodoxy. This contentious context confronted the Reformed tradition's defenders with a two-fold challenge: first, they had to preserve orthodoxy. Second, they had to shape their defense of orthodoxy to the intellectual and spiritual currents of their time, currents dominated by the moderate Enlightenment and smitten with Baconian common sense thought. They had to defend orthodoxy, that is, in a Scottish mode. In the process, the Princeton circle created a system of meanings and doctrines that drew on both the principles of Reformed theology and evangelical piety.

Principles

Theological reflection at Princeton invariably began with certain fundamental principles, assembled through a process of combining the traditional theological principles of Reformed confessionalism and the first principles of Common Sense Philosophy. The Reformed tradition, from the time of Calvin's successor, Beza, operated on the basis of a collection of theological principles, *principia theologiae*, which principles it held to be biblical, necessarily true, immediately knowable, and normative.[1] The Scottish philosophers, in their turn, claimed the existence of another set of principles that are immutable, commonsensical, known intuitively, self-evident to all normal and unprejudiced people, impossible to reject, real, true, and planted by God in the constitution of human nature itself.[2] Princeton merged these two views of fundamental or first principles, thus grounding its system of meanings in a doubly solid and well-established panoply of basic presuppositions, variously listed and described.

Princeton, taking its cue from its Reformed heritage, consistently sought to ground its theological principles in the Scriptures, embracing the Bible as its unquestioned source for all religious truths. William Henry Green, a member of the seminary faculty for over fifty years, stated that the Bible is an "infallible communication from God" ruled over by the "immediate voice and hand of God." He rejected out of hand any and all doubts and criticisms of the Bible that questioned its authority, arguing that such doubts only left the doubter stranded in a vacillating, indecisive darkness.[3] Alluding to the ground of Princeton's theological principles, he also stated, as we saw in Chapter One, that the Princetonians rejected any doctrines or views that "the word of God, honestly expounded, will not sanction." [4] Princeton, in sum, based its basic principles on the infallible and immediate authority of God's Word, a strong and sure foundation on which to build its theology.

Princeton, also taking its cue from Common Sense Philosophy, just as consistently sought to root its theological principles in common sense. In his argument for the universality of religion, Archibald Alexander reasons that human nature must have a religion of one kind or another, that all peoples have a capacity for religion, and that, as a result, no nation has ever been found without religion. He concludes that, "these principles of our nature are so deeply radicated, that they never can be removed." Charles Hodge followed a similar line of reasoning in his argument that humanity is composed of two substances, body and soul. He contends that, "The idea of substance is one of the primary truths of the reason. It is given in the consciousness of every man, and is therefore a part of the universal faith of men." He went on to assert that, "it is intuitively certain that matter and mind are two distinct substances. And such has been the faith of the great body of mankind." [5] Princeton, thus, also established its fundamental principles on the consciousness and commonly held beliefs of humanity, which again provided it with a secure, trustworthy foundation on which to build its systems of meanings and of doctrines.

Princeton availed itself of the best of two worlds, Reformed confessional theology and Scottish Enlightenment philosophy. Hodge summed up his argument for the existence of both soul and body with the ringing affirmation that, "It is the common belief of mankind, the clearly revealed doctrine of the Bible, and part of the faith of the church universal, that the soul can, and does exist, and act after death." His principle was that body and soul are separate, real entities, and he based that principle on considerations that were at one and the same time commonsensical, biblical, and orthodox. Archibald Alexander put the matter more generally and simply, stating, "But it is reasonable to believe what by our senses we perceive to exist; and it is reasonable to believe whatever God declares to be true." [6] It is reasonable, that is, to depend on common sense and the Bible, the repositories of, respectively, sensible and religious truths. Alexander also wove an orthodox evangelical sense of spiritual renewal into the fabric of these

principles by equating the knowledge of them with the work of the Holy Spirit. He held that the Holy Spirit alone provides the illumination or enlightenment necessary to fully understand basic theological principles.[7] Only converted, enlightened Christians, according to Alexander, can gain full knowledge of the fundamental principles that subsume all of reality, including most particularly the Christian religion itself.

The Princeton theologians offered various lists of confessional-commonsensical first principles, depending on the particular issue or topic under discussion. Hodge, for example, provides a list of basic assumptions, or principles, in his argument that we can understand the nature of God by abstracting human characteristics to their perfect state, namely that humanity knows and God is all knowing and that humans love and God is perfect love. He writes,

The ground, or reason, why we are authorized to ascribe to God the perfections of our own nature, is that we are his children. He is the Father of spirits; we are of the same generic nature with him; we were created in his image; we are, therefore, like him, and he is like us. This is the fundamental principle of all religion.[8]

Hodge's first principles, in this case, include: God is the Father of Spirits. We share in God's generic nature. God created us in God's image. Taken together, these principles reveal another first principle, fundamental to all others, namely that we are like God and God is like us. The Princeton circle habitually created and used such lists of first principles, as can be seen from the example of their more general views on the Bible. They believed that Christ, for example, is the central theme of the Hebrew Scriptures, that particular books or parts of the Bible are inspired, that God's revelations in nature and in the Bible supplement rather than contradict each other, and that biblical scholars should be limited to dealing with strictly objective, factual data in the Bible.[9] The possibilities for laying down such principles were virtually limitless, although controlled by Princeton's understanding of its Reformed heritage, the Bible, and human consciousness.

In a sense, both Hodge's immediate list of principles and the one extracted from Princeton's views of the Bible appear to be merely lists of narrowly constructed religious doctrines. What transformed them into principles that are more general was the unequivocal manner in which Princeton associated them with human consciousness. Hodge argued that any refusal to accept the basic doctrines of the Christ faith constitutes an offense against reason and God. Those doctrines are "sustained by a well authenticated revelation of God," a revelation that is proved by the same weight of evidence that our senses and consciousness provide us concerning external and internal realities. Hodge claimed that disobedience to the divinely given commonsense principles of human consciousness is unreasonable and constitutes rebellion against God.[10] He almost unconsciously leaped, that is, from doctrines to consciousness to commonsense principles, thereby translating Reformed orthodoxy into the idiom of Common Sense Philosophy. He could just as easily vault in the other direction, jumping from philosophy to theology. In his classroom lectures on systematic theology, for example, Hodge provided his students with three commonsensical principles to explain why Christians must place their religious trust in common sense: first, our very nature, as God created it, leads us to trust the testimony of our senses; second, placing confidence in our senses is thus the same as trusting God; and, third, all revelation is first addressed to the senses, be it hearing the Word preached or seeing it through reading.[11] Where earlier generations of orthodox Reformed savants drew only on Geneva for their principia theologiae, Princeton also called upon Edinburgh's first principles in order to reinforce their own principles in a manner relevant to an age that put great store, as we have seen, in the Scottish Enlightenment.

One can judge Princeton's principles in at least two different ways. On the one hand, some scholars criticize both the common sense philosophers and the Princeton theologians for arbitrarily turning anything and everything convenient to their own prejudices into supposedly unassailable first principles. Loetscher observes, "When used loosely, without the safeguards that the father of the Scottish philosophy [Reid] sought to place upon them, the concept [of first principles] could easily be made to endorse many a dogmatism." [12] Taylor claims that Archibald Alexander did precisely that. He transformed his own theological views on biblical inspiration, the workings of providence, and the authority of the Bible into commonsensical first principles of human consciousness. This approach, Taylor contends, prevented Archibald from accepting any views on the text of the Bible that contradicted his own, because in Alexander's view, "the results of any legitimate critical inquiry into the texts would necessarily corroborate the orthodox understanding of the scriptures." [13] Princeton's use of Reformed and Enlightenment strategies in tandem has left them open, in sum, to the charge of creating a self-serving, closed doctrinal system impervious to contradiction. On the other hand, if we understand Princeton's concern to establish and defend a system of meanings and doctrines that it believed divinely inspired and rooted in human consciousness, the professors' wedding of Reformed and Enlightenment thought appears, perhaps, less self-serving than self-reinforcing. It surely had several advantages, not the least of which was its relevance to its antebellum cultural context, which will be discussed later in this chapter. Suffice it to say for the moment, that Princeton's reliance on an indeterminate number of enlightened theological principles provided it a firm conceptual base from which to develop its system of doctrines and meanings, whether in the United States or northern Siam.

Princeton faced certain problems, however, including a number of difficult questions. If, before all else, its doctrines were so evidently commonsensical, why did so many of Princeton's contemporaries refuse to accept them? The professors had a ready answer. Adopting Reid's criticism of Hume, they claimed that their doctrines and views represented first principles while their adversaries based their opinions on unfounded presuppositions and, frequently, obvious, willful prejudices. Henry C. Alexander declared that all of the philosophies that stood in opposition to Christian revelation, from ancient times to the present, founded themselves on false assumptions. Removing those assumptions, he claimed, reinstated commonsensical theism immediately. [14] Archibald Alexander applied this general principle to Hume's denial of miracles, arguing that Hume engaged in a process of circular reasoning by which he first assumed that miracles cannot take place and then turned around and made that assumption his conclusion. Alexander complains, "What sort of reasoning is it, then, to form an argument against the truth of miracles founded on the assumption, that they never existed?" [15] Green similarly attacked an English biblical scholar for engaging in a specious method of circular reasoning based on foregone conclusions. He writes, "As a matter of course the critic finds exactly what he wishes to find." He also complains, "If this method is allowable there is no difficulty in proving anything that a man may undertake to prove." [16] To those, in sum, who might wonder why so many others disagreed with the Princeton Theology and its many principles, the Princeton circle answered that false and frequently prejudiced assumptions blinded its opponents to the truth.

J. Addison Alexander's critique of German biblical studies and their interpretation of the Gospels, however, demonstrates that Princeton based its own principles on assumptions just as much as did its opponents. Alexander advised those college and seminary teachers who wanted to bring German biblical studies into their classrooms that, "With respect to the principles on which the teacher should proceed in digesting these materials, we need hardly say that he must necessarily assume the inspiration of the gospels and their consistency one with another." Alexander went on to criticize radical German interpretations of the Gospels for starting from purely speculative false assumptions that could be used to prove anything. [17] He does not seem

to have realized that "the Germans" could have just as easily accused him of starting with an unwarranted assumption, namely that the Bible is divinely inspired. As early as 1825, Hodge warned that the preconceived assumptions of those who engaged in philosophical speculations represented the greatest danger facing biblical studies. Hodge, nonetheless, worked from his own set of preconceived assumptions, arguing that the only cure for speculative theological abuse of the Scriptures is careful, reverential inductive study of the Bible based on the conviction of its divine origin and the need to rely on the Holy Spirit to overcome human resistance to the Truth.[18] Alexander and Hodge's views depended upon fundamental assumptions just as much as any of those whom they criticized, the difference being, in their own opinion, that their assumptions were based on the Bible, inspired by God, and arrived at through the carefully wrought inductive method of Bacon.

Princeton's construction of its first principles on the twin pillars of Reformed theology and Enlightenment philosophy provided it with a doubly secure foundation for its system of doctrines and meanings. Those principles were at one and the same time self-authenticating and authoritative, being grounded in human consciousness and divine revelation. Princeton believed that these two sources of its knowledge of first principles rendered the principles themselves unassailable and proved them obviously different from the false assumptions of those who disagreed with Princeton's views on theology and philosophy. On this apparently solid foundation, it built the rest of its theology.

Piety

Princeton's evangelical context required it, however, to mold a theology that satisfied the pious heart as well as the rational mind. It accomplished that task through a relatively straightforward strategy that aligned the mind and heart, based on three principles: First, it posited an essential unity between right thinking and right feeling. Second, it held that right feeling cannot contradict right thinking. Third, Princeton involved the Holy Spirit in the process of right thinking and feeling.

First, mind and heart comprise an essential unity. Archibald Alexander believed that it is difficult to frame the truths of the Bible in logical statements because they involve more than just the intellect. He avowed that those biblical truths have an "astonishing power" over ethical behavior and æsthetics as well—a power to penetrate the heart and influence the conscience. Alexander states, "There is a sublime sanctity in the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel; a devotional and heavenly spirit pervading the Scriptures; a purity and holy tendency which cannot but be felt by the serious reader of the word of God, and a power to soothe and comfort the sorrowful mind..." His son, James W. Alexander, declared that God created the human heart and mind as well as the body, and Christ expected his followers to render him "a service of mind and heart." [19] Hodge's writings contain a sprinkling of aphorisms making the same point, namely that the Christian heart and mind are congruent with each other. He asserts, as one example, that, "All religious language false to the intellect is profane to the feelings and a mockery of God." [20] The principle in all cases is the same, namely that one cannot divorce piety from doctrines, heart from mind.

Second, the Princetonians believed that right thinking and correct doctrines provide an important way to achieve right feeling and piety. Although this second principle would seem to be an obvious corollary of the first, it entailed a slight but highly important shift in emphasis toward the mind that quietly reinforced the integrity of Princeton's principia theologiae as commonsense first principles. We have already seen in Chapter Two that Princeton generally believed that the heart is the seat of human corruption while the mind is the avenue for reaching into the heart. Wrong feeling is the problem. Right thinking is the solution. James W. Alexander

argues, accordingly, that sin dethrones the higher powers of the mind and puts "the inferior passions and carnal appetites" in their place. Conversion removes the mental disorders of sin, restores harmony, and reorients the affections to center on "things above." [21] According to Alexander, furthermore, matters of doctrine and intellect must be set straight if one is to achieve a state of inner harmony between mind and heart. He sums up his observations by stating, "The closest connexion between faith and love is manifest from the nature of the case; as no object can be loved which is not perceived; and the more vividly an object of love is presented to the mind, the more is the affection increased in vigour." [22] Perception precedes affection. Mind drives emotions. For Green, the key to the process of achieving inner harmony was the proper apprehension of the true meaning of Christian doctrines; he objected to German biblical scholarship because its critical theories destroyed the factual, rational foundation of biblical religion. Gaining a correct understanding of the meaning of Christian doctrines is crucial, he thought, to religious life. In the particular case of "heathen" peoples, he believed that it is essential to "christianize" their languages as part of the process of conversion. The process could not be completed until those languages are "reached and purified." [23]

Faith, piety, the heart, right affections-by whatever name we chose to call the Christian's inner life and relationship with God, Princeton firmly pegged that life to right thinking, the concern for proper doctrines and sensible principles. It cut its piety from the same bolt of cloth as its theology and ideology. Feelings strengthened the common sense foundations on which both were based.

Third, the process of reaching the heart through the mind depends on the Holy Spirit. That is to say, the powerful and ultimately authoritative work of the Spirit in the deepest recesses of the human soul validated Princeton's commonsense perception of reality. On Sunday afternoon, 26 November 1854, Dr. Hodge addressed his weekly conference with the student body, presumably with Wilson and McGilvary in attendance, on the subject of "The indwelling of the Spirit." He opened his informal comments with the statement that certain specific effects always mark the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Among these effects, he included "graces," which are the fruits of the Spirit. He went on to say that,

The graces are 1st. Knowledge. This is one of the chief ends for which the Spirit was promised by the Saviour to his disciples. This knowledge includes correct intellectual convictions and spiritual discernment. To this are due orthodoxy and love of the truth, and adherence to it under all circumstances. To this source also are we indebted for the unity as well as the preservation of the faith. This is a ground of conviction beyond the reach of scepticism and unassailable by infidelity.[24]

The first grace given through the Holy Spirit, in other words, is that of right thinking, which is a matter of spiritual discernment as well as intellectual understanding. The Spirit and knowledge cannot be separated from each other. Hodge also believed that the indwelling of the Spirit confirmed orthodoxy's principia theologiae, which were also Princeton's commonsense first principles of theology and faith. He based his entire system of meanings on this epistemological-spiritual foundation, which included the love of truth, adherence to truth, the unity of that truth, and the preservation of Christian faith. His final statement, above, relates his views on the relationship between the Spirit and knowledge back to the context of Common Sense Philosophy; the grace of knowledge rests on convictions so compelling and immediate that neither philosophical skepticism nor infidelity of any sort could shake it. That is precisely Reid's contention against Hume: the intuited principles of common sense are so immediate, so obviously true that no amount of skepticism can shake one's belief in them.[25]

Princeton built its system of doctrines and meanings on a theology that drew upon Common Sense Philosophy to establish its own biblical-theological principles as God-given intuited first principles of human consciousness. It held that such principles could not be "proved" by reason, but must be accepted as residing in the very structure of human nature itself, in the feelings as well as the intellect. God not only created these principles in us, but also reconfirms them through the agency of the Holy Spirit. The Princeton circle, thus, began with its own set of theological assumptions, transformed them into commonsense principles, and then defined and defended them as intellectually and spiritually incontrovertible. It was a closed system intended to function as a credible, solid, and convincing defense of Reformed confessional orthodoxy. The Princeton Theology, as we have already seen, was born into hard times for orthodoxy; the forces of infidelity seemed to be on the march at every quarter of the compass. Reformed confessional theology in America could withstand the onslaught only if it had a defense fitting to both its theological heritage and its post-Revolutionary, Enlightenment context, such as would give it a solid ideological base from which to achieve its defense of orthodoxy.

In Defense of Orthodoxy and Reality

If there was one thing that Princeton and its Old School compatriots believed more firmly than anything else, it was that "Calvinism" embodied the truest, most pure and faithful system of theology and the best distillation of the teachings of Jesus available to humanity. Its principia theologiae were contained in both the Bible and the human heart. Conservative Presbyterians felt deeply compelled thus to defend this system of truth, especially in the difficult decades of the Early Republic and the Antebellum. At a time in which inherited social and political structures came under increasing attack, the system they defended encompassed social as well as theological concerns, which meant that they required a system of defense that would uphold traditional social and political structures as well as religious and theological orthodoxy. The members of the Princeton circle found that system in their unique blend of confessionalism, common sense thought, and evangelicalism.[26]

Old School Presbyterian leaders, indeed, established Princeton Seminary for the very purpose of defending and disseminating Old School confessionalism through the training of an educated clergy, who would be well able to combat the forces of deism, emotional excess, speculative philosophy, and heresies of all stripes. In his 1812 inaugural address as the seminary's first professor, Archibald Alexander focused his audience's attention on apologetical issues, mounted a defense of the inspiration of the Bible, and gave a rebuttal of Hume's arguments against miracles. The seminary's original plan and early curriculum also reflected the intention of its founders, including most particularly Alexander, to defend orthodoxy from the forces of infidelity, an intention that strongly shaped Princeton's subsequent history.[27] Nothing symbolized and embodied Princeton's commitment to the defense of Reformed orthodoxy more than its flagship publication, *The Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, more widely known simply as the *Princeton Review*. It provided an ideal format for identifying and attacking infidelity while defending Reformed confessionalism. Noll suggests that Hodge's polemical writings in the *Princeton Review* provide a "fuller, more comprehensive picture" of his thought than any other of his works, including his *Systematic Theology*. He concludes, "Hodge's defense of the Reformed faith in the *Princeton Review* is a vast and complex subject. The journal's pages were his bricks from which he constructed a fortress for defending an Augustinian Calvinism that still insisted on the sovereignty of God in salvation." [28] Princeton Seminary existed, above all else, to defend Reformed orthodoxy.

While its Early Republic-antebellum context may have, in a sense, driven the Old School and Princeton to a concern with apologetics, they took to the tasks of defending the faith and

attacking infidelity with a will born of both their Reformed and Enlightenment heritages. Reformed confessionalism, right down to the time of Turretin, faced a situation somewhat similar to the one American orthodox evangelicals confronted in the post-Revolutionary era. They each emerged out of a period of contending religious forces that threw them on the defensive and encouraged them to develop a more scholastic, articulated set of doctrines. Those doctrines allowed Reformed theologians of both eras to aggressively defend their own understanding of Christian faith and attack deviations from that understanding.[29] The Enlightenment, although frequently antagonistic to the Christian religion, was no less zealous in its defense of truth and attacks on superstition. The more moderate Common Sense philosophers, in particular, pursued a clear apologetical agenda in their assertion that Hume and other radical Enlightenment thinkers engaged in wild speculations that undermined tradition and common sense.[30] Ahlstrom concludes with disarming simplicity, "The Scottish Philosophy was an apologetical philosophy, *par excellence*."[31] Reformed confessionalism defined and defended the reality of truth. Common Sense Philosophy defined and defended the truth of reality. Princeton combined the two in a profound commitment to defend old truths in new, difficult times.

As inheritors of both Reformed confessionalism and the Scottish Enlightenment, Princeton worked out a particular format or style of presentation that appears repeatedly in its apologetical literature, one that proceeds in a series of steps: First, the Princeton authors identified the orthodox doctrine or principle they intended to defend. Second, they described the various mistaken positions of others to the left and right of the true, orthodox position. Their position, that is, was the *via media* between the errors of extremism. Third, they then demonstrated the reasons for the correctness of orthodox thought, using biblical citations and logical arguments to make their case. Finally, they often referred to commonsensical principles including the generally accepted views (the common sense) of the church over the centuries. There were variations on these steps, of course, but most of them are found most of the time in most of Princeton's apologetical literature. Charles Hodge's *Systematic Theology* is an important example, as are A. A. Hodge's *Outlines of Theology* and his commentary on the Westminster Confession, *The Confession of Faith*. William Henry Green favored this format, as can be seen especially in his book, *The Pentateuch Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso*. Hodge, at least, used this same format extensively in the classroom, marching his students through an almost endless parade of theological errors to ascertain the correct, middle way of orthodoxy.[32]

The professors faced still other issues, however, in their defense of orthodoxy. Just as they had to clarify why so many others disagreed with their theological principles, so too the Princetonians had to explain why they gave so much attention to the whole issue of apologetics in the first place. The short answer was that God required it of them. J. A. Alexander explained that from its earliest days the church has had to contend with doctrinal differences. Those differences represent part of God's plan for the church, forcing it to struggle with error, doubt, uncertainty, and temptation and to work its way through to the truth "by diligent investigation, careful comparison, and deliberate judgment." God, in short, used theological dissension to teach the church the rudiments of the Baconian inductive method. Alexander contended that before the church could overcome its obstacles and enemies, it had to face them. He states,

That this was God's providential purpose with respect to the Church, is evident from the whole tenor of his dispensations towards it; and a part of this disciplinary system was the permission of doctrinal diversities, even in her infancy. God enjoined on the church the duty of eschewing all doctrinal errors and achieving a unity of faith.[33]

Defense of the Princeton system was taken thus to be nothing less than a sacred duty, a duty that included the use of common sense and Baconian methods for ascertaining Christian truth.

Alexander's statements and the general apologetical rationale underlying the Princeton Theology represented yet another girder reinforcing the Princeton circle's confidence in the reliability of its system of theology. According to its own self-understanding, Princeton was not merely circling the wagons for a temporary defense against an occasional attack on the frontiers of orthodoxy. The Princetonians, rather, believed that they defended the walls of a massive redoubt, one built long since by the biblical authors, under divine guidance, and strengthened by the likes of Augustine, Calvin, and Turretin.

Conclusion

Princeton's system of doctrines and meanings, in the view of its adherents, rested on a solid foundation, grounded in the traditions of Reformed confessionalism and Enlightenment common sense. That system fitted Princeton's conservative evangelical understanding of the relationship of heart to mind. It relied on the traditions and strategies of both Reformed and Enlightenment apologetics, which provided it with ready answers as to why others disagreed with Princeton's doctrines and why the church had to engage in the defense of its doctrines. It took, as we said earlier, the best from two worlds, allowing the professors to argue that their foundational principles were at once biblical (traditional, Reformed) and commonsensical (contemporary, Enlightened). In both incarnations, they held those principles to stand beyond question or doubt. The Princeton Theology was, at one and the same time, well-conceived and highly resistant to change to the point that, paradoxically, it was methodologically highly flexible and yet doctrinally just as highly inflexible. The professors could answer any question, quell any doubt, and meet any challenge without having to entertain the possibility that there might be a reason for questions, doubts, and challenges. While the Princeton Theology caused its would-be detractors endless frustration and discomfort, it encouraged its adherents to "stay the course" of their evangelical faith.

Theological Strands

Introduction

Princeton's system of meanings was simple in its conception, drawing on the traditional principia theologiae, recasting them into a common sense mold, and ringing them with a solid defense rooted in the Bible and human nature. The system itself also involved important strands that reinforced the fundamental simplicity of the system while extending its usefulness. The most important of these for the Laos Mission's particular context include: (1) Princeton's dualistic perception of boundaries; (2) its belief that it could know the nature and will of God; and, (3) its understanding of the nature of truth. These three key strands, taken together, provide a gauge of Princeton's ability to mold its foundational principles into a more elaborate system of meanings and doctrines, one that could deal with virtually any doubt or objection. To these significant strands, must be added a fourth one, moderation, a strand that failed to make the transition to northern Siam. That failure itself reveals important data regarding the way in which the Laos Mission adapted its Princeton-like system of doctrines and meanings to its situation in Chiang Mai.

Boundaries

Theological principles define cognitive boundaries and create their own need for apologetics, which is the defense of a theologically defined cognitive territory. Boundaries may,

of course, be defined loosely or precisely and may be taken with varying degrees of seriousness, but where there are theological principles there are theological and ideological boundaries. Princeton took its boundaries with the utmost seriousness and marked them with almost mathematical precision, ultimately acknowledging only two spheres or kingdoms-those of God and of Satan, good and evil, light and darkness-defined by closely drawn boundaries that allowed for no shades of gray between them. A. A. Hodge once told his students that

In considering and defining a doctrine, you should know what lies beyond. To bound Pennsylvania, you have to tell what is on the north-New York; on the west-Ohio; on the east-this kingdom of New Jersey, &c. And so with a doctrine. It is well that we should know about the heresies beyond its boundaries, that we may, by negation, exclude them. I shall sometimes ask you to come with me to the edge, and get the alternatives.[34]

Thinking in terms of boundaries between the kingdoms of good and evil came easily and "naturally" to the Princeton professors, who stood as heirs of the West's larger intellectual tradition of dualistic thinking and its cognitive habit of dividing reality into opposite pairs-mind and matter, body and soul, divine and mundane, Christian and infidel.

In an article published in 1855, while McGilvary and Wilson were his students, J. A. Alexander summarized Princeton's bounded, dualistic worldview by writing,

The Mosaic Cosmogony is simply introductory to the creation and original condition of man; and this again to the account of the fall; and this to the Protoevangelium, or first promise of a Saviour, with its prophetic distinction of the race into two hostile and antagonistic parties, of which Christ and Satan are the heads and representatives. The character and destiny of these two parties forms the subject of all subsequent religious history...[35]

The division of humanity into "two hostile and antagonistic parties," Alexander believed, was a consequence of Adam and Eve's original sin and God's subsequent promise to humanity of a savior. Alexander's words reflect the theological traditions of Reformed federalism with its two parties, the elect and the damned, and their two federal heads, Christ and Adam. Reformed thought had long taken the Fall with the utmost seriousness, believing that it created the oppressive conditions under which humanity has since struggled, is the source of every problem facing the human race, and also led to the division of humanity into the two camps of Christ and Satan. For a great many Reformed Christians, most notably the English Puritans, the boundary between those two camps and the ultimate necessity of finding themselves on the right side of it was a pressing, frightful concern. Reformed theologians long struggled thus with the question of assurance, how, that is, one could be sure of her or his salvation.[36]

Princeton found the issue of assurance less immediate than its Reformed forbearers, probably because common sense thought provided it with the confidence that it could know God and God's will perfectly, if not fully (see below). The Princetonians, nonetheless, drew the boundaries between the saved and the lost just as sharply as did their Reformed predecessors. Hodge, to take one example, explains the hotly debated antebellum political issue of Sunday closing laws designed to protect the sanctity of the Sabbath in terms of two opposing camps. When church people stand on one side of the Sabbath question or any other issue and the "irreligious, as a class," take the opposite side, he reasons, invariably "the contest between them is a contest between light and darkness, between God and Satan." He summarizes the entire matter of keeping or breaking the Sabbath with the principle that, "He that will not bow to God,

must bow to Satan." [37] We will find in Chapter Five that the concern for religious and doctrinal boundaries that lay behind this simply stated aphorism had an immense, immediate impact on the course of northern Thai church and missionary history.

That same concern for boundaries had earlier confronted the Reformed Church with the practical ecclesiastical problem of who should and who should not be admitted to full membership in local churches. Should the boundary between light and darkness cut through the society of the church itself? If so, where should Reformed churches draw the line? It resolved this dilemma by adhering to Augustine's solution, namely that since there is no human authority competent to discern the righteous from the unrighteous, both must be allowed to coexist within the church. It must be left to God to resolve the final destiny of the individual member. [38] The Princeton theologians could not accept Augustine's compromise, however, when it came to all-important questions of doctrine; it could not allow doctrinal heresy to exist in the church. Hodge claimed that throughout the history of the church there had been two grand, antagonistic systems of theology at war with each other, the "Augustinian and anti-Augustinian" systems. The one affirms divine sovereignty, the other the rights of human nature. He held that they cannot be reconciled. [39] Both Hodge and Alexander felt that the key to this centuries long, church-wide doctrinal conflict lay in the theological understanding of Christ. The issue was whether one viewed Christ as "a mere man, or the mighty God." Archibald Alexander states, "As we embrace the one or the other of these opinions, our whole system of doctrine will be modified. Accordingly, it is found, that all who deny the deity of Christ, reject all the fundamental truths of the Christian religion." Hodge is equally emphatic: "The difference is absolute between the inward religious state of those who regard Christ as a creature, and that of those who regard him as God. If the one be true religion, the other is impiety." [40] The Princeton Theology, in sum, displays a keen sense of the cognitive boundaries between the kingdoms of God and Satan and a precise appreciation of who resided on which side of those boundaries.

Tongchai's study of the impact of Western conception of maps and mapping on Thailand provides an instructive parallel to the role sharply drawn boundaries played in Princeton's thinking. Tongchai observes that before the advent of Western mapping, shifting allegiances among the rulers of Southeast Asia's many petty states left political boundaries fluid, diffuse, and ill defined. The smaller principalities frequently gave allegiance to two higher political patrons, so that travelers only gradually moved across the "boundary" between those centers. There was no clearly defined geo-political boundary, that is, between Burma and Siam or Siam and Vietnam, for example. The European colonial powers could not tolerate this hazy attitude toward boundaries and insisted upon carefully surveying and marking out the lines between each state and territory-down to the inch and centimeter. [41] They thought about territory, that is, much the way Princeton thought about theology, in terms of inches and centimeters, each valley and ridge carefully marked out and defended. The existence of such sharply defined boundaries, however, left the Princetonians with little room to maneuver or compromise. No demilitarized zone lay between truth and heresy. Hodge states in *The Way of Life*, "There is no middle ground between the two. Every one is either the servant of God, or the servant of the devil. Holiness is the evidence of our allegiance to our maker, sin is the service of Satan." [42] This meant that there could be no compromises of any kind with theological error. Alexander, preaching in 1844, sought to clarify a local pastor's responsibility to resist such error and urged pastors to adhere to an uncompromising defense of the truth. [43]

The Princeton circle emphasized Alexander's injunction against compromise for the simple reason that it believed that eternal salvation was at stake. Princeton took as one of its most important and basic first principles the "fact" that only those who accept the Christian gospel can be saved-where the principle is not stated explicitly, it was always assumed implicitly. Hodge urges that repentance "is the great, immediate and pressing duty of all who hear the gospel."

They are to give up their sin and accept Christ, and if they do not, "The neglect of this duty, is the rejection of salvation. For, as we have seen, unless we repent we must perish." Alexander distilled the exclusive nature of the Christian message down into a simple aphorism, "It is the Gospel which brings God nigh." [44]

Its narrowly constructed dualism, in sum, enabled the Princeton circle to define and defend its system of meanings as the cognitive equivalent of sacred space. They believed that they shared this territory with Augustine, Calvin, and Turretin and, most particularly, with Jesus and the biblical authors. By God's grace, then, they worked from within the sacred realm of God's kingdom for the expansion of that kingdom into the whole world. They knew themselves to be God's people, and they knew those who did not share in at least the rudiments of their orthodoxy to be God's enemies. The boundaries of Princeton's orthodoxy enabled it to define both itself and others according to a well-established, sharply-delineated set of principles that divided the elect from the reprobate, the enlightened from the superstitious, the righteous from the wicked, and the children of light from the children of darkness. Princeton's dualistic cosmology also reinforced its disinclination to engage in an open dialogue with systems of meaning that contradicted it, even when those contradicting systems were identifiably Reformed. [45] The discourses it aimed at its opponents in the pages of the *Princeton Review* and other publications were pedagogical and apologetical rather than dialogical.

Doctrinal boundaries mattered to Princeton. With them, it secured its identity and at the same time acquired a sure means for knowing and categorizing those who stood outside the pale of right believing. The Princeton professors, however, faced the problem of demonstrating the certainty of its boundaries. How did they *know* that they had drawn those boundaries correctly? It was here that Princeton turned to the Scottish philosophers of Common Sense to gain for them an absolute confidence in the truth of their theological system.

Knowledge of God

Princeton secured its doctrines and underlying system of meanings by transforming its doctrines into commonsensical, fundamental principles established by God in human consciousness. Princeton's epistemology, as we have already seen, combined insights drawn from its confessional and common sense progenitors. From Reformed confessionalism, it inherited a general inclination to trust reason and to use reason to obtain reliable knowledge, particularly in relationship to fundamental theological truths. [46] From the Scottish philosophers it learned to trust human consciousness and its ability to comprehend fundamental principles of knowledge, including metaphysical knowledge. That trust transformed the Reformed confessional tendency to trust human reason conditionally into a faith in human knowing that seems to have had few conditions and that Princeton seldom questioned. [47] The fathers of American Presbyterian common sense, John Witherspoon and Samuel S. Smith, thus worked out an epistemology committed to Newtonian scientific principles and natural philosophy and so apparently trustworthy that, as Noll states, "To Smith it was self-evident that proper science set one upon a privileged road to truth." Noll goes on to note that like many thinkers of his own time, "Smith was mesmerized by Newton's accomplishments and those of other natural scientists. He felt, as did so many of his contemporaries, that the triumphs of Newton established empirical and inductive methods as the unique means for discovering the truth in any sphere." [48] Hodge and his colleagues, like Smith before them, lived in a "luminous world" epistemologically. They believed that careful, circumspect observation proves the world really is what the human race's common sense shows it to be. The Fall did not impair humanity's ability to know the truth. [49]

Princeton insisted that humanity can know not only the truth concerning reality generally, but it can also know the truth about God specifically because the Bible and creation contain clear

evidence of the nature and person of God. Princeton found the question regarding human knowledge of God a pressing one. Hodge felt that it lay at the very foundation of religion itself, arguing, "If God be to us an unknown God; if we know simply that he is, but not what he is, he cannot be to us the object of love or the ground of confidence. We cannot worship him or call upon him for help. Our Lord tells us that the knowledge of God is eternal life." [50] Hodge gives the human race no choice. It must and can know God. Princeton perceived three avenues for attaining that knowledge: special revelation as contained in the Bible, human nature or consciousness, and the natural world-which three they divided into Revealed Theology (the Bible) and Natural Theology (human consciousness and the natural world). [51] In terms of the Bible, Green states that it is "the only source of saving knowledge" and comprises a solid foundation for Christian knowledge and faith, one that has withstood a multitude of challenges over the centuries. It is the sole, ultimate base for the Christian faith. In terms of nature, Archibald Alexander writes, "The truth, however, is, that every thing which proceeds from God, whatever difficulties or obscurities accompany it, will contain and exhibit the impress of his character." And in terms of human consciousness, Hodge claims, "We are commonly and correctly said to know whatever is given in consciousness, or that can be fairly deduced from these primary truths or intuitions. It is in this sense we know God." [52]

When the professors maintained that humanity can know God, they meant it. In his seminal essay entitled, "Can God be Known?," Hodge argues that humans know "in the constitution of our nature" who God is and goes on to state,

We form our notion, or idea, of God, therefore, by attributing to him the perfections of our own natures without limitations, and in an infinite degree. And in so doing we attain a definite and correct knowledge of what God is; while we admit there is in him infinitely more than we know anything about; and while we are duly sensible that our ideas or apprehensions of what we do know are partial and inadequate, we are, nevertheless, assured that our knowledge within its limits is true knowledge; it answers to what God really is. [53]

Hodge, here, makes a fine but highly important distinction; humanity can *apprehend* God but it cannot *comprehend* God. Earlier in the same article, he acknowledged that humanity can have only a limited, partial knowledge of God because God is infinite and humans are finite, but he insisted that within their limitations humans can truly know, or apprehend God. "God," he writes, "really is what we believe Him to be, so far as our idea of Him is determined by the revelation which He has made of Himself in his works, in the constitution of our nature, in his word, and in the person of his Son." [54] We do well at this point to remember that Charles Hodge and his colleagues were common sense realists and, therefore, adamant in their conviction that humanity can know reality as it really is. For them reality included Ultimate Reality, and they could no more deny the possibility of knowing God than they could deny the reliability of the human senses in obtaining true knowledge of the physical world.

With their belief that human beings can truly know or apprehend God as God actually is, Princeton took a crucial step forward in the construction of its system of meanings and doctrines. Lacking that belief, the Princeton professors could not go on to insist that they themselves knew the truth about God's nature and God's will. They could not have claimed the virtually infallible authority in matters of faith and practice that they did claim for their system of doctrines. Having averred a true knowledge of God, however, they could and did go on to assert a certain dogmatic infallibility. In the frequently quoted introduction to his *Systematic Theology*, Hodge states, "Believers have an unction from the Holy One: they know the truth, and that no lie (or false doctrine) is of the truth." They know the truth, he explained, as an inner conviction that

cannot be shaken because it "...is founded on consciousness, and you might as well argue a man out of a belief in his existence, as out of confidence that what he is thus taught of God is true." Hodge then reminds his readers that this conviction of truth grows out of the work of the Spirit and is "confined to truths objectively revealed in the Scriptures." Many years earlier, while arguing that the Hebrew Scriptures teach that salvation cannot be won through works, he made the same claim, stating, "We have the great advantage of an infallible interpretation of these early oracles of truth, and the argumentative manner in which their authority is cited and applied prevents all obscurity as to the real intentions of the sacred writers." [55] When Princeton claimed that they knew God's truth as God intended to communicate divine truth, they meant it literally and without qualification. For them to believe otherwise would be tantamount to questioning the Holy Spirit's ability to communicate perfectly with the human mind and heart. If God is supreme and perfect, they reasoned, God must be able to construct a perfectly comprehensible revelation.

With the possibility of gaining true, if limited knowledge of the nature and person of God and an infallible knowledge of Scripture, Princeton also took a large step forward in the reification of its principles and the system of doctrines and meanings subsumed within them. The next step was to gain for itself priority over access to the knowledge of God. For, one could argue that the true knowledge of God described thus far is open to any individual, Christian or otherwise, who took the trouble to study nature, human consciousness, and the Bible inductively. Anyone, it would seem, could work through this process. Princeton would never have admitted to such a possibility and avoided doing so by claiming that only Christian believers could, finally, gain a clear, correct knowledge of God. Drawing yet again on both their theological and philosophical heritage, the professors used several strategies for authenticating that claim, two of the most frequent and most important being reliance, first, on the common sense of humanity and, second, on the power of the Holy Spirit.

The first way Princeton established its priority over knowledge of God was commonsensical; the Princeton circle claimed that its system of meanings was true because it represented the common sense of humanity, or of the church universal, or of orthodox Christians, or of a relevant interest group—depending on the occasion and need. Drawing on Common Sense Philosophy, they saw in the commonly held opinions of one vast majority or another a revelation of God's person and purposes, for those patient and wise enough to read it. If they could ascertain what that vast majority believed, they thought, they could understand something about God. At times, they cited the common sense of the entire human race. Hodge, as we have seen, argues that denial of the doctrine that human nature is composed of both body and soul "...is inconsistent with the common consciousness of men, who uniformly refer certain acts and states to the mind as one subject or substance, and certain others to the body as a different subject or substance." He goes on to claim that, "As this is a fact revealed in the common consciousness of men, it enters into the avowed convictions of all ages and all parts of the world. Every nation, ancient or modern, civilized or savage, has believed in the separate existence of the soul." Hodge then reinforces his point by drawing on the commonly held beliefs of the church, another "majority" that carried considerable weight with the Princetonians. He asserts that the doctrine of body and soul "...is also the faith of the universal church. The Greeks, the Latins, the Lutherans, the Reformed, in short the whole Christian world, believes that the soul lives and acts in the full exercise of all its faculties, after it has left the body." [56] The Princetonians frequently limited "the whole Christian world," moreover, to those segments of the church that they themselves considered orthodox. Even then, the term "orthodox" could be taken to include Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy as well as Protestantism, or on other occasions selected segments of Protestantism alone. [57] It sometimes seems as though the Princetonians were not satisfied that they had secured a point in their apologetical debates until they could identify the common sense of one majority or another to substantiate their defense of that point. When the

PCUSA was considering changing to a rotary system for electing local church elders in place of the existing system of permanent tenure, Alexander T. McGill defended the older system by claiming that it was the "universal usage" of English-speaking Presbyterian immigrants to the American colonies and their home churches in England, Scotland, and Ireland.[58] Viewed from beyond Common Sense's pale, it is difficult to see the relevance of such an artificial, contrived "majority" to deciding whether to adhere to a rotary or life-tenure system for electing elders. For those, like McGill and his colleagues at Princeton, ascertaining the common sense of the mass of common people was always a relevant, crucial matter-no matter how limited or artificial that mass might be.

Princeton did not depend on common sense alone, nonetheless, to establish its epistemological priority over the knowledge of God. Hodge made that point by observing that there is a difference between mere learning and the knowledge that Christians derive from the operation of the Holy Spirit working through their inner consciousness and their experiences. The difference was that the Spirit reveals the truth of the very nature of things to Christians. Knowledge of God, thus, is essentially an assent to the truth that can be made only with the aid of the Spirit. Hodge calls that assent the "spiritual apprehension of the truth" or, again, the "spiritual discernment of divine things." He states, "Without knowledge there can be no religion; for religion consists in knowledge and in the effects which knowledge, through the influences of the Holy Spirit, produces upon the heart and life." [59] Archibald Alexander concurred, emphasizing more strongly perhaps than Hodge did the fundamental difference between "spiritual knowledge" and "speculative knowledge." Spiritual knowledge, Alexander believed, touches the heart and emotions and enlightens the whole person so that one has holy feelings and a heart-felt inclination to worship God. To experience spiritual knowledge is to be converted into a new person. Ultimately, Alexander argued, this knowledge and the evidence on which it is founded is not rational or based on reasoned thinking, although it satisfies reason. It arises, rather, "from the supreme excellence of divine truth revealed to the soul, by the illumination of the Holy Spirit." The person who has received such spiritual knowledge knows without doubt that "the doctrine of the gospel is of God." [60] The Spirit, in short, inspires those who have experienced spiritual conversion so that they, and they alone, discern the deeper truths contained in human knowledge.

It should not be thought, however, that the "spiritual apprehension of the truth" involves mystical spiritualism. The Princetonians firmly believed that the Holy Spirit works through more conventional and far more effective means to bring the believer to knowledge of spiritual things. As Hodge writes,

The doctrine that the Holy Spirit works in the people of God both to will and to do according to his own pleasure, is not inconsistent with the diligent use of all rational and scriptural means, on our part, to grow in grace and in the knowledge of God. For though the mode of the Spirit's influence is inscrutable, it is still the influence of a rational being on a rational subject. It is described as an enlightening, teaching, persuading process, all of which terms suppose a rational subject rationally affected. The in-dwelling of the Spirit, therefore, in the people of God, does not supersede their own agency.[61]

He believed, that is, that the Holy Spirit worked through all of the professors, teachers, pastors, elders, Sunday school teachers, and others who preached and taught the orthodox evangelical system of meanings and doctrines, as well as all of their books, articles, pamphlets, sermons, and lectures. The Holy Spirit used all of these means to educate the faithful rather than mystify them, to the end that the studious, faithful student would acquire a certain knowledge of Christian

truth. Archibald Alexander claims thus that the "sincere and diligent inquirer" after the truth "will be in no danger of fatal mistake" because God will attest to the veracity of divine revelations to such inquirers. Or, as Hodge puts it, God shines into the hearts of Christians and gives them "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ." John Eckard, one of Princeton's faithful outriders, went so far as to declare the superiority of religious over scientific knowledge. He argued that revealed religion involves historical proofs, logical proofs, and an authentication of its truths by God "to the heart of each true believer." [62]

The value of the Princeton circle's epistemological confidence in its own set of divinely inspired, commonsensical theological principles is clear. Breward points out that the sixteenth-century English Puritan, William Perkins, also believed that Christian revelation provided him with "infallible information and axioms, divinely revealed through the secret operation of the Spirit," with the consequence that Perkins obtained "a watertight argument against those consciences which differed from one's own. Different conclusions when truth was one and infallibly revealed could only be due to sinful blindness." [63] So it was for the Princeton professors. They knew the truth. Those who differed with them were necessarily blind to the truth, self-deceiving, possibly arrogant, and always faithless to the Gospel. We have already seen that in the bounded, dualistic world of Princeton there could only be one truth, and Breward's evaluation of Perkins hints at another implication of the Princeton circle's epistemology, namely that all truths from whatever sources must also be one.

Truth

If the Princetonians would have chosen one word, more than any other, to summarize their own understanding of their system of doctrines, they almost surely would have chosen the word "truth" as being more adequate than any other single word. The word appears so frequently in their theological writings in association with the doctrines they advocated that it can be taken as a synonym for the Princeton Theology itself. [64] Princeton coupled its own system of theology with a concept of truth that, in turn, included a number of excellent qualities ultimately associated with God. Hodge avows that knowledge of the truth is essential for "any genuine religious feeling or affection" and links it with "that the inward state of mind, which constitutes religion." He writes, "We are begotten by the truth. We are sanctified by the truth. It is by the exhibition of the truth, that the inward life of the soul is called into being and into exercise." [65] While he and his colleagues honored truth of all sorts including scientific truth, he asserted the primacy of moral and religious truths as being "just as certain, and infinitely more important than the truths of science." [66] Princeton, in sum, invested in the concept of truth all that it held to be ultimate, good, and holy.

Equally to the point, Hodge and his colleagues insisted that the truth is objective and therefore reliable. He states,

The primary idea of truth is that which is trustworthy; that which sustains our expectations, which does not disappoint, because it really is what it is assumed or declared to be. It is opposed to the deceitful, the false, the unreal, the empty, and the worthless. To regard a thing as true is to regard it as worthy of trust, as being what it purports to be. [67]

Princeton valued truth for the reason that it is objectively real or, as Archibald Alexander puts it in the particular case of the Christian religion, "the truth of Christianity is really a matter of fact." [68] Alexander also argues that truth must be reasonable, that knowledge of the truth

depends on reason, and that, "Truth and reason are so intimately connected, that they can never, with propriety, be separated." The reason he had in mind, however, was that of the common sense philosophers. Reason is that which makes sense, or is believable, to human nature. He concludes, "But it is reasonable to believe what by our senses we perceive to exist; and it is reasonable to believe whatever God declares to be true." Hodge makes it clear that what is finally involved in the Princeton conception of truth is the first principles of common sense, truths that he calls "the laws of our being" or "laws of belief" that God has "impressed upon our constitution." [69] Princeton joined Edinburgh in thus insisting that humanity can know the truth about reality, reality as it actually is, and it emphasized that knowledge of the truth must be apprehensible, believable, and factual, else, as A. A. Hodge observes, "...it is mere superstition." [70]

Princeton's understanding of the truth parallels their arguments concerning the knowledge of God: just as humans can know God truly, so they can know the truth just as truly. Knowledge of the truth, like knowledge of God, is lodged in divinely created human nature, contained in God's special revelation in Scripture, and, we will remember, confirmed and made operative by the enlightening power of the Holy Spirit. Again, just as in the case of the knowledge of God, enlightened, pious Christians alone have full access to the truth. [71] By the same token, knowledge of the truth influences the heart as well as the mind and is an important factor in the individual Christian's piety. Hodge states, "Truth and holiness are most intimately related." [72] Princeton's equation of its system of doctrines with this conception of truth as both divinely given and entirely objective reinforced its system of doctrines and meanings by grounding that system all the more firmly in the nature of reality itself. It lent increased weight to Princeton's confidence in its theology and in that sense of knowing the truth that its nineteenth-century opponents and twentieth-century critics have sometimes found so frustrating.

Various members of the Princeton circle built upon the concept of truth in at least three important ways, each of which went even further to strengthening Princeton's grasp of that truth. McGill, first, worked out a "high Presbyterian" view of the church in relationship to the truth. He writes, "Before Abraham was Christ was, and where Christ was the Church his body was, in word and type and prophesy inscribed upon her pillar." Thus, "The Church was part of the truth and the truth was declared by the Church from the beginning, and these two-so distinct, but inseparable-are like the Urim and Thummim..." He views the church, then, as, "a part of revealed truth, and not merely as the depository, the interpreter, the expedient and the missionary of truth." [73] Stated more strongly than usual for Princeton, McGill's comments make explicit its assumption that the church was intimately associated with truth. Second, Princeton's dualism demanded that there could be only one single, internally consistent system of truth without any contradictions to it, reinforcing Princeton's perception that religious truth could not exist outside of the Christian religion and the church. [74] At the same time, the truths discovered by various branches of study could not contradict each other. A. A. Hodge told his students that, "Genuine science does not conflict with revelation." [75] With these two points, Princeton staked an even stronger claim to the truth and made it clear that it viewed any divergence from orthodox theology as a divergence from the truth itself, for there can be only one truth.

The third way in which Princeton expanded on its understanding of the truth was its belief that truth cannot change over time or be influenced by place; truth is neither temporal nor contextual. Reformed confessionalism had long held that its truths applied to the whole of the human race, since it was the whole race that had fallen through the sin of its "federal head," Adam. Only one truth leads thus to salvation, a truth that applies to all peoples and ages. [76] Common sense thought reinforced Princeton's conception of timeless, universal truth by claiming that it is the very essence of the concept of first principles that they are common to the whole

human race in all ages and nations. Princeton took it as one of its tasks to demonstrate that the Christian religion is central to that one truth.[77]

Several scholars have argued that the Princetonians, as a consequence of their belief in the unity and universality of truth, lacked an historical consciousness. Other scholars, more recently, present a mixed picture, suggesting that the Princeton circle combined a certain historical consciousness with what can only be called an a-historical attitude towards truth.[78] The distinction and the point made by these later studies is an important one because, paradoxically, the Princeton professors' conception of the past actually reinforced their a-historical understanding of the relationship of religious truth to time and context. On the one hand, Princeton held that God reveals divine truth in time, that the Bible contains historical truth, and that any denial of the historicity of biblical facts undermines the authority of the Bible itself. Princeton believed that knowledge of the truth, furthermore, is progressive and that the church in various times has had to struggle to understand the truth for its own age and place. On the other hand and as we have seen, Princeton took what amounted to a Platonic view of truth itself, meaning that it understood truth to be a category that is eternal, unchanging, and one.[79] Green summarizes Princeton's view of the relationship of truth to history by stating, "Truth is one, but it has its changing relations to the changing state of things." [80] Truth itself, in sum, is not historically or culturally contingent and does not change. What was true one hundred or two thousand years ago remained true in the nineteenth-century and would continue to be true forever. Given Princeton's confidence in the relationship of its confessional orthodoxy to the truth, the timeless, unchanging nature of truth meant that their theology could not and should not be adapted to given contexts, except as those contexts opened further knowledge of the truth to them; and since knowledge is one, the new truths they learned must necessarily reconfirm and reinforce the truth they already knew. Princeton's view of truth, thus, protected its adherents from any thought of relativism, historical or cultural.

Moderation

In Chapter Two, we saw that both the Princetonians and McGilvary shared in a certain degree of broad-mindedness. In Princeton's case, at least, a deeper spirit of moderation led to an occasional inclination to take stands that might seem to have been out of line with its conservative Old School associations. Two of the chief spokesmen for moderation on the seminary faculty were Alexander T. McGill and J. A. Alexander. In his studies on church government, McGill repeatedly urged that the church has frequently had to discover and follow what he termed "the golden moderation of the gospel" that lay between the "opposite extremes of error." [81] The Catholics, for example, place too much emphasis on church government while "reactionary" Protestant groups fail to give it sufficient attention or weight. McGill observes, "Truth, in this department as in others, will be found a just mean betwixt opposite extremes." [82] J. A. Alexander, commenting on the relationship of the Hebrew Scriptures to the New Testament, elaborates on McGill's dictum, explaining,

The truth thus taught is intermediate between two extremes of error. This is not unfrequently, we might perhaps say invariably, the case. There are few important doctrines which are not in conflict with a plurality of errors, or of forms of error, not collateral or incidental, merely, but directly adverse to the truth in question. And as this most frequently arises from our proneness to extremes, and from the tendency of these to generate each other, the defender or discoverer of truth must frequently be occupied in seeking a safe standing place between two fatal, or at least untenable extremes.[83]

Truth and correct doctrinal Christianity invariably stand safely between the extremes of fatal error.

Several scholars have pointed out that Princeton also acted moderately, one of the most important examples being its unwillingness in 1837 to take sides with the hardcore Old School "ultras" in their drive to oust the New School from the Presbyterian Church but to find, instead, a middle ground that could lead to a reconciliation between the two sides.[84] J. A. Alexander explains that, theologically, the best policy was always that of "eschewing all exaggeration and extravagance" even in defending the truth and opposing error because, "...all erratic and disorderly efforts to promote religion, however good the motive, tend not only to fanatical excitement as the proximate result, but to the ulterior result of apathy and spiritual deadness, which is almost sure to follow it." [85] Hoffercker points out that from its inception Princeton felt driven to forge a middle way, or *via media*, between those who emphasized cognitive religion on the one side and those on the other side who emphasized affective over objective faith, a division found among Presbyterians as well among American evangelicals generally. Princeton strove for a balance that was at once cognitive and affective, while avoiding the excesses of imbalance in either direction.[86]

Princeton valued moderation, both in doctrine and in action, but the professors' moderate attitude depended on circumstances, and, at times, they displayed a less than enthusiastic commitment to the middle way. They noted, for example, that some of their opponents also laid claimed to a middle ground between extremes of their own creation, a *via media* that failed to stand the test of orthodoxy, created unsupportable theological superstructures, and usually ended up combining the worst rather than best aspects of the extremes they stood between.[87] Green, in particular, seems to have had doubts about the wisdom of moderation. Taylor observes of Green's views on German critical biblical scholarship that, "Green was not convinced that one could occupy the middle position in the battle with integrity." Green felt that the options involved were clear, namely, "One either embraced the critical methodology wholeheartedly and with it atheism or pantheism or one held tenaciously to a traditional understanding of the biblical texts as the inspired and revealed word of God." [88] There were limits, that is, to Princeton's understanding of moderation and of its willingness to think and to act moderately. Drawing on a dualistic worldview that allowed no compromise between rigidly drawn spheres of good and evil, the Princetonians saw themselves as representing the truth against falsehood, and ultimately they could not moderate their adherence to the side of God and truth.

This last point would prove highly significant in northern Siam. While the Laos Mission's records do not convey the impression that its members were pulpit thumping radical evangelicals, Chiang Mai shared with Princeton, as we saw in Chapter Two, a radical antipathy towards heathenism. In Chiang Mai, apart from the Laos Mission and its converts, there were only "heathens," and we will recall that the members of the mission variously described the heathen as being like a valley of dry bones, vain, idolatrous, irreverent, angry and wicked wolves, morally degraded, helpless, ignorant, lonely, and dead. The records of the Laos Mission contain no hint of moderation when it comes to heathenism, so that in Chiang Mai the missionaries could find no "middle ground" to occupy. They, rather, thought of themselves as an invading army, locked in an epic, cosmic struggle with the heathen forces of Satan.[89]

In spite of the inclination to moderation that the members of the Laos Mission, particularly McGilvary, shared with Princeton (see Chapter Two), their perception of their situation in Chiang Mai switched off that inclination. They could not act in moderation in their relations with and attitudes towards heathenism. From what we have seen here concerning Princeton's views on both the heathen and moderation, it seems apparent that the mission's immoderate attitudes towards Buddhism and Buddhists represents yet another parallel between

Chiang Mai and Princeton. The mission, that is, behaved and believed as Princeton would have if Princeton found itself in Chiang Mai.

Conclusion

All four of these strands or ramifications of Princeton's system of doctrines and meanings - its sense of dualism, knowledge of God, understanding of the truth, and moderation - served to confirm and strengthen the Princeton circle's confidence in the correctness of its theology. These ramifications disallowed more than one true religion, more than one way of knowing God, and more than one way of possessing truth. They placed people of other faiths and Christians of other theologies in the twin categories of heathenism and infidelity, seeing them as people who deny the first principles of common sense, orthodoxy, and evangelical piety and who stand against God. The Princeton circle measured even its moderation over against heresies to its right and left, preserving for itself the one true center. Only the Holy Spirit, according to Princeton, can authenticate knowledge of God and the truth, and those who have not experienced such authentication are not among the elect. We have called Princeton's system of meanings a closed ideology. These four key strands of its system of meanings and doctrines further buttressed the ramparts of its theological fortress.

In the following chapters, we will find that the pioneer members of the Laos Mission conducted themselves in a manner that reflected these same four aspects of Princeton's system of doctrines and meanings. They based their actions on a sharply defined sense of dualism, seeing themselves at war with their Buddhist-animist context. They believed that they alone knew God and knew the truth. Even their failure to act moderately towards the heathen echoed the limitations of Princeton's own moderation. They especially shared, at the last, in Princeton's sense of confidence in the unqualified rightness of their system of doctrines and meanings, a sense that powerfully influenced, as we will see, their behavior in Chiang Mai.

Conclusion

The Princeton circle drew on its Reformed, Enlightenment, and evangelical traditions to work out a pious and apologetical theology based on fundamental first principles. That theology insisted that humans could know God truly, if guided to such knowledge by the Bible and the Holy Spirit. It claimed, however, that only those who had experienced the Holy Spirit and been led to true Christian faith could actually know God and the truth. The Princeton circle felt a deep commitment to discern and defend the boundaries of God's truth because the salvation of the human race depended on preserving that truth untainted by heathen superstitions, religious enthusiasm, and the wild speculations of faithless philosophers.

One hesitates to brand the Princeton Theology with the label "ideology" for the reason that it was clearly systematic, elaborate, consistent, and self-conscious - features normally lacking in most ideologies. Still, as we have noted repeatedly, the Princeton circle built its theology out of the main currents in American religious and intellectual thought, including even romanticism. That theology represented a blend of culture and theology that leaned heavily towards its theological side, as we would expect from a group of self-conscious and articulate theologians. The Princeton Theology does not have the "feel," the smell and texture, of an ideology. When transported beyond the walls of seminaries and the bindings of theological tomes into local churches, however, it lost most of its rigor as a systematic theology. In the course of the journey from pastors in their pulpits to the people in their pews, it became submerged once again in its larger evangelical context as a shared set of assumptions and attitudes that shaped the peoples' values and behavior. It became, in a sense, a "people's theology," a theology that took on more of the form of a semi-covert, less systematic, and less self-aware ideology.

In the particular case of the small group of Old School Presbyterian missionaries who worked in Chiang Mai in the 1860s and 1870s, distinct traces of Princeton remained, but the measured theological cadences of the Hodges and Alexanders did not find their way across the expanse of the Pacific-except, to a limited extent, in the writings of Daniel McGilvary. As we have also observed, the missionaries took with them, instead, a more diffuse manner of thinking that combined theology and ideology into a single system of doctrines and meanings. Where Princeton encapsulated its system of doctrines and meanings in a systematic theology contained in books and articles, sermons and tracts, the Chiang Mai Nine expressed their system of meanings and doctrines, first and foremost, in a set of activities and events. It is to those activities and events we now turn, seeking to understand the relationship of missionary thinking to their behavior in light of the Princeton Theology.

Notes

Abbreviations:

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AP	<i>American Presbyterians</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
BRPR	<i>Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
JAH	<i>Journal of American History</i>
JER	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of Presbyterian History</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Social History</i>
NCP	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian</i>
NCP NS	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian New Series</i>
LN	<i>Laos News</i>
PQPR	<i>Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review</i>
SCJ	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>
WJT	<i>Westminster Journal of Theology</i>
WWW	<i>Women's Work for Women</i>

[1] González, *Christian Thought*, 271; Donnelly, "Italian Influences," 82-3; and Phillips, "Turretin's Idea of Theology," 83. Meeter argues that the doctrine of God was the single fundamental principle of Calvinism, from which Reformed theologians drew a number of corollaries including the role of the Bible as God's special revelation, the sovereignty of God, God's relationship to humanity in covenants, the sinful state of the world, and God's special revelation in Christ. H. Henry Meeter, *The Basic Ideas of Calvinism*, 6th ed. rev. by Paul A. Marshall (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1990), 17-20, 23.

[2] John C. Vander Stelt, *Philosophy and Scripture: A Study in Old Princeton and Westminster Theology* (Marlton, New Jersey: Mack, 1978), 23-5, 287; Paul Helm, "Thomas Reid, Common Sense and Calvinism," in *Rationality in the Calvinian Tradition*, ed. Henrik Hart, et. al. (University of America Press, 1983), 72-4; and Peter J. Wallace, "History and Sacrament: A Study in the Intellectual Culture of Charles Hodge and John W. Nevin," article on-line (available from: <http://www.nd.edu/~pwallace>)[<http://www.peterwallace.org/hn.htm> (9/12)], 3. Haakonssen has pointed out that Reid actually proposed two sets of first principles, one set is necessary and immutable and the other contingent and mutable. The first set reflects what Grave terms the "metaphysical level" in *Common Sense Philosophy*. Haakonssen, "Reid's Philosophy," 41-2; and Grave, *Scottish Philosophy*, 100-04. The Princeton theologians, by and large, ignored this distinction.

[3] William Henry Green, *The Pentateuch Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso* (New York: John Wiley, 1863), 194; William Henry Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch* (New York: Charles Scribner's

Sons, 1895), 173; and William Henry Green, "Horne's Introduction to Scriptures" BRPR 29, 3 (July 1857): 378-79.

[4] Green, "Inaugural Discourse," 62. See also Wallace's statement that for the Princetonians, "The normative character of the Bible informed their work in an all-encompassing manner." Wallace, "Foundations," 2.

[5] Archibald Alexander, *A Brief Outline of the Evidences of the Christian Religion* (Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, 1829), 18-9; and Charles Hodge, "Nature of Man," BRPR 37, 1 (January 1865): 111-2.

[6] Hodge, "Nature of Man," 113; and Alexander, *Evidences*, 7.

[7] Alexander, *Practical Sermons*, 13-5, 19.

[8] Hodge, "Can God be Known?", 145.

[9] Green, "Matter of Prophecy," 565; J. Addison Alexander, "The Gospel History," BRPR 20, 4 (October 1848): 604; Charles Hodge, "The Unity of Mankind," PQPR 5, 18 (April 1876): 106; and John William Stewart, "The Tethered Theology: Biblical Criticism, Common Sense Philosophy, and the Princeton Theologians, 1812-1860" (Ph. D. diss., University of Michigan, 1990), 255.

[10] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 101, 100.

[11] Charles Hodge, "Notes on Lectures by Charles Hodge written by C. W. Hodge and Classmate," vol 1, n.d. (Papers of Charles Hodge, Princeton Theological Seminary Archives, Princeton, New Jersey).

[12] Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 164.

[13] Taylor, *Old Testament*, 29-31. See also Taylor's similar comments on J. Addison Alexander, Taylor, *Old Testament*, 109.

[14] Henry C. Alexander, "Reason and Redemption," PQPR New Series 4, 3 (July 1875): 435-37.

[15] Alexander, *Evidences*, 59. William Henry Green, "Of the Hebrew Prophets" BRPR 38, 4 (October 1866): 655-56. See also William Henry Green, "Christology," BRPR 31, 3 (July 1859): 453.

[16] William Henry Green, "Of the Hebrew Prophets" BRPR 38, 4 (October 1866): 655-56. See also William Henry Green, "Christology," BRPR 31, 3 (July 1859): 453.

[17] Alexander, "The Gospel History," 604, 610ff. For the similar views of his father, Archibald Alexander, see Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 219-20.

[18] Calhoun, *Princeton*, 116-17.

[19] A. Alexander, *Evidences*, 179; and J. W. Alexander, *Discourses*, 245.

[20] Hodge, *Essays and Reviews*, 561. See also Charles Hodge, "Question No. 60. How is the Sabbath to be Sanctified?" (Bellefonte, PA: Bellefonte Press Company, n.d.), 9; and Hodge, *Way of Life*, 167.

[21] Alexander, *Practical Sermons*, 117-18.

[22] Alexander, *Practical Sermons*, 253.

[23] Green, *Higher Criticism*, 163; and William Henry Green, "Modern Philology," BRPR 36 4 (October 1864): 639.

[24] Hodge, *Conference Papers*, 77.

[25] See Hodge's summary of his arguments against Park on the theological relationship of intellect and feeling. Hodge, *Essays and Reviews*, 565. See also, Hodge, *Way of Life*, 153ff.

[26] Bozeman, "Inductive and Deductive Politics," 706-07; and Mark A. Noll, "Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought," *AQ* 37 (Summer 1985): 218.

[27] Mark A. Noll, "The Founding of Princeton Seminary," *WJT* 42, 1 (Fall 1979): 85, 94, 95; Mark A. Noll, "The Irony of the Enlightenment for Presbyterians in the Early Republic." *JER* 5, 2 (Summer 1985): 162; and Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 176-78. See also Loetscher, *Broadening Church*, 21-2.

[28] Noll, "Princeton Review," 287-88, 296.

[29] Donnelly, "Italian Influences," 85-6, 93; Burchill, "Zanchi," 186; and Phillips, "Turretin's Idea of Theology," 61. See also, González, *Christian Thought*, 272-73.

[30] Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1966), 127, 129; .and, Grave, *Scottish Philosophy*, 131.

[31] Ahlstrom, "Scottish Philosophy," 266.

[32] See, Charles Hodge, "Notes from Lectures on Didactic Theology (1856-1857)," taken by Henry A. Harlow, 3 vols. (Papers of Charles Hodge, Princeton Theological Seminary Archives, Princeton, New Jersey).

[33] Alexander, "Apostolic Ministry," 293, 298. See also, Samuel Miller, "The Early History of Pelagianism," *BRPR* 2, 1 (January 1830): 77.

[34] C. A. Salmond, *Charles & A. A. Hodge: with Class and Table Talk of Hodge the Younger* (New York: Scribner & Welford, 1888), 117-18.

[35] J. Addison Alexander, "The Plan and Purpose of the Patriarchal History" *BRPR* 27, 1 (January 1855): 26. See also J. Addison Alexander, "Primeval Period of Sacred History," *BRPR* 32, 1 (January 1860): 100.

[36] Weir, *Origins*, 21; and von Rhor, *Covenant of Grace*, 156-58.

[37] Hodge, "Sunday Laws," 737, 762.

[38] McGrath, *Reformed Thought*, 192.

[39] Hodge, *Essays and Reviews*, 614. See Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 217, and David F. Wells, "Charles Hodge," in *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*, ed. David F. Wells (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1997), 45.

[40] Alexander, *Practical Sermons*, 143; and Hodge, "Christianity without Christ," 359.

[41] See Tongchai, *Siam Mapped*, esp. 20ff.

[42] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 87.

[43] Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 291.

[44] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 179; and Alexander, *Discourses*, 112-13.

[45] One example that has received considerable scholarly attention is Hodge's feud with a former student and, briefly, colleague at Princeton Seminary, John W. Nevin; particularly at issue were the doctrines of the church, sacraments, and Incarnation. See Wallace, "History and Sacrament"; Nichols, *Romanticism*; and Holifield, "Mercersburg".

[46] See Phillips, "Turretin's Idea of Theology," 62ff, 82ff; and Donnelly, "Italian Influences," 92. Calvin, by way of contrast, generally emphasized the "epistemic distance" between God and humanity, a distance made even greater by the affects of sin. Humanity, thus, cannot adequately discern God through its own experiences and understanding, not even in nature. It does not know what it must do to obtain salvation. Calvin's views reflect an "emphasis characteristic of the Reformation on the impotence of humanity and the omnipotence of God." McGrath, *Calvin*, 124, 154, 157.

[47] Kennedy, "Sin and Grace," 165-66; and Rogers and McKim, *Authority and Interpretation*, 290.

[48] Mark A. Noll, *Princeton and the Republic, 1768-1822: The Search for a Christian Enlightenment in the Era of Samuel Stanhope Smith* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 193.

[49] Noll, *Princeton and the Republic*, 205; Stewart, "Tethered Theology," 266-69; and Vander Stelt, *Philosophy and Scripture*, 279.

[50] Hodge, "Can God be Known?", 122.

[51] See Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, 18ff; and A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, 30, 31. See also James L. McAllister, Jr. "The Nature of Religious Knowledge in the Thought of Charles Hodge" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1957). 127.

[52] Green, "Inaugural Discourse," 41-5; Alexander, *Evidences*, 177; and Hodge, "Can God be Known?", 144. See also, Elwyn A. Smith, *The Presbyterian Ministry in American Culture* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), 153-54.

[53] Hodge, "Can God be Known?", 145. See also, Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, 195-99.

[54] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol 1, 338. See also, Hodge, "Can God be Known?", 142.

[55] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, 15; and Hodge, *Way of Life*, 127.

[56] Hodge, "What is Christianity?", 133-34. See also Hodge's argument against those who believe that human nature is made up of body, soul, and spirit in which he insists that the simpler division into body and soul is "the common doctrine of the church." Hodge, "Nature of Man," 121

[57] See, for example, J. A. Alexander, "New Dispensation," 637; Green, "Christology," 441; and Hodge, "Sabbath Sanctified," 1.

[58] Alexander T. McGill, "Tenure of the Elder's Office," PQPR New Series 1, 3 (July 1872): 580-81.

[59] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 153-56, 203; and Hodge, "Sabbath Sanctified," 6.

[60] Alexander, *Practical Sermons*, 9-11, 17.

[61] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 228.

[62] Alexander, *Evidences*, 48; Hodge, *Way of Life*, 156; and John R. Eckard, "The Logical Relations of Religion and Natural Science," BRPR 32, 4 (October 1860): 607.

[63] Breward, *Perkins*, 65. See also, Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (New York: Macmillian Company, 1939), 20.

[64] See, for example, A. A. Hodge's statement, "As would have been anticipated, it is a matter of fact that the church has advanced very gradually in this work of accurately interpreting Scripture, and defining the great doctrines which compose the system of truths it reveals." Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, 113.

[65] Hodge, *Essays and Reviews*, 608.

- [66] Hodge, "Unity of Mankind," 105.
- [67] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3, 43.
- [68] Alexander, *Evidences*, 153.
- [69] Alexander, *Evidences*, 5, 7; and Hodge, *Way of Life*, 100.
- [70] Salmond, *Charles & A. A. Hodge*, 123-24. See also Hodge, *Way of Life*, 58.
- [71] See Green, "Inaugural Discourse," 45, 46; Hodge, *Essays and Reviews*, 609; and Alexander, *Evidences*, 72.
- [72] Hodge, *Essays and Reviews*, 556.
- [73] McGill, *Church Government*, 17-8, 20.
- [74] See J. W. Alexander, "Systematic Theology," 174; Hodge, *Essays and Reviews*, 565; and A. A. Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, 112.
- [75] Salmond, *Charles & A. A. Hodge*, 126. See also Bozeman, *Protestants*, 108.
- [76] Weir, *Origins*, 3-4, 6, 100; and Stewart, "Tethered Theology," 257.
- [77] See Scovel, "Orthodoxy," 206.
- [78] For the earlier view, see Kennedy, "Sin and Grace," 356, 358; Nichols, *Romanticism*, 90; and Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 207. For the revised understanding, see Taylor, *Old Testament*, 107; Wallace, "Foundations," 2-3; and Wallace, "History and Sacrament," 6.
- [79] Green, *Higher Criticism*, 163-64; and J. Addison Alexander, "What is Church History?" BRPR 19, 1 (January 1847): 91.
- [80] Green, "Inaugural Discourse," 64.
- [81] Alexander T. McGill, "Practical Theology," in *Discourses at the Inauguration of the Rev. Alexander T. McGill as Professor of Pastoral Theology, Church Government, and the Composition and Delivery of Sermons in The Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J.* (Philadelphia: C. Sherman, Printer, 1854), 43-4.
- [82] Alexander T. McGill, *Church Government: A Treatise Compiled from His Lectures in Theological Seminaries* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1888), 15.
- [83] J. Addison Alexander, "The Relation of the Old to the New Dispensation," BRPR 23, 4 (October 1851): 640. See also Alexander, "The Gospel History," 604.
- [84] See Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 243-47, 325-28; Earl A. Pope, *New England Calvinism and the Disruption of the Presbyterian Church* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1987), 209ff; David R. Plaster, "The Theological Method of the Early Princetonians" (Th. D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1989), 34-5, 38-9; and Scovel, "Orthodoxy," 216ff, 270-71.
- [85] Alexander, "New Dispensation," 644.
- [86] Hoffecker, *Piety and the Princeton Theologians*, vi-vii, 20, 23. See also Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 95.
- [87] Hodge, "What is Christianity?", 130; and Green, "Horne's Introduction," 378.
- [88] Taylor, *Old Testament*, 187.

[89] See, Swanson, *Khrischak Muang Nua*, 40; and Swanson, "This Heathen People," 156.

CHAPTER FOUR

Theology, Ideology, and Evangelism

Outline of the Chapter

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [Baconian Evangelism](#)
 - 2.1. [Nan Inta](#)
 - 2.2. [After Nan Inta](#)
3. [Baconian Medicine](#)
 - 3.1. [The Theory](#)
 - 3.2. [The Practice](#)
4. [Conclusion](#)
5. [Notes](#)

Introduction

The nine pioneer members of the Laos Mission took with them to Chiang Mai a number of advantages that should have stood them in good stead as they sought to communicate the Christian message to the people of northern Siam. By 1867, Protestant missionaries had accumulated nearly forty years of experience in Siam. They knew the language, the religion, and the culture of the people, and while northern Siam differed from Bangkok in all these respects, it was not *that* different. The missionaries themselves were well educated and highly motivated, had supplies of modern medicines, and the good will—initially—of the Chiang Mai government. They also had the interest and respect of the general populace and the support of the Bangkok government.[1] In spite of these advantages and its later success as an agent of Westernization, the Laos Mission apparently failed to take advantage of its favorable position, particularly in the field of evangelism.[2] As we have seen, later generations of missionaries, church leaders, and scholars have tried to explain that failure in various ways. Contemporary historiographical approaches, as we have also seen, direct our attention to the deeper sources of behavior found in the system of doctrines and meanings that the early members of the mission also took with them to northern Siam, a system that both paralleled and had direct links to the Princeton Theology. When one turns to the history of the Laos Mission between 1867 and 1880, it becomes apparent that three facets of the mission's work provide the clearest evidence of the role of theology and ideology in that work. Those three facets include the mission's evangelistic efforts, relations with the northern Thai church and society, and program of education. We begin here with evangelism and leave education and ecclesiastical relations for the following chapters.

Baconian Evangelism

Introduction

During their first months in Chiang Mai in 1867, the McGilvary family lived under appalling conditions, crowded into a public "sala," a porch-like building, located on a main thoroughfare leading into the city. They had little privacy and few amenities. Their personal goods stood stacked and piled about, and they had to contend with constant crowds of people who came to watch them and talk to them. For all of its inconveniences, however, the

McGilvays did not regret their situation because it gave them a multitude of opportunities to teach people about the Christian faith. They guided every conversation towards that end, and, strange as it may seem to later generations, they found that teaching the rudiments of Western science to their auditors frequently offered them the best avenue for introducing their religious message. McGilvary later remembered that in those earliest days, "We could often, if not usually, better teach religion-or, at least, could better lead up to it-by teaching geography or astronomy. A little globe that I had brought along was often my text." [3]

Unless we have an understanding of the McGilvays' theological heritage, using a globe and discussing science with the good citizens of Chiang Mai would appear to be a rather curious way to approach them with the Christian message. Daniel's professors at Princeton, however, would have approved and seen his use of scientific knowledge for evangelistic purposes as a practical application of Archibald Alexander's claims that, "The internal evidence of revelation is analogous to the evidence of the being and perfections of God from the works of creation..." and that, "there is in the structure of the world, the most convincing evidence of the existence of an all-wise and all-powerful Being." [4] McGilvary apparently accepted the Princeton view that there is a clear relationship between the natural sciences and a saving, rational faith, believing that if he could convince the people of the truth of science they would themselves see that the truths of science lead up to and confirm the greater truth of Christianity. [5] The initial progress of their scientific and cosmological dialogue with the people of Chiang Mai encouraged the McGilvays with its potential for spreading the Christian message, especially after one of their partners in those discussions found their arguments from scientific to religious truth challenging and, ultimately, persuasive. His name was Nan Inta, the first-and as far as we know, the only-convert the Laos Mission ever obtained directly through the application of "Baconian evangelism," that is, by using science information and theories to validate the truth of the Christian religion.

Nan Inta [6]

Among the great number of people who visited the McGilvary family in their first weeks in Chiang Mai, McGilvary recalled most clearly Nan Inta, a tall, handsome, thoughtful looking man, who called on them ostensibly to obtain medicine for a severe cough. He actually came more out of curiosity about their strange religious message than anything else. He was roughly forty-nine years old, had seven children, and had been an abbot at one time; people knew him to be a devoutly religious individual with a studious, logical, active mind and a personality that McGilvary described as honest, frank, and sincere. After his first visit, Nan Inta began to drop by frequently and to read manuscript copies of the few tracts that the missionaries had translated into northern Thai. Although he had ceased to find his own religion satisfying, he also found it difficult to accept the patently alien religious message of the missionaries. McGilvary reports, "We had some arguments, also, on the science of geography, on the shape of the earth, on the nature of eclipses, and the like. What he heard was as foreign to all his preconceived ideas as was the doctrine of salvation from sin by the death of Christ." [7] Over the course of this debate, Nan Inta grew increasingly intrigued by the plausibility of the biblical account of the creation of the world as well as the Christian "plan of salvation," but he could not decide how true they were. McGilvary, meanwhile, continued to argue that Christianity provided a better understanding of the physical world, under the assumption that if he could prove that point Nan Inta would accept the religious truth of Christianity as well.

Having failed to bring Nan Inta to a definite decision concerning the truth of Western religion and science, McGilvary employed a new tactic in place of debating cosmology. He knew from his almanacs that Siam would experience a solar eclipse on 18 August 1868, and about a

week before the event, he informed Nan Inta of the coming eclipse. McGilvary wrote that Nan Inta later stated his feelings about this prediction as follows,

His sacred books had taught him that it [the eclipse] is occasioned by a huge monster devouring the sun. Of course therefore such a thing as predicting beforehand the day and the hour is impossible. We accounted for it on natural principles, and as an evidence of their correctness told beforehand the very hour of its occurrence...It seemed to him a bold venture in us as if we were staking all on a single event, and were willing to rest the falsity of Buddhism on the issue.[8]

Nan Inta agreed that a correct prediction would disprove his former beliefs about the nature of the world because McGilvary could not possibly predict when a huge monster would devour the sun. He also allowed that a correct prediction of the solar eclipse would suggest that he had been misled in religious as well as scientific matters.

McGilvary's correct prediction threw Nan Inta into an even deeper quandary, facing him with the probability that his whole worldview, including his religious faith, was wrong. McGilvary claimed that Nan Inta faced "a sea of uncertainty," because his trust in his own merit and the foundation of his religious faith had shown themselves built not on rock but on "the drifting sand." Nan Inta then had to deal with the question of whether or not he should accept the Christian message and diligently set himself the task of finding an answer to that question.[9] He studied all of the literature the missionaries could provide him and learned to read central Thai so he could study the Bible and other literature the Siam Mission had produced in that script. McGilvary observes,

He soon gave evidence that he sought by prayer to be guided into the knowledge of the truth. Having need of a teacher and writer I employed him in that capacity, with the design in part, of having him under our immediate instruction. He accompanied me on a tour to Lampoon, the 1st of November. This gave us more opportunities of conversation, than we had even at home. During that tour he expressed his full conviction on the truth of Christianity.[10]

Nan Inta received baptism in January 1869 and in later years proved to be the most important northern Thai leader of the church up until his death in 1882.

McGilvary, of course, expressed his personal sense of joy with Nan Inta's conversion, writing, "Well may we exclaim, What hath God wrought! It is well calculated to inspire us with faith in God's promises that he can and will gather in his own chosen ones." [11] It was not so much, however, the simple fact of that conversion that impressed McGilvary as the role his cosmological arguments, capped by the prediction of the eclipse, played in Nan Inta's decision. McGilvary wrote of Nan Inta,

The explanation of it [the eclipse] seemed to him so natural and beautiful and rational compared with what their books teach, that it led him to a clear and firm foothold on which he feels and knows that he is safe. And now almost daily he uses the same argument to his countrymen. He feels in reference to it as you do when you have been deceived once by an individual, that you cannot be caught again. So Nan Inta argues, Buddh has lied there I know. How can I believe him in more important matters? If he has deceived me when he teaches me that an eclipse is caused by a huge monster devouring the sun-how can I trust him when he tells me

that the worship of his image will save me? When I come to think of it, the one is as ridiculous and as absurd as the other.[12]

Whether or not these sentiments faithfully summarize Nan Inta's own interpretation, they do accurately reflect the Baconian message McGilvary delivered to him, a message that precisely paralleled Princeton's systems of theology and meaning. McGilvary challenged Nan Inta with a dualistic choice between what he presented as the unconditional, a-historical, and enlightened truth of Christianity as over against the false superstitions of the northern Thai, such as the belief in sun-eating monsters.[13] In the process, he exhibited a Baconian faith in the truth of science and its value as a "handmaiden" to Christian faith, particularly relying on Newtonian principles to demonstrate the rational nature of both science and faith. The whole process was a mental one based on McGilvary's favorable impression of Nan Inta's intellectual qualities and on a fundamental, Enlightenment trust in human cognition. He, more specifically, argued with Nan Inta on epistemological grounds that further demonstrated McGilvary's quiet confidence in the human intellect to discern the truth and make rational, methodical choices based on a careful weighing of evidence. He was as much a Reformed scholastic as he was an enlightened Baconian, bent on laying before Nan Inta a set of irrefutable principles in a patently apologetical mode. McGilvary called Nan Inta to faith by calling on him to understand the nature of the Newtonian universe and its implications for his traditional cosmology and religious beliefs. He did not begin with Scripture, but with a little globe, and only brought Nan Inta to the study of the Bible after he had scored substantial debating points in the cosmological arena.

Implicit in not only the method of his delivery of the Christian message to Nan Inta but also in McGilvary's attitude was the dualistic assumption that the transfer of knowledge should go in only one direction. He believed that he knew and preached the one, universal, and objective truth that leads to salvation, and it surely never entered his mind that Nan Inta's perception of reality had anything positive to teach him. "The Buddh," after all, had "lied" to Nan Inta about the nature of the physical world, a "fact" that threw into serious doubt the whole belief system of northern Siam. In that sense, McGilvary lived in a doubly Newtonian world in which both physical and religious reality could be understood and events in each predicted. Equally to the point, he equated the activity of God with the fact that he persuaded Nan Inta to change his religious allegiance and affiliation. What, he asked in wonder and astonishment, had God wrought? In seeking to understand why the pioneer members of the Laos Mission introduced an apparently alien religious message to the people of northern Siam without attempting to adapt the message to the audience, this point requires emphasis. Daniel McGilvary did not seek to enter into a dialogue with Nan Inta, and all of his discussions with Nan Inta involved a one-way transfer of data that Nan Inta eventually found compelling. Newton the Scientist and Paul the Apostle were both right. The Buddha and northern Thai cosmology were both wrong, and the only way one could become a Christian was to cross over the sharply defined boundary between northern Thai cosmology and religion on the one hand and the Newtonian-Pauline-Augustinian system of doctrines and meanings on the other.

McGilvary made the necessity of cleanly stepping across that border between faiths and cosmologies abundantly clear when Nan Inta sought to avoid making a public declaration of his faith, arguing that he would have more success in bringing others to Christianity if he did not have to openly reject Buddhism. Among other things, he did not want to give up the advantages and special privileges that pertained to being a former abbot. McGilvary rejected his suggestion out of hand and later wrote, "But the assurance that duty was his-consequences God's-that he was able to take care of his own cause, decided him early in December to delay no longer." [14] We will find in later chapters that McGilvary's unwillingness to allow Nan Inta and the other early converts the choice of remaining private believers was a momentous decision for the early

history of the Laos Mission and its embryonic northern Thai Christian community. For the moment, it is important because it reaffirmed the radically dualistic, rigidly closed system of meanings and doctrines that shaped McGilvary's practice of missions.

In this mix of doctrine and ideology, Nan Inta eventually achieved what can only be called an evangelical conversion experience, albeit one laid on the foundation of many hours of intellectual struggle with a new worldview. McGilvary remembers,

While the truth dawned gradually on his mind, the full vision seemed to be sudden. His own account was that afterwards when walking in the fields and pondering the subject, it all became very plain to him. His doubts all vanished. Henceforth for him to live was Christ; and he counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Him.[15]

Nan Inta knew the truth. He had no doubts. He had become a man of faith, a conservative evangelical cast in the same mold as McGilvary himself, or so McGilvary leads us to believe. McGilvary alluded to his own Reformed heritage once again by observing, as we saw above, that Nan Inta's conversion demonstrated that he was one of God's chosen people.

Nan Inta was the Laos Mission's first baptized convert, and his conversion marked an important step forward in the mission's history, ranking second in importance only to the founding of the mission itself. More immediately, it confirmed for McGilvary that his Baconian approach to evangelizing the northern Thai was a useful, correct one. Where the Presbyterian Siam Mission required some nineteen years to gain its first Thai convert, the Laos Mission achieved that same end in less than two years.[16] McGilvary had every reason, thus, to continue to use scientific information to convince northern Thais that they should convert to Christianity.

After Nan Inta

Nan Inta's conversion validated McGilvary's commitment to Baconian evangelism as a key model for the evangelization of the northern Thai. For his own part, as we saw above, Nan Inta immediately began to use McGilvary's Baconian, scholastic arguments on other northern Thai, suggesting that he had accepted missionary theology and ideology as his own. He found McGilvary's explanation of the eclipse "so natural and beautiful and rational" in comparison to his former religious beliefs that it convinced him to convert to Christianity and to try to convince others to take the same step. McGilvary also began to use the lesson of the eclipse and in after years kept a close eye on his almanac, announcing the approach of every eclipse in the hope of winning others to the Christian faith.[17] Eventually, he ceased his attempts to reach the northern Thai through the direct presentation of scientific data for the simple reason that no other northern Thai ever followed in Nan Inta's footsteps. It took several years, however, for McGilvary to drop Baconian evangelism, and in the years after 1869 he turned to it on a significant number of occasions, leaving the impression that he maintained an important cosmological "dialogue" with several members of the northern Thai educated elite.

Although Nan Inta's conversion was his only successful application of Baconian evangelism, McGilvary did come close to gaining a convert through scientific arguments in at least one other instance. In 1872, he and Dr. Vrooman made an extensive tour that included Nan, another of Bangkok's dependencies in the North. There he renewed his friendship with Chao Borirak, a member of Nan's ruling elite who McGilvary had come to know in Chiang Mai and who had an active interest in cosmological and religious topics. In the course of this visit, McGilvary had opportunity to predict a lunar eclipse, and he managed to impress Chao Borirak

both with the event itself and with Western scientific ideas. The following year McGilvary returned to Nan with the specific aim of continuing his discussions with Chao Borirak. He later claimed that his friend, "...seems to be fully convinced of the truth of our system of geography and astronomy, and has but little doubt as to the truth of Christianity." [18] McGilvary realized that this high official's conversion would greatly facilitate the founding of a mission station in Nan, but, as McGilvary wrote years later, "Our walks by day and our talks by night are never to be forgotten. But the convenient season to make a public profession never came. He lived in hope of seeing a station in Nan, but died not long before the station was established." [19] The tantalizing possibility of Chao Borirak's accepting the Christian faith, however, evidently further reinforced McGilvary's commitment to Baconian evangelism during the 1870s.

Some three years later, in February 1876, McGilvary once again took up his Baconian cudgel by entering into an extended debate with a prominent northern Thai individual he described as being "zealous in merit-making." McGilvary discussed with him, among other topics, "the sphericity and rotary motion of the earth on its axis." He particularly emphasized the fact that the North Star remains stationary in the night sky while other stars revolve around it, a fact that he argued was, "utterly inconsistent with Buddhistic teaching on the subject of geography and astronomy." He reported that the man stayed up all night one night to verify for himself the truth of McGilvary's astronomical views and that, as a consequence, "He was evidently much struck with the fact and explanation given of it, and also of the explanation given by means of a small globe and lamp of the phases of the moon." Although McGilvary won his point, he failed to persuade his partner in these scientific debates to convert, and he could only remind his readers (and himself), after the fashion of Princeton, that the Holy Spirit alone can lead people to know the truth and enable them to embrace it. [20] The following May found McGilvary arguing geography and astronomy with a "high prince," a man of great intelligence and broad-mindedness. This prince resolutely defended the existence of Mt. Meru, which his religion taught him stood at the center of the earth, reached a height of 42,000 miles, and was the pillar that held up the heavens. On this occasion, McGilvary loaned the prince a small sea glass that he had brought with him in 1867, and eventually the prince concluded for himself that the skies are not constructed as he had been taught to believe. McGilvary recorded that, "He has finally given in that Buddh, or more probably his disciples, must be wrong in their report of his teachings." [21]

McGilvary clearly invested a considerable amount of time in these debates, apparently under the assumption also made by a number of members of the Siam Mission, located in central Siam, that the introduction of Western thought and technology would necessarily result in the destruction of Thai Buddhism. The Rev. James W. Van Dyke of the Siam Mission's Phet Buri Station noted in 1874 that Siam was experiencing an increase in "wickedness" that he attributed to an increase in the "spirit of inquiry" that "has lead people to distrust their own religion while they have not as yet accepted that which is taught by the servants of Christ." Van Dyke looked for a time in the near future when the people would accept Christianity in place of their superstitions. [22] The Rev. John N. Culbertson, working in Bangkok, agreed. He believed that Westernization had a negative influence on the people's perception of the Buddhist Scriptures because those Scriptures were being proven false and their authority undermined. Making his own Baconian, scholastic leap from reason to reverence, he concluded, "When Buddhism ceases to command [the] confidence of sober reason, it must th[en] cease to inspire reverence and faith." Intelligent individuals could not, he felt, continue to put their confidence in a religious system that science proved to be false in so many of its particulars. [23] The people of Siam, however, did not accept Culbertson and Van Dyke's logic, primarily because they were not Reformed scholastics who put such great store in the links between doctrine, knowledge, science, and religion.

The Chiang Mai prince mentioned above had already begun to adjust his views of Buddhist Scriptures by claiming that errors had been made in the transmission of some of the Buddha's teachings. That "fact" did not seem to undermine his faith, in spite of the inconsistencies between northern Thai Buddhism and Western science. McGilvary, like his counter-parts in the Siam Mission, only gradually came to realize that winning cosmological arguments with members of the educated elite did not mean that they or the general populace would feel compelled to reject Buddhism and convert to Christianity. He himself tells the story of one man who came to Chiang Mai to take part in a public works project and seriously considered converting to Christianity. Not long after he returned home, however, he declared that he had decided he would never worship Jesus and would be saved or lost with his own people. McGilvary stated, "Some, of course, have real doubts as to the entire falsity of Buddhism-some hold back to see if the authorities will make any opposition-while others cannot storm the opposition of their own families." [24] Which is to say that those northern Thais, not a great number in any event, who felt compelled to make a decision about conversion, did so on the basis of political, personal, and other factors unrelated to Baconian evangelism; the assumption that a successful cosmological attack on traditional religion would result in conversions did not bear out in practice.

The failure of Baconian evangelism as a specific evangelistic strategy suggests that the whole of the Laos Mission's crusade to win the minds and hearts of the northern Thai faced inherent difficulties, for even where McGilvary did not preach Baconianism openly, his theological and ideological assumptions encouraged him to pursue a generally scholastic strategy modeled on Baconian evangelism. His autobiography provides a detailed case in point. As he tells the story, McGilvary visited the Prince of Chiang Mai's palace on New Year's Day 1877, to pay his respects, and he found Princess (*chao mae*) Tip Keson, the Prince of Chiang Mai's wife and a friend and supporter of the Laos Mission, in an unusually pensive mood. Normally she vigorously entered into extended debates with him over points of philosophy and religion, and McGilvary called her an enjoyable antagonist, a person with a sharp, quick mind. On this day, however, she dropped the adversarial guise and asked McGilvary straight out why the missionaries rejected Buddhism. In response, he embarked on a long theological monologue, the record of which comprises as complete a statement of his theology as can be found in any one place in his writings. The core of his argument remained dualistic, a contrast between Buddha, the man who failed to provide an adequate solution to the dilemma of human sin, and Jesus, the divine-man and self-existent First Cause of all that is. McGilvary appealed to the Princess as a rational person, avowing that the missionaries came as seekers of the truth. He strongly affirmed Jehovah as Creator and sovereign Lord, and employed rational arguments to affirm that the orderliness and complexity of the natural world gives clear evidence of the creative Mind behind it. He presented her with Princeton's idea that humanity shares in God's divine attributes, if only on a mundane plane. He expounded on the doctrines of original sin, Christ's forensic sacrifice on the cross to pay for human sins, free grace, and eternal salvation. Chao Mae Tip Keson mostly listened [25] Although McGilvary did not explicitly mention Baconian science or draw on the analogy between science and religion, his evangelistic strategy with her remained the same. He appealed to the mind with an objective, reasonable, and commonsense truth. He emphasized doctrines. Where his auditors might concede the validity of some or all of his views, he reciprocated only in the most superficial way with generalities about the good intentions of the Buddha. McGilvary confronted the Princess with a Reformed Enlightenment message devoid of any considerations of the northern Thai context or how one might shape the message to fit the audience.

In this case, the Princess admitted for the first time that his message contained considerable truth, and McGilvary added her name to a long list of those who accepted his doctrines but never found it convenient to convert. Of them he could only write, "the Lord

knoweth them that are His." [26] The actual course of events proved that the northern Thai were not going to be won for Christ through the study of the stars, debates over the existence of Mt. Meru, or presentations of Reformed theology in an Enlightenment mode.

Conclusion

In November 1874, the McGilvary family visited Japan on their way home to the United States, and in a brief article published in the *North Carolina Presbyterian*, Daniel remarked in passing that, "Here is a field where Christianity and science -twin sisters -or the mother and the daughter are both in demand." [27] His casual comment not only shows how he viewed the relationship between faith and science as one in which faith is the superior, but also it reveals once again how closely he allied these two branches of knowledge, entirely in keeping as we have seen with Princeton's own deep interest in science. The historical record, however, contains no evidence that the people of northern Siam found his cosmological arguments for religious change on the basis of scientific information a persuasive one, excepting only Nan Inta. In his autobiography, McGilvary relates an amusing incident that took place in 1872 in Phrae, another of the major cities of the North and the next stop after his visit to Nan, mentioned above. In Nan, we will remember, he predicted a lunar eclipse; the eclipse actually took place while he was in Phrae, and he announced the fact of its coming with the expectation that he would impress the people of that city with the superiority of Christian scientific knowledge. Normally, the northern Thai reacted to eclipses with a great commotion of noise making intended to scare off the monster that was eating the sun or moon. This time, however, the people of Phrae apparently assumed that this particular eclipse belonged to McGilvary, and the city remained completely, comfortably silent. [28] Its citizens utterly failed to make the connection between science and religion that was so important to McGilvary, and they readily adjusted their understanding of the eclipse without giving up their traditional ways of thinking and believing. We can only assume that incidents like these led McGilvary to quietly discard the Baconian approach to evangelism in later years, after having invested considerable attention to it in during the mission's pioneer era.

So far as can be told from the records of the Laos Mission, only McGilvary among the pioneer members of the mission consciously employed Baconian evangelism to reach the people of northern Siam with the Christian message. The fact that most of the mission's evangelistic work fell to him, however, lent his use of that strategy a crucial significance to the early life of the mission. McGilvary's Baconian evangelistic strategy, moreover, reflected a more basic mindset linked to a combination of doctrinal and ideological themes drawn from Reformed confessionalism, the Enlightenment, and evangelical piety. McGilvary's Baconian strategy for the evangelization of the northern Thai, in other words, influenced his more general orientation to the conduct of evangelism. He inclined to the presentation of objective information delivered in the course of intellectual debate based on the dualistic assumption that Western learning and religion were God's truth in opposition to northern Thai superstitions and ignorance. These same themes, in sum, appeared in other guises as elements of the Laos Mission's efforts to evangelize the northern Thai, most especially in its use of Western medicine.

Baconian Medicine

Introduction

From the very inception of the Laos Mission, medicine played a key role in attracting people to the missionaries. Where the general populace seemed little enough interested in the mission's imported cosmology, the people did show a desire for missionary medicine and its apparently miraculous cures of a variety of diseases, some quite deadly. When conducted under

the direction of a Wilson or a McGilvary, however, Western medicines and medical procedures amounted to nothing less than Baconian evangelism in another guise. The mission believed that Western medicine functioned as a carrier of their epistemology and, when properly understood by the people, destroyed their confidence in their superstitious beliefs and practices. The mission used Western medicine in two ways. First, it relied on medicine as a theoretical way to establish the truth of the Baconian, scientific worldview in opposition to traditional northern Thai cosmology. Second, it utilized medical care as a practical way for gaining the sympathy and trust of the people, to the end that they would convert to Christianity.

The Theory

From June through August 1869, the North Carolina Presbyterian published a series of articles by McGilvary that shared the general title of "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians." In these articles, McGilvary presents in carefully thought out steps his rationale for the employment of missionary medicine as a key element in the practice of foreign missions. The articles also provide important witness to McGilvary's commitment to Common Sense Philosophy and Baconianism and represent a remarkable exercise in the inductive method of enlightened common sense reasoning.[29]

In article No. I, McGilvary lays down two key foundational principles upon which his argument and conclusions proceeds, that is, first, that missionary work is "the great work of the church" and was commanded by Jesus and, second, that as faith is necessary to salvation, so knowledge is necessary to faith. He then works through a carefully reasoned examination of key biblical passages that provide "warrant" for these principles. In articles No. II and No. III, he surveys a significant amount of primary data, often quoting directly and at length, from sources in Siam, Burma, China, and India that demonstrate the validity of the biblical passages concerning the use of medicine for evangelism as borne out in the actual experience of missionaries on the field. When viewed together, the line of argument in these first three articles adheres strictly to a Baconian inductive approach in which McGilvary begins with biblical principles, presents a mass of detailed data, engages in a minute, patient examination of the facts, and establishes the truth and meaning of the general principle those facts prove. It is a process of reasoning, as we have seen, that the Princetonians advocated and that Hodge considered God's way for leading humanity "along the paths of knowledge." [30] The three articles, at the same time, reflect that same mix of other themes and traditions, which, along with Scottish Realism and Baconianism, is a "marker" of the Princeton Theology. McGilvary's emphasis on knowledge as the precondition to faith and salvation places him firmly in the mainstream of Princeton's Reformed confessional heritage. His concern for strengthening the missionary movement itself stood entirely in line with Princeton and with American evangelicalism's abiding concern to save souls.

In the fourth article in the series, No. IV, McGilvary extends his line of argument to include the common sense of all of humanity. He states, "What is thus supported by Scriptural illustrations and divine example and the acknowledged influence that the healing art and medical missions have exerted in all countries where the experiment has been made, is found in accord with the common ideas of most nations." We have already noted in Chapter Three the Princeton circle's habit, drawn from Common Sense Philosophy, of substantiating its debating points by citing the commonsense beliefs of one or another "majority." McGilvary employs this same tactic in article No. IV. Following the standard approach of the Princeton apologetical method, he then goes on to assert as common sense the fact that the healing arts are invariably associated with religion and priesthoods-among "rude peoples" as well as civilized nations. He claims that "there is a natural congruity between the two professions" of doctor and priest. McGilvary reaches, with that claim, a pivotal point in his whole line of reasoning, for it is on the

assumption of that "natural congruity" that he claims that doctors and priests carry out analogous roles, the one ministering to the body and the other to the soul. McGilvary believes that this analogy provides a "window of opportunity" for reaching people, through the use of medicine, who are uninterested in their own spiritual needs. He asks, rhetorically, "Need we be surprised that one who has tested the superiority of our bodily remedies should listen with deeper attention to the remedy of the soul?" This last point from article No. IV requires emphasis. It indicates that McGilvary used medicine to reach the northern Thai with his evangelistic message in the same way that he used astronomy. Each provided him with a body of scientific knowledge that he could use to break down northern Thai resistance to his understanding of the truth and the Christian religion. In that sense, McGilvary's explanation of the facts of the heavens to the intellectual elite and his medicating the general populace with quinine constituted one activity, not two. Article No. IV then moves McGilvary's argument a step closer to his goal of proving the worth of medical missions by observing that no missionary agency is so likely to touch the human heart as missionary medicine, for medical missions reach out to help people at their hour of greatest suffering. People find it hard to resist the kindness shown them at such times of need. Citing the example of Jesus, McGilvary states in article No. IV that,

The great characteristics of human nature are the same the world over. And the means that were seen adapted to reach the heart of the Jews of our Saviour's time will be equally available wherever the sons and daughters of suffering and sorrow are found. And these are the inevitable concomitants of man, as man, in his present state.

The ideas of Scottish Common Sense Philosophy abound in this brief statement: Human nature is one. What worked in the past will work just as well today. Human nature is necessarily what it is. It can be nothing else. McGilvary shared with his mentors at Princeton that same mixed perception of history that demonstrated a sensitivity to the events of the past and the passage of time and, yet, asserted a oneness of all time and places that allowed them to hurdle across the ages without having to change their doctrines, values, attitudes, strategies, or actions since What Was, in essence, Still Is. McGilvary, in this particular case, advocates the general use of missionary medicine because medicine reaches the human heart absolutely, in all times and contexts.

In the midst of all of these Baconian, common sense arguments in article No. IV, McGilvary drops back into a Reformed theological mode long enough to assert the importance of a Calvinistic worldview for missionaries working on the field. Calvinism, he claims, helps them to see and understand the "moral desolation" found in "heathen" lands and to see how that moral desolation confirms the doctrine of total depravity. The grand Calvinistic doctrines of divine sovereignty, covenantal theology, and the assurance that God sees and is satisfied by the travail of the missionary soul, also help to sustain the missionary in times of distress or discouragement. We should note yet again how large a role cognition, information, and knowledge played in McGilvary's own missionary life as he found solace in the great doctrines of Reformed confessionalism. In a sense, these Reformed theological sentiments feel almost out of place in amongst all of the Scottish philosophy that McGilvary otherwise applied to his evangelistic task, but it seems clear that they provided him with a set of ideas and principles that gave meaning to all of his work. They helped him to define himself, his northern Thai audience, and the relationship between them.

Scholars of the Princeton Theology have applied a number of images to try to make sense out of the relationship between Reformed confessionalism and Enlightenment philosophy. Loetscher gives pride of place to Reformed theology and views eighteenth-century Common

Sense Philosophy as a "graft" on the stock of seventeenth-century Reformed orthodoxy. Kennedy argues that the Princetonians used common sense thought as an apologetical tool for defending their Reformed confessionalism. Vander Stelt claims that, "Princeton conservatism entered into a courting relationship with 'a moderate form of Enlightenment rationalism,' and this courtship has continued to be evident in the development and problems of nineteenth-century Presbyterianism..." Stewart envisages Princeton's Reformed heritage as being "tethered to common sense philosophy." [31] To one degree or another, all of these images assume the primacy of Reformed confessionalism, and most of them imply that the result of Princeton's use of Common Sense Philosophy was problematic. Ahlstrom's groundbreaking article on the impact of Common Sense Philosophy on American Presbyterian theology set the tone for many that have followed him. In his article, Ahlstrom claims that Scottish realism rendered the doctrines of conservative American Calvinism static, lifeless, and drove out the "fervent theocentricity of Calvin." [32] If McGilvary's articles on missionary medicine are any measure, however, the Reformed and Enlightenment strands of his thinking were more seamless and organic as well as less troubled with the scholarly desire to "make sense" of the relationship between them. It was as if he looked out on reality with two eyes, to make use of a natural image of the type so beloved by Princeton. Although each eye had its distinct point of view, together they provided him with a single, coordinated prospect on the world-not quite enlightened, not quite Reformed, but a blend or a single image that seemed well focused to McGilvary. [33] Thus, in the midst of his commonsensical apologetics for missionary medicine he still affirmed the importance of his confessional heritage. It seemed "natural," "sensible," and "right" to do so.

McGilvary's next article, No. V, reveals precisely this two-eyed, coordinated perspective on the role of science, in general, and medicine, in particular, in missionary evangelism. In a key section of that article, he writes, "No one thinks for a moment that the church is out of her sphere when teaching science in connection with Christianity in Christian lands. They are in fact so intimately connected that they cannot be separated. They are both revelations of God, the one in His word, the other in His works." In "heathen lands," he continues, the teaching of science and Christianity must first overthrow the indigenous "gigantic systems of error" before they can lay down their own foundations. He states in article No. V,

And when we take into consideration that teaching the very first principles of geography and astronomy that matter has not existed from all eternity, and the true theory of the motions and revolutions of the heavenly bodies, the very foundation of Buddhism and other false systems is effectually undermined, who would advocate the rejection of these invaluable handmaidens of religion?

McGilvary concludes, "Some of the simplest truths of western science, when taught to the adult overthrow his system of idolatry, when to the young they can no longer embrace it." McGilvary then returns to his advocacy of missionary medicine, demonstrating how the use of Western medicine tends to undermine northern Thai superstitions about the causes of illness. His point: Western medical care proves conclusively that diseases have natural, not supernatural causes, and that the northern Thai have a wrong view of reality. Medical care made, that is, the same point as his little globe, the North Star, and predictable solar eclipses. With his Reformed eye, McGilvary saw the depravity and sin of the northern Thai, which his Enlightenment eye brought into even sharper focus as superstition. Meanwhile, with that Enlightenment eye he saw the possibilities of using science and medicine to attack that supposedly vast system of error, a vision aided by the Reformed confessional eye's inclination toward a reliance on human cognition.

Some might object that McGilvary's rationale for the practice of missionary medicine sounds utterly devoid of humanitarian concern. In the dark days after September 1869 and the persecution of the infant Chiang Mai Church when the Wilsons and McGilvarys lived in some fear for their lives, McGilvary gave his answer to that objection. Chao Kawilorot told the missionaries at that time that they could stay if they would "merely" practice medicine and refrain from teaching Christianity. McGilvary replied, "We were willing to do all we could for the bodies of the people and to advance their temporal interest. But still all the king's money would not have induced us to come here for any other purpose than to teach Christianity-that it is now and must always be our principle business here." [34] In his autobiography, McGilvary described with some apparent satisfaction the "temporal" value his lay practice of medicine had for the people of Chiang Mai, but from the very first when people asked the McGilvarys why they came they always answered, "We were come with messages of mercy and with offer of eternal life from the great God and Saviour. We were come with a revelation of our Heavenly Father to His wandering and lost children." [35] McGilvary valued the humanitarian healing provided by missionary medicine, but he placed his first concern with the soul rather than the body. In this as in so many other ways, McGilvary's theological and ideological orientation heavily influenced his understanding of his work, defining medicine thus as a tool for undermining northern Thai "superstition" as well as the means for reaching the people's hearts.

Other members of the mission shared McGilvary's proclivity for Baconian medicine to such an extent that it constituted the semi-official policy of the Laos Mission itself, rather than the private inclination of just one member. In the period leading up to the arrival of Dr. Vrooman, Wilson anticipated that long-awaited event with the thought that Vrooman's work would challenge, "the muttering of charms and the incantations of the spirit-doctors' means of cure." He too, in another statement, linked Vrooman's medical work to evangelism, observing that, "Triumph will succeed triumph until victory shall be complete on the side of the Christian physician." Medicine proved the superiority of Christianity, and Wilson triumphantly expected that Vrooman would open wide the doors of northern Siam to the Christian message through his practice of medicine. [36] Dr. Cheek gave particular heed to the relationship of Western medicine to science and how science and medicine stood in enmity with the vast superstructure of northern Thai superstition. He believed that the northern Thais' reasoning facilities had fallen under the power of an absurd, monstrous, and superstitious imagination, and he concluded that any scheme seeking to elevate and enlighten the northern Thai, or desiring their religious and intellectual regeneration, must necessarily include "efficient medical work." He claimed that the "rational treatment of diseases" represented the quickest way to overcome their superstitions. [37] Even the errant Dr. Vrooman appears to have caught something of the vision for Western medicine in Chiang Mai, if only momentarily. Upon his arrival, he wrote of his medical work that,

We hope that this department of our mission work will, in the future as in the past, be an avenue to the confidence and hearts of the people; and that by working together, we may become instrumental in the hands of God of establishing His kingdom in this land, and of turning a nation from the worship of evil spirits and dumb idols unto Him, whom to know is to love and adore. [38]

While lacking in the precise wording of scientific evangelism, Vrooman's sentiments still reflect the collective goal of the pioneer members of the Laos Mission to use medicine to the end that the northern Thai would take leave of their "superstitions" and accept a saving faith in the Christian religion.

When McGilvary wrote his series of articles on missionary medicine in early 1869, his family still resided in that tiny, cramped sala near a city gate, Nan Inta had just been converted,

and the scenes and scents of "exotic" Chiang Mai surrounded him and dominated his waking hours. The people lived within a patron-client social structure rather than a society that (in theory) espoused democracy. They went to temples instead of churches, chanted the Dharma rather than sang Psalms. The very sights and smells of daily life were a far cry from McGilvary's native North Carolina. In that distant setting, nonetheless, he still took up pen and paper to lead his readers through a typical, even proto-typical operation of commonsense logic in defense of missionary medicine. The stark contrast between his articles and his social, cultural, and cognitive context suggests the breadth of the doctrinal and ideological chasm that separated him from the northern Thai, a distance made only wider by his assumption that the chasm did not even exist. In his view, Jesus' time and his, whether it was northern Siam or North Carolina, were essentially the same. Still, while the unvarnished practice of Baconian evangelism yielded up just one sure convert, Baconian medicine captured the attention of all levels of Chiang Mai's population and soon became the main avenue for gaining converts to the missionaries' new religion.

The Practice

The Laos Mission had the attention of the people of Chiang Mai, medically, from its earliest days. Nan Inta, we saw, first went to visit the McGilvays ostensibly for cough medicine. Noi Sunya, another convert, who himself practiced medicine in addition to tending a herd of Chao Kawilorot's cattle, went to see McGilvary the first time because he wanted a cure for goiter, a swelling of the neck glands then common in Chiang Mai. He became a favorite of the McGilvays because he embraced the missionary message at his first encounter with it and agreed to cease all "idolatrous" practices immediately. He attended mission worship services faithfully, and by June 1869, it appeared that his whole family might also convert to Christianity.[39] Nan Chai, a friend and neighbor of Noi Sunya, went to see the McGilvays, not long after their arrival in Chiang Mai, seeking quinine. Thereafter, he proved himself a regular visitor who was soon employed by Wilson as a language teacher and scribe. Like Nan Inta, Nan Chai at first wanted to accept Christianity only secretly so that he could retain his social standing in his community. McGilvary and Wilson firmly pointed him also in the direction of his "duty," and he eventually made a public profession of his new faith.[40] At least two others among the first seven converts brought medical problems to the McGilvays, meaning that no less than five out of the first seven converts initially approached the missionaries for medical assistance.[41] From the first days of their arrival, furthermore, McGilvary devoted considerable time to medical activities, especially in vaccinating people for small pox and distributing simple drugs, most notably quinine. The commitment to medical missions that he articulated in his series of articles in the *North Carolina Presbyterian* reflected his own personal experience at least as much as any body of missiological theory.[42]

When Dr. Vrooman reached Chiang Mai in January 1872, Wilson and McGilvary hoped that he would significantly improve the efficiency of the medical outreach of the Laos Mission in fulfilling their vision for missionary medicine in northern Siam, and Vrooman's initial success seemed to prove the wisdom of pushing medicine into the forefront of the mission's work. He was literally called from the mission boat landing on his arrival to treat Nan Inta, who was suffering from acute dysentery and appeared close to death. Vrooman's timely arrival saved his life. After a few Western-style surgical operations, the first ever performed in Chiang Mai, Vrooman found himself with a wide reputation. The mission also erected its first "hospital" for him, a makeshift, temporary affair of bamboo huts built by the families of the patients themselves and located in the McGilvary compound. By April 1872, those families had constructed eight such huts.[43]

Things did not, however, work out well for Vrooman. His workload was heavy. He felt unable to meet all the demands for his services. He worked day after day, and there was frequently a crowd of people waiting at his door. By April, the pressure and the heat had markedly weakened him. In an attempt to regain his health, he joined McGilvary on the Laos Mission's first long exploration tour, but his health did not improve to any degree. After returning to Chiang Mai briefly, he took another trip, this time down to Bangkok. His health, again, did not improve. By November 1872, discouragement set in. Vrooman felt keenly the lack of a proper hospital, of facilities and equipment for surgery, and his own language limitations. He expressed a desire to be transferred to Japan, then decided to resign, and finally left Chiang Mai for the United States in June 1873, feeling soured not only on the prospects for medical practice in northern Siam but also on the future of the Laos Mission itself.[44] The disillusionment, as we have already seen, was mutual. McGilvary charged that Vrooman failed because he did not base himself thoroughly on the orthodox foundation of Charles Hodge's theology. Vrooman made a bad impression on others as well, including the influential Dr. House in Bangkok, who openly considered Vrooman his enemy and whose opposition contributed to Vrooman's leaving.[45]

Vrooman left discouraged, feeling that professional medicine had little immediate prospect in Chiang Mai. Much to Wilson and McGilvary's embarrassment, he did not hesitate to share his views with the Board, and McGilvary felt constrained to assure the Board that, in spite of his short stay, Vrooman's work proved the need for a doctor. McGilvary avowed, "I regard the success of the experiment as truly wonderful. I still believe that there is no mission connected with the Board where a physician of the right kind can exert so much influence for good as among the Laos." Vrooman, McGilvary argued, had simply not been the right kind of missionary doctor to take advantage of the situation in Chiang Mai.[46] Apparently a wide ideological rift lay between the professional, formerly Methodist doctor and the professional, profoundly Old School evangelist, the one saying Chiang Mai held no hope for Western medicine and the other claiming a bright prospect for its practice among the northern Thai. We will find, shortly, that Dr. Cheek eventually shared several of Vrooman's concerns and similarly lost much of his enthusiasm for practicing medicine in Chiang Mai. McGilvary, on the other hand, remained a stout believer in missionary medicine throughout his missionary career. His confidence in the importance of *Baconian* medicine, as we have seen, was based on his Reformed confessional and Enlightenment understanding of the role of knowledge in salvation and the importance of an objective presentation of the one truth, universal and timeless.

The case of Noi Choi, who received baptism in December 1872, suggests the ultimate seriousness with which McGilvary and Wilson took the question of medicine and how fully they applied their system of doctrines and meanings to its use. Wilson tells the story. In June 1874, he felt compelled to suspend Noi Choi from communion for "complicity in spirit worship" because Noi Choi had allowed a spirit doctor onto the mission compound to care for his sick grandchild, who was visiting him. Wilson tells how he demanded that they leave after he caught them making spirit offerings and using holy water. When the spirit doctor tried to argue with Wilson and tell him Wilson misunderstood what was happening, Wilson took the blessed water and threw it out the window. Noi Choi also tried to explain that the rite did not involve spirit propitiation, but Wilson refused to listen to his reasoning as well, especially because he felt that Noi Choi had become indifferent to Christianity and suspected that he had converted only to get the missionaries to pay off his debts.[47] In his account of this event, Wilson makes it clear that Noi Choi had undergone a great deal of personal suffering both before and after his conversion. He had been accused of causing demon possessions. Several of his children had become debt-slaves to a local member of the governing class. Other members of his family had also been accused of causing demon possession and driven from their homes, only to have some of them die before he could clear them of the charges. Knowing all of this, however, did not influence

Wilson's angry, physical response to Noi Choi's action, because, in his view, Noi Choi had crossed back across the boundary between Christianity and traditional northern Thai religion. He could not hear Noi Choi's attempts to negotiate the placement of that boundary or that Noi Choi sincerely believed the rite he sponsored did not violate his allegiance to Christ. From Wilson's perspective, Noi Choi had turned against God and the truth by allowing a demon-worshipping spirit doctor into the mission compound. However much he might sympathize with Noi Choi, he could not let him get away with such actions-for Noi Choi's own sake as much as anything else. Wilson, in this instance, drew hard, clear boundaries between Christianity and culture for reasons he perceived to be of dire necessity. He did not intend to treat Noi Choi harshly. Noi Choi, on the other hand, tried to draw the boundaries between Christianity and northern Thai culture more loosely (or, at least, in a different place), while seeking to solve a serious problem with the cultural and medical resources at hand. Noi Choi did not believe he was renouncing his Christian faith, and, after his suspension, he applied for readmission to the church three times. The church accepted him back into membership in 1876.[48]

A person's system of doctrines and meanings powerfully focuses that person's attention. Wilson did not see in Noi Choi a grandfather concerned for his grandson's health. He did not see a ceremonial application of traditional northern Thai medicine that might have been unrelated to matters of religious faith. He did not see, that is, a possibly harmless situation that might have been dealt with circumspectly and even afforded him an opportunity for further instruction of a new Christian. What he *thought and believed* he saw left him with no latitude in his response. Equally to the point, he did not see these events as an opportunity to learn more about the cognitive and spiritual world of Noi Choi. He saw, rather, devil worship taking place on mission premises and dealt forcefully, immediately to halt it. However we might view the different interpretations Wilson and Noi Choi each gave to the rites of traditional medicine, they betray a vital difference in their understanding of medical care itself. Noi Choi wanted to heal his grandson. His act had, for him, no essential relationship to Christian faith. Wilson, however, equated northern Thai medical practices with animism. Noi Choi's act was packed with theological and ideological meaning.

As an aside, Wilson's handling of Noi Choi testifies to the somewhat different way in which their systems of meanings and doctrines influenced McGilvary and Wilson. We have already seen, in Chapter Two, that McGilvary generally acted out of the moderate approach typical of several of the Princetonians, while Wilson seemed more prone to an emotional and sentimental attitude. At the risk of over-simplifying the matter, it does seem that McGilvary more consciously exemplified the Princeton Theology itself whereas Wilson more readily operated from the ideological substrata implied not only in Princeton but also in nineteenth-century American evangelical attitudes and values generally. As far as we know, McGilvary never acted harshly, abused northern Thai sensibilities so blatantly, or in any way behaved in a manner that could be labeled ungentlemanly. In this case, Wilson did behave harshly, abusively, and ungentlemanly, according to the customs of the northern Thai people.

In the years after Noi Choi's suspension from the church in May 1874, the Laos Mission continued to employ Baconian medical evangelism as one of its key strategies for winning northern Thai converts. In February 1875, it stood again on the verge of taking a major step forward in its medical program with the arrival in Chiang Mai of Dr. Cheek, its second professional physician. If his colleagues hoped for an immediate expansion of medical work, however, they were disappointed. Cheek's first year, 1875, repeated Vrooman's experience of 1872-1873. Cheek did perform some impressive operations and, in McGilvary's own words, "He has had a few very successful patients in the King's palace which will greatly aid his practice." [49] Otherwise, however, he did little medical work, one reason being a lack of medicines to dispense.[50] Cheek was not a Vrooman, however, and in spite of the problems he

faced in taking up medical practice in Chiang Mai, he avowed in September 1875 that he expected to enjoy his work as a doctor. He had, by that time, also begun to articulate a vision for his work, one that included the construction of a hospital. In August 1875 he wrote to New York that,

I have been studying the language a part of the time; but I have not had an opportunity of doing any medical work since I came here. And, indeed the prospect in the future, I must say, is not cheering. Unless I have a hospital here, my medical work will be a failure. I may give out medicine to any who come for it and visit as many as I can; but this will do little good except to relieve suffering to a slight extent. I would be able to reach only a very few in this way. I could visit only a small number, and my practice would be very unsatisfactory both to the patient and myself. The people are scattered and few in number.

Cheek concluded, "A hospital is necessary if a medical man is expected to do enough work to justify keeping him here." [51] He sounded just like Vrooman, and like Vrooman he had a very different attitude about the value of medical work from that of McGilvary and Wilson.

McGilvary seconded Cheek's desire for a hospital, nonetheless, but for quite different reasons. Where Cheek believed he could not be a successful doctor without a hospital, McGilvary felt much greater concern over the fact that when Cheek treated patients in their homes they also made use of animistic cures and, thus, did not give full and complete credit to missionary medicine for their recoveries. In a controlled institutional setting, the mission could prevent people from combining Western and indigenous medical treatments, a situation McGilvary much preferred because, as he wrote, the "One great object we expect to gain from medical missions among the Laos is to break the superstitious belief in the power of charms and incantations." [52] In the event, Cheek did establish a small, makeshift hospital composed again of grass huts, with evangelistic results that, to a degree, confirmed McGilvary's doctrinal and theological arguments for a medical institution. On the first Sunday of December 1876, for example, the church received four men into its membership, including Noi Wong, Nan Inta's son-in-law, and Noi Aliya, Nan Panya, and Lung (Uncle) Tooi. All four of these men had received treatment from Dr. Cheek at his bamboo hospital. [53]

McGilvary's account of Nan Panya's conversion is especially helpful because it reflects both Nan Panya's feelings about his conversion and his neighbors' reactions to that conversion. Nan Panya had been a devout individual before his coming under Cheek's care, but, after his month in the hospital, he lost interest in his former religion. He stated, according to McGilvary, that his heart was no longer in the temple. McGilvary writes,

The villagers wondered what spell had come over him to keep him from the temple and his idols. There was a general mourning over his defection. That he should give up all his store of merit, the accumulation of a devotee of three score years and ten and become crazy over the notion of the foreign teachers was surely a sad comment on human fallibility from their stand point. He was the one man of the village of whom all of this would not have been expected. [54]

During his long stay at Dr. Cheek's hospital, Nan Panya learned things and had experiences that encouraged him to become a Christian, to cross over, that is, the boundary between his former and his new religion. By taking the step of conversion, he acted according to the mission's ideological conception of the nature of truth, the exclusivity of Christianity, and the division of

reality into antagonistic spheres of God and Satan, good and evil. His neighbors took a different view of the matter. His conversion surprised and dismayed them, and they considered him a fool, or worse for giving up all of the benefits of his own religion; it was foolish to become a Christian. His conversion, that is, alienated Nan Panya from his neighbors who took conversion to Christianity to be a negative, regrettable act, thereby divorcing the Christian religion from further consideration by them. Some may have changed their minds later, but generally people saw Christianity as an alien, competing, and regrettable religion-viewing it in much the same way that Chao Kawilorot had seen it less than a decade earlier.

If McGilvary's account is correct, it appears that both McGilvary himself and Nan Panya's neighbors fixed their attention on the same point, namely the fact that converts had to reject Buddhism and defect from their former religious practices. The point, for the neighbors at least, was not that Nan Panya became a believer in Jesus but that he defected from the temple. In this particular instance, McGilvary claimed that Nan Panya lost interest in Buddhism, implying that he himself was the one who decided to break away from Buddhism completely. As we have already seen, however, in other instances where converts, such as Nan Inta and Nan Chai, did not want to make a total, overt break the mission still insisted that they totally divorce themselves from their former faith. The records of the Laos Mission indicate thus that the medical and scientific strategies of Baconian evangelism intentionally built walls against rather than bridges reaching across to the people of Chiang Mai. The mission's reliance on hospitals, which in the decades after 1890 became a major component in its overall program, only strengthened the religious ramparts separating Christianity from the people. The strategy, indeed, calls to mind Gerald Grob's study of nineteenth-century American mental hospitals. According to Grob, many evangelical Protestants in the years before 1860 considered mental illness a moral problem caused by individuals failing to live up to the norms and values of rural, Protestant American culture. They saw the mental hospital as the perfect tool for retraining social deviants because it provided a controlled environment that allowed those in charge to carry out a scheme of "moral therapy" intended to cure the mentally ill person, a cure that emphasized placing the patient in a safe, humane environment.[55] Dr. Cheek's little hospital, in like manner, provided a "safe" evangelical-Baconian haven where the mission could overcome the supposed moral, social, and religious deficiencies of its "heathen" patients through the exercise of full social control over them.

The mission's strategy of gaining converts through this process of placing them in a medical institution, as we observed above, did work to a limited extent; it faced the obvious problem, however, that the Laos Mission could only hospitalize a small number of individuals and only a certain number of those so hospitalized actually converted. This dilemma symbolizes the inherent problem the mission faced in its drive to evangelize the people of Chiang Mai through a Baconian strategy premised on Enlightenment epistemological assumptions. The application of Newtonian principles to religion and arguments based on an analogy between science and Christianity did not make sense to the great majority of people. Baconian evangelism failed in its efforts to teach them to mistrust the Buddha and give up the religious ways of their ancestors. It did not prove to them that their medical practices were superstitious. One had to accept an Enlightenment epistemology for Baconian medicine to make sense, and the mission had no way of instructing potential converts in that epistemology unless it could remove them from their every day world. The mission's records also contain no evidence for the years up to 1880, again excepting only Nan Inta, suggesting that those who converted to Christianity did so because they accepted the argument that Buddhism had a false cosmology and, therefore, they should convert. It is little wonder that Edna Cole later remarked, as we saw in Chapter Two, on the ignorance of the "native Christians," how they understood so little about the Christian faith, and how they still stood in need of "real life" in Jesus. The missionaries were quite unaware of how much they depended on Enlightenment thinking, one reason being that the Scottish

Enlightenment itself assured them that humanity shares one common, fundamental nature, moral code, and religious consciousness. If, therefore, the northern Thai failed to comprehend the missionary message, it must necessarily be because of the people's failings and not due to any inherent problems in the delivery of the message.

Another of the weak links in the mission's exercise of Baconian medicine during the pioneer period was the two doctors themselves, Vrooman and Cheek. By 1877, a scant two years after Cheek's first arrival, McGilvary once again found himself responsible for most of the mission's medical program. In an April 1877 letter, laced with obvious irritation and disappointment, McGilvary informed the Board that Cheek, not long returned from Bangkok, had just left again for yet another trip down river. Cheek pleaded a hernia that needed quick and proper medical attention, but McGilvary point blank accused him of running off to Bangkok every time some little ailment appeared, threatened Cheek with Board displeasure at his frequent health trips, and required that he personally pay most of the expenses for his trip to Bangkok. McGilvary's disappointment was doubly keen because he felt Cheek had a promising medical practice that could be the means for converting many to Christianity. Cheek, for his part, began to contemplate the possibility of finding missionary work some place else in Siam besides Chiang Mai, which he considered an extremely unhealthy place to live.[56]

McGilvary, thus, had to take over the medical work-and this at a time when the mission's supply of quinine was low and the number of fever cases very high. When word got out that the quinine was nearly gone, there was a rush of patients so large that McGilvary could not handle them all. There were a few deaths, but McGilvary proved himself once again a capable lay physician. First, he noted that many of the ill he treated were suffering mostly from scurvy imposed on them by animistic medical procedures. He started feeding them fish and rice. He also whipped up from the mission's supply of drugs his own experimental substitute for quinine and found that it worked quite well in many cases. Nan Inta and another recent convert, Nan Suwan, helped him with this work and took the opportunity to discuss Christianity with many of the patients McGilvary treated.[57] On the whole, however, McGilvary would have much preferred that Cheek carry out this work and put the mission's medical program on a secure, permanent footing. During the next three years, 1878-1880, Cheek did appear to settle down somewhat, worked in a more orderly fashion, and, thus, treated an increased number of patients. Wilson's annual mission report for 1879 indicates that many of those hospital patients who recovered were "disposed" to give the Christian religion a hearing.[58]

In the decades after 1880 and especially after 1900, the Laos Mission developed a relatively extensive network of hospitals and schools that came to dominate much of its efforts both in outreach and in Christian education.[59] Cheek's hospital, thus, was a portent of future developments in mission institutional work, both in its advantages and its limitations as a tool for evangelistic outreach. Social control, the temporary removal of potential converts from their cultural context, the implementation of the principle that Christians should live apart from that context, and the perception by northern Thai society that Christianity turned neighbors into strangers-all of this began in the mission's pioneer period. McGilvary's approach to evangelism, in particular, dug deep, permanent channels for the mission and set the pattern for future activities and behavior. Or, perhaps more correctly, McGilvary's strategy for using medicine as a tool for evangelistic outreach reflected deeper currents of thinking among Presbyterian missionaries over several generations. As late as 1891, Dr. William Briggs of the Lampang Station, informed the Board of Foreign Missions that God had blessed his medical work as an aid in breaking down superstition and gaining him access to the people's homes and hearts.[60] It seems, however, that later missionaries tended to replace Wilson and McGilvary's Baconian agenda and its emphasis on combating "heathen superstition" with a more practical perception

that successful medical care opened peoples' hearts. Dr. Charles Crooks, writing in 1912, and the Rev. John H. Freeman, writing in 1910, both stressed the importance of the missionary doctor as an agent for relieving human suffering, bringing people new hope, and thus gaining their sympathetic attention for the presentation of the Christian message.[61] Even at that, mission doctors long retained their desire to place their patients in hospitals for evangelistic as well as medical reasons. In 1899, Dr. Mary Bowman wrote,

Promiscuous medical work does not seem to yield as satisfactory results as hospital work. If the patients come to remain a short time even, they come directly under Christian teaching, while if attended in their homes they can hear a very little of our faith and continue to worship the spirits, and very often combine the native treatment with that of the foreign physician.[62]

Although the Laos Mission's original Baconian agenda for its medical work quietly faded away, the behavioral pattern initiated in the years before 1880 remained in place. The mission engaged in an extensive range of medical activities, including the founding of hospitals in each of its stations, and medical care continued to be a key element in its overall program of evangelistic outreach. Medical outreach attained a climax during a widespread and serious outbreak of malaria that took place between 1911 and 1916. The mission added well over a thousand new members to its rolls, the result of the medical assistance it provided people in dire need.[63]

Conclusion

It is difficult to assess the impact of the Laos Mission's use of Baconian medicine for the simple reason that the missionary record fails to state with any clarity why those who benefited from missionary medicine converted. As the years went by, as we have just seen, the mission increasingly emphasized winning people's gratitude and giving them hope as the reasons for medical work. The cognitive approach with its goal of replacing the northern Thai worldview with an American Protestant one quietly dropped by the wayside, surely because it never appealed to the people. In any event, the mission did not carry out its program of Baconian medicine as a series of discrete, frequent discussions in the manner of McGilvary's evangelistic strategy, and it seems doubtful that the missionaries sat down with patients and carried on an intellectual dialogue with them, explaining how the successes of Western medicine should teach them to reject Buddhism. McGilvary did not carry his globe into the bamboo wards of the mission hospital. It appears that the "natives" were left to make the connection between medicine and Christianity for themselves. They made the connection in terms of a feeling of gratitude, or relief, or because they found in the Christian God a new Spirit Guardian more powerful than other animistic spirits.[64] Those who converted, as far as we can tell from an admittedly spotty record, did not do so because they made an intellectual connection between the superiority of Western medicine and the religious truth of Protestant Christianity. If very many of them had, we would surely have heard about it in the Laos Mission's letters and papers.

Missionary medicine, premised on Baconian assumptions, in sum, contributed substantially to the modest levels of conversion gained by the Laos Mission-in spite of those assumptions, not because of them. While we are working towards the conclusion that the Laos Mission's system of doctrines and meanings contributed significantly to the mission's failure to contextualize the Christian faith in northern Siam, that does not mean that it was always a stumbling block. Sometimes, as the mission's medical experience suggests, that system was irrelevant. The point that follows is equally important, namely that even when the mission's system of doctrines and meanings was irrelevant to the people of northern Siam it caused the missionaries to expect results that would never come and hope for religious changes in northern Thai culture that have never taken place.

Conclusion

Four important points emerge from this chapter. First, the Laos Mission's evangelistic strategy played a key role in the pioneer period in determining how the mission addressed the people of Chiang Mai and which individuals received particular attention. The mission engaged the people in a debate over cosmological as well as theological issues, and, in the process, it gave particular attention to the small class of educated people who had an interest in arguing over matters of science and religion. Second, although the Baconian justification for evangelism and medicine gradually disappeared, the Laos Mission in later years continued to engage in medical activities originally designed to employ the analogy between science and religion to northern Thai evangelism. The system of meanings and doctrines shifted (at least somewhat), but the pattern of behavior remained the same. Third, the Laos Mission found it difficult to listen to other voices. It rejected Nan Inta, Nan Chai, and Noi Choi's urgent advice that it consider redefining its doctrinal and ideological boundaries in a way they felt better fit the northern Thai worldview. It could not accept the idea that one could worship Jesus and attend temple ceremonies or use holy water and still be a Christian. Finally, the Laos Mission built its evangelistic strategy, its directions for ministry, and its attitudes concerning northern Thai Christian advice on the foundation of its Baconian, Princeton-like system of doctrines and meanings, which system it brought with it from the United States.

Taken together, these four points lead us to the conclusion that the mission's evangelistic outreach directed some of its efforts and much of its attention to issues that did not concern the vast majority of northern Thais. They suggest, furthermore, that the mission's commonsensical, dualistic epistemology made it difficult for its members to understand that the vast majority of northern Thai made no connection between Western science and Christianity or that the northern Thai people could accept the science and some elements of Christianity and yet not feel compelled to convert. The Laos Mission functioned, thus, much more effectively as a carrier of modernization than of Christianity.

Notes

Abbreviations:

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AP	<i>American Presbyterians</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
BRPR	<i>Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
JAH	<i>Journal of American History</i>
JER	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of Presbyterian History</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Social History</i>
NCP	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian</i>
NCP NS	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian New Series</i>
LN	<i>Laos News</i>
PQPR	<i>Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review</i>
SCJ	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>
WJT	<i>Westminster Journal of Theology</i>
WWW	<i>Women's Work for Women</i>

[1] See Edwin Zehner, "Church Growth and Culturally Appropriate Leadership: Three Examples From the Thai Church" (Unpublished paper, School of World Mission, 1987), 25ff.

[2] For the Laos Mission's success in Westernization, see, Herbert R. Swanson, "Advocate and Partner: Missionaries and Modernization in Nan Province, Siam, 1895-1934," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 13, 2 (September 1982): 296-309.

[3] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 79.

[4] Alexander, *Evidences*, 176, 177.

[5] See, Bozeman, "Inductive and Deductive Politics," 714.

[6] The following discussion is based on McGilvary to Brother Sherwood, 31 December 1868, *NCP* New Series 2, 77(23 June 1869): 2; McGilvary, "Our First Convert," *NCP* New Series 2, 85 (18 August 1869): 4; McGilvary, undated letter in *FM* 28, 3 (August 1869): 58-63; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 96-9. See also Curtis, *Laos of North Siam*, 264-65.

[7] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 97.

[8] McGilvary, "Our First Convert," *NCP* New Series 2, 85 (18 August 1869): 4.

[9] McGilvary, undated letter in *FM* 28, 3 (August 1869): 59.

[10] McGilvary, undated letter in *FM* 28, 3 (August 1869): 59.

[11] McGilvary, undated letter in *FM* 28, 3 (August 1869): 60.

[12] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP* New Series 3, 106 (12 January 1870): 4.

[13] See McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP* New Series 1, 26 (2 July 1868): 4, where McGilvary refers to the Buddha as an "idol-god." For a more detailed description on McGilvary's views on Buddhism as superstition, see McGilvary, letter dated 21 February 1876, *NCP* NS 9, 440 (14 June 1876): 4. Also found in, McGilvary, "Warming of Buddh," *FM* 35, 4 (September 1876): 121-23.

[14] McGilvary, undated letter in *FM* 28, 3 (August 1869): 60.

[15] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 98.

[16] Concerning the Siam Mission, see McFarland, *Historical Sketch*, 50.

[17] *Half Century*, 158.

[18] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP* New Series 5, 280 (14 May 1873): 4. See also McGilvary, *Half Century*, 158ff; and McGilvary to Irving, 28 February 1873, v. 3, BFM.

[19] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 163.

[20] McGilvary, letter dated 21 February 1876, *NCP* New Series 9, 440 (14 June 1876): 4.

[21] McGilvary, "The Laos Mission, *NCP* New Series 10, 485 (25 April 1877): 1.

[22] James W. Van Dyke, "Report of the Station at Petchaburi for the year ending Sep 30th 1874," v. 3, BFM.

[23] Culbertson to Irving, 10 November 1876, v. 3, BFM.

[24] McGilvary, undated letter, *FM* 28, 9 (February 1870): 215.

[25] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 180-86.

[26] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 188.

[27] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks." *NCP* New Series 7, 356 (4 November 1874): 4.

[28] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 158-59.

[29] The articles referred to are here cited in the text by their article number. See the Bibliography for the full citation of each article.

[30] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 97.

[31] Loetscher, *Facing the Enlightenment*, 161; Kennedy, "Sin and Grace," 144; Vander Stelt, *Philosophy and Scripture*, 287; and Stewart, "Tethered Theology," 268-69.

[32] Ahlstrom, "The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology," 269.

[33] This image is borrowed from John A. T. Robinson, *Truth is two-eyed* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979).

[34] McGilvary to Irving, 17 February 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[35] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 88-90, 78-9.

[36] Wilson to Irving, 24 October 1871, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson, undated letter, *FM* 31, 10 (March 1873): 307. See also, Wilson, letter dated 7 July 1869, *FM* 28, 10 (March 1870): 232-33.

[37] Cheek, "Treatment of the Sick," in *Siam and Laos as Seen by Our American Missionaries*, 515-16. More generally, see, Cheek, "Treatment of the Sick, 511-24; and Dr. and Mrs. Cheek, "Superstitions of the Laos," in *Siam and Laos as Seen by Our American Missionaries*, 504-10.

[38] C. W. Vrooman, letter dated, 6 February 1872, *FM* 31, 2 (July 1872): 52.

[39] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," dated July 1869, *NCP* New Series 3, 107 (19 January 1870): 4; McGilvary undated letter, *FM* 28, 9 (February 1870): 212-17; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 99-100.

[40] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," dated 1 September 1869, *NCP* New Series 3, 111 (16 February 1870): 4; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 100-01, 114.

[41] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," dated July 1869, *NCP* New Series 3, 107 (19 January 1870): 4; and McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," dated 1 September 1869, *NCP* New Series 3, 110 (9 February 1870): 4.

[42] See, McGilvary, *Half Century*, 86-8; and McFarland, *Historical Sketch*, 117.

[43] C. W. Vrooman, letter dated 6 February 1872, *FM* 31, 2 (July 1872): 51-2; and McGilvary, letter dated 10 April 1872, *FM* 31, 5 (October 1872): 150-51.

[44] Vrooman to Irving, 6 February 1872 and 7 November 1872, v. 3, BFM; McGilvary to Irving, 4 December 1872 and 28 February 1873, v. 3, BFM; McGilvary, *Half Century*, 150-59; Wilson, undated letter, *FM* 31, 10 (March 1873): 307-8; and McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP* New Series 5, 282 (28 May 1873): 4.

[45] McGilvary to Lowrie, 8 November 1875, v. 3, BFM; Vrooman to Irving, 7 November 1872, and 15 April 1874, v. 3, BFM ; and House to Irving, 12 August 1873, v. 3, BFM.

[46] McGilvary to Irving, 6 January 1873, v. 3, BFM.

[47] Wilson to Irving, 5 June 1874, v. 3, BFM. Also found in Wilson, letter, 5 June 1874, *FM* 33, 7 (December 1874): 214-18.

[48] "Sessional Records. The First Presbyterian Church of Chiangmai," in the Records of the American Presbyterian Mission (Payap University), 32, 41.

[49] McGilvary, "For the Family," *NCP* New Series 9, 417 (7 January 1876): 4.

[50] Cheek to Irving, 3 September 1875, v. 3.

[51] Cheek to Ellinwood, 21 August 1875, v. 3, BFM. Emphasis in the original.

[52] McGilvary, "For the Family," letter dated 1 October 1875, *NCP* NS 9, 417 (7 January 1876): 4.

[53] "Sessional Records," 45-49; and McGilvary, "The Laos Mission," letter dated 5 December 1876, *NCP* New Series 10, 485 (25 April 1877): 1.

[54] McGilvary to Irving, 4 December 1876, v. 3, BFM. Emphasis in the original.

[55] Gerald N. Grob, "Mental Illness, Indigency, and Welfare: the Mental Hospital in Nineteenth-Century America," in *Anonymous Americans: Explorations in Nineteenth-Century Social History*, ed. Tamara K. Hareven (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971), 250-79. For a fuller treatment of the points made here, see Swanson, "This Heathen People," 128-29.

[56] McGilvary to Irving, 21 April 1877, v. 4, BFM; and Cheek to Irving, 20 June 1877, v. 4, BFM.

[57] McGilvary to Irving, 10 August 1877, v. 4, BFM; and McGilvary to Irving, 6 December 1877, v. 4, BFM.

[58] Wilson, "Annual Report of North Laos Mission for the year ending Sept. 30th 1879," 30 September 1879, v. 4, BFM. See also, Cheek to Irving, [October? 1879], v. 4, BFM; Wilson to Brethren, [Annual Report], 30 September 1880, v. 4, BFM; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 225.

[59] See Swanson, *Khrischak Muang Nua*, 120-22.

[60] Briggs to Mitchell, 21 August 1891, v. 9, BFM.

[61] Charles H. Crooks, "Chas. T. Van Santwoord Hospital. Lakawn Dispensary," *LN* 9, 4 (October 1912): 142; and John H. Freeman, *An Oriental Land of the Free* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1910), 138-40.

[62] Mary A. Bowman-Irwin, "Report of Nan Medical Work for the year 1899," v. 22, BFM.

[63] Swanson, *Khrischak Muang Nua*, 138-41.

[64] See, Hughes, *Proclamation and Response*, 19-20.

CHAPTER FIVE

Theology, Ideology, and the Church

Outline of the Chapter

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [Martyrs' Blood](#)
 - 2.1. [Events Leading Up to the Persecution of 1869](#)
 - 2.2. [The Persecution](#)
3. [Interregnum](#)
 - 3.1. [Dormacy](#)
 - 3.2. [Resurrection](#)
4. [The Edict of Religious Toleration](#)
 - 4.1. [The Event](#)
 - 4.2. [Impact of the Edict](#)
5. [Conclusion](#)
6. [Notes](#)

Introduction

Even before the mission baptized its first convert, it turned its attention to the establishment of a church, and, in the process, confronted two major crises, in 1869 and 1878. Each crisis involved a political confrontation between the mission and the Chiang Mai state government that reflected, at a deeper level, a conflict between systems of meaning. Conservative political forces feared the missionaries' new religion because it seemed bent on overturning the religion of the people, thus undermining one of the pillars of social and political stability. State repression of the early Christian community represented one of northern Thai society's most important responses to missionary evangelism. State-church tensions also highlighted the Laos Mission's attempt to introduce its own system of doctrines and meanings into Chiang Mai while eschewing any contextualization of that system. As we will see in what follows, the group most immediately affected by that attempt was the first generation of northern Thai Christians.

This chapter focuses on the crises of 1869 and 1878 as well as key events in the founding of the church in the intervening years. In 1869, Chao Kawilorot, the Prince of Chiang Mai, successfully interrupted the initial formation of a northern Thai church and delayed its effective establishment for nearly a decade; in 1878, his ideological heirs failed to halt the church's permanent emergence. By 1880, thus, the Laos Mission successfully instituted a stable, growing northern Thai church, but at great cost and in ways that ultimately precluded any large migration from traditional religion to the "Jesus religion."

Martyrs' Blood

Introduction

Apart from the arrival of the McGilvays in Chiang Mai in 1867 and the conversion of Nan Inta in 1868, Chao Kawilorot's brutal suppression of the first community of northern Thai converts in September 1869 stands as the most important single event in the history of the Laos Mission and its churches. It halted the foundation and formation of the church for several years and, consequently, fundamentally altered the mission's relationship to its converts. In the course of events, it also exemplified the impact of the mission's Princeton-like system of doctrines and meanings on the course of northern Thai mission and church history. Although grim and bloody in its consequences, the persecution of September 1869 was in part a cognitive event, a clash of meanings that had severe consequences for the Laos Mission and its churches.

Events Leading Up to the Persecution of 1869

From the very first, the Laos Mission lived in the shadow of Chao Kawilorot's reputation as a man best not trifled with, a man with a keen sense of his own prerogatives. Although not present when the McGilvays arrived in Chiang Mai in April 1867, his reputation was such that as soon as they began to preach their new religion, a rumor spread among the people that anyone employed by the McGilvays would be punished in some unknown but severe way. Their language teacher immediately quit. Chao Kawilorot, on his return, however, showed them nothing but kindness and everything seemed fine between him and the mission; but as time passed, Kawilorot quietly grew more suspicious and resentful of the missionaries. For a time he even employed a foreign advisor who sought to undermine the McGilvays' standing with the ruling class and the people.[1] The Laos Mission, in the meantime, went about the task of establishing its first church, made possible by the visit of Dr. Samuel R. House of the Siam Mission in early 1868. The minutes of the church, written by McGilvary, record that,

The committee appointed by the Presbytery of Siam to organize a church in Chiangmai met at the house of Rev. J. Wilson on the evening of Saturday April 18th 1868. Prayer was offered by Rev. D. McGilvary, chairman of the committee. Rev. J. Wilson was appointed secretary. Mrs. Sophia Bradley McGilvary presented a letter of dismission from the church in Petchaburi. And as Mrs. Kate M. Wilson is known to be a member of the church in good standing and though the letter of dismission for which she applied to the church of Bethlehem Pa. has failed to reach her, on motion She and Mrs. McGilvary were received as members of the newly constituted church, to be known as The First Presbyterian of Chiangmai. It was resolved that the government and discipline of this church be for the present committed to the ordained members of the Chiangmai Mission.[2]

The new church worshipped officially for the first time the next day, April 19th, when it administered the sacrament of baptism to the Wilsons' and McGilvays' newly born infants, Margaret Wilson and Cornelia McGilvary. Dr. House, himself a clergyman, then conducted communion, "it being the first time the sacraments of the church were ever administered in this land." [3]

The founding of the Chiang Mai Church surely appeared to the Wilsons and McGilvays to be a normal, expected event that required no elaborate explanation, such as McGilvary gave for the importance of missionary medicine (See Chapter Four). It does strike one as odd, however, that the new church's only officers were the missionary men, its only members the missionary women, and its only baptisms were of missionary children. Further reflection uncovers additional oddities, particularly in the context of nineteenth-century Chiang Mai, such as the fact that the ecclesiastical forms, structures, and procedures involved were all American Presbyterian and the first language of the church was English. The formation of the Chiang Mai Church, that is, took place at a substantial cultural distance from its northern Thai social context and poses questions

not unlike those we began with in the Introduction. Why did the mission establish a church in such a blatantly foreign way? Why did it show so little interest in drawing on religious resources from its cultural context in order to fit its infant church to its social and cultural setting? As far as we can tell, these questions never even occurred to the McGilvays and Wilsons, a point that reinforces the impression that they operated from a set of assumptions that grew out of their own system of doctrines and meanings. They simply took Presbyterian polity as a given, a system of church order based on Scripture that required no adaptation to the different situation in Chiang Mai. In Chiang Mai's "heathen" context, indeed, their system of meanings and doctrines precluded any idea of adapting Presbyterian forms to northern Thai sensibilities, which they believed to be "benighted" and "enslaved" to the forces of evil. Commonsense thinking would have also encouraged them to ignore the fact that American Presbyterianism was historically and culturally conditioned and to assume that they could use Presbyterian forms in Chiang Mai as well as American churches used them in Pennsylvania or North Carolina. Missionary ideology and theology, we will recall, was a closed, reified system with a keen sense of sharply defined boundaries. Such a system virtually dictated an American ecclesiastical order for the churches of the Laos Mission. Closed systems do not adapt their forms and structures to cultural contexts believed to stand beyond the doctrinal and ideological pale of the system itself.

The writings of Alexander T. McGill, one of McGilvary and Wilson's professors at Princeton, reinforce our sense that his former students took a closed system of meanings and doctrines to Chiang Mai that automatically rejected the contextualization of ecclesiastical structures and procedures. McGill particularly compares the democratic institutions of the Presbyterian Church to the American government, writing, "The Church begins in heaven; the State begins on earth. The Church begins with unity, the State with multiplicity. The Church is founded on one divine 'Rock'; the State is founded on many minute constituencies of men." [4] He implicitly identifies, that is, the Presbyterian Church with the true Church and the Church with Heaven, the sacred realm of everything that is eternal and unchanging. The church stands thus far above the state and culture even in America. It is difficult to believe that McGill's two former students in Chiang Mai would have thought any differently about the relationship between church and state in that context.

The decision to found the Chiang Mai Church at some social and cultural distance from the city's people, however, did not initially intrude on the development of a northern Thai church; things went generally well for the rest of 1868 and into 1869. We have already told the tale of Nan Inta's conversion and admission into the church as its first northern Thai member. McGilvary later claimed that Nan Inta's "...defection from Buddhism produced a profound impression among all classes. Emboldened by his example, secret believers became more open. Not the number alone, but the character of the enquirers attracted attention." [5] He reported that prospective converts included at least one member of the extended royal family, another member of the rural petty ruling class, and several commoners. Interest in Christianity also spread to the neighboring state of Lamphun. The early months of 1869, thus, represented a time of great hope for the McGilvays and Wilsons, the one dark cloud on the horizon being Chao Kawilorot. No one knew how he would react to the growing interest in Christianity of a number of his subjects. McGilvary took some comfort in the fact that during these months the Prince treated the missionaries kindly and threw up no hindrances to their work, but he still felt that matters would come to a head in 1869. [6] The increased interest in Christianity soon began to bear visible results as six more men joined the church between January and September 1869. On 2 May 1869 Boonma and Noi Sunya received baptism, followed by Saan Ya Wichai on June 27th and Nan Chai, Noi Kanta, and Poo Sang on August 1st. McGilvary claimed that many others were considering conversion and watching to see what Chao Kawilorot would do. [7] McGilvary and Wilson felt they stood on the verge of a "people's movement," and many people assured them that if Chao Kawilorot did not move against the incipient Christian community, there would be

many more conversions. The audiences they addressed impressed the missionaries as being attentive and thoughtful. They felt the presence of God in their work, and McGilvary, at one point, declared enthusiastically that northern Siam was possibly the most promising Presbyterian mission field in the world. By September 1869, they had asked Siam Presbytery for permission to establish new churches at their own discretion, an act that showed they were preparing to receive many new converts.[8] Whether or not McGilvary and Wilson were correct in that assessment, Chao Kawilorot evidently agreed that "something" was indeed happening-something he did not like and wanted to halt as quickly as possible.

The Persecution

Both Nan Inta and Nan Chai, as we have already seen in Chapter Four, originally wished to "ease into" their new religious affiliation by undergoing a private rather than public baptism, but McGilvary and Wilson insisted in the strongest terms that duty required them to make a clear, public profession of their Christian faith. In northern Thai culture, an act conducted in private can be considered "unofficial" even though everyone knows it has taken place. It would appear that Nan Inta and Nan Chai were not asking to be "secret" Christians so much as private, unofficial ones. People would know that they had become Christians, so there was nothing secret in their conversion. Yet, by refraining from making a public break with Buddhist-animistic practices they would not offend the sensibilities of their neighbors, thereby also avoiding the official notice of the authorities. McGilvary and Wilson would not have made a distinction between a secret and an unofficial follower of Christ; the converts were forbidden from making any compromise with their former beliefs. Nan Inta and Nan Chai had proposed to their foreign mentors a northern Thai process for conversion that sought to avoid an abrupt break with society and confrontation with political authority. In their general social and immediate political context, such an approach seemed eminently sensible to them, but it did not fit the missionaries' ideological and theological understanding of what it meant to convert-to cross over, that is, a clear boundary from superstition to truth. In this particular case, the missionaries' insistence on their approach led to grievous consequences for the converts.

Hodge addresses the question of "soft" conversions in *The Way of Life*, a popular evangelical treatise that we may presume several pioneer members of the Laos Mission had read at one time or another. His strictures against such conversions help us to understand Wilson and McGilvary's handling of the matter in Chiang Mai. Realizing that some Christians may want to hide their conversion for various reasons, Hodge rejects that option out of hand. Christians, he argues, have public obligations that require an open confession. Hodge condemns those who try to escape those obligations for their weak faith and claims that a large portion of converts must face the pain of ridicule and chastisement. Christianity, he states flatly, cannot remain hidden. The Bible, if nothing else, demands public profession. In words that take on a particular force in light of the Laos Mission's context in Chiang Mai, he insists that converts take Christ as their King and profess their allegiance publicly. They take Christ as their father and must give him public honor and obedience. He states,

But what kind of worshipper is he who is ashamed or afraid to acknowledge his God? All the relations, therefore, in which a Christian stands to Christ, as his king, as the head of the family of God and as the object of divine worship, involve the necessity of confessing him before men; and we practically reject him in all these relations by neglecting or refusing this public profession of him and his religion.

Being a Christian, Hodge argues further, cannot be hidden in any event because Christians have to behave in ways utterly alien to general social conventions. He writes, "This is one of the reasons why the people of God are called saints. They are distinguished, separated from others

and consecrated to God. When they cease to be distinguished from those around them, they cease to be saints." [9] Hodge concludes with the unequivocal statement concerning every convert's confession of faith that, "This confession must be made public; it must be made before men; it must be made with the mouth, and not left to be inferred from the conduct." [10]

McGilvary and Wilson never elaborated on their refusal to entertain the notion of a "back door" or "soft" conversion. It took Hodge, a man with the theological training and time, to work out precisely why a convert must confess her or his faith publicly; but whether in Chiang Mai or Princeton, the system of doctrines and meanings was the same. We see that similarity in Hodge's words and the Laos Mission's actions-both of which were premised on an inviolable principle, rooted in an absolute, dualistic distinction between the heathen and the saved, and envisioned conversion as walking publicly across a pencil-thin boundary between the two.

There is no evidence that Wilson and McGilvary, however, intended to challenge Chao Kawilorot's political authority. They came from a secular state where religion legally was largely a personal matter, one that did not normally impinge upon one's loyalty to the state itself. Dr. A. A. Hodge summed up the American Presbyterian doctrine on the question of church-state relations by asserting that the two are entirely independent from each other and have quite different purposes. He writes, "But neither the officers nor the laws of either have any authority within the sphere of the other." [11] Chao Kawilorot and the earliest converts came from a very different polity, one in which ritual and religion played an official role in the affairs of state. It was impossible that Chao Kawilorot would see things as the missionaries (or the Hodges) did, and he watched the expanding interest in the new religion with close attention and growing alarm. He felt threatened. He had not, we must surmise, expected his people to pay any more attention to Christianity than had the people of Bangkok, and he must have been taken aback when men of the quality of Nan Inta and Nan Chai decided to convert. He must also have been aware that others, including some members of the ruling classes, claimed an interest in the new religion, and he surely felt that their interest challenged his power in a number of ways. First, it threatened to remove Christian converts from the influence of the rituals that legitimized his political power. Second, the missionaries' insistence that converts not work on Sundays undermined the social control and status of the whole ruling class, not least of all his own. Third, in light of these first two points, it must have appeared to Chao Kawilorot that the missionaries were setting themselves up as a new patron class. Ratanaphorn observes,

The rulers of the Northern States, therefore, claimed legitimacy by serving the ritual function of mediating between peasant communities and the state spirits. They were the only ones who could perform the worship of state spirits from which common people were excluded. In this manner, they were able to establish a patronage relationship with the peasants. Their ceremonial function, in return for tribute and respect from the peasants, guaranteed crop fertility and protection from misfortune. [12]

Vachara argues that the Prince's role as benefactor of Buddhist temples "provided him with the most significant legitimizing force to his rule, ensuring his power and enabling him to be more effective in ruling the kingdom." [13] The conversion of hundreds, rather than a mere handful, to Christianity could have seriously undermined Chao Kawilorot's authority, or so he had to believe, since the people would no longer depend on him for protecting them from the powers of the spirits.

There was more at stake than just the power of a single ruler. Davis points out that historically Buddhism united the *chao* and the *phrai*, the rulers and the people, in a single socio-religious system that provided society with a rich literature, cosmology, philosophy, and social

ethic. Buddhism comprised the most dynamic factor in the creation of northern Thai ritual, and the ruling class, especially the Prince, functioned as the protectors of this whole way of life.[14] Christianity, in the light of all of this, threatened social and political chaos by loosening the bonds of the authority of the state.

The mission and the state entered into a profound conflict based on incompatible religious and ideological differences that neither side felt it could compromise. McGilvary and Wilson insisted that their converts make a clean and complete break with Buddhism as a precondition to conversion. They did not see the act of conversion as a political one. Chao Kawilorot insisted with equal single-mindedness that religion and state were one. Conversion constituted rebellion. Matters were bound to come to a head, but when they did, it was over what would appear to have been one of the finer points of missionary thought, the keeping of the Sabbath.

Once Nan Inta converted, both he and the mission had to decide how to deal with Christian strictures against working on Sunday in a society where the patron classes felt free to call on the labor of their clients at almost any time. Only two weeks after his baptism, Nan Inta's patron, Chao Tepawong, called him to work on a Sunday. McGilvary writes,

He [Nan Inta] sent word back that if his master insisted on the work he might hire a man in his place for which he would pay, or if he would wait he would work any number of days afterwards; but he begged his Sabbath. On Monday morning he went in and found his master in good humor, and he asked him about the change in his views, with all pleasantness, which gave him an opportunity of explaining it himself. Since then he has called very pleasantly on me, when we both had a long talk on the same subject. It was a noble sight to see such a stand taken the first time for God and the Sabbath[15]

Nan Inta's behavior constituted a gross violation of the principle of *corvée*. Chao Tepawong, however, reacted with patience, even though at one point he did express some displeasure at the limitations Sabbath observance placed on his right to Nan Inta's labor. He also discussed the whole matter very carefully with Nan Inta and with the missionaries. McGilvary seems to have felt that Chao Tepawong's interest was a positive thing, but one wonders whether, as a senior member of the government and confidant of Chao Kawilorot and other known opponents of the missionaries, he was not actually gathering information for Chao Kawilorot.[16]

Tampering with Chiang Mai's corvée system of labor was a dangerous enterprise. McGilvary and Wilson understood the significance of that system quite clearly and knew they took a risk in insisting upon Sabbath observance; they willingly took that risk, however, because of the crucial significance of the day to their religious system. Charles Hodge, their >mentor at Princeton, provides important insights into why the Laos Mission felt so strongly about not working on Sundays that it was willing to risk Chao Kawilorot's displeasure over the issue. Hodge argues that the keeping of the Sabbath is a matter of fundamental importance, first, because the Sabbath is a divinely given institution commanded in the Bible. Those who believe in the Bible must observe it. Second, keeping the Sabbath provides a time for the study of the Bible and other sacred literature, as well as time for worship. Knowledge of and a meaningful relationship with God, thus, both depend on it. Third, God designed the Sabbath to fit the spiritual, social, and physical needs of the human race, and any people who fail to take advantage of it soon degenerates into an ignorant, idolatrous, and superstitious mob, hopeless of any good in this life or of salvation in the life to come.[17] In his 1859 article in the *Princeton Review* urging the need for Sunday closing laws, Hodge lays down a series of injunctions concerning the Sabbath, including, "Christianity is a law of life; a law of Divine authority; it binds the conscience, it must therefore be obeyed by those who profess to be Christians." He continues, "They cannot deliberately violate any

of its injunctions without doing violence to their own consciences, and forfeiting their allegiance to God." Again, "If a set of men believe in God and the moral law, it is self-evident that they must obey that law, not only as individuals, but in all the associations into which they may enter." He goes on, "Christians are bound to recognize the authority of Christianity in their government acts. They must do it." Hodge continues, furthermore, by arguing that, "It is expedient to obey God. If he has enjoined the observance of the Sabbath, all who recognize his authority, will feel that it is expedient, best for the interests of society, that the day should be observed." And, finally, he states, "...Christians, in all their relations and associations, should have reverence to the law of God as revealed in his word, as their rule of action." [18] Hodge returned to his emphasis on the necessity of Christians observing the Sabbath in his *Systematic Theology*, where he states flatly, "Any community or class of men who ignore the Sabbath and absent themselves from the sanctuary, as a general thing, become heathen. They have little more true religious knowledge than pagans. But without such knowledge morality is impossible." [19]

Hodge lodged his concern for the Sabbath squarely within his system of doctrines and meanings, arguing that observing the Sabbath is biblical, necessary to the knowledge of God and evangelical piety, in accord with human nature, and a divine command. Faithful Christians have no choice in the matter. They must observe the Sabbath. Wilson and McGilvary's insistence that their converts refrain from working on the Sabbath thus represented a central theological and moral concern for Princeton as well as for them. McGilvary writes of Nan Inta's refusal to perform corvée labor on the Sabbath that, "It was a spectacle over which angels must have stooped with interest to see the first stand that had ever been taken by a native Laos in favor of God and the Sabbath." Wilson writes of Chao Tepawong's patient response to Nan Inta, "And here again the hand of the Lord was visible in causing the Sabbath question to pass its first test under such favorable circumstances." [20] They believed that God intervened to give the mission a victory in the question of keeping the Sabbath and that the whole matter had a cosmic dimension, the very angels of heaven giving their attention to the event. Equally to the point, they felt that when Nan Inta refused to work on Sunday, he was taking a stand, not just for a doctrine, but also for God.

The mission chose a poor time, however, to insist on the strict observance of the Christian Sabbath. By the 1860s, Chao Kawilorot found himself embroiled in conflict with British teak companies over logging rights in his forests, a confrontation that threatened his political power and economic security to the extent that at one point he attacked a logging camp, killing four loggers and wounding four others. [21] The mission, by the same token, appeared to him to be setting itself up as a new, alternative system of patronage by controlling the labor of its converts-representing still another attack on his authority and the economic well-being and stability of his state. McGilvary later noted that,

In the light of subsequent events we now know that the most dangerous element in the gathering storm was the angry surprise of the Prince himself at the discovery that the old order seemed actually passing away under his very eyes; that his will was no longer supreme in men's minds, nor always consulted in their actions. [22]

Whatever his particular thoughts, Kawilorot acted decisively, forcefully, and effectively to put a halt to the new religion, and when he had finished, two men were dead and the Christian community was broken, its remnant in hiding.

The martyrdom of Nan Chai and Noi Sunya in September 1869 can be summarized briefly here. [23] Lulled into a false sense of security by the assurances of members of the royal family, the McGilvarys and Wilsons believed that Chao Kawilorot had decided to allow the new religion to grow unmolested, where, in fact, the Prince was simply waiting for an appropriate moment to act. [24] On Monday morning, 13 September 1869, a party of armed men collected two of the

Christians, Nan Chai and Noi Sunya, and brought them before a local official, who accused them, on trumped up charges, of having committed certain crimes. The two men were beaten. Based on information the missionaries obtained later, Wilson relates that after they had been beaten,

The arms of the prisoners were tied behind their backs. Their necks were compressed between two pieces of timber (the death-yoke) tied before and behind so tightly as painfully to impede both respiration and the circulation of the blood. They were thus placed in a sitting posture near a wall, and cords were passed through the holes in their ears and tied to a beam above. In this constrained and painful position-not able to turn their heads or bow them in slumber-they remained from Monday afternoon till Tuesday morning about ten o'clock, when they were led out into the jungle and executed.[25]

Their families had been helpless to intervene. Although Nan Chai's wife did stay with him for a time, the authorities prevented her from going to Wilson and McGilvary. On the evening of 13 September 1869, the servants of both mission families suddenly left without a word of explanation. All they would say was that if Nan Chai did not turn up in a few days, the missionaries should be concerned. Having been quietly warned, Nan Inta fled Chiang Mai and wandered about the countryside for some months. One other convert, San Ya Wichai, was hauled before the *chao muang*, or Prince, of Lamphun, condemned to death for being a Christian, and saved only by the timely intervention of his own patron, the son of the Prince.[26]

With these events, the two mission families, the Wilsons and the McGilvays, entered into a period of intense anxiety, made only worse by a lack of information, the large number of rumors abroad in Chiang Mai, and their inability to communicate with Bangkok. They responded to all of this as calmly and passively as possible; all they could do was to wait on events.[27] News of their situation did reach the Bangkok government and the Siam Mission, and after worried consultations, the King dispatched an official representative with vice-regal powers (*kha luang*) in November; the mission sent along two of its own members with the Siamese government party.[28] They finally reached Chiang Mai on Monday, 27 December 1869, and the next day had an audience with Chao Kawilorot, at which time McGilvary stood before the Prince and charged him with the murder of two Christians. At first, Kawilorot angrily denied that they had been executed on religious grounds, but,

When pressed a little closely on that point, so that he found he could not deny it, he declared before us all, in the most defiant manner, that he had done it and would kill every man that should dare to become a Christian-that he regarded every man who rebelled against his god as a rebel against himself.[29]

In the wake of this bitter confrontation, both the *kha luang* and the Bangkok mission representatives urged the McGilvays and Wilsons to leave Chiang Mai, fearing for their lives, but over the next few months matters settled down into something of a routine. Chao Kawilorot comported himself in a relatively friendly manner, although he made it clear that he would eventually expel the two families.[30] Officials in Chiang Mai later informed the missionaries that Kawilorot might be willing to have them remain if they would only engage in medicine and refrain from teaching religion. They rejected this offer out of hand, as we have seen, and McGilvary affirmed that, "...all the king's money would not have induced us to come here for any other purpose than to teach Christianity-that is now and must always be our principal business here." [31] As it turned out, the Siamese government called Chao Kawilorot down to Bangkok on other business. While there he became seriously ill, and although he hurried back to Chiang Mai, he failed to reach the city and died on 29 June 1870. Within some 24 hours of Chao

Kawilorot's death, Chao Inthawichaiyanon ("Chao Intanon" to the missionaries), his son-in-law and successor, assured McGilvary that the missionaries were free to remain and carry out their work without hindrance.[32]

It required months and then years before the Laos Mission's situation returned to a semblance of normality, particularly with respect to the development of a stable, growing Christian community. The four surviving converts kept their distance from the missionaries, and by mid-year 1870, two of them, Noi Kanta and Boonma, permanently withdrew from the church. The missionaries themselves, meanwhile, continued to receive numerous visitors and McGilvary went about his medical work, much as before. Kawilorot's death, however, fundamentally changed the mission's situation, and at some point during July 1870 Nan Inta quietly renewed his relationship with the Wilsons and McGilvarys; the mission, nonetheless, had powerful enemies, and the people of Chiang Mai continued to refrain from displays of interest in the Christian religion.[33]

Conclusion

Coleman, we will recall, complained that the nineteenth-century American Presbyterian missionaries he studied articulated only a rudimentary version of the Princeton Theology. Missionary behavior, methods, and activities up to 1870, however, make it clear that the Laos Mission founded its work on a complex, interlocking cognitive system much richer than Coleman suggests. That the mission's written records reveal only the tip of that theological and ideological system does not mean the system did not exist. It is notable, for example, that before the events of September 1869, the mission based its decisions on clear and non-negotiable principles, namely, that conversion to Christianity had to be public and Christians must keep the Sabbath. The converts, that is, had to "cross over" the boundary from traditional northern Thai religion to Christianity in a single, visible step, and they must thereafter act according to a foreign behavioral pattern mandated by the mission's foreign system of doctrines and meanings. From these principles, it is not difficult to work back to the mission's closed, Old School, and evangelical system of meanings and doctrines as exemplified by and, to a degree, taken directly from the Princeton Theology—a system characterized by its dualistic world view, Enlightenment epistemology, universal understanding of truth, and profound concern for defining and defending doctrinal boundaries.

During the agonizing months after September 1869, McGilvary and Wilson both wrote letters to the Board reaffirming the importance of their system of doctrines and meanings and avowing that they relied heavily on their theological beliefs to comfort them and help them make sense of Chao Kawilorot's actions. Wilson avowed that God would lead them through their time of trouble and, more broadly, that all hearts are in God's hands. The murder of Nan Chai and Noi Sunya only confirmed for him the "fact" that northern Siam was a "benighted land." He called on people in the United States to "Pray for this persecuting king. Pray for these benighted & down trodden Laos." In the face of the possibility of having to leave Chiang Mai, Wilson felt that their decision to stay or go amounted to nothing less than discerning God's will in the matter.[34] With Chao Kawilorot away in Bangkok and the fate of the Laos Mission still uncertain, McGilvary wrote in mid-February 1870 that, "...we are just waiting to see what God will have us to do and we cannot tell till the King's return. But present duty is still as plain as ever. We can trust God's love to us and his people and the Laos for the future." [35] God is sovereign. God leads. God has a will. The faithful can discern that will. God has a people. God is love. God is trustworthy. McGilvary and Wilson's statements were not merely formal expressions of dogma; they stood as operating principles that provided the two Presbyterian families with the patience and endurance to persevere under profoundly trying circumstances. In that sense, they recall

McGilvary's affirmation that the fundamental doctrines of Calvinism both strengthened missionaries and helped them to understand the situations they faced.

Apart from their system of meanings and doctrines, Wilson and McGilvary's refusal to allow private conversions and their insistence that the converts must refuse their patrons' lawful calls for service on Sundays make little sense. Everyone, including the missionaries themselves, understood that Kawilorot was a dangerous man, zealous in the protection of his rights and power. The mission played with fire when it challenged the state religion and the fundamental social and political structure of Kawilorot's patronage, and it paid a substantial price as a consequence. The persecution of September 1869 effectively halted the emergence of the church in northern Siam for nearly a decade, nipped in the bud a potential "people's movement" towards Christianity, severely reduced interest in Christianity among people of all classes, and led to the total domination of the weakened northern Thai church by the mission.[36] According to the constraints of missionary ideology and theology, however, Wilson and McGilvary behaved in an entirely reasonable and correct manner; as dangerous as Kawilorot might have been, they believed that rebellion against God was vastly more perilous than challenging the power of a mere prince.

Interregnum

Introduction

The Laos Mission, with the death of Chao Kawilorot in June 1870, entered a peculiar period in its history. It had no Christian community to speak of, the authorities remained discreetly aloof, and the mission's members could only lay plans for the future and try out various strategies that had few immediate results. Things went on like this for some six years, until the mission began to experience a renewal of its work and hopes in 1875 and 1876.

In the months after June 1870, meanwhile, an event took place that symbolized the cultural differences between the mission and the people of Chiang Mai. Upon the accession of the new Prince, Chao Intanon, the mission immediately approached him concerning the problem of the status of its property. Chao Kawilorot had given the mission a site as a gift, with the understanding that they could not own the land legally since, according to the law, the Prince owned all land. The piece of property he gave the mission, however, was land he had taken away from others without compensation. He left the mission thus with neighbors who bitterly resented them, and the missionaries wanted Chao Intanon to allow them to pay for the property, expand it, and hold legal title to it. Chao Intanon, however, publicly sided with the mission's enemies, refusing it permission to buy land, hold title, and expand its site. Quietly and on the sly, however, he let it be known that the missionaries could give their neighbors compensation in the form of "gifts" and even expand their property by the same stratagem, just so long as no one spoke of buying and selling property. By December 1870, McGilvary could write, "We have since the accession of the new prince remunerated [the previous owners] for their places so that we have now a place that we can feel is by right as well as in fact our own." [37]

Chao Intanon's solution to the mission's property problems, in a strictly legal sense, changed nothing. The mission's enemies could lodge no accusations against the new Prince because he maintained his traditional rights over all property and did not allow the missionaries to purchase any land. Yet, he managed to accommodate the mission's desires by employing the principle that reality can be described in different ways using different words; buying and selling property is not *really* buying and selling unless we *say* it is. The contrast between this event and those related to the persecution of 1869 is striking. In this instance Wilson and McGilvary went along with the game and came away satisfied because, whatever they called it or did not call it,

the mission had exchanged money for land. They refused, however, to consider Nan Inta's and Nan Chai's desire to follow a similar stratagem concerning conversion, that is to convert without calling the act "conversion." The purchase of property, apparently, did not involve theological or ideological principles while keeping the Sabbath and making public declarations of faith did. The missionaries, that is, could accept culturally appropriate ways of solving problems just so long as those decisions did not impinge upon their system of doctrines and meanings.

Dormancy

After Chao Kawilorot died, as we have seen, Nan Inta quietly renewed his relationship with the missionaries, who presumed that San Ya Wichai also remained a Christian although they heard nothing from him. Two other Christians, Noi Kanta and Boonma, continued to absent themselves from any relationship with the missionaries. McGilvary hinted at some continuing discrete interest in Christianity among the people, but until April 1872, no one dared make a public profession of faith. There were no converts.[38] One person interested in Christianity told Wilson "an open profession of Christianity would cost him his head." This individual and several others asked to become what we have called "back door disciples," but the missionaries again adamantly refused to consider such an option, although they took comfort in the fact that some people were still attracted to Christianity.[39] Even Nan Inta's status is not entirely clear. In a letter written on 24 April 1872, Wilson indicates that Nan Inta was keeping his distance from the missionaries and not participating in mission activities. Wilson writes, "Whether his heart has become indifferent to the gospel, or whether the fear of his master keeps him away from our worship, we know not. We have long hoped for his return, but disappointment & sorrow are all that his present course brings us." [40] As of March 1872, then, the mission had no active converts.

During the month of April 1872, however, the situation changed somewhat for the better. On 7 April 1872, the mission received its first convert since September 1869. Then, on Sunday, April 21st, McGilvary and Vrooman, who were on their tour of the far north, unexpectedly met San Ya Wichai, who was traveling on a Sunday. Although the missionaries considered travel on the Sabbath sinful and instructed him to that affect, they were still glad to see him. He affirmed that he continued to consider himself a Christian. After this meeting, he went on to Chiang Mai, arriving Saturday evening, April 27th. He met Wilson, who heard for the first time how the Prince of Lamphun hauled San Ya Wichai into his presence and nearly had him executed. Sunday morning San Ya Wichai joined in worship and then Sunday evening Wilson held a special worship service. A few of San Ya Wichai's traveling companions attended this service, and so, interestingly enough, did Nan Inta. It was a black, stormy evening with only a few persons present. They sat on the floor, and San Ya Wichai avowed his intention to remain a faithful Christian. He prostrated himself and prayed that God would provide him with food, the Holy Spirit would touch his friends, and that Jesus would come and set up his throne in the land. Wilson observed that San Ya Wichai prayed simply and in such a child-like manner that, "The Spirit of God must have been in that prayer." Nan Inta also prayed a moving prayer, and they closed the prayer meeting with hymns and injunctions to San Ya Wichai to lead a faithful Christian life. He left the next day.[41] From this time, Nan Inta evidently resumed his full place in the life of the church and the Laos Mission. He was again employed as a language teacher and Bible translator. Later in the year, McGilvary described him as meek, humble, faithful, and a good scholar who was "our brightest trophy of the power of the gospel." [42]

The closing days of 1872 brought a further modest increase in the number of members belonging to the Chiang Mai Church. Three men received baptism on 29 December 1872. They were Lung (Uncle) In, Lung Dang, and Noi Choi. Lung In had lived with the McGilvarys for about two years, for reasons unknown. Lung Dang had come to Vrooman's hospital seeking cure

for a disease the spirit doctors could not heal. At this same time, the church Session, meaning Wilson and McGilvary, dropped the three "old" members who had long ceased to participate in church life. These additions and subtractions left northern Thai membership standing at six, including Nan Inta, San Ya Wichai, and Nan Ta as well as the three baptized in December.[43] McGilvary, however, did not seem particularly enthusiastic about these converts and acknowledged that the years 1871 and 1872 had been filled with discouragement. The McGilvarys and Wilsons had put a great deal of effort into their work, but they had little to show in return. Drawing once again on his system of doctrines and meanings, McGilvary stated that only his belief in biblical promise that Christianity must triumph throughout the world, including in Chiang Mai, sustained him.[44]

Early in January 1873, the McGilvary family left Chiang Mai for a long-awaited furlough, leaving the Wilsons and Dr. Vrooman behind in Chiang Mai. By June 1873, as we have seen, Vrooman left Chiang Mai and the Wilsons were entirely on their own. They felt lonely and pressured, and their situation became particularly difficult in September 1873 when the city experienced a great deal of illness and Wilson had to fill McGilvary's shoes by treating over a thousand people with quinine. There were no converts during 1873 or 1874, and two of the six active northern Thai members-Nan Ta and Lung Dang-died during Wilson's tenure. Nan Ta's death especially troubled Wilson because during his search for a cure Nan Ta allowed spirit doctors to perform their rites over him. In Wilson's eyes, Nan Ta had virtually rejected his Christian faith.[45] The year 1874, in any event, belonged entirely to the Wilsons, and by and large it went along much as the previous year had. Wilson described his tasks as "varied." He had to oversee the work of the mission compound. He visited people in their homes. He provided medicines to the ill. He spent some time most days teaching theology to Nan Inta. In June, Wilson wrote, "The people come as of old, and many an hour is given up to receiving their desultory visits." [46]

It was at the end of 1874, we will remember, that Wilson discovered Noi Choi also engaged in what Wilson took to be anti-Christian rites for the healing of his grandson (see Chapter Four). The mission time and again had to face the question of the boundaries between the insipient Christian community and Chiang Mai's larger cultural and social world as the northern Thai converts and potential converts repeatedly attempted to redraw those boundaries along lines that made more sense to them. More people, as we have already seen, would have converted if the mission had allowed "unofficial" conversions. It refused. Nan Ta, on his deathbed, went back to indigenous medical treatments, as did Noi Choi for his grandson's illness. They saw nothing "un-Christian" in doing so, but the mission did. The ideological and doctrinal "dialogue" between the mission and church, thus, took place over matters of life, health, risk, and death. The mission remained closed to all options but its own, an attitude made clear in its annual report for 1873. In that report, Wilson told the story of an elderly widow, from a village near the city, whose interest in Christianity led her to decided to convert. Her relatives, however, warned her concerning the dangerous consequences of abandoning spirit propitiation, and in the face of their threats, she abandoned her intention and returned to temple worship. She told Wilson that she still paid homage to Jesus every day. She, that is, opted for the soft, private conversion originally advocated by Nan Inta and Nan Chai in 1868. Wilson, of course, did not accept the validity of her decision. Her family, on the other hand, evidently did not care where she gave her personal religious loyalty so long as she participated in communal religious life, which life insured the safety of her family and community from evil spirits.[47]

The widow's personal decision to worship Jesus and her family's willingness to allow her to hold a private faith other than theirs so long as she remained a secure part of its ritual life calls to mind yet again Tongchai's description of the traditional Southeast Asian conception of political boundaries as overlapping power centers involving large swatches of territory rather

than razor thin boundary lines. Her family would not allow the mission to lay down a boundary that destroyed its unity and ritual integrity. Where Wilson and his colleagues in the Laos Mission refused to permit any participation in Buddhist or animistic ritual, the northern Thai sense of communal unity demanded such participation. Those rites and practices tied community members to their ancestors and their past, allowed the community to live in harmony with the spiritual powers that inhabited their world, and provided an avenue for reconciliation when disputes arose. They also provided for the well being of the community and the salvation of individuals through communal merit-making activities. Northern Thai communities, thus, rejected the Laos Mission's intention to create a second, religiously independent social structure in the North and refused to accept willingly the introduction into their midst of an alternative, exclusive ritual. They could not abide, in short, the thought of two mutually antagonistic religions in one community.[48] Potential converts to Christianity, as a consequence, faced two choices: they had to decide whether or not they found meaning in Christian teachings and faith, and they had to decide if they would divorce themselves from the religious life of their family and community, a life that lay at the heart of northern Thai society. After 1869, the great majority of individuals who faced this choice decided not to withdraw from the practices of their neighbors and ancestors; it is now impossible to know how many of them felt as the widow did.

Kosuke Koyama, we will remember, wondered if the northern Thai of McGilvary's time understood his message because he observed "how thoroughly strange and unrealistic-how 'western'-is the Christian vocabulary to the ears of my Thai neighbors!" If this case is any measure, the people of Chiang Mai understood a great deal of what they heard. The widow found meaning in Jesus and wanted to become a Christian. Her family understood the dangers her conversion posed for it and angrily opposed her taking that step. The widow and her family surely did not understand the mission's underlying system of meanings and doctrines, but they did understand something of both the positive and negative implications of that system for their own lives.

In mid-March 1875 and at the end of the Wilsons' difficult months alone in Chiang Mai, in the meantime, Wilson wrote a letter to the Board describing the Laos Mission's situation. It was a discouraging time, in spite of the return of the McGilvays and the arrival of Dr. Cheek. He depicted the pervasive influence of animism in northern Thai life and society and how it insinuated itself into every part of daily life; and he enumerated the numerous hindrances the mission faced. Wilson concluded, however, on a more positive note by praying for a stronger faith and affirming his trust in God. He wrote, " [God] has good in store for this land. He will gather his chosen ones unto himself. Not one shall be lost." [49] Like McGilvary, Wilson found strength and comfort in the doctrines of Reformed confessionalism, doctrines such as divine grace and divine election.

Church life continued to languish. One important event did take place, however, when the church held its first congregational meeting on 10 April 1875, to elect Nan Inta as its first northern Thai elder. Presbyterian polity recognized two ordained offices, clergy and elders. Elders were members of the local church's governing body, known as a "session" in Presbyterian parlance, along with the church's pastor, who moderated the meetings of the session. Prior to this time, the Chiang Mai Church session was made up of only ordained missionary clergy, an irregular situation according to American Presbyterian ecclesiastical practices. Nan Inta's election, thus, regularized and normalized the church's government, giving it a "proper" session for the first time.[50] There were some other stirrings of life in the church. By October, it appeared that Nan Inta's wife was considering conversion. Dr. Cheek's language teacher, Nan Chai, also seemed ready to become a Christian. In November, McGilvary reported that Dr. Cheek's patient, Boon Ruen, might also convert.[51]

The events of 1875 reinforce the impression that the missionaries' system of meanings and doctrines took their power partly from the fact that they silently embedded themselves in the assumptions on which the missionaries acted. They apparently never stopped to consider the question of how best to organize a northern Thai church. In 1868, they established a typically American Presbyterian congregation composed entirely of the missionary families themselves. In 1875, they reconstituted that church's organizational structure by the election of a northern Thai elder, while maintaining it along those same Presbyterian lines. One hears bubbling quietly in the background of these discrete actions the ideological assumption that Christianity alone represented truth, morality, and God's will for humanity. Its structures were best. Its representatives were the ones best suited to lead. Cementing this unconsciously ideological approach to the formation of the church into place was the equally unconscious commonsense assumption that the Presbyterian Church's organizational structure was essentially universal and timeless, equally relevant to any time, any place.

Resurrection

For some six years after September 1869, the Laos Mission struggled to resurrect the Chiang Mai Church and only began to see some glimmers of hope towards the end of 1875. The church's first communion service in 1876, held on the first Sunday of the New Year, marked an important turning point in the history of the northern Thai church. On that Sunday, Chiang Mai Church received its first two women members, Pa (Aunt) Kamun, the widow of Noi Sunya, the martyr, and Mae (Mother) Noo, the wife of Lung In. These two women were the first northern Thai women to convert to Christianity, and Mae Noo and Lung In became the first Christian couple.[52] From this point on, the number of conversions began to accelerate. In September 1876, the mission baptized three more women including Yai (Grandmother) Peng, the wife of Nan Inta and two daughters of Pa Kamun, meaning that for the first time the church numbered more members than it had at the time of the persecution seven years earlier.[53]

Kate Wilson, recuperating in the United States, hailed the conversion of the five women as being good news indeed and wrote of the Laos Mission that, "The missionaries seem to be very much encouraged, and I think have great occasion to be, as the people seem anxious to hear the gospel." She went on to observe, nonetheless, that it cost northern Thai women a great deal to convert.[54] She may have had Yai Peng in mind. According to McGilvary, Yai Peng suffered for her interest in Christianity even before she was baptized. In July 1876 her brother, the family patriarch, called on her to assist in certain family animistic ceremonies, and she refused. Her brother then summoned both Yai Peng and her husband, Nan Inta, to a family conference at which he became abusive and threatening. McGilvary recounts,

[Yai Peng] told him that as to that he might do as he pleased but that she was never going to worship the spirits. She was willing to redeem herself for life by paying to the family a small sum, but that she could not again join the family directly or indirectly in their worship. The brother somewhat calmed down and said he would consider that proposition, though insisting still that his sister should be an alien to the family.[55]

Those words, "an alien to the family," as we have already seen, could well serve as the title of a social history of early northern Thai Christianity. Yai Peng and most of her Christian compatriots, men as well as women, had to step beyond the normal boundaries of their society and culture in order to become Christians in the face of considerable social pressure. Even so, Yai Peng resorted to a strategy not unlike the one used by Chao Intanon to solve the problem of the mission's property. She agreed to pay a sum of money to the family as long as no one called it a payment to the *spirits*. McGilvary seems to have acquiesced to her way of calming the

waters, perhaps in recognition of the fact that the mission had to give its converts some leeway in solving the problem of their relationship with their relatives and with their former religion. As we will see in the following section of this chapter, however, there were still definite limits to missionary toleration of the northern Thai inclination to rely on convenient definitions as a way out of conflict.

Mae Noo had her own problems, once she converted. In early December 1876, the session of the church suspended her from communion on charges of "complicity in spirit worship" and failure to exhibit "consistent Christian conduct." [56] McGilvary blamed a foolish, worthless son who was her only child for getting her into trouble; Mae Noo could refuse him almost nothing he wanted. McGilvary expressed some remorse at having to suspend Mae Noo but felt the mission had no choice. "We were compelled to do so," he writes, "for the purity and discipline of the church, though we feel that great charity is due to her." [57]

When Wilson suspended Noi Choi from the church for participating in "heathen" rites, he did not express any remorse, however he may have felt about the matter. When the church suspended Mae Noo, McGilvary did express regret and sympathy, but he justified the act as necessary for the sake of the purity and discipline of the church. Smith argues that in the early decades of the nineteenth century, Old School Presbyterians staked out more and more of a "position of defense" doctrinally, and in the process found it necessary to focus considerable attention on church discipline "lest wolves infiltrate the flock or clergyman of good standing and high reputation begin to entertain dangerous thoughts." The seminaries taught their students to defend the faith and to preach sermons that would enable local church members to identify false philosophies. [58] The same doctrinal and ideological dynamic was at work in Chiang Mai, urgently reinforced by the Laos Mission's need to replace northern Thai traditional religion with Christianity. In the case of the mission's sister Presbyterian mission to the south, the Siam Mission, church discipline issues dominated its relationship with its churches throughout the last decades of the nineteenth century to the extent that the Siam Mission seriously jeopardized church growth by alienating converts and potential converts for the sake of maintaining moral and doctrinal purity. The Siam Mission particularly worried that most central Thai Christians converted out of a desire for "temporal" benefits rather than from a "pure" faith in the Christian message. [59] Although somewhat more patient with its church members, the Laos Mission took the same ideological stance, exercising especial care to prevent participation in Buddhist rites and animistic ritual.

The Laos Mission, in spite of Mae Noo's lapses, could look back on 1876 with some satisfaction. The rate of conversions had picked up. Its political relationships had also improved and stabilized. McGilvary writes, "The whole year has probably been one of greater labor and greater success than any one year of my mission life." [60] The year 1877 marked yet another quiet advance in the life of the small, but growing Christian community. On the first Sunday of that year, McGilvary baptized three of Nan Inta's grandchildren, the first children to receive baptism. Eventually, it became common practice to baptize entire families as units, a practice McGilvary later termed "household baptism." [61] The following May, Nan Suwan, from the village of Mae Dok Daeng, received baptism. He was the son of Nan Panya, an elderly convert who had been baptized in December 1876 and died shortly thereafter. [62] Nan Suwan demonstrated qualities of leadership, and he thereafter emerged as one of the Laos Mission's most capable local church leaders. The process of family conversion, meanwhile, became clearly apparent at the Chiang Mai Church's monthly communion of 7 October 1877. Among the four adults and two infants baptized that day were the mother-in-law and two infant daughters of converts. Another convert's wife would also be baptized in less than a year. It is notable, furthermore, that three of these six new Christians came from Nan Suwan's village, one of them being his own infant daughter. [63] By October 1877, the converts were thus beginning to create a

distinct, viable community of their own, an augury of the Christian counter society that the mission sought to create. At the same time, Christians showed the first signs of clustering together in larger groups, to the extent that an identifiable Christian group began to take shape in Mae Dok Daeng, a village near Doi Saket some twenty kilometers east of Chiang Mai. The slow, steady accretion of new members that began in January 1876 continued in 1878, with the church baptizing a total of ten adults and five children during the year.[64] Among these, as before, were several more wives and children of Christians. Most notable among the new Christians who received baptism in 1878 was one of the highest-ranking converts in the history of the northern Thai church, a government official from Lampang, named Chao Phya Sihanot, who was baptized on 5 May 1878.[65]

Conclusion

In Chapter Four, we found that the Laos Mission, particularly in the person of Daniel McGilvary, rooted its evangelism and the practice of medicine in its system of meanings and doctrines. It emphasized the dissemination of knowledge as the gateway to faith, engaged the learned classes in cosmological and theological debate, and pressed Western science into its service—all of this after the manner of its mixed Reformed confessional and Scottish common sense heritage. The mission maintained a closed, dualistic attitude at all points, taking nothing from northern Thai culture that might fit its message to that context. In the first section of this chapter, we rediscovered many of the same theological and ideological themes. They came most sharply into focus in the mission's absolute insistence on keeping the Sabbath, an insistence that gained the ultimately fatal attention of the ruling powers of Chiang Mai. In spite of the initial success of the mission in gaining converts in 1868 and 1869, then, the experience of the first years of the Laos Mission did not bode well for its future. It preached a richly textured Western religious message grounded in Western scientific data and a cosmology that convinced almost no one to convert to Christianity. Some people who came into contact with missionary thinking accepted the new world view more or less readily enough; some even accepted Christian theological ideas to one degree or another, but only one person, Nan Inta, converted because of the mission's Baconian evangelistic strategy. The political establishment eventually intervened effectively to disrupt the mission's evangelistic program, postponing for years any hope of a significant number of conversions or the establishment of strong churches. McGilvary and Wilson themselves, in the years following September 1869, knew that things were not going well and both of them admitted discouragement to the Board, and yet they also both avowed a continued reliance on the Princeton-like system of doctrines and meanings they took with them to the field. McGilvary preached his Baconian message for years after the deaths of Nan Chai and Noi Sunya, while both he and Wilson long retained their confidence in Western medicine as a means for undermining northern Thai Buddhism. Both of them took comfort from their system of meanings and doctrines and relied on it for strength to persevere through the hard years between 1869 and 1876.

Nowhere did McGilvary and Wilson give clearer evidence to their unstinting, unchanging allegiance to confessional, commonsense evangelicalism, and the ideological principles of dualism and exclusivism than in their relations with the small band of Christian converts. They expected the converts to reject Buddhism, cease spirit propitiation, withdraw from many aspects of daily life, and accept the mission's conception of the clearly defined boundary between their former and new faiths. The great majority of the citizens of Chiang Mai rejected the idea of conversion, and even those who joined the new religion found their decision fraught with difficulties and tensions. Nan Inta had to flee for his life and then absent himself from the missionaries for several years. Nan Chai and Noi Sunya were killed. Yai Peng suffered serious tensions with her family. Noi Choi and Mae Noo went through the humiliation of being suspended from communion. The unnamed widow could not withstand the pressure of her family

and refrained from converting at all, although she retained her personal allegiance to Jesus. The convert community, that is, lived on the boundary between their old society and the new one the mission wanted to create, and they found it a difficult place to reside. When they tried to redefine the boundary in ways more in keeping with their own culture and society, the mission usually refused to go along. The Chiang Mai Church, in sum, embodied the mission's system of meanings and doctrines, preserving that system through the exercise of discipline to the end that it would remain free of religious influence from the surrounding culture.

The Laos Mission intended nothing less than a cultural and social revolution, one that necessarily began with the converts themselves. Chao Kawilorot understood the nature of the challenge the mission posed his state and people, and he took steps to thwart it. After his death, other politically powerful figures stepped in to carry on that defense of traditional structures. Even as the mission experienced tension with its own converts, it continued to experience political opposition. Matters came to a head in 1878.

The Edict of Religious Toleration

Introduction

Chao Kawilorot's death in June 1870 created a new situation in Chiang Mai. The accession of Chao Intanon brought to prominence a pro-Bangkok and pro-Westernization party led by Intanon and his wife, Chao Mae Tip Keson. As would be expected of the daughter of Chao Kawilorot, Chao Mae Tip Keson was the stronger personality and true leader of this faction that was friendly to the missionaries. Opposing Intanon and Tip Keson was the *chao ho na* ("Second King"), Chao Bunthawong, a strong personality who succeeded in usurping much of Intanon's authority to the point that little could be done in Chiang Mai without his permission. He sought to maintain the traditional structures of a semi-independent Chiang Mai, resisted change, and firmly opposed the Laos Mission. Chao Bunthawong, however, had neither the strength of personality nor the prestige of Kawilorot and consequently could not deal with the Laos Mission as forcefully and effectively as had Kawilorot. He applied what pressure he could, but he failed to prevent the emergence of a northern Thai church, just as he could not, finally, preserve the political integrity of the Chiang Mai state.[66] McGilvary diligently played upon this situation to maintain the missionaries' situation by spending considerable time visiting the city's important political figures; he worked particularly hard at developing a close relationship with Chao Intanon and Chao Mae Tip Keson. McGilvary noted that in the early years after Chao Kawilorot's death Chao Bunthawong did not openly act against the Laos Mission.[67]

We have already noted that by 1878 the small band of Christian converts was growing in numbers and beginning to take the shape of a true community. In the course of things, two young Christians, Noi Intachak, who was studying theology privately with McGilvary, and Kam Tip, the daughter of Nan Inta, who was studying with Sophia McGilvary, caught each other's eye and decided to get married. The mission planned a big affair, as this would be the first marriage between two baptized northern Thai Christians. It should have been a happy event, but politics intruded to transform a simple wedding into a serious political crisis, providing Chao Bunthawong with an opportunity to jeopardize the Laos Mission's prospects in Chiang Mai. In the process, the northern Thai converts found themselves yet again caught between missionary theologies on the one hand and the conservative political ideology of the mission's enemies on the other.

The Event

Plans for the wedding progressed nicely until the very morning of the wedding when the family patriarch of Nan Inta and Kam Tip's extended family objected to it. He demanded payment of the proper "spirit fee," as McGilvary called it, in order to show regard to the spirits and legalize the marriage according to northern Thai custom and law. The mission refused to allow its adherents to pay because, as McGilvary writes, "In fact, the payment may be regarded as a distinctively religious act, since it recognizes the spirits as the guardians and protectors of the family. When one becomes a Christian, that allegiance is cast off." [68] After hastily consulting with Nan Inta's patron, the missionaries called a halt to the wedding and began to come to grips with the ideological and legal tangle facing them. They refused to have anything to do with what appeared to them to be animistic practices, but at the same time, they wanted the marriage to be legal. Their efforts to resolve the dilemma began with a visit to the Siamese *kha luang* (Commissioner), who had been appointed Bangkok's permanent representative in the North under the Chiang Mai Treaty of 1874 between Siam and Britain. He sympathized with the missionaries' situation but had no power to act in this case. The mission next turned to Chao Intanon and Chao Mae Tip Keson, but they felt they dared not take an open stand because they were already the objects of some criticism for their pro-missionary attitudes. In desperation, Cheek and McGilvary went to see Chao Bunthawong and the Chao Rachabut, another key figure in the Chiang Mai government. As political rivals of the mission, they both found the situation hopeful and satisfying, reasoning as they did that if Christians could not marry, the Christian religion obviously would not survive in Chiang Mai. They refused to help. [69]

This dispute over the legalization of Christian marriages recalls the events leading up to the persecution of the church in September 1869. The issue at stake in both cases, as Ratanaphorn points out, involved the place and authority of Chiang Mai's ruling powers as against the social and political status of the missionaries themselves. By forbidding their converts to participate in traditional religious rites, the missionaries attacked the political status of the ruling elite, which drew its authority and power from the rituals of spirit propitiation. The right to perform such rituals also functioned as a means for social control and helped designate who would be at the top of the social hierarchy. Ratanaphorn states,

The *chao ho na* [Chao Bunthawong] realized that this intervention by missionaries into the traditional system posed yet another threat to the *chao*. He was concerned that the converts would seek shelter under the missionaries from corvee requirements. Besides their actions exacerbating the problems of labor scarcity prevailing in the Northern States since the time of Kawila, the missionaries came to take the role of patrons that formerly had been the exclusive preserve of the *chao* and other local elites. The widespread propagation of Christianity and its potential adoption by many in the population, threatened the traditional social order of the Northern States. [70]

The stakes were high. The traditional hierarchy, on the one side, felt that the Laos Mission was attacking the religious and ceremonial pillars of its authority. The Laos Mission, for its part, desired nothing less than the right of Christians to conduct their own rituals unmolested by outside authorities. The heart of the matter, as we have already said, lay in a confrontation between the political ideology of a ruling elite and the system of meanings and doctrines of the mission itself.

On further consultation with the Siamese Commissioner, Phraya Thep Prachun, McGilvary and Cheek finally decided to petition King Chulalongkorn in Bangkok, and Phraya Thep Prachun promised that he would write the King a letter supporting the mission's petition. The mission

sent its petition to the American Consul in Bangkok for him to present to the King; in it, they appealed for general religious toleration rather than simply the right of Christians to marry. The mission's petition reminded the King that it was founded with the official permission both from the King himself and from Chao Kawilorot, specified Chao Bunthawong as the culprit in this case, and requested that northern Thai Christians receive the same civil and religious rights given to other Siamese citizens. The mission knew that this petition could cause trouble in Chiang Mai, but McGilvary felt they had little choice and could rely on political supporters in the Siamese government to assist them.[71]

While the Laos Mission's petition found its way to Bangkok and through the capital's bureaucracy, tensions mounted in Chiang Mai. Chao Bunthawong ordered that Nan Inta be detained and threatened his entire family with slavery if they did not renounce Christianity. He threatened Nan Inta personally with banishment to the far north and then had him held in physical confinement, which lasted for three months and resulted in such a serious deterioration of Nan Inta's health that McGilvary felt constrained to intervene. After some further dispute, Cheek gained permission to look after him, and Nan Inta began to recover his health.[72]

The King's reply to the mission's petition finally arrived in late September 1878. It gave Phraya Thep Prachun authority to proceed in the matter of the mission's complaint in any way he saw fit and specifically gave him permission to issue an edict, at his discretion, guaranteeing toleration of the Christian religion. After some further discussions with the different sides in the marriage dispute, the Commissioner issued an "Edict of Religious Toleration" that went beyond what even the missionaries had asked for.[73]

The edict (See Appendix I) opens with a statement of the Commissioner's intention to issue a proclamation to the princes and people of Chiang Mai, Lamphun, and Lampang states. It mentions briefly the origins of the edict and makes it clear that it rests on the full authority of the King of Siam. It then provides a general statement of a concept of religious toleration that affirms the right of individuals to worship as they choose without governmental interference. The edict affirms the right of citizens to become Christians and enjoins the princes, relatives, and friends of converts to throw up no obstacles to conversion and the practice of the Christian religion. It frees Christians from participation in non-Christian rituals and affirms the right of Christians to observe their Sabbath unmolested, excepting only in times of war or genuine pressing need. The edict also confirms that American citizens living in Chiang Mai, Lamphun, and Lampang (i.e. the missionaries) had the right given to them by international treaties to employ anyone they chose. No one could impinge on that right.

Although McGilvary realized from the beginning that the anti-missionary faction among the ruling elite would resist the implementation of the "Edict of Religious Toleration," he was elated. The edict had the immediate affect of lessening the pressure on the convert community, particularly Nan Inta. Chao Bunthawong, it seems, backed off and assumed a publicly less threatening, more gracious attitude towards the missionaries.[74] Nan Inta shared McGilvary's feelings of elation and wrote to the McGilvarys' daughter, Emilie, in the United States that, "...[God] inclined the heart of the great King of Siam to send a royal decree forbidding the princes and masters in Chiengmai to oppose those who wish to become believers and forbidding any oppression of those who have or will become such in the future." [75]

Impact of the Edict

In the events of September 1869, as we have seen, the Laos Mission's systems of meanings and doctrines guided missionary behavior and played a key role in sparking the religious persecution and political repression that followed. Virtually the same dynamic played itself out

in the marriage crisis of 1878, but in the midst of all of the political maneuvering involved, one can easily lose track of the simple theological principle and subsequent ideological chain of reasoning that set off the crisis. Stated most simply, the missionaries adhered to the principle that the payment of "spirit fees" by converts to legalize marriages would amount to a denial of their allegiance to God. After the manner of Princeton, this principle closed the door on compromise by turning the payment of spirit fees into an absolute, clearly defined boundary issue between Christianity and heathenism. The principle had to be defended. The missionaries believed that any violation of it put the converts and mission at risk of complicity in devil worship, idolatry, and superstition that threatened the converts with eternal damnation. If pressed on the matter, McGilvary and Cheek could have pointed to numerous passages in Scripture as the source of their principle and would have argued that such principles are as timeless as the Bible itself. Fundamental to the question of spirit fees was the doctrine of God's sovereignty; paying them denied divine sovereignty. The missionaries approached these questions and principles with a Scottish-like commonsensical attitude that gave them confidence in their ability to know God's truths and a reified self-assurance that the thought-ways of their American Presbyterian religious consciousness were immediately relevant to the situation they faced in Chiang Mai.

In the light of their theological and ideological habits of mind, it never occurred to Cheek and McGilvary that they could have appropriated Chao Intanon's strategy for allowing them to purchase property without buying it (see Chapter Four). They could have easily enough argued that the fee in question was a "legal fee" rather than a "spirit fee," employing a line of thinking similar to that of Yai Peng in a similar situation, an approach they seem to have tolerated in her case. The point here is not whether or not a northern Thai approach would have been "better" or "worse" in this particular case; the point is, rather, that all possibility of compromise was made impossible after McGilvary laid down his theological principle that the payment of the fees was an anti-Christian act. He grounded his actions in his system of meanings and values, irrespective of alternatives available through drawing on the thought-ways of northern Thai culture.

The "Edict of Toleration" marked an important step in the permanent establishment of the northern Thai church, although later commentators have at times considerably over-stated its long-term consequences.[76] The most important immediate result of the Edict, perhaps, was its impact on the Christian community. That small band joined McGilvary and Nan Inta in rejoicing, and the rate of conversion did increase, although at a still very modest rate in comparison to the size of the population. Early in 1879, moreover, McGilvary used the Edict to protect a family accused of causing demon possession (*phi ka*) from further persecution.[77] Beyond these immediate benefits of the Edict, McGilvary also argues that the event offered Bangkok an opportunity to increase its influence in the North at the expense of the northern Thai ruling class. The northern states, as McGilvary observed many years later, quietly and slowly became, "an integral portion of the consolidated Kingdom of Siam." [78] Ratanaphorn agrees, noting that the Edict of Toleration not only reduced the power of the patrons of Christian converts over them, but it also undercut the role of religion as a pillar of the state and helped to transform religion into a matter of personal choice rather than a tool for state control.[79] The Laos Mission's system of doctrines and meanings, in other words, became a factor of some consequence in the secularization of northern Thai social and political life. Consideration of that larger historical role lies beyond the scope of this study, but it does suggest the significance missionary theology and ideology had for every phase of the mission's work and the breadth of the impact missionary thinking had in the North.

Whatever the long-term impact of the Edict of Toleration, McGilvary believed that it did improve the mission's situation considerably. He states,

Our work is, of course, more hopeful though we of course do not anticipate a rush into the church as the princes and people seemed to fear to take off all restraint till the proclamation comes from the Laos princes themselves. The one from the king secures exemption from punishment, but all the moral influence is still on the side of Satan as far as the princes can make it so. But still the people are less fearful to talk than they were. Even the priests and princes themselves talk more freely than before. And there is, no doubt, a spirit of inquiry among the people such as has probably never been before.[80]

The central problem concerning the Edict, as McGilvary noted, was that it came from Bangkok; and even then, we might add, not directly from King Chulalongkorn but through his agent in Chiang Mai. Those powers arrayed against the Laos Mission remained in opposition. McGilvary returned to this thought in 1881 when he noted that it would have been a distinct advantage to gain the same sanction from the northern Thai rulers as the Mission had gained from Bangkok.[81]

Persecution of Christians and tension between them and their neighbors, however, did not end with the Edict. In a long letter to the Board written in July 1880, Wilson cited three cases of evident persecution in which the Edict proved of no value. In one case, having to do with the Prince of Lamphun, the mission dared not intervene by citing the Edict for fear that it would only make matters worse. In the two other cases, including one involving Chao Bunthawong, the mission could not prove that converts were being treated unjustly because of their religion even though they were sure such was the case. The Edict could not be brought into play to protect them. Wilson summarized these cases by stating, "The proclamation for Christian toleration was a great thing. It stands as a significant precedent in favor of the native Christian & his cause. But it will not meet every difficulty. It should not be expected to do so." [82] Missionary Christianity, in sum, remained in tension with the conservative powers of the northern states. While one suspects that the mere fact of the missionaries' purpose of introducing a new religious faith-apart from any theological or ideological considerations-sparked that tension, the Laos Mission's confrontational, closed ideological stance only added fuel to the fire.

Conclusion

At the close of the pioneer era of the Laos Mission, the mission remained in tension with a substantial conservative, anti-Christian political faction led by the singly most powerful figure in Chiang Mai, Chao Bunthawong. Its converts still experienced various forms of petty persecution, personal threats, and tests of loyalty by their patrons. The Edict of Toleration itself testifies to the level of local opposition the mission's message had conjured, a level of intensity it could overcome only through reliance on the still greater power of the King in Bangkok. The mission, to be sure, had also won some influential friends in the Chiang Mai court, but even so, it had become a symbol of social change and instability that seems to have overlaid any "simple" preaching of the Christian message with a blanket of controversial political, religious, and cosmological ramifications. While the Edict was certainly of some short-term benefit, it is doubtful that in the long run it represented a victory for the Christian cause, in spite of what the missionaries thought at the time.

Conclusion

The Laos Mission's system of meanings and doctrines shaped its evangelistic message, its use of Western medicine, the way in which it configured the Chiang Mai Church, and its expectations of how individual converts should behave. That system put it in considerable tension with conservative political forces and its converts in comparable tension with their

neighbors and even families. It also prevented almost any consideration of tactical compromises or a judicious softening of the system's rigid, Western conception of cognitive and religious boundaries.

The original question that opened this study asked after the reasons for the apparent failure of Presbyterian missions to gain a large constituency in northern Siam; it cited the work of several scholars who argue, variously, that the Laos Mission failed to understand the religion of the people and failed to communicate effectively with the people. In light of actual events, however, the issue of the missionaries and their message seems more complex. The statements that the missionaries misunderstood the northern Thai people and communicated their message poorly are themselves premised on the critics own system of doctrines and meanings, ones quite different from those of nineteenth-century American Old School Presbyterians. It is difficult to write off a man as intellectually competent and theologically perceptive as Daniel McGilvary by simply saying that he did not understand northern Thai Buddhism or, again, to claim that he failed to communicate with his northern Thai contemporaries. What such statements mean is that McGilvary and his colleagues failed to understand or communicate in a way that would have been more culturally appropriate and, arguably, won the Christian faith a larger northern Thai constituency. McGilvary and Wilson would themselves immediately respond that it is their latter-day critics who fail to understand the depths of northern Thai idolatry, superstition, and heathenism. It is their twentieth-century liberal critics who fail to realize that the importance of preserving the purity of the gospel in such a context necessarily determined how one would communicate the Christian message. Only the pure gospel, they would argue, could save individual northern Thais or offer hope for the future salvation of the whole northern Thai nation. If we grant the Laos Mission the integrity of its system of doctrines and meanings, that is, it is misleading to state either that they misunderstood northern Thai Buddhism or failed to communicate their message to the northern Thai people. We have to grant that, within the confines of their system of meanings and doctrines, they may well have understood the northern Thai situation clearly and communicated quite effectively.

If, however, we stand beyond the precincts of missionary ideology and theology, it must also be granted that other interpretations of northern Thai religious consciousness were possible and other strategies for reaching them with the Christian message available. The missionaries' own converts tried, by word and deed, to tell them they could do things differently-that conversion need not be confrontational and that not all indigenous ceremonies were objectionable. The very nature of missionary thinking prevented the mission from learning these lessons. Breward's insight, cited in Chapter Three, that William Perkins' sixteenth-century Puritanism used its belief in the unity of an infallible truth to deny all other viewpoints applies with equal force to the Laos Mission. The mission simply would not and, evidently, could not learn to approach its tasks in ways that meshed with northern Thai society when it perceived that matters of theological principles were at stake. It could accept Intanon's redefinition of buying as gift-giving since no such principles were involved, but it absolutely refused to redefine its understanding of conversion, the Sabbath, participation in non-Christian rituals, or the payment of certain fees because the mission believed that all of these instances involved fundamental religious principles. Its system of meanings and doctrines thus constrained its understanding and its ways of communicating.

With these observations, we now turn to the third key set of activities engaged in by the Laos Mission up to 1880, educational activities. For a mission born of Reformed confessionalism and a scholastic heritage, we have in a sense saved the best for last, although the study of missionary educational strategies will only serve to confirm the patterns we have already identified in Chapters Four and Five. The variety of its educational activities, however, adds

texture and further understanding to those patterns and, thus, helps explain why the Laos Mission behaved as it did in its pioneer era.

Notes

Abbreviations:

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AP	<i>American Presbyterians</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
BRPR	<i>Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
JAH	<i>Journal of American History</i>
JER	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of Presbyterian History</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Social History</i>
NCP	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian</i>
NCP NS	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian New Series</i>
LN	<i>Laos News</i>
PQPR	<i>Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review</i>
SCJ	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>
WJT	<i>Westminster Journal of Theology</i>
WWW	<i>Women's Work for Women</i>

[1] McGilvary, "Laos Mission," *FM* 26, 10 (March 1868): 234-36; Bradley Journal, 29 March 1868; McGilvary to Dear Brethren, 20 November 1867, v. 3, BFM; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 102-04.

[2] Sessional Records, 1-2.

[3] Sessional Records, 4-5.

[4] Alexander T. McGill, "American Presbyterianism: From the Founding of the Presbyterian Church to the War of the Revolution," in *A Short History of American Presbyterianism* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1903), 35.

[5] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 99.

[6] McGilvary, undated letter in *FM*, 28, 3 (August 1869): 58-63; McGilvary, undated letter in *FM* 28, 4 (September 1869): 80-8; and McGilvary to Irving, 1 March 1869, v. 3, BFM.

[7] Sessional Records, 10, 12, 15; and McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP* New Series 3, 109 (2 February 1870): 4.

[8] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP* New Series 3, 109 (2 February 1870): 4; McGilvary, undated letter, *FM* 28, 9 (February 1870): 212-17; and *Siam Repository* 2, 1 (1870): 124.

[9] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 180-83. The quotations are from page 183.

[10] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 185.

[11] Hodge, *Outlines of Theology*, 433.

[12] Ratanaphorn, "Chiang Mai Treaties," 22-3. Vella noted a similar relationship between the state and religious ritual in Bangkok. He writes, "The performance of many Hindu and Buddhist ceremonies was one of the most

important services of the Siamese government in its estimation and in the estimation of the Siamese people. These ceremonies, rituals, and acts of religious merit that were conducted by the king and his government were regarded as efficacious in bringing the people material benefits as well as spiritual benefits. Although the principal function of the state ceremonies was realized through the king's activities as religious intermediary, the ceremonies and other displays of power and wealth by the government also made it possible for the people to see in their king the apex of the hierarchy of respect that was operative in the Siamese family and throughout Siamese society." Walter F. Vella, *Siam Under Rama III 1824-1851* (Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1957), 16.

[13] Vachara Sindhuprama, "Modern Education and Socio-Cultural Change in Northern Thailand" (Ph.D. diss., University of Hawaii, 1988), 35-6.

[14] Richard Davis, *Muang Metaphysics: A Study of Northern Thai Myth and Ritual* (Bangkok: Pandora, 1984), 37.

[15] McGilvary, "Our First Convert," *NCP New Series* 2, 85 (18 August 1869): 4.

[16] McGilvary, undated letter in *FM* 28, 4 (September 1869): 80-4; and McGilvary, undated letter, *FM* 28, 9 (February 1870): 212-17.

[17] See, Hodge, "Sabbath Sanctified"; and Hodge, "Sunday Laws."

[18] Hodge, "Sunday Laws," 760-65. During the Antebellum years, Princeton and the Old School supported various campaigns to prevent the Sunday delivery of the mail, hence this emphasis on *the Sabbath* in Hodge. See, Charles Elliott, *The Sabbath* (Philadelphia: Board of Publication, 1867); Bertram Wyatt-Brown, "Prelude to Abolitionism: Sabbatarian Politics and the Rise of the Second Party System," *JAH* 58, 2 (September 1971): 316-41; and Richard R. John, "Taking Sabbatarianism Seriously: The Postal System, the Sabbath, and the Transformation of American Political Culture," *JER* 10, 4 (Winter 1990): 517-67. It was more than coincidental that Jonathan Wilson refused to go to the post office on Sundays. His colleagues praised this trait as symbolic of his strict observance of the Sabbath. See "Personal and Otherwise," *LN* 8, 3 (July 1911): 77.

[19] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3, 331.

[20] McGilvary "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 3, 106 (12 January 1870): 4; and Wilson to Irving, 27 January 1869, v. 3, BFM.

[21] Ratanaphorn, "Chiang Mai Treaties," 123ff, 156ff, esp. 157, 160-61.

[22] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 102.

[23] For fuller accounts, see, McGilvary, *Half Century*, 104-117; and Swanson, *Khrischak Muang Nua*, 12-20. The key sources are, Wilson, letter dated 3 January 1870, *FM* 28, 12 (May 1870): 281-84; Wilson to Irving, 3 January 1870, v. 3, BFM; Sessional Records, 16-21; McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 3, 120 (20 April 1870): 4; and McGilvary, "Latest News From Chieng-Mai," *FM* 28, 10 (March 1870) 227-29.

[24] McGilvary, undated letter, *FM* 28, 9 (February 1870): 216-17; and Wilson, letter dated 3 January 1870, *FM* 28, 12 (May 1870): 281.

[25] Wilson, letter dated 3 January 1870, *FM* 28, 12 (May 1870): 283, quoted in McGilvary, *Half Century*, 114-17.

[26] Wilson to Irving, 31 August 1872, v. 4, BFM; and Wilson, letter dated 30 April 1872, *FM* 31, 5 (October 1872): 151-53.

[27] For the aftermath of the events of September 1869, see, McGilvary, *Half Century*, 107ff; McGilvary to Irving, 1 November 1869, v. 3, BFM; McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 3, 120 (20 April 1870): 4; McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 3, 121 (27 April 1870): 4; S. R. House, "Sad and Unexpected News from Chieng-Mai," *FM* 28, 9 (February 1870): 202-04; and McGilvary, "Latest News From Chieng-Mai," *FM* 28, 10 (March 1870): 227-29.

[28] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 112; McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 3, 121 (27 April 1870): 4; and McDonald to Irving, 2 February 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[29] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 3, 121 (27 April 1870): 4. See also McGilvary, *Half Century*, 118-26.

[30] McGilvary, "Shall Chieng-Mai be Given Up?" *FM* 28, 12 (May 1870): 274; McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," dated 4 January 1870, *NCP New Series* 3, 121 (27 April 1870): 4; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 126-29.

[31] McGilvary to Irving, 17 February 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[32] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 133-39; and Wilson, letter dated 28 July 1870, *FM* 29, 7 (December 1870): 182-88.

[33] Wilson, "Fourth Annual Report of the Laos Mission," 18 July 1870, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson, letter dated 28 July 1870, *FM* 29, 7 (December 1870): 182-88. See also McGilvary to Irving, 17 February 1870, 4 March 1870, and 30 May 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[34] The quotation is from, Wilson to Irving, 3 January 1870, v. 3, FM. See also, Wilson to Irving, 15 October 1869, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson to Irving, 24 January 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[35] McGilvary to Irving, 17 February 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[36] Swanson, *Khrischak Muang Nua*, 18-9.

[37] McGilvary to Irving, 31 December 1870, v. 3, BFM. See also, McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 5, 266 (5 February 1873): 4; McGilvary to Irving, 22 August 1870, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson to Irving, 1 October 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[38] McGilvary to Irving, 22 August 1870, v. 3, BFM; and McGilvary to Irving, 11 March 1871, v. 3, BFM.

[39] Wilson to Irving, 24 October 1871, v. 3, BFM.

[40] Wilson to Irving, 24 April 1872, v. 3, BFM

[41] Wilson to Irving, 24 April 1872 [and 30 April 1872], v. 3, BFM. Emphasis in the original. See also Vrooman, undated letter, *FM* 32, 2 (July 1873): 53-7.

[42] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 5, 266 (5 February 1873): 4; and McGilvary, letter dated 10 April 1872, *FM* 31, 5 (October 1872): 150-51.

[43] Sessional Records, 27-9; and McGilvary to Irving, 4 December 1872, v. 3, BFM.

[44] McGilvary to Irving, 4 December 1872, v. 3, BFM.

[45] Wilson to Irving, 9 December 1872, 1 September 1873, and 30 September 1873, v. 3. BFM; and Wilson, "Annual Report of the North Laos Mission, 30 September 1873, v. 3. BFM.

[46] Wilson, letter dated 5 June 1874, *FM* 33, 7 (December 1874): 214-18.

[47] Wilson to Executive Committee [annual report], 30 September 1874, v. 3, BFM.

[48] See Kumool Chinawong and Herbert R. Swanson, "Religion and the Formation of Community in Northern Thailand: The Case of Christianity in Nan Province" (Paper delivered at the Fifth International Conference on Thai Studies, London, July 1993); and , S. J. Tambiah, *Buddhism and the Spirit Cults in North-east Thailand* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970), 54-7.

[49] Wilson to Irving, 15 March 1875, v. 3, BFM.

[50] Sessional Records, 35-6. See also McGilvary, "For the Family," *NCP New Series* 9, 417 (7 January 1876): 4. Note that McGilvary, *Half Century*, 169, incorrectly dates Nan Inta's ordination as 1876.

[51] McGilvary, "For the Family," letter dated 1 October 1875, *NCP New Series* 9, 417 (7 January 1876): 4; and McGilvary to Irving, 1 November 1875, v. 3, BFM.

[52] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 170; Sessional Records, 38-40; McGilvary to Irving, 22 February 1876, v. 3, BFM.; and McGilvary, "For the Family," letter dated 1 October 1875, *NCP New Series* 9, 417 (7 January 1876): 4.

[53] Sessional Records, 42-4.

[54] Kate Wilson, undated letter, *WWW* 7, 7 (September 1877): 243.

[55] McGilvary to Irving, 12 August 1876, v. 3, BFM. Emphasis in original.

[56] Sessional Records, 46-7.

[57] McGilvary, "The Laos Mission," *NCP New Series* 10, 485 (25 April 1877): 1. See also McGilvary to Irving, 4 December 1876, v. 3, BFM.

[58] Smith, *Presbyterian Ministry*, 143-44.

[59] See Herbert R. Swanson, *Towards a Clean Church: A Case Study in 19th Century Thai Church History* (Chiang Mai, Office of History, Church of Christ in Thailand, 1991).

[60] McGilvary, "The Laos Mission," *NCP New Series* 10, 485 (25 April 1877): 1.

[61] McGilvary to Mitchel, 3 July 1885, v. 5, BFM.

[62] Sessional Records, 59-61; and McGilvary, letter dated 10 August 1877, *NCP New Series* 10, 521 (2 January 1878): 4.

[63] Sessional Records, 69-71, 81.

[64] Sessional Records, 72-6; and McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 12, 579 (12 February 1879): 1.

[65] Sessional Records, 78-80; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 199-201.

[66] Ratanaphorn, "Chiang Mai Treaties," 175-78; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 141-44.

[67] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 144-45. See also McGilvary to Irving, 22 August 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[68] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 208.

[69] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 207-09; and Sessional Records, 82.

[70] Ratanaphorn, "Chiang Mai Treaties," 209, 210.

[71] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 210-12.

[72] Sophia McGilvary, undated letter, *WWW* 8, 11 (November 1878): 309-10; McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 12, 579 (12 February 1879): 1; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 210, 211.

[73] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 12, 579 (12 February 1879): 1.

[74] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 12, 579 (12 February 1879): 1.

[75] Loong Nan Inta to Emelie McGilvary, in McGilvary, "Letter from Siam," *NCP New Series* 12, 617 (5 November 1879): 1.

[76] See Swanson, *Khrischak Muang Nua*, 28-9.

[77] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 12, 579 (12 February 1879): 1; and McGilvary, "Letter from Siam," *NCP New Series* 12, 617 (5 November 1879): 1.

[78] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 217-20.

[79] Ratanaphorn, "Chiang Mai Treaties," 209-10.

[80] McGilvary to Mother [Sarah Bradley], 28 October 1878, McGilvary Papers. Emphasis in the original.

[81] McGilvary to Irving, 11 February 1881, v. 4, BFM.

[82] Wilson to Lowrie, 23 July 1880, v. 4, BFM.

CHAPTER SIX

Theology, Ideology, and Education

Outline of the Chapter

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [Church Education](#)
 - 2.1. [Theological Education](#)
 - 2.2. [Literacy Education and Sunday School](#)
3. [Formal Education](#)
 - 3.1. [The Burman School](#)
 - 3.2. [The Interim](#)
 - 3.3. [The Girls' School](#)
4. [Printing and Literature Distribution](#)
5. [Conclusion](#)
6. [Notes](#)

Introduction

Charles Hodge closes the Introduction of his *Systematic Theology* with a consideration of the role of the Bible in Protestant thinking and practice in which he argues that Protestants have both the right and the duty to study Scriptures for themselves in light of the church's common understanding of the meaning of the Bible. He maintains that Protestants must be "diligent" in their study, but that at the same time there are no impediments to their obtaining a correct understanding of the Bible's contents. The Bible itself, he states, enjoins the people of the church to study it and teach it to their children, and he makes a point of criticizing the "tyranny" of the Catholic Church in setting up the parish priest as the "arbiter of the faith and morals of his people." [1] Lodged at the beginning of 2,260 pages of theology packed into three densely argued volumes, Hodge's observations symbolize the importance of learning and education to Princeton's understanding of the Christian faith. In *The Way of Life*, he confirms that importance by claiming, as we saw in Chapter Three, that the Holy Spirit works in rational ways, appropriating the usual educational and evangelistic "agencies" of the church to work its divine influence on the people of God. These views provide some indication of the seriousness with which the Old School and Princeton took education. [2]

In the preceding chapters, we have seen that the Laos Mission frequently, perhaps even habitually, conducted its work on the basis of a system of meanings and doctrines that closely paralleled the Princeton Theology and was quite possibly influenced, to a degree, by that theology. McGilvary practiced Baconian evangelism. The mission advocated medical work on patently Baconian grounds. McGilvary and Wilson, in 1869, pressed for a Princeton-like observance of the Sabbath and public profession of faith in spite of clear political risks. That this same pattern holds true for the Laos Mission's educational work before 1880 should already be apparent, particularly in the case of the mission's evangelistic approach. The Laos Mission pursued evangelistic strategies that were patently educational in nature, including especially McGilvary's cosmological debates with northern Siam's educated elite and the mission's use of Western medicine to undermine the peoples' faith in traditional religious beliefs.

From a Princetonian perspective, moreover, the nature of the northern Thai context itself urgently reinforced the importance of education because of the negative impact "heathenism" is supposed to have had on both language and cognition. Green discerned an absolute contrast between those who speak "Christian" and "pagan" languages in terms of the "ideas and modes of thought" that they can express linguistically. He believed that language shapes people's judgment, character, and feelings to such an extent that, in the case of non-Christian languages such as Chinese,

An entirely new class of notions and associations must be waked up within [the Chinese], different from any they have ever had, and which there are no terms capable of conveying to them. It requires a slow process of elaborate training to eradicate or correct that concatenated system of false notions which is thus far the only thing that has ever entered their thoughts. The language needs to be christianized as well as the people; the work of transformation in the latter cannot be complete and thorough until the former shall be reached and purified.[3]

Green supposed that the Christianization of languages such as Chinese (and northern Thai, presumably) demands an elaborate, long-term, and necessary process of education, with emphasis on the importance of the process. One could not, apparently, be truly Christian until one has had ones thinking and speaking reformed to conform to Christian thought.

Green took biblical Greek as his model. Although classical Greek was a refined, polished language with its own high literature and cultivated modes of expression,

As the language of a Pagan people, however, it needed a thorough purgation. This was effected by causing it to circulate for centuries in the Jewish mind, until it was charged with ideas, and breathed a life drawn from the Old Testament, and from the divine training to which the people of Israel had been subjected for ages. The new idiom thus created by the transfusion of Jewish thoughts into the tongue of classic Greece, then stamped into uniformity and permanence by a special literature of its own, was finally wrought into its New Testament form by the lips and pens of the apostles, trained by Christ himself in the new truths which he came to communicate.[4]

The process of translating Hebrew ideas into Greek, thus, transformed Greek into a language fit for Christian expression.

Whether or not Wilson and McGilvary read Green's 1864 article in the *Princeton Review* on "modern philology," just quoted, they did create a set of educational activities for the Laos Mission well-adapted to his underlying principle that the evangelization of non-Christian peoples requires teaching them to speak and think in new ways. Northern Thai converts had to learn virtually a new manner of speaking, one based on new ideas and inculcating a new set of judgments, character traits, and emotions. The mission aimed at nothing less, as we will see, than the transformation of nearly every aspect of the converts' lives, and it established, or attempted to establish, a range of educational activities to achieve that end. Those activities divide themselves into three broad categories: first, church education, including theological education, Sunday school, and literacy education; second, formal education; and, third, printing and literature distribution. If we include the Laos Mission's Baconian evangelism among its educational activities, it is not too much to say that the mission used educational activities as the chief engine of its overall program both for reaching the general populace and for nurturing the emerging northern Thai church.

Church Education

Introduction

The Laos Mission's Enlightenment trust in human knowing, the perception that as a Christian agency it knew the truth, Reformed views on the total depravity of the heathen, and an understanding of the Bible as the only source of saving knowledge played, as we saw in Chapter Five, a key role in the establishment of the northern Thai church. That Enlightenment-Reformed system of meanings and doctrines encouraged the mission to challenge the power of the state by insisting that the converts make public declaration of their faith and keep the Sabbath. It discouraged the mission from heeding the converts' advice on conversion in a northern Thai context and on participation in northern Thai ritual. That same theological and ideological complex convinced the mission that it had to retrain its converts in a process that amounted to a one-way transfer of information, attitudes, values, and beliefs. An intriguing passing comment by Wilson symbolizes the depth of the mission's concern for "one-way" education. In the mission's annual report for 1879-1880, Wilson emphasized the pressing need the mission faced in educating its converts, and he illustrated his point with the example of one convert who told Wilson that he believed that the Hindu god, Phra In, is the angel Gabriel. Wilson rejected such apparently fantastical thinking and called for more teachers for the converts and a still more long-suffering care of them. [5] He did not see the convert's ideas as an opportunity for dialogue or learning, but as an indication that the convert required more educating and that the mission had to place even more emphasis on training and oversight. The mission's system of doctrines and meanings, in short, guided its educational activities as surely as it determined the mission's evangelistic strategies.

Theological Education

The Laos Mission did not initiate a formal program of theological education until 1889, when it founded its Training School for evangelists and church workers,[6] but McGilvary felt a burden for preparing converts for ordained ministry from the earliest days of the northern Thai church. In July 1869, he reported that he planned to start up a theological training class for three of the seven converts as soon as possible; he wanted to prepare them as assistants with the hope that some of them would eventually become pastors.[7] The persecution of September 1869 cut short his plans for that class. In late 1875, however, when the Chiang Mai Church was showing signs of renewal, McGilvary informed the Board of Foreign Missions of his interest in one younger convert, Nan Chai, who had an educational background that made him well qualified to become an evangelist and minister. In stating his hopes for Nan Chai, he avows, "No burden weighs so heavily on my own mind now as the prayer that God will raise up laborers among the Laos themselves. From our distant and isolated position we cannot hope to have a large reinforcement of foreign laborers." He goes on to state that, "The substantial character of the Laos as a race will I have no doubt enable more to be accomplished thru native assistants than in many other heathen lands." [8] In 1875, however, McGilvary was not yet in a position to act on his concern for developing the abilities of northern Thai Christians to assist in the work of the Laos Mission. The Chiang Mai Church showed only the first glimmerings of its coming modest renewal.

McGilvary took the mission's first, tentative step towards establishing a formal system of theological education when he began to tutor Noi Intachak in theology; we have already met this young convert in Chapter Five, where his plans to marry Kam Tip resulted in the Edict of Religious Toleration. Elected an elder in 1879, he shortly thereafter became McGilvary's private student. In October 1880, McGilvary reported that he was a conscientious and reliable student who was making good progress in his studies. He states that Noi Intachak, " is a young man of

great worth, and bids fair to well repay the time & expense in teaching him." [9] He possibly had Noi Intachak in mind when he wrote a few months earlier that, "Our work here has been progressing as we have prayed it might, mainly through native agency. In all mission fields, this should be the one great object, to raise up a native ministry, particularly in distant fields of difficult access like ours." McGilvary concludes, "A native ministry and a working church should be our motto." [10]

From McGilvary's comments in 1869, 1875, and 1880, it is clear that he saw the significance of training converts for ministry and felt anxious to set the process in motion. In 1883, he founded a more formal training class that involved four full-time students, stating in two letters in April 1883 that, "The great work of the mission is to raise up a native ministry, and I am glad that I have taken the first step towards it," and, again, that theological education was "the work that I regard of most importance just now." The class itself did not work out, but the effort reinforces our appreciation for the significance McGilvary attached to educating church workers. [11] He returned to this same theme in his autobiography, where he chides the Laos Mission for its failure in theological education; he writes, "I frankly confess that our greatest mistake has probably been in doing too much of the work ourselves, instead of training others to do it, and working through them." [12]

McGilvary had one clear goal for theological education: to equip northern Thai converts to complement the missionary force, perhaps with an eye to their one day supplanting the missionaries entirely. While he did not make a clear connection between theological education and his system of meanings and doctrines, such as he did for evangelism, his alma mater's historical experience throws light on that connection. We will remember that the Presbyterian Church established Princeton Theological Seminary in 1812 at a time when it felt beleaguered by dangerous social and religious forces. The church intended to use the seminary to train pious clergy in the defense of the faith, an inherently conservative and apologetical agenda bent on preserving Reformed orthodoxy. [13] Noll states,

The Princeton Theology was conservative, at least in part, because the founders saw the creation of a seminary as one means to combat cultural chaos. It was conservative, at least in part, because the spirit of the founders was preserved with unusual fidelity throughout most of the century. [14]

For McGilvary, as a Princetonian, theologically trained northern Thai church leaders offered the mission the same advantages of a conservative, orthodox church leadership. The Laos Mission's "heathen" context made the whole matter of preparing a properly educated leadership even more pressing. Because of that supposedly godless, immoral context, they faced a social and cultural situation more potentially dangerous to the fledgling northern Thai church, if anything, than the one conservative American Presbyterians faced earlier in the nineteenth century.

As it turned out, the Laos Mission failed during its pioneer period to put into place a program of theological training for potential church leaders. McGilvary's concern for theological education, however, still highlights the importance of education for the work of the Laos Mission. Where some other American evangelical churches emphasized a sense of calling and piety over formal theological training, McGilvary adhered to the Old School's insistence that education is a primary prerequisite for the clergy.

Literacy Education and Sunday School

McGilvary extended his concern for Christian education to include every member of the church, not just those he hoped would one day lead it. As a self-conscious Calvinist, he naturally

centered that concern on teaching the converts to know and cherish the Bible, which, as we have seen, he took to be the authoritative source of Christian truth and faith. He shared this concern for biblical education with American orthodox evangelicals generally, who used public (state) school systems as well as Christian education to inculcate their values, moral standards, and beliefs in the whole of American society. They believed that education actually made people more intelligent as well as more receptive to Christian truths, so that education became, in orthodox evangelical hands, a tool for evangelism, apologetics, and social uplift. Presbyterians gained for themselves a particular reputation for advocating education, especially higher education, as a key tool for the advancement of the Christian cause.[15] During its early years, however, the Laos Mission faced serious obstacles in its efforts to conduct biblical education because it had yet to translate the Bible into the distinctive northern Thai alphabet. When Nan Inta began his intense study of the Christian faith, he first had to learn to read central Thai before he could read the Bible or the other Christian literature that the Protestant missions in Bangkok had prepared over the years.[16] Central Thai literacy education soon developed into one of the mission's most important educational tasks.

McGilvary once again took the lead in teaching church members and potential converts to read central Thai as well as in emphasizing the importance of a literate membership for the Chiang Mai Church. He consistently paid attention to the literacy skills of the converts. He noted, for example, that all three of the young men who received baptism in the opening months of 1877 had learned to read central Thai as part of their preparation for church membership and that more than half of the church's sixteen members at that date could read central Thai capably. He predicted that central Thai would eventually become the "Christian dialect" and, beyond that, the language of all of northern Siam. He also observed that it was easiest to teach illiterate people to read central Thai, but the mission still needed to develop a northern Thai literature for those who were already literate in that script. [17] During the course of the year 1877, McGilvary had opportunity to teach central Thai literacy to other new converts and potential converts, including some in-patients at Cheek's bamboo and thatch hospital and individuals from outlying communities.[18] After 1877, he continued to teach central Thai literacy as opportunities arose, and while at Rahang (modern-day Tak) he even taught English to the children of government officials.[19]

Literacy education, be it in central or northern Thai, remained an important part of McGilvary's ministry throughout his life. At the time of his death, Dr. James W. McKean wrote,

No one who has done country evangelistic work with Dr. McGilvary can ever forget the oft-seen picture of the gray-haired patriarch seated on the bamboo floor of a thatch-covered Lao home, teaching some one to read. Of course, the book faced the pupil, and it was often said that he had taught so many people in this way that he could read the Lao character very readily with the book upside down.[20]

Literacy education, then, did not represent a passing fancy or expediency for McGilvary. It amounted to a serious educational commitment based on a system of doctrines and meanings that emphasized the role of the Bible as a source of both doctrinal truth and enlightened insights in Christian living.

Perhaps nothing symbolized McGilvary's commitment to biblical and literacy education so much as the establishment of Chiang Mai Church's first Sunday school. In December 1876, he reported that he had found the task of teaching new converts and a few others to read a burden, and he organized a Sunday school that met after worship to assist him in that work. He recruited several literate members of the church to teach those members who could not yet read and write; they used the "Shorter Catechism," one of the classic statements of Presbyterian doctrine, as

their text.[21] This Sunday school seems to have remained generally informal until 1880, when the other members of the mission put it on a more regular footing by organizing a set of classes. Dr. Cheek served as the superintendent and took charge of a boys' class. Sarah Cheek taught a women's literacy class, Cole and Campbell conducted a class for younger women, and three older girls from their school supervised an infant class. Wilson taught a Bible class, and two Christian men taught two men's literacy classes. Wilson reported an average attendance of about eighty.[22]

Given the small size of the mission and the church in 1880, the reorganized Sunday school represented a major programmatic development involving all of the missionaries. In spite of its new format, however, it did nothing more than recapitulate the theological, biblical, and literacy education emphases of earlier years. The expanded Sunday school also embodied, yet again, the mission's overall strategy of importing Western forms and strategies to accomplish its ends in northern Siam. Seymour notes that during the last four decades of the nineteenth century, the international Sunday school movement reached its "heyday" in the United States and other English-speaking nations. After 1860, that movement experienced rapid growth, the establishment of an international organization, the development of a widely used international curriculum, and the emergence of many different training programs for Sunday school teachers.[23] In the United States, evangelical churches of all stripes established Sunday schools as one of a set of key programs aimed at transforming local churches into complex institutions.[24] Orthodox evangelicals in both the United States and Chiang Mai, in sum, found the Sunday school movement especially important as an embodiment of their central concern for education.

Conclusion

In one sense, the Laos Mission's educational work up to 1880 does not seem to amount to much. McGilvary took on one young man as a theological student. He spent an indeterminate amount of time teaching an unknown number of people to read central Thai. He set up a Sunday school, which his colleagues later expanded and reorganized. When viewed from the difficult situation the mission faced in the 1860s and 1870s, however, when for long periods McGilvary was the only healthy missionary able to work full time, his efforts take on much greater importance. The Laos Mission's commitment to theological, literacy, and local church educational programs symbolizes, furthermore, the importance of placing the Princeton Theology's relationship to the mission in a broad context. For, as Johnson points out, orthodox evangelicals from several denominations and traditions grounded their educational concerns, as did the Princetonians, in their traditional Protestant emphasis on the Scriptures as the sole source authority over Christian faith. Johnson observes of the orthodox evangelicals that,

Given their belief that God spoke only through the written word, formal [orthodox] evangelicals saw it as their duty to spread institutions of literacy, which made it possible for common folk to read and understand the Word of God. These believers were also committed to an orderly, productive, and modernizing society and saw themselves, the best-educated evangelicals in the land, as arbiters of the new order.[25]

Princeton and the Laos Mission comprised two overlapping circles enveloped by this larger American orthodox evangelical context, Princeton best articulating what we might call "evangelical scholasticism" on paper and the mission in programs.

Formal Education

Introduction

Given the considerable amount of its limited time and resources that the Laos Mission invested in educational activities, it may not be overstating the case to argue that the mission looked upon itself and on the Chiang Mai Church as being, first and foremost, educational agencies. McGilvary, at key moments in the church's early history, sought to institute rudimentary programs for the theological education of its leadership. The whole mission concerned itself with literacy education and the instruction of new members, especially in the Bible. In keeping with its conservative American evangelical heritage, then, the mission invested a great deal in the process of education as the best way to establish a strong, intelligent church. It also relied on education as yet another tool for evangelistic outreach, and from nearly the beginning aimed at the establishment of formal educational institutions to the end that it could reach northern Thai society with Christian and Western learning. It believed, we will remember, that Western learning must inevitably drive out traditional knowledge just as the Christian religion must necessarily drive out traditional religion.

In the years up to 1880, the Laos Mission made two major efforts at establishing a school. The first one, undertaken in 1871, failed. The second attempt succeeded, leading not only to the establishment of the mission's first school but also to the beginnings of formal women's education in northern Siam.

The Burman School

On the last day of 1870, McGilvary reported to the Board that some princes wanted the mission to open a school to educate a number of the princes' followers and that the mission hoped to respond in the near future. He also asserted, as an inarguable principle, the statement that the mission could not build up the church without the aid of schools.[26] McGilvary did not see the projected school simply as a way of influencing the larger society or for gaining converts, but he also saw it, specifically, as a tool necessary for "building up" the church. In the end, however, this first school did not live up to the mission's hopes for it, and we have almost no information about it. It appears to have lasted for roughly one year, from some time early in 1871 until either late 1871 or early 1872. The school had only a few students, most of them evidently children of "Burman" parents, although a few northern Thai students also attended. Wilson took charge of the school, and the mission hired a young Burmese who spoke English to teach, hoping that the prospect of learning English would entice more northern Thai students to enroll. They did not, and eventually some or all of the students themselves withdrew from the school, leaving the mission no choice but to close it. As far as McGilvary and Wilson could tell, parents of students and potential students were reluctant to become associated too closely with the missionaries, fearing official displeasure and possible retaliation.[27] Wilson later observed that Chao Intanon, Chao Bunthawong, and other top political leaders saw no need for education or for Western-style schools and Wilson asked, rhetorically, "Unable to read themselves why should they wish the common people to know the advantages of a school?"[28]

Apart from official indifference, the Laos Mission failed to establish a school in 1871 because it lacked a Christian constituency as the core around which a school could coalesce. The mission also lacked the staff and the educational resources necessary to take advantage of what seemed to be an opportunity for mission outreach. Premature as it was, however, the mission's eagerness to grasp this opportunity to initiate formal educational work suggests how close education was to the missionary heart. Over the course of the next few years, the Laos Mission

continued to work towards the founding of a school, and in the larger scale of things, it did not take long for it to attain that goal.

The Interim

After the initial effort at founding a mission school wound its way to a dismal end, McGilvary wrote to the Board in late 1872 concerning yet another of his dreams and schemes, namely the appointment of single women to the mission. He cited the fact that women were nearly the equals of men in northern Thai society and the political influence of Chao Mae Tip Keson, the "Princess" of Chiang Mai, as evidence that "enlightened Christian women" could exert great influence over northern Thai women.[29] McGilvary did not mention the possibility of a girls' school, but whether he had such an eventuality in mind at the time, his letter anticipated events of just seven years later. In the mission's annual report for 1874, in the meantime, Wilson noted that Chao Intanon's son had visited Burma and came back to Chiang Mai impressed with the Baptist missionary schools he saw there; his enthusiasm inspired a brief flurry of educational interest in the palace that soon died down. Chao Intanon and Chao Bunthawong remained completely indifferent and unsupportive.[30]

In Chapter Five, we saw that the Chiang Mai Church did not begin to recover from the persecution of 1869 or win any number of new converts until 1875. The church's modest renewal that began in that year and gained momentum in the following years created the conditions that made it possible for the mission to start its first permanent school. Although the exact date is uncertain, Sophia McGilvary took the first step in that direction at some point during the year 1875 when she gathered a small group of Christian girls into what we might today consider a tutoring center. The six to eight students involved lived with the McGilvays, and Sophia gave them as much time as her health and family responsibilities allowed. She apparently worked with the students individually as much as in a class and, at the beginning at least, she taught them primarily to read, presumably in central Thai. By September 1876, the mission was laying firm plans to start a girl's school and applied to the Board for two women missionary teachers for it.[31] Mission records for roughly the next two years are silent about developments in Sophia's tutoring class, but then in later 1878 her husband reported to the readers of the *North Carolina Presbyterian* that, "More has been done than ever towards a school. We have the nucleus of a girls' school of ten pupils, started in part to educate the children of the church and preparatory to the teachers who have been promised to carry it on a larger scale." [32] All the mission lacked was the promised teachers, and that problem was soon remedied.

If we recall the time Daniel McGilvary devoted to literacy work and his Sunday school, by 1876 he and Sophia together were investing considerable effort in educational activities. During most of this period, the Wilsons were on furlough and Dr. Cheek tended to spend large blocks of time in Bangkok, leaving only the McGilvays to carry out the work in Chiang Mai. Where other missionaries in other evangelical missions devoted their time to literature distribution, house-to-house visitation, and public evangelistic campaigns, Daniel McGilvary gave an important part of his attention to teaching people to read, tutoring a potential theological student, and organizing a Sunday school. Sophia McGilvary tutored young girls. Even when McGilvary distributed medicines, he ultimately hoped that the local citizenry would learn to trust Western science and religion. He was still educating the people.

The Girls' School

Returning from his own furlough, Wilson escorted Edna Cole and Mary Campbell on their trip from the United States through Bangkok to Chiang Mai, the party finally arriving there in April 1879, after a trip of four and one-half months. Cole and Campbell, we will remember, had

just graduated from Western Female Seminary, Oxford, Ohio, where, in the grip of an intense religious revival, they each decided, separately, to respond to the Laos Mission's call for single women missionaries. Cole was 25 and Campbell 21 years' old-young, dedicated women filled with a deep sense of their calling to serve God and their students, "their girls," in Chiang Mai.[33] The new missionaries' educational efforts met with immediate success. They took over Sophia's class and within a week doubled the number of students from six to twelve; they counted among their students Kam Tip, whose wedding plans had led to the Edict of Religious Toleration just the year before. They also had an assistant teacher, Chantah. Cole and Campbell entered into their work enthusiastically and experienced an immediate love for their students.[34] By September 1879, they had 18 girls living and studying with them full time, plus another 11 students who studied at home but spent some time each day at the girls' school. Cole and Campbell anticipated another one or two full time day students, making a total of 30 or 31 students under their care. Wilson insisted on turning his home over to the school, and he moved into a temporary bamboo house.[35]

Campbell wrote home that most days she and Cole had numerous visitors who came to observe both how the two young missionaries lived personally and how they conducted their educational work, recalling the McGilvays and Wilsons' experience of the 1860s. She claimed that these visitors were especially taken with the students' singing, which had become quite good and which impressed them with the abilities of their own people. She further noted that the singing at Chiang Mai Church's worship also improved under the influence of the girls. The two young missionary teachers exercised a decided influence over their students, introducing to them the same evangelical, revivalist piety that they themselves had experienced as students. By the end of 1879, several of the girls had begun to seek membership in the church. The first of them to be received was among the ten who joined the church on the last Sunday in December of that year.[36] In a letter to Mary's parents written in 1881, McGilvary praised both Campbell and Cole for the astonishing success they experienced in such a brief period. He wrote of the students that, "Many of their pupils are already recorded on the church's roll, and give evidence of a new heart by a new life." [37] We will remember from Chapter Two the emphasis both Princeton generally and McGilvary in particular placed on the importance of reaching the heart through the mind. The new girls' school became one of the mission's chief agencies for achieving that end.

None of the pioneer members of the Laos Mission, as we also saw in Chapter Two, were more thoroughly evangelical in their revivalist fervor than Cole and Campbell. Campbell captured the depth of that evangelical ardor in a letter she wrote about their trip up to Chiang Mai; along the way, their party set a small brush fire "after the fashion of the Siamese." In her letter, she exclaims, "How we long to see the spiritual fire spread as rapidly, sweeping every thing before it." [38] Reflecting the more critical side of their fervor, Cole complained, while still in Bangkok, that, "We have seen so much of heathenism since coming here that our hearts are sick and we long for the time when our Lord shall come and claim this kingdom." [39] There is nothing to distinguish these sentiments, positive and negative, from the outlook of millions of American evangelicals of all stripes and sects, but what does capture our attention is the manner in which the Laos Mission took two zealous young evangelicals and "stuck" them in a formal educational setting. No one in the mission, including Campbell and Cole themselves, seems to have felt it a strange or inappropriate place for them. On the contrary, these Old School Presbyterians-heirs to Reformed "scholasticism" and the Scottish Enlightenment-would have argued that in a "heathen land" a school was the very best place the mission could have placed them. In a school, they could educate the minds and prepare the hearts of their students in that blend of evangelical piety and Old School intellection exemplified by the Princeton Theology. It might be argued that nineteenth-century American thinking concerning the place of women limited the work Cole and Campbell could do to education. The Laos Mission, nonetheless, went

out of its way to recruit them specifically to that work, still seeing no contradiction between it and their revivalistic inclinations.

Princeton said, as we have already seen, that one best reaches the heart through the mind. It is important in the context of the Laos Mission's educational program, however, to emphasize the manner in which the Princetonians made that point by clothing this essentially scholastic approach to religious conversion in evangelical garb. Hodge states in his celebrated, widely read treatise, *The Way of Life*, that faith is a gift from God and that, "The evidence indeed is presented to all, or there would be no obligation to believe; but men are morally blind, and therefore the eyes of their understanding must be opened that they may understand the things which are freely given to them of God." He goes on to state that, "believers are the recipients of an influence, an unction, from the Holy One, which convinces them of the truth, makes them see and know that it is truth." [40] The whole process of conversion, that is, begins for Hodge with the presentation of evidence. Although he would have disagreed in theory, in practice it seems as if God did not enter into the process of conversion until the potential convert received information through one agency or another. Later in *The Way of Life*, Hodge argues that those in search of faith must assent to certain facts and integrate that assent into their very consciousness. The search for faith requires, he says, a certain "state of mind," and he writes, "Whatever may be the particular occasion, the mind is led to fix itself on its responsibility to God and the conviction of its guilt becomes settled and confirmed." Hodge insisted that the human heart resists this process and rises up against the very idea that it stands under God's condemnation. Only strict adherence to the truth can change the heart, which means that pious judgment and sentiment must conform themselves to the objective truths revealed in the Bible. [41] At each turn, Hodge grounds all other aspects of the Christian life in the process of receiving and understanding data and integrating that data into one's consciousness.

Hodge's scholastic approach to the Christian life and the point already made in this chapter that he believed that one acquires faith through normal means and agencies take on added significance in light of Cole and Campbell's educational approach to the evangelization of the northern Thai. In *The Way of Life*, Hodge states explicitly that religious knowledge and experience do not come by way of some mysterious, extra-mundane means. He writes, "What has been said hitherto is designed to illustrate the nature of saving faith, as it is represented in the Scriptures. It differs from all other acts of the mind to which the term faith is applied, mainly on account of the nature of the evidence on which it is founded." He also states that, "There is one general truth in relation to this point which is clearly taught in the Bible; and that is, that all true repentance springs from right views of God." He concludes, as was quoted more fully above, "The in-dwelling of the Spirit, therefore, in the people of God, does not supersede their own agency." [42] Faith, in sum, differs from other forms of knowledge primarily in terms of the data it draws upon, data taken from the Bible and orthodox theological doctrines. The Holy Spirit does not appear (to Old School Presbyterians, at any rate) in the midst of wild, ecstatic frenzy or deep mystical experiences, but it appropriates, rather, the normal processes of learning to its own spiritual ends. McGilvary made the same point in the first of his series of articles on missionary medicine, cited in Chapter Four. He observes that Jesus and the apostles relied upon miraculous powers of teaching and healing that have since been withdrawn from the church. The nineteenth-century church therefore had to rely upon less spectacular methods, for, as he states, "...the extraordinary and temporary have given place to the permanent and ordinary means which God has ordained to employ and bless for the temporal and spiritual welfare of man." [43]

Campbell and Cole themselves relished the prospect of engaging in educational work. They could not wait to get to Chiang Mai and take up founding the girls' school. After they had been at the task for six months, Campbell told the Board how Christ had "claimed" three of their students "for his own," and she enthused, "Oh, how we thank Him and pray that he will not leave

us until all are His!" She prayed that God would be their strength, wisdom, and source of guidance and blessing.[44] In December 1879, she reported still greater results from their first year's efforts, writing,

But I have not told you how the Saviour is still with us, calling our girls to Himself. Last Sabbath, five presented themselves to be received into the church with two of our day scholars. We have sufficient evidence for believing that part have really given their hearts to the Saviour, but it was thought best to give them another month, until our next communion, and if at that time they still wish to publicly confess Him, we can hesitate no longer. In other hearts there is the quiet, deep working of the Spirit. Oh, how unworthy we are of all our Saviour is doing for us! Pray that we may be brought nearer, and work more earnestly for Him.[45]

Her words contain a full measure of revivalist ardor, but subsuming her evangelical piety were the grand Reformed themes most clearly articulated for Old School American Presbyterians at Princeton: God's activity, election, the quiet and orderly working of the Holy Spirit, the unworthiness of the worker, and the deep sense of God's grace in Christ.[46]

Whether or not, furthermore, we can demonstrate a clear connection between Hodge's theology and Campbell and Cole's perception of their work, the two new missionaries shared his reliance on knowledge, under the guidance of the Spirit, to bring the unconverted to Christ. Commenting in a letter written at the very end of July 1880 concerning the admission to the church of still more of her students, Campbell writes, "Oh, for a tongue to teach them more of the Saviour they have confessed, for they are such babes in their knowledge." The problem was not merely with the students, however. She continues, "We understand enough of the language to teach the story of Genesis, but are often puzzled to convey the spiritual meaning." [47] Campbell, the deeply committed evangelical teacher, had begun to wrestle with the pedagogical issues involved in transferring her knowledge and understanding of the Christian faith to her students. Although baptized Christians, her students still knew too little about that faith and lacked vital spiritual information, while she and Cole found it difficult to convey the Bible's deeper meanings to northern Thai students in the medium of their own language. Later, after Mary Campbell's death in the muddy waters of the Chao Phraya River, Cole struggled on alone and felt even more keenly how truly difficult it was for her students to understand the Christian faith. In an undated letter published in December 1882, she reported that another five girls' school students would join the church. She felt, however, that they still did not understand the fact of their own evil natures or God's plan of salvation. She writes, "I want to see a thorough repentance for sin and a real longing for the new life in Jesus. They have a little life; they move and breathe; but oh, for real life in Jesus!" In another letter, published in March 1883, Cole seems to have felt somewhat more optimistic, but still troubled. She had been teaching the Bible to eight of her students and reported that she sometimes felt encouraged by their answers to her questions; those answers showed a degree of thoughtfulness and "awakening." Still, heathenism's ignorance appeared to infect them and all of the converts. They did not understand the "vital points" of the Christian faith. She concluded that the situation would improve if the Laos Mission could translate, publish, and distribute northern Thai Bibles.[48]

Where the epistemological deficiencies of her students depressed Cole, her correspondence contains no similar criticisms of their behavior, the depth of their affection for her, or their level of commitment to their new faith.[49] In the letter published in March 1883, mentioned just above, she noted with a hint of pride the substantial sacrifices converts had to make when they became Christians. She fixed, however, on the supposedly plain fact of their ignorance of the key doctrines of the Christian faith and seems to have assumed that true faith is dependent upon understanding the meaning of those doctrines. We will recollect from earlier

chapters that Princeton had a relatively broad conception of "understanding" that included spiritual insight as well as the accumulation of factual knowledge. Cole and Campbell, from what we have said of them so far here and in Chapter Two, shared that broad understanding and sought to teach their students a vital way of living as much as to instruct them in any particular set of facts. Cole, in particular however, also shared the Princetonians' concern for the objective, factual base on which both she and they believed all faithful Christians must ground their faith. A student once came to Cole to consult with her about a difficult home situation in which the girl's family rejected her new religion; she was afraid and uncertain. Cole told her about Jesus' suffering in this world. She described how Jesus now resides in heaven and intercedes for Christians. Cole then told her to go home and face the problems there, hoping that her student had understood the lessons she taught her and would take her strength only from Jesus.[50] Cole rested her counsel on the premise that, if her student understood what Jesus had done on earth and who he is now, she would gain the ability to withstand the problems she faced in her home. In her simple, loving wish for the well being of her student lay what we can only call a scholastic evangelicalism: know, she enjoined this student, and from that knowledge take strength in Jesus, the personal Saviour. Edna Cole's evangelical and scholastic instincts, that is, paralleled Princeton's: know, and in that knowing, believe.

Cole and Campbell's approach to their missionary tasks, when compared to that of Wilson and McGilvary, reveals a somewhat different juxtaposition of the confessional, commonsensical, and evangelical elements that informed all of the missionaries' systems of doctrines and meanings. Without denying the influence of evangelical piety on their thinking and behavior, McGilvary and Wilson demonstrated a strong reliance on the grand doctrines of the Reformed faith and a strong inclination towards Common Sense Realism. They were what we might term "classical scholastics" in that they drew their emphasis on the importance of the mind as the channel for reaching the heart from post-Reformation orthodoxy and the Scottish Enlightenment. Evangelical piety appears to take something of a "backseat" to these other elements, particularly in McGilvary's writings. Cole and Campbell, as we have already seen in Chapter Two, represented a less classical, more evangelical approach, one that fully valued an educational approach but grounded that approach in a warmer, more exuberant piety. Their writings reveal much less of a Reformed base and the direct influences of Common Sense Philosophy, although substantial traces remain once one knows to look for them. A number of factors contributed to these differing emphases. Campbell and Cole were young and they were new to the field; one expects a certain amount of exuberant piety from them, almost as a matter of course. The two senior missionaries, moreover, had theological training, which they received at the hands of several key representatives of the Princeton Theology. Campbell and Cole did not have formal theological training as such. In the end, however, one suspects that these two sets of missionaries, one older and one younger, simply represented two different eras. Wilson and McGilvary grew up during the Antebellum, a time when the engines of Reformed and Scottish Enlightenment thinking still pulled great weight on the American scene. The split between radical and conservative evangelicals was only gradually narrowing. The Old School was a separate denomination and had a distinct identity of its own. Cole and Campbell grew up in a much different social and theological climate. The Old School merged with the New School while they were still children. The distinction between radical and conservative evangelicals, meanwhile, counted for less, and the drift away from interest in formal systems of theology was accelerating. Different times and training led to different emphases, but in spite of these differences both sets of missionaries, senior and junior, shared a profound commitment to education as the way to convert the northern Thai people to Christianity.

These comments on the differences between McGilvary and Wilson in comparison with Cole and Campbell reinforce our sense that it is impossible to claim that the Princeton Theology had a profound impact on the work of the Laos Mission during its pioneer period. The sources of

missionary behavior are too dependent on a variety of factors, including age, background, and theological training, to allow the easy assertion of any direct links of significance. At the same time, even Campbell and Cole *acted* like Princetonians would act and their correspondence contains a nascent, unsystematic theology something like the Princeton Theology.

Conclusion

The Burman school proved itself a dead end. The girls' school was an immediate success, and in spite of having to face many future obstacles eventually evolved, under the name of Dara Academy, into one of the two premier Christian educational institutions of northern Siam. The Laos Mission, more generally, invested a large portion of its time, personnel, and resources in the establishment of an elaborate educational system that placed boarding schools in all of its stations and, after 1900, inspired the emergence of numerous local church parochial schools. In the process, the mission played a substantial role in women's education and the fostering of new social roles for northern Thai women. Mission schools also produced many of the first teachers for the Bangkok government schools in the North and otherwise provided models for government educational efforts. As the years passed, meanwhile, the mission itself depended more and more on its schools to train church leaders and provide resources for church life.[51] The "scholastic," "enlightened," and institutional approach to church life and evangelistic outreach remained thus a key mark of the mission's life throughout its history. Like the Earth's molten core, the mission's Reformed, Enlightened, and Evangelical system of doctrines and meanings lay deep within everything its members wrote and did.

Printing and Literature Distribution

No one, as we have already observed, went through a process of evaluation and planning in anticipation of the founding of a new mission in northern Siam. Later, during the Laos Mission's pioneer era, the missionaries never instituted a formal, or even informal, process for evaluating the lessons they could learn from their early experience in Chiang Mai. The McGilvays and Wilsons came with a clear set of cognitive blueprints already in place, ones that included a large place for Baconian evangelism and medicine, churches founded along the lines of Presbyterian congregations in America, the establishment of key American Presbyterian liturgical and pietistic practices, and the creation of Western educational institutions. The theological and ideological assumptions the pioneer members of the mission brought with them preclude the necessity of "thinking through" the use of Western, American, and Presbyterian methods and forms. They knew the truth of their religion. They understood the evils of heathenism. They believed God inspired them and their methods. They discerned the presence of the Holy Spirit carrying them forward even under the most trying circumstances. Given this set of meanings and doctrines, the mission felt no motivation to rethink any aspect of its work.

So far as the Wilsons and McGilvays could see, then, their system of doctrines and meanings provided them with a clear plan of action for Chiang Mai, one involving the usual set of evangelistic, educational, and medical activities. Printing took its place on this list of unquestioned, assumed activities as having a special importance in the missionaries' drive to re-educate the northern Thai. As early as 1864, McGilvay ranked the establishment of a printing press high on the list of the future Laos Mission's priorities, and, under his leadership, the Siam Mission formed a committee to acquire northern Thai script type.[52] The Laos Mission had to wait until the 1870s, however, before it took its first concrete steps towards setting up a printing establishment. At some point before the end of 1870, it acquired a lithographic press but then faced the serious obstacle of carting its large and extremely heavy containers upriver from Bangkok to Chiang Mai. Boat captains refused to undertake the task, and it was some time before the mission finally got the press up to Chiang Mai. There is no record of when it actually

reached the city, and we only hear about it again when McGilvary informed the Board in February 1872 that Wilson had closed the Burman school and planned to begin working on the press instead. Wilson himself reported that he had opened the boxes the press arrived in and begun to set it up.[53] After this hopeful beginning, however, the reality of trying to run a press in Chiang Mai set in. The lithographic press itself seemed to be in fine working condition, but Wilson found it impossible to make good impressions using the ink that came with it. He tried to read the machine's German manual, but could not understand enough to solve the ink problem. He even tried to make a substitute ink himself, but he eventually informed the Board that the mission lacked both the materials and expertise needed to operate the press successfully. In his 1873 annual report to the Board, Wilson also observed that he simply did not have the time or the physical strength to invest in the press when there was so much else to be done.[54] Several years later, in 1877, McGilvary admitted to the Board that the lithographic press was a "dead loss" that had wasted \$400 to \$500.[55]

Meanwhile McGilvary looked in other directions for a solution to the problem of how to set up a press in Chiang Mai. While on furlough, he had asked the American Bible Society (ABS) for financial assistance in obtaining a northern Thai font. Although the ABS granted him the funds, he was unable to make use of them because he had made no progress towards getting that type font made. In May 1875, after his return to Chiang Mai, McGilvary alerted the Board of Foreign Missions that he still wanted to obtain a font of type if possible. He suggested that his brother-in-law in the United States, Cornelius Bradley, might be willing to help. Bradley knew central Thai well and had a scholarly bent of mind, and his father, Dr. Bradley, had trained him as a printer. McGilvary sent along with his letter to the Board samples taken from well-known northern Thai scribes, including Chao Tamalangka, reputed to be the best scribe in the North.[56]

In spite of their repeated failures, then, both Wilson and McGilvary had not changed their mind about the necessity of establishing a working press in Chiang Mai; and while all of this talk of stones and ink seems to be far removed from the mission's "system of doctrines and meanings," in reality Wilson and McGilvary pursued the establishment of a printing press for largely theological reasons. Cole made that point when she claimed, above, that printed northern Thai Bibles offered the best hope for teaching the northern Thai converts to understand the Christian faith. The mission wanted a press so it could create a northern Thai Christian literature and especially so it could publish a northern Thai Bible. Translation work, however, was also not progressing very rapidly. McGilvary reported in May 1875 that he had not been able to revise his preliminary translation of the Gospel of Matthew because of the press of other work. Thus, he could not send it to be printed as soon as a font was available. Nine months later McGilvary was still struggling to finish the revision of Matthew. At that time he acknowledged that even his revision was of limited quality because he lacked the critical and linguistic tools needed, such as a Greek text of the New Testament as well as access to the latest in textual criticism.[57] The two senior missionaries, nonetheless, remained committed to a press.

By their own admission, both McGilvary and Wilson confessed that they lacked the time, tools, and skills to put a printing establishment into place and the time and tools to carry out translation work; in spite of these facts, they persevered. Dr. Cheek, meanwhile, had growing doubts about the wisdom of the whole printing venture. He informed the Board in 1875 that setting up a press in Chiang Mai would be an expensive task, and he doubted that the benefits would justify that expense. Cheek advised the Board that it would be better to use the Siam Mission's press in Bangkok for printing northern Thai materials and invest the money saved in other, more worthwhile ventures. He also correctly predicted that it would take many years to translate the Bible.[58] Events over the next five years generally confirmed his skepticism. In 1876, Wilson returned to the United States on furlough with plans to acquire a northern Thai font, but nothing seems to have come of those plans. Four years later, in 1880, the mission did

succeed in acquiring a font, but part of it was lost in shipping. Wilson, meanwhile, continued to lament the technical obstacles he faced in setting up a functioning press, complaining to the Board that he felt "outside" the world. McGilvary made some progress on his translation of Matthew during the last years of the pioneer era, but still had to ask the Board to send him some very basic translation helps.[59] Meanwhile, the other 65 books of the Bible awaited translation. In the years after 1880, the Laos Mission continued to struggle with the profound difficulties involved in trying to import a completely new modern technology in the face of nearly insurmountable technical and transportation obstacles. It finally did succeed in 1893, and eventually the Chiang Mai Mission Press developed into a major printing establishment, printing millions of pages of religious literature and "secular" job work each year. Although by 1914 the mission managed to publish a complete northern Thai New Testament, it only finished translations of 34 books of the whole Bible and never did manage to put a complete northern Thai Bible in the church's hands.[60]

In spite of the fact that Cheek surely gave a more realistic assessment from a strictly business point of view of the impracticability of setting up a press in Chiang Mai, Wilson and McGilvary never wavered in their determination to achieve that goal. They would have rejected any suggestion that they themselves were unrealistic and surely would have argued that Cheek failed to see the urgency of translating and publishing the Bible for the sake of the mission's work. Relying on the Siam Mission's press, located weeks and weeks away from the North, simply would not do. Cheek, presumably, accepted the premise that publishing comprised an important adjunct to the mission's overall strategy, but his comments suggest a more "hard-headed" approach to the matter. Cheek accepted the Old School system of meanings and doctrines only in a general, somewhat indifferent manner and, as we saw in Chapter Two, eventually withdrew from the mission entirely to pursue his private business ventures. The two senior missionaries took a far more serious view of the question of doctrine, while also accepting whole-heartedly the meanings implied in the Old School theological system they studied at Princeton. Faith in the Bible as the literal, unquestioned Word of God comprised an important element of that system for the mission as well as the seminary, as we saw in both Chapters Two and Three.

Princeton and Chiang Mai's shared faith in the Christian Scriptures also was grounded in their larger Old School system of doctrines and meanings. Marsden points out that Antebellum American evangelicals of all persuasions, furthermore, shared an unquestioning reverence for the Bible founded on two Western intellectual and epistemological assumptions: first, the Bible can be clearly and correctly understood by all individuals; second, all truth is one. He then highlights the important role Common Sense Philosophy played in reinforcing evangelical faith in the Bible by providing evangelicals with a sure defense against speculative philosophies and any interpretations of the Bible that did not accord with their own theological views. Common Sense Philosophy assured them that humanity shares a common consciousness, that the Bible reflects and addresses that consciousness, and that it transcends cultural or social differences. It communicates God's commonsensical truths with equal facility in all languages and settings. American evangelicals also affirmed that the Bible speaks to the heart as much as the mind and that the Holy Spirit confirmed objective biblical truth. Marsden argues that Antebellum evangelicals combined romantic emotionalism and subjectivism with Baconian, scientific objectivism to create an integrated view of the Scriptures.[61]

Building on this evangelical, commonsensical, Reformed heritage, Hodge's *Systematic Theology* outlines the rationale for emphasizing the Scriptures as an indispensable tool for the Christian life. He equates the "word of God" with the Bible and then issues two key theological maxims than virtually mandate obligatory Bible study. He states, "The word of God, so far as adults are concerned, is an indispensable means of salvation. True religion never has existed, and

never can exist, where the truths revealed in the Bible are unknown." He goes on to write, "The word of God is not only necessary to salvation, but it is also divinely efficacious to the accomplishment of that end." [62] Hodge also addresses the particular condition of the heathen, asserting that, "...it remains a fact patent to all eyes that the nations where the Bible is unknown sit in darkness. The absence of the Bible is just as distinctly discernible as the absence of the sun." He elaborates, "a second fact on which the testimony of experience is equally clear is, that true Christianity flourishes just in proportion to the degree in which the Bible is known, and its truths are diffused among the people." Finally, he claims, "A third important fact equally well established is, that true religion prevails in any community, in proportion to the degree in which the young are instructed in the facts and indoctrinated in the truths of the Bible." [63] Hodge had not yet published these thoughts when McGilvary first proposed the need of a press, in 1864, for the future Chiang Mai mission, and it would strain credulity in the extreme to believe that he or Wilson thumbed through their old Princeton lecture notes seeking a rationale for their persistent quest for a mission press. Hodge, on the other hand, does reveal the issues at stake in that quest and provides some insight into why McGilvary and Wilson stayed the course in establishing a mission press as well as why the mission emphasized literacy and education as key activities and commitments. There was a great deal at stake. Hodge's views suggest that if the missionaries failed to provide northern Thai society and the northern Thai church with the Bible, they could not hope for lasting success. If they did not train the church to the use of the Bible and, in the process, provide their members with literacy skills, the mission had little hope for the future. Northern Thai society would remain in darkness. The church would not flourish. Christianity would not prevail.

Hodge's comments also tie the Laos Mission's emphasis on printing and translation back into its inherited system of meanings and doctrines. He articulated a rigidly dualistic epistemology, based on the asserted truism that spiritual truth is found only in Christianity and known only to faithful Christians. In keeping with his dualism, Hodge believed that salvation is found in Christianity alone and contained exclusively in the Bible, the word of God. He seasoned his exclusivist dualism with a strong dash of Scottish Enlightenment universalism, holding that his principles apply to every community in every condition. When taken together as an interlocking system, Hodge's principles concerning the centrality of the Bible in Protestant life virtually demanded precisely the emphasis on translating and printing the Scriptures, as well as teaching reading and writing, found in the mission's records from the 1860s onwards.

Conclusion

If Kosoke Koyama could have addressed his question concerning whether the people of Chiang Mai understood what the mission was attempting to teach them directly to McGilvary and his colleagues (see the Introduction), they quite possibly would have answered, "No, they do not understand, but they will. They must, if they are to be saved." Even before 1880, the mission invested a substantial portion of its limited time and resources to the end that they would understand, and by that year, it had embarked on a formal educational enterprise that would make it the leader in modern education in northern Siam for decades to come. Aside from the girls' school, the pioneer members of the mission invested themselves in literacy education, theological education, and several unsuccessful attempts to introduce printing technologies into Chiang Mai. The Laos Mission, that is, made a concerted effort to communicate Western learning, including its system of doctrines and meanings, to the people of Chiang Mai.

In the early 1880s, as we saw, however, Edna Cole fretted over the inability of the converts to grasp the heart of the mission's religious message to the satisfaction of the missionaries. Some thirty-five years later, in 1915, several members of the mission continued to complain that the northern Thai lacked intellectual skills, administrative ability, and ambition.

They painted an especially dismal picture of the administrative and cognitive ability of northern Thai church leadership and argued that the missionaries would have to remain in charge of the northern Thai church for years to come. Leaders and local church members had only a limited understanding of the Christian faith.[64] McGilvary himself, in later years, regretted the fact that the vast majority of Buddhist monks refused to engage him in theological discussion and debate, thus preventing him from finding openings to convince them of the truth of the Christian religion.[65] Which is to say, the Laos Mission's emphasis on educational activities and a cognitive approach to religious life seemed, as far as the missionaries themselves could tell, to have achieved few results. Northern Thai church members still struck them as being ignorant of the Christian faith. Northern Thai Buddhists, furthermore, showed little inclination to enter into intellectual debate on religious subjects with the missionaries. The Laos Mission, however, continued to pursue the course charted for it by McGilvary and his colleagues in the 1860s and 1870s, one that sought to transfer saving information through Western forms and thought ways.

The Laos Mission's sense of educational failure brings us full circle to the mission's Old School Presbyterian and American evangelical system of doctrines and meanings and the role of the Princeton Theology in clarifying that system. By 1883, as we noted above, Cole felt that the converts were not receiving the religious message the mission was sending them, at least not fully. Even earlier, Cheek alerted the Board to the massive obstacles the Laos Mission faced in setting up a press; he warned that the cost of such a press would far outweigh its benefits, even if they succeeded. Why, in the face of many discouraging circumstances did the mission initiate these activities and why, in the face of apparent programmatic failures, did it persist in pursuing them long after 1880? This is precisely the question we started with at the beginning of this study. The answer, however, is clearer than before. The Laos Mission depended upon a system of doctrines and meanings that influenced every significant facet of its work up to and well beyond 1880. Where a hardheaded realist, such as Cheek, thought McGilvary and Wilson's vision for a Chiang Mai press an expensive, impractical dream, the two senior missionaries never once wavered in their determination to see the Bible translated, printed, and accompanied by a substantial pious and printed literature. They were as hardheaded and realistic as Cheek. They simply looked at reality in a different manner.

Notes

Abbreviations:

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AP	<i>American Presbyterians</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
BRPR	<i>Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
JAH	<i>Journal of American History</i>
JER	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of Presbyterian History</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Social History</i>
NCP	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian</i>
NCP NS	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian New Series</i>
LN	<i>Laos News</i>
PQPR	<i>Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review</i>
SCJ	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>
WJT	<i>Westminster Journal of Theology</i>
WWW	<i>Women's Work for Women</i>

- [1] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, 185-86.
- [2] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 228.
- [3] Green, "Modern Philology," 639.
- [4] Green, "Modern Philology," 640.
- [5] Wilson to Brethren, [Annual Report], 30 September 1880, v. 4, BFM.
- [6] See Swanson, *Khrischak Muang Nua*, 80-4.
- [7] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 3, 107 (19 January 1870): 4.
- [8] McGilvary to Irving, 1 November 1875, v. 3, BFM.
- [9] McGilvary, Rahang Substation Report, 1 October 1880, v. 4, BFM; and McGilvary to Lowrie, 12 October 1880, v. 4, BFM. See also Sessional Records, 103.
- [10] McGilvary, "Letter from Siam," *NCP New Series* 13, 665 (6 October 1880): 1.
- [11] McGilvary to Cornelia, 23 April 1883, McGilvary Papers; and McGilvary to Irving, 26 April 1883, v. 4, BFM.
- [12] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 416.
- [13] See, Calhoun, *Princeton Seminary*, 27ff; and Noll, "Founding of Princeton Seminary."
- [14] Noll, "Founding of Princeton Seminary," 109.
- [15] Swanson, "This Heathen People," 138ff.
- [16] McGilvary, *Half Century*, 98.
- [17] McGilvary to Irving, 11 March 1877, v. 4, BFM.
- [18] McGilvary to Irving, 10 August 1877, v. 4, BFM; and McGilvary to Irving, 1 October 1877, v. 4, BFM.
- [19] Wilson, "Annual Report of North Laos Mission for the year ending Sept. 30th 1879," 30 September 1879, v. 4, BFM; and McGilvary to Lowrie, 12 October 1880, v. 4, BFM.
- [20] Quoted in Arthur J. Brown, "Appreciation," in McGilvary, *Half Century*, 3-4.
- [21] McGilvary to Irving, 4 December 1876, v. 3, BFM.
- [22] Wilson to Irving, 12 February 1880, v. 4, BFM; and Wilson to Brethren, 30 September 1880, v. 4.
- [23] Jack L. Seymour, *From Sunday School to Church School: Continuities in Protestant Church Education in the United States, 1860-1929* (Latham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1982), 55.
- [24] Johnson, *Road to Civil War*, 13-4.
- [25] Johnson, *Road to Civil War*, 23-4. See also, Marsden, *Evangelical Mind*, 30.
- [26] McGilvary to Irving, 31 December 1870, v. 3, BFM.

[27] Wilson to Irving, 24 October 1871, v. 3, BFM; McGilvary to Irving, 5 February 1872, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson, undated letter, *FM* 31, 10 (March 1873): 307-08. See also, McGilvary, *Half Century*, 177.

[28] Wilson to Irving, 15 March 1875, v. 3, BFM.

[29] McGilvary to Irving, 4 December 1872, v. 3, BFM.

[30] Wilson to Executive Committee, 30 September 1874, v. 3, BFM.

[31] McGilvary, "For the Family," *NCP New Series* 9, 417 (7 January 1876): 4; McGilvary, Laos Mission Annual Report, 1 October 1875 to 1 October 1876, v. 3, BFM; and McGilvary, *Half Century*, 177.

[32] McGilvary, "For the Little Folks," *NCP New Series* 12, 579 (12 February 1879): 1.

[33] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 16ff; McGilvary, *Half Century*, 221-22; Cole, letter dated 25 January 1872, *WWW* 9, 6 (June 1879): 205-06; and Campbell, letter dated 19 April 1879, *WWW* 9, 11 (November 1879): 389-91.

[34] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 26; and Campbell, undated letter, *WWW* 9, 12 (December 1879): 424-25.

[35] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 28-9.

[36] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 29-32.

[37] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 49.

[38] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 21-2

[39] Cole, letter dated 25 January 1879, *WWW* 9, 6 (June 1879): 205-06.

[40] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 62.

[41] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 108-10, 113.

[42] Hodge, *Way of Life*, 159-60, 167, 228.

[43] McGilvary, "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. I," 1.

[44] Campbell to Irving, 20 October 1879, v. 4, BFM.

[45] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 31-2.

[46] See also, Cole, undated letter, *WWW* 9, 12 (December 1879): 425-26; and Campbell, letter dated 18 December 1879, *WWW* 10, 6 (June 1880): 210-11.

[47] Peabody, *Mary Margaretta Campbell*, 32-3.

[48] Cole, undated letter, *WWW* 12, 12 (December 1882): 411; and Cole, undated letter, *WWW* 13, 3 (March 1883): 83.

[49] See, for example, Cole to Irving, 1 October 1880, v. 4, BFM.

[50] Cole, undated letter, *WWW* 11, 7 (July 1881): 224-26.

- [51] See, Swanson, "Advocate and Partner," 299-301; Vachara, "Modern Education," 125, *passim.*; and Herbert R. Swanson, "A New Generation: Missionary Education and Changes in Women's Roles in Traditional Northern Thai Society," *Sojourn* 3, 2 (August 1988): 187-206.
- [52] McGilvary to Lowrie, 10 May 1864, v. 2, BFM; and McGilvary to Brethren, 5 December 1864, v. 2, BFM.
- [53] McGilvary to Irving, 7 October 1870, v. 3, BFM; McGilvary to Irving, 31 December 1870, v. 3, BFM; McGilvary to Irving, 5 February 1872, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson to Irving, 8 February 1872, v. 3, BFM.
- [54] Wilson to Irving, 28 September 1872, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson, "Annual Report of the North Laos Mission," 30 September 1873, v. 3, BFM.
- [55] McGilvary to Irving, 11 March 1877, v. 4, BFM.
- [56] McGilvary to Irving, 2 May 1875, v. 3, BFM.
- [57] McGilvary to Irving, 2 May 1875, v. 3, BFM; and McGilvary to Irving, 22 February 1876, v. 3, BFM.
- [58] Cheek to Ellinwood, 21 August 1875, v. 3, BFM.
- [59] McGilvary to Irving, 1 November 1875, v. 3, BFM; McGilvary to Irving, 22 February 1876, v. 3, BFM; McGilvary to Irving, 15 April 1876, v. 3, BFM; and Wilson to Irving, 5 October 1880, v. 4, BFM.
- [60] See Herbert R. Swanson, "This Seed: Missionary Printing and Literature as Agents of Change in Northern Siam, 1892-1926," in *Changes in Northern Thailand and the Shan States 1886-1940*, ed. Prakai Nontawasee (Singapore: Southeast Asian Studies Program, 1988), 175-207.
- [61] George M. Marsden, "Every One's Own Interpreter? The Bible, Science, and Authority in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America," in *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*, ed. Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 79-94. See Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 1, 15-6.
- [62] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3, 466-67.
- [63] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. 3, 469-70.
- [64] Speer, *Report of Deputation*, 86-7, 104ff.
- [65] McGilvary, "The Buddha or Christ," *LN* 1, 4 (October 1904): 109.

CONCLUSION

Foreign missionaries invariably stand between two sets of cultures, the ones on the field and the ones at home. The truth of this statement does not "go without saying," however commonplace it may seem, as the very future of a Christian mission depends on how it relates to its host cultures and utilizes its home cultures. A mission's "system of doctrines and meanings" is a cognitive mechanism, with a strong affective substratum, that plays a crucial role in determining the way in which the relationship between field and home cultures plays out. It strongly influences what a missionary notices and fails to notice concerning the host culture and provides an equally crucial interpretive framework for understanding and making judgments about what is noticed. That system also helps to determine how the missionaries feel about what they notice. As the term "system of doctrines and meanings" itself suggests, missionary thought contains both conscious (theological) and semi-conscious or unconscious (ideological) components that, when taken together, comprise an ordered system of cognition. By their very nature, missionary records tend to reveal that system in terms of events, policies, decisions, and attitudes rather than in formal statements of doctrines and principles. The student has to read through the historical record to the system, in and of itself a difficult task unless one has access to formal statements of the missionaries' system of doctrines and meanings from other sources. The Laos Mission and the Princeton Theology provide a fascinating case in point.

On the field, the Laos Mission carried out its mission in the midst of northern Thai culture, while it maintained a vital link with the central Thai state culture and its power center in Bangkok. Commentators have long noted that the mission took an essentially negative attitude towards northern Thai culture, especially towards its religion and its ceremonial practices. It consciously attempted to preserve the Western character of the Christian faith that it preached, and it required that its converts publicly renounce their former religious allegiance and permanently sever relationships and activities based on Buddhism and animism. This stance, as we have seen, exerted an immense influence on the history of the mission between 1867 and 1880. It precipitated major crises in 1869 and 1878. In 1869, the mission defied the Prince of Chiang Mai, Chao Kawilorot, by instructing its converts to refuse to work on Sundays. In 1878, it disputed the manner in which northern Thai society legalized marriages through the payment of a "spirit fee." The mission called on its system of doctrines and meanings in both instances to determine crucial matters of policy. It also usually spurned the advice of its own converts on how best to proceed with the evangelization of the region, advice that reflected an indigenous perspective and that, if taken, might have reduced tensions between the mission and northern Thai society. The missionaries, again, drew on their system of meanings and doctrines to dismiss the convert's "local wisdom," because that wisdom seemingly violated what the missionaries took to be the fundamental tenets of the Christian faith. More largely, the Laos Mission's system of doctrines and meanings virtually programmed a "scholastic approach" that characterized its evangelistic, medical, and educational activities throughout the mission's pioneer era.

Scholars have argued, in light of the Laos Mission's denial of northern Thai culture and religion, that the Laos Mission misunderstood Buddhism and improperly communicated the Christian message. In one sense, these arguments point to the important insight that the mission viewed Buddhism and communicated with the people of northern Siam from within a closed system of doctrines and meanings that disparaged the self-understanding of northern Thai Buddhists themselves. For those who do not share in a narrowly constructed, Old School Presbyterian system of doctrines and meanings, the Laos Mission certainly appears to have misunderstood the religion of northern Siam and improperly communicated the Christian

message to the northern Thai people. From within the mission's own doctrinal and ideological system of thought, however, it did not misunderstand Buddhism. It delivered its message to the people in an appropriate manner. It is at this point that the Princeton Theology sheds important light on our understanding of missionary behavior in northern Siam up to 1880. It brings us face to face with the Old School Presbyterian missionaries' own cultural and religious experience, an experience that wove the strands of Reformed confessionalism, Common Sense Realism, evangelical piety, and a touch of romanticism into a single, if complex, system of thought. The historical record does not reveal precisely and clearly the degree to which the Princeton Theology directly influenced the thinking and work of the Laos Mission. The biographical data presented in [Chapter Two](#), however, makes it likely that Princeton did exercise at least some influence on Daniel McGilvary and Jonathan Wilson, the two key leaders of the mission before 1880. That record also indicates that the theological stance of other pioneer members on the mission, as far as we can reconstruct it, did not differ markedly from Princeton. It was like Princeton, if not Princetonian. Dr. Charles Vrooman was the exception that proves the rule.

From a nineteenth-century, orthodox American evangelical perspective, the pioneer members of the Laos Mission conducted themselves in an exemplary manner—from, it must be repeated, that perspective. It was the perspective articulated by the Old School Presbyterian theologians at Princeton Seminary. The Princetonian circle comprised a group of highly educated thinkers, men well versed in the history of Western thought and widely respected for their intellectual skills and breadth of learning. By the standards of their day and nation, they were also moderates who had a profound respect for scientific thought and resisted the supposed excesses of popular American religious enthusiasm just as much as they dismissed the supposed excesses of German philosophical skepticism. The Presbyterian practice of missions in northern Siam and missionary theological expression conformed closely to the doctrines of these moderate, articulate, and influential theologians. If we could step back in time and if we accepted as our own a theological system similar to Princeton's, we would surely feel that McGilvary and his colleagues were doing as well as could be expected under unusually trying circumstances. Arthur J. Brown, one of the most highly respected figures in the history of American Presbyterian missions, considered McGilvary to be "one of the great missionaries of the Church Universal." After summarizing McGilvary's leading role in the formation and conduct of the Laos Mission, Brown writes, "He was a Christian gentleman of the highest type, a man of cultivation and refinement, of ability and scholarship, of broad vision and constructive leadership."[\[1\]](#) This is the praise of a skilled mission administrator for one of his most skillful colleagues working out in the field. One might take the early members of the Laos Mission to task for particular failures, but in terms of their own system of meanings and doctrines, it is hard to find fault with the general direction and policies of the mission in its pioneer era.

If, however, we step beyond the carefully circumscribed confines of the mission's Princeton-like system of doctrines and meanings a different picture quickly manifests itself. The critics described in the [Introduction](#) have a strong case, one rooted in the fact that down to this day northern Thai Protestants remain religious strangers in their own villages and even extended families.[\[2\]](#) Protestant churches offer a message that only a tiny proportion of northern Thais find interesting, let alone meaningful. Given the manner by which the Laos Mission founded the northern Thai church, one finds it hardly surprising that northern Thai Protestantism has made only very modest headway since 1867, making its greatest impact in terms of modernization rather than evangelization.

The problem does not seem to have been with the Christian message as such. For whatever reasons, the message concerning Jesus Christ struck a responsive cord in many northern Thais—or so, as we have seen, Daniel McGilvary firmly believed. The facts that the Laos Mission gained its first converts fairly quickly, that in 1869 it was preparing for a people's movement, and that

Chao Kawilorot felt constrained to use violence to snuff out the new religion all support the impression that the people of Chiang Mai did show a serious interest in Christianity. Under other circumstances, many of them *might* (there is no way of knowing with certainty, of course) have converted to the new religion. The problem potential converts faced was that as things stood they had to refuse much more of traditional northern Thai religious and cultural life than the great, great majority of them were willing to reject in order to convert. If they wanted to become Christians, that is, they had to cross a sharply delineated Western-style boundary, sometimes at no little personal risk. Princeton and the Laos Mission both demanded such a conversion, as we saw in [Chapter Five](#). Several early converts and potential converts, as we also saw, desired a more Southeast Asian conception of religious boundaries, by which conversion might be seen-in a less confrontational way-as a journey across loosely drawn spheres of power and influence.

Presbyterian missionary Christianity in northern Siam built itself, we can only conclude, on rejection as much as it did on affirmation. In a paper he sent to Davidson College, North Carolina, McGilvary explained that those who were discouraged by the small statistical results in new missions forgot that,

There is a double process to be carried on, a double work to be accomplished-just as if we were to be required to rear an edifice on the grounds occupied by some ancient stronghold, some fortress or palace, which must be rased to the very foundations before the new superstructure can be reared. 'Hath a nation changed its gods?' Yet, difficult as this is, it is the first thing to be done; it is what we demand of the heathen as an indispensable prerequisite towards embracing the gospel. Many of them would love to combine the two-to lift up the hand and offer a flower to the name of Jesus and Buddha-as many in Christian lands would combine the service of God and mammon.[\[3\]](#)

With these words, McGilvary explicitly rebuffed a Southeast Asian understanding of conversion. Converts had to change their gods, which in the northern Thai context meant discarding vast chunks of family, social, and cultural life. Chao Kawilorot took the missionary understanding of conversion to mean nothing less than rebellion against the authority of the state, which authority rested in him personally. The Laos Mission never ceased to expect its converts to divorce themselves from much of their cultural and social heritage. Writing at the turn of the century, Lillian Curtis, formerly of the Lampang Station, unfavorably compared Buddhism's conquest of northern Siam many centuries earlier with the arrival of Protestant missions on the scene in the 1860s. She acknowledged Buddhism's success. It came, however, at too high a price, because Buddhism had so adapted itself to northern Thai "superstitions" that it had lost its power to transform the people.[\[4\]](#)

What captures one's attention in the records of the Laos Mission, however, is not the bare fact that it demanded that converts make a complete break with northern Thai Buddhism and animism plus a partial break with northern Thai culture. What stands out in those records is the fact that the pioneer members of the mission never doubted the necessity of making that break. They consistently rejected the possibility of compromise in matters of religious faith. They failed to listen to the views of the converts about the way one should convert in Chiang Mai-or how one might adapt traditional medical rites to Christian medical needs. Their self-assurance in these matters is striking. There is not the slightest trace of a doubt in their writings that they should demand an absolute, abrupt conversion. They never questioned the appropriateness of using Presbyterian ecclesiastical structures and forms in the northern Thai context.

Apart from the Princeton Theology, we might simply brand the missionaries as "stubborn" or consider them to have been incredibly "ignorant." In light of Princeton and in all fairness,

they were neither stubborn nor ignorant. Their approach and attitudes were based on an Enlightenment epistemology integrated with Reformed confessionality. That epistemology affirmed the essential unity of all of humanity. It gave the missionaries a sense of assurance that they could know reality, divine as well as natural, as it is. They could know God and God's will for them. Enlightenment epistemology also assured them that the great majority of humanity, on one level, and the vast majority of orthodox Christians, on another level, agreed with their views concerning God and the world. Presbyterian Princeton shared all of this with the Presbyterian Laos Mission, and it is through the lens of the Princeton Theology that we come to appreciate how fully the missionaries accepted a commonsensical and confessional epistemology. They took their own personal beliefs and views to be nothing more or less than a matter of faith in God and good common sense.

We must emphasize repeatedly that the Laos Mission's Enlightenment and Reformed epistemology assured its pioneer members that the northern Thai were essentially like Americans, having the same religious needs and the same fundamental consciousness. It was neither arrogant nor a mark of ignorance to use American methods and apply Old School Presbyterian attitudes in Chiang Mai. It was wise-and necessary. It was not, then, merely that the missionaries did not listen to the views of their converts or that they failed to adapt their message to the northern Thai context. Within the constraints of their system of doctrines and meanings and their Reformed-Common Sense epistemology, they could not listen. They could not contextualize. Equally important, they were entirely confident that they should not attempt to adapt the Christian faith to a heathen context. The result could only be, for them, the "heathenization" of the Christian faith, a tragedy to be avoided at any cost.

Standing outside of the Laos Mission's inherited system of doctrines and meanings, we cannot help but sense the ideological and consequent behavioral constraints that system placed on the early members of the mission. It provided them, as we saw in [Chapter Three](#), with sets of absolute principles, again supposedly grounded both in "the truth" of Christian doctrine, the Bible, and human consciousness. It then assured them that they alone knew the true truth and had true knowledge of God. They also believed that the Holy Spirit confirmed the truth of the mission's system of doctrines, as did the common beliefs and consciousness of common people throughout history and across the boundaries of cultures and nations. Most importantly, the Laos Mission's system of doctrines and meanings assured its members that they could truly know God's will for them and, consequently, the proper way to carry out the evangelization of northern Siam. *This* is the point at which their theological beliefs became an ideology. The assumption that they could unerringly know how to conduct themselves lay quietly embedded in their whole system of thinking, always assuring them of the ultimate correctness of their views and actions. It lay beyond the possibility of critical analysis. Given their dualistic views of heathenism and their confidence in the truth of their own beliefs, it was simply impossible that the pioneer members of the Laos Mission would consider adapting the Christian faith to the northern Thai context. They could not contextualize. As far as they could see, the Christian message represented timeless truth that stood beyond culture and context.

To make the flat, unadorned assertion that the pioneer members of the Laos Mission "could not contextualize," would appear to be an overstatement of the case since we cannot know that events might not have taken a different course than they did. Still, the experience of another ideological movement in Thailand, the Communist insurgency of the 1960s and 1970s, lends some credence to that bold, bald assertion. Tom Marks' *Making Revolution* seeks to understand, among other things, why the Thai government in the 1960s and 1970s was able to "beat the Communists," a feat not everyone at the time thought was possible. The reason for the failure of the Communist revolution in Thailand, according to Marks, is clear. Thai Communism wedded its revolutionary aspirations to what he describes as a rigid, ideologically driven form of

Maoism, which the insurgents failed to adapt to changing circumstances in Thailand. The Thai government, although subject to its own internal dissensions, sufficiently adjusted itself to the conditions it faced to defeat the insurgents.[5] The government took, that is, a pragmatic, contextual rather than an ideological, anti-contextual approach to its conflict with Communism and succeeded, while the insurgents acted ideologically, rather than pragmatically, and failed.

The situations facing the Laos Mission in the nineteenth century and that facing Thai Communism in the twentieth were, obviously, quite different. The two revolutionary movements were themselves also quite different, the one comprising radical leftists dedicated to the violent overthrow of the existing system and the other moderately conservative pacifists who desired the overthrow of only parts of the existing system. Still, they shared a dependence on ideology that constrained them both tactically and strategically to the ultimate frustration of their central goals. Given the anti-contextual approach of each, their failures do seem inevitable-on hindsight.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* adds further texture to the perception that the ideological nature of the Laos Mission's system of doctrines and meanings ultimately frustrated its drive to Christianize northern Siam. Smith claims that, historically, much of Western knowledge about non-Western peoples has amounted to "imperial knowledge," which is self-serving, self-involved, and takes European realities as the bench marks for defining the non-European world. Imperial knowledge, furthermore, circumscribes indigenous peoples and their life ways with a set of pre-fabricated categories that provides the knower with an unwarranted confidence in what she or he "knows" about those peoples.[6] Smith's concept of "imperial knowledge" may be commonplace in the sense that most people most of the time tend to fit their knowledge of others into a preconceived framework, but it still reminds us that on the mission field the Laos Mission's nineteenth-century system of meanings and doctrines functioned as imperial knowledge. That system placed the northern Thai into a pre-assembled framework of categories summarized by the concept of "heathenism". Its Enlightenment epistemology, in combination with its Reformed theology, then guaranteed the missionaries that their understanding of the heathen was valid, universal, and timeless truth.

In the northern Thai context, then, the Laos Mission's system of doctrines and meanings amounted to an alien ideology grounded in an imperial, self-fulfilling epistemology. Reinhold Niebuhr's, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, summarizes the consequences of this imperial ideology with a stark clarity. In the course of his arguments, Niebuhr devotes considerable attention to intellectual pride, writing, "All human knowledge is tainted with an 'ideological' taint. It pretends to be truer than it is. It is finite knowledge, gained from a particular perspective; but it pretends to be final and ultimate knowledge." He continues, "Intellectual pride is thus the pride of reason which forgets that it is involved in a temporal process and imagines itself in complete transcendence over history." [7] He claims that intellectual pride manifests itself as a desire to dominate others, a will to power that reflects a sense of fear or insecurity in the face of humanity's limited, conditioned situation.[8]

The system of meanings and doctrines that the Laos Mission shared with Princeton Seminary betrays all of the epistemological marks of Niebuhr's description of the sin of intellectual pride. It was, to state the matter once more, a closed system hugely confident in its ability to know reality, know the truth, and know God. It led the missionaries to behave towards the people, religion, and culture of northern Siam in a manner that can only be termed arrogant, when viewed from outside of that system itself. They generally shut their ears to any voice that did not speak with the peculiar accents of Old School Presbyterianism, a Scottish-Genevan dialect set to a New Jersey brogue. McGilvary praised Nan Inta when he sounded like a Baconian (regarding the eclipse of 1869) and ignored his advice and wishes when he sounded like a northern Thai (concerning his desire to be an "unofficial" convert). Niebuhr's analysis points to

the conclusion that the Laos Mission fell victim to its own system of meanings and doctrines, placing in that system more trust than was warranted and allowing it more authority than was wise. The pioneer members of the Laos Mission, if Niebuhr is correct, fell victim to the reified meanings of the terms they applied to the northern Thai such as "heathen," "benighted," "godless," "devil worshippers," and "superstitious". They fully believed, without question, that God concurred in those judgments, a belief that froze their Reformed-Enlightened-Evangelical and thoroughly American Good News into forms and contents that were not Good News to the vast majority of northern Thais.

We conclude, then, that, first, the pioneer members of the Laos Mission conducted themselves in light of a system of doctrines and meanings that they brought with them from the United States. Second, that system combined the marks of an overt, self-conscious theology and a covert, semi-conscious ideology and demonstrates strong affinities with the Princeton Theology. Third and finally, the affinities and parallels between Chiang Mai and Princeton provide us with a valuable tool for understanding why the first generation of Presbyterian missionaries to northern Siam thought and behaved as they did.

It is one of those ironic twists of history that the very theological and epistemological traits that so aptly fitted the Princeton combination of Reformed theological exclusivism and Enlightenment epistemological self-assurance to the nineteenth-century American context prevented the Laos Mission from similarly fitting its message and means to the northern Thai context. The Laos Mission's Princeton-like system of doctrines and meanings introduced a central tension into the life of the northern Thai church, a tension between its Christian identity and its northern Thai cultural heritage. Where the mission's system of religious doctrines and cultural meanings complimented each other, it is almost as if the northern Thai church's religious meanings are at war with its cultural meanings. Like water and oil, they seem unable to form a single solution. The northern Thai church, subsequently, has found it incredibly difficult to resolve the tension between loving God, who commands exclusive allegiance, and loving its neighbors, who demand a communal loyalty that seems to violate that allegiance. That, however, is another story, the one that comes after 1880. This study is about what came before the irony and led to it-what one might call the "prelude to irony."

Notes

Abbreviations:

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AP	<i>American Presbyterians</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
BRPR	<i>Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
JAH	<i>Journal of American History</i>
JER	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of Presbyterian History</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Social History</i>
NCP	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian</i>
NCP NS	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian New Series</i>
LN	<i>Laos News</i>
PQPR	<i>Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review</i>
SCJ	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>

- [1] Arthur J. Brown, "An Appreciation," in McGilvary, *Half Century*, 1, 3.
- [2] See Kummool and Swanson, "Religion and the Formation of Community in Northern Thailand."
- [3] McGilvary, Extracts from a paper sent to the Society of Inquiry, Davidson College, *FM* 28, 2 (July 1869): 31.
- [4] Curtis, *Laos of North Siam*, 224.
- [5] Tom Marks, *Making Revolution: The Insurgency of the Communist Party of Thailand in Structural Perspective* (Bangkok: White Lotus, 1994), 211ff.
- [6] Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Books, 1999). 80ff.
- [7] Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. 1, *Human Nature* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941), 194, 195.
- [8] Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. 1, 197-98.

Appendix I

Text of the Edict of Religious Toleration

"PROCLAMATION OF RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE FOR THE LAOS"

"I, Phyo Tape Phrai Chune, the royal representative of His Majesty, the supreme King of Siam, at Chiangmai, and also for the Laos States and cities of Lakawn and Lampang, do hereby make a proclamation to the princes and rulers and officers of various grades, and the common people, in the States and cities named, that His Majesty, the King of Siam was graciously pleased to send a royal letter, with the royal seal, to the effect that D. E. Sickles, Esq., the United States Consul, has communicated to His Excellence, the Foreign Minister of Siam, a complaint signed by Rev. D. McGilvary and Dr. M. A. Cheek, against certain parties for molesting the Christians and compelling them to observe their old religious customs. The Foreign Minister has laid the subject before His Majesty, who had most graciously listened to the said complaint, and had given the following royal command in reference to the same:

"That as religious and civil duties do not conflict, any religion that is seen to be true may be embraced by any person without constraint; that the responsibility of a correct or a wrong decision rests with the individuals making it; that there is nothing in the foreign treaty, nor in the laws and customs of Siam to throw any restriction on the religious worship of any. To be more specific; if any person or persons wish to embrace the *Christian* religion they are freely allowed to follow their own choice, and this proclamation is designed from this time forth to remove any fear that may have existed to the contrary. It is, moreover, strictly enjoined on the princes and rulers, and the relatives and friends of those who may wish to embrace the Christian religion, that they throw no obstacles in the way, and that no creed be enforced on the Christians, nor work demanded of them which their religion forbids them to hold or to do, such as the worship and feasting of demons or departed spirits, and working on the Sabbath day. Except in cases of war and other unavoidable or necessary work, and not *feigned* as such, they are to have the free observance of the Sabbath. No obstacle is to be thrown in the way of American citizens employing any persons needed for their service. The treaty in this respect must be observed. Whenever this *proclamation* is known by the princes and rulers, and officers and people, they are to beware that they violate no precept contained therein.

"Proclamation made on the 11th of the 12th waxing moon, year of the tiger, and 11th year of His Majesty's reign."

Source: "Proclamation of Religious Tolerance for the Laos," *North Carolina Presbyterian* New Series 12, 579 (12 February 1879): 1. For a later translation, see, McGilvary, *Half Century*, 216-17.

Appendix II

Map and General Tables

Figure 1
Map of Modern Day Thailand and Its Northern Region



Table A.1
Stations of the Laos Mission

Station	Year Founded		Station	Year Founded
Chiang Mai	1867		Phrae	1893
Lampang	1885		Nan	1895
Lamphun	1891		Chiang Rai	1896

Note: Lamphun Station became a sub-station of Chiang Mai Station in 1897.

Table A.2
Membership Statistics the Laos Mission's Churches 1869-1880

Year	Members		Year	Members		Year	Members
1869	5		1873	4		1877	21
1870	5		1874	4		1878	31
1871	5		1875	4		1879	49
1872	6		1876	9		1880	83

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Outline of the Bibliography

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [The Laos Mission, Northern Siam, and Siam](#)
 - 2.1. [Primary Resources](#)
 - 2.2. [Secondary Resources](#)
3. [Presbyterian History and Thought](#)
 - 3.1. [Primary Sources](#)
 - 3.2. [Secondary Sources](#)
4. [Background and General](#)
 - 4.1. [General](#)
 - 4.2. [Enlightenment, Scottish Philosophy, and Baconianism](#)
 - 4.3. [Evangelicalism and Romanticism](#)
 - 4.4. [Reformed History and Thought](#)

Introduction

This bibliography includes all of the sources cited in the dissertation, excepting only dictionary and encyclopedia entries and sources. Thai names are alphabetized by first name. The number in brackets [] following each entry indicates the chapter in which the entry is first cited. [I] stands for the Introduction and [C] for the Conclusion.

Abbreviations:

AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
AP	<i>American Presbyterians</i>
AQ	<i>American Quarterly</i>
BRPR	<i>Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review</i>
CH	<i>Church History</i>
JAH	<i>Journal of American History</i>
JER	<i>Journal of the Early Republic</i>
JPH	<i>Journal of Presbyterian History</i>
JSH	<i>Journal of Social History</i>
NCP	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian</i>
NCP NS	<i>North Carolina Presbyterian New Series</i>
LN	<i>Laos News</i>
PQPR	<i>Presbyterian Quarterly and Princeton Review</i>
SCJ	<i>Sixteenth Century Journal</i>
WJT	<i>Westminster Journal of Theology</i>
WWW	<i>Women's Work for Women</i>

The Laos Mission, Northern Siam, and Siam

Primary Sources

- "Annual Report of the Principal of the Western Female Seminary." 1871. Oxford, Ohio: W.A. Powell, 1871. [2]
- Backus, Mary, ed. *Siam and Laos as Seen by Our American Missionaries*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1884. [2]
- Briggs, W. A. "'Father Wilson.'" *LN* 8, 3 (July 1911): 83-4. [2]
- Campbell, Mary M. Letter dated 18 December 1879, *WWW* 10, 6 (June 1880): 210-11. [6]
- _____. Undated letter. *WWW* 9, 4 (April 1879): 336-37. [2]
- Cole, Edna. Undated letter. *WWW* 9, 12 (December 1879): 425-26. [6]
- _____. Undated letter. *WWW* 10, 11 (November 1880): 389-90. [3]
- _____. Undated letter. *WWW* 11, 7 (July 1881): 224-26. [6]
- _____. Undated letter. *WWW* 12, 11 (November 1882): 366-68. [2]
- _____. Undated letter. *WWW* 12, 12 (December 1882): 410-11. [2]
- _____. Undated letter. *WWW* 13, 3 (March 1883): 82-4. [2]
- Crooks, Charles H. "Chas. T. Van Santwoord Hospital. Lakawn Dispensary." *LN* 9, 4 (October 1912): 140-43. [4]
- Curtis, Lillian Johnson. *The Laos of North Siam*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1903. [2]
- House, Samuel R. "Sad and Unexpected News from Chieng-Mai." *FM* 28, 9 (February 1870): 202-04. [5]
- Journal of Dan Beach Bradley. At the Oberlin College Archives. Microfilm copy at the Payap University Archives, Chiang Mai. [1]
- McGilvary Family Papers. At the Payap University Archives, Chiang Mai. [5]
- McGilvary, Daniel. "Blessed Are Ye that Sow Beside All Waters." *NCP* 2, 19 (May 1859): 1. [2]
- _____. "The Blind Ngiew or Northern Shan." *NCP* NS 3, 110 (9 February 1870): 4. [5]
- _____. "'Chieng Mai Trip.'" *NCP* 9 (24 October 1866): 1. [1]

- _____. "Chieng Mai Trip." *NCP* 9 (31 October 1866): 1. [1]
- _____. "The Claims of the Laos upon our Church." *FM* 25, 3 (August 1866): 93. [2]
- _____. "The Consciousness of Divine Vocation." In *Counsel to New Missionaries: From Older Missionaries of the Presbyterian Church*, 7-16. New York: Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., 1905. [2]
- _____. "Extracts from a paper sent to the Society of Inquiry, Davidson College." *FM* 28, 2 (July 1869): 29-32. [C]
- _____. "For the Family." *NCP* NS 9, 417 (7 January 1876): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Family." *NCP* NS9, 427 (17 March 1876): 4. [2]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 1, 26 (2 July 1868): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 2, 106 (12 January 1870): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 3, 107 (19 January 1870): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 3, 108 (26 January 1870): 4. [5]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 3, 109 (2 February 1870): 4. [5]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." dated 1 September 1869, *NCP* NS 3, 110 (9 February 1870): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 3, 111 (15 February 1870): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 3, 120 (20 April 1870): 4. [5]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 3, 121 (27 April 1870): 4. [5]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 5, 266 (5 February 1873): 4. [5]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 5, 280 (14 May 1873): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 5, 282 (28 May 1873): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 7, 356 (4 November 1874): 4. [4]
- _____. "For the Little Folks." *NCP* NS 12, 579 (12 February 1879): 1. [5]
- _____. *A Half Century Among the Siamese and the Lao*. New York: Revell, 1912. [1]
- _____. "Laos Mission." *FM* 26, 10 (March 1868): 234-36. [5]

- _____. "The Laos Mission." *NCP* NS 10, 485 (25 April 1877): 1. [4]
- _____. "Latest News From Chieng-Mai." *FM* 28, 10 (March 1870): 227-29. [5]
- _____. Letter dated 19 March 1858. *NCP* 1, 34 (21 August 1858): 1. [2]
- _____. Letter dated 31 May 1858. *NCP* 1, 35 (28 August 1858): 1. [2]
- _____. Letter dated 21 June 1858. *NCP* 1, 47 (20 November 1858): 1. [2]
- _____. Letter dated 7 September 1858. *NCP* 2, 20 (14 May 1859): 1. [2]
- _____. Letter dated 20 May 1863, entitled "Light Strokes and great Mercies at Petchaburi." *FM* 22, 6 (November 1863): 151-53. [2]
- _____. Letter dated 10 April 1872. *FM* 31, 5 (October 1872): 150-51. [4]
- _____. Letter dated 13 July 1874. *NCP* NS 7, 344 (12 August 1874): 2. [2]
- _____. Letter dated 21 February 1876. *NCP* NS 9, 440 (14 June 1876): 4. [4]
- _____. Letter dated 10 October 1876. *FM* 35, 9 (February 1877): 281-84. [2]
- _____. Letter dated 10 August 1877. *NCP* NS 10, 521 (2 January 1878): 4. [5]
- _____. "Letter from Siam." *NCP* NS 12, 617 (5 November 1879): 1. [5]
- _____. "Letter from Siam." *NCP* NS 13, 665 (6 October 1879): 1. [6]
- _____. Letter to the Church & Congregation of Carthage & Union, 1 September 1859. *NCP* 2, 51 (17 December 1859): 1. [4]
- _____. Letter to Brother Sherwood, 31 December 1868. *NCP* NS 2, 77 (23 June 1869): 2. . [4]
- _____. Letter to Orange Presbytery, 5 March 1859. *NCP* 2, 29 (16 July 1859): 1. [2]
- _____. "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. I." *NCP* NS 2, 77 (23 June 1869): 1. [2]
- _____. "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. II." *NCP* NS 2, 78 (30 June 1869): 1. [4]
- _____. "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. III." *NCP* NS 2, 79 (7 July 1869): 1. [4]
- _____. "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. IV." *NCP* NS 2, 80 (14 July 1869): 1. [2]

- _____. "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. V." *NCP* NS 2, 81 (21 July 1869): 1. [2]
- _____. "Medical Missions and Missionary Physicians - No. VIII." *NCP* NS 2, 84 (11 August 1869): 1. [4]
- _____. "Our First Convert." *NCP* NS 2, 85 (18 August 1869): 4. . [4]
- _____. "Rev. Jonathan Wilson, D.D., An Appreciation." *LN* 8 (July 1911): 78-81. [2]
- _____. "Revival in Moore County." *NCP* 1, 2 (8 January 1858): 1. [2]
- _____. "Shall Chieng-Mai be Given Up?" *FM* 28, 12 (May 1870): 274. [5]
- _____. Undated letter. *FM* 27, 10 (March 1869): 242. [2]
- _____. Undated letter. *FM* 28, 3 (August 1869): 58-63. [2]
- _____. Undated letter. *FM* 28, 4 (September 1869): 80-84. [2]
- _____. Undated letter. *FM* 28, 9 (February 1870): 212-17. [4]
- _____. "Warming of Buddh." *FM* 35, 4 (September 1876): 121-23. [4]
- McGilvary, Sophia. Undated letter. *WWW* 8, 11 (November 1878): 309-310. [2]
- James W. McKean, "Dr. Wilson's Laos Hymnal and its Value to the Laos Church." *LN* 8, 3 (July 1911): 82-3. [2]
- Papers of Dan Beach Bradley. At the Oberlin College Archives. Microfilm copy at the Payap University Archives, Chiang Mai. [1]
- Peabody, Helen. *Mary Margaretta Campbell: A Brief Record of a Youthful Life*. Cincinnati: Silvius and Smith, 1881. [2]
- Peoples, S. C. "Rev. Daniel McGilvary, D.D. An Appreciation." *LN* 8, 4 (October 1911): 116-20. [2]
- Records of the American Missionary Association. At the Amistad Research Center, Dillard University, New Orleans, USA. Microfilm copy at the Payap University Archives, Chiang Mai. [1]
- Records of the Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church U. S. A. At the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, USA. Microfilm copy at the Payap University Archives, Chiang Mai. [1]
- Research Papers of Maen Pongudom. Originals at the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, USA. Photocopies at the Payap University Archives, Chiang Mai. [I]

"Sessional Records. The First Presbyterian Church of Chiangmai." In the Records of the American Presbyterian Mission. At the Payap University Archives, Chiang Mai. [4]

Vrooman, C. W. Letter dated, 6 February 1872, FM 31, 2 (July 1872): 51-2. [2]

Wilson, Jonathan. Letter dated 7 February 1861, entitled "Tokens of Encouragement' in Siam." FM 20, 2 (July 1861): 43-44. [2]

_____. Letter dated 7 July 1869. *FM* 28, 10 (March 1870): 232-33. [4]

_____. Letter dated 3 January 1870. *FM* 28, 12 (May 1870): 281-83. [5]

_____. Letter dated 28 July 1870. *FM*, 29, 7 (December 1870). [2]

_____. Letter dated 30 April 1872. *FM* 31, 5 (October 1872): 151-53 [5]

_____. Letter dated 5 June 1874. *FM* 33, 7 (December 1874): 214-18. [5]

_____. Undated letter. *FM* 27, 10 (March 1869): 240-42. [2]

_____. Undated letter. *FM* 31, 10 (March 1873): 307-08. [4]

Wilson, Kate. Undated letter. *WWW* 7, 7 (September 1877): 243. [5]

_____. "Shadows in Laos." *WWW* 14, 5 (May 1884): 149-50. [2]

Secondary Sources

Bowring, John . *The Kingdom and People of Siam*. 1857. Reprint. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1977. [1]

Brailey, Nigel J. "The Origins of the Siamese Forward Movement in Western Laos, 1850-92." Ph.D. diss., University of London, 1968. [1]

Breazeale, Kennon. "English Missionaries Among the Thai." In *Anuson Walter Vella*. Edited by Ronald D. Renard, 208-28. Honolulu: University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1986. [1]

Bristowe, W. S. *Louis and the King of Siam*. London: Chaoot & Windus, 1976. [2]

Davis, Richard. *Muang Metaphysics: A Study of Northern Thai Myth and Ritual*. Bangkok: Pandora, 1984. [5]

Hudson, Cornelia Kneedler. [Life of Daniel McGilvary]. Undated photocopy. [2]

Hughes, Philip. "The Assimilation of Christianity in the Thai Culture." *Religion* 14 (1984): 313-36. [1]

- _____. "Christianity and Culture: A Case Study in Northern Thailand." Th.D. diss., South East Asia Graduate School of Theology, 1983. [I]
- _____. *Proclamation and Response: A Study of the History of the Christian Faith in Northern Thailand*. Chiang Mai: The Manuscript Division, Payap College, 1982. [I]
- Keyes, Charles F. "Being Protestant Christians in Southeast Asian Worlds." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 27, 2 (September 1996): 280-92. [I]
- _____. "Why the Thai Are Not Christians: Buddhist and Christian Conversion in Thailand." In *Conversion to Christianity: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives on a Great Transformation*, edited by Robert W. Hefner, 259-83. Berkeley: University of California, 1993. [I]
- Koyama, Kosuke. "Aristotelian Pepper and Buddhist Salt." *Practical Anthropology* 14, 3 (May-June 1967): 97-102. [I]
- Kummool Chinawong, and Herbert R. Swanson. "Religion and the Formation of Community in Northern Thailand: The Case of Christianity in Nan Province." Unpublished paper, Fifth International Conference on Thai Studies, London, July 1993. [5]
- Laws of King Mangrai (Mangrayathammasart)*. Edited and translated by Aroonrut Wichienkeo and Gehan Wijeyewardene. Canberra: Australian National University, 1986. [1]
- Lord, Donald. *Mo Bradley and Thailand*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1969. [1]
- Maen Pongudom. "Apologetic and Missionary Proclamation Exemplified by American Presbyterian Missionaries to Thailand (1828-1978), Early Church Apologists: Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and the Venerable Buddhadasa Bhikku, A Thai Buddhist Monk-Apologetic." Ph.D. diss., University of Otago, 1979. [I]
- McFarland, George Bradley, ed. *Historical Sketch of Protestant Missions in Siam 1828-1928*. Bangkok: Bangkok Times Press, 1928. [I]
- Penth, Hans. *khwambenma khonglannathai* [The Lan Na Thai Past]. In *lannathai* [Lan Na Thai]. Edited by Thiu Wichaikhatakh, 1-31. Chiang Mai: Chiang Mai Province, n.d. [1]
- Ratanaphorn Sethakul. "Political, Social, and Economic Changes in the Northern States of Thailand Resulting from the Chiang Mai Treaties of 1874 and 1883." Ph.D. diss., Northern Illinois University, 1989. [1]
- Rujaya Abhakorn. "Changes in the Administrative System of Northern Siam, 1884-1933." In *Changes in Northern Thailand and the Shan States 1886-1940*. Edited by Prakai Nontawasee, 63-108. Singapore: Southeast Asian Studies Program, 1988. [1]
- Sarasawadee Ongsakun. *prawatisat lanna* [Lan Na History]. Chiang Mai: Chiang Mai University, B.E. 2529 [1986]. [1]

- Speer, Robert E., Dwight H. Day, and David Bovaird. *Report of Deputation*. New York: Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., 1916. [I]
- Swanson, Herbert R. "Advocate and Partner: Missionaries and Modernization in Nan Province, Siam, 1895-1934." *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 13, 2 (September 1982): 296-309. [4]
- _____. "A New Generation: Missionary Education and Changes in Women's Roles in Traditional Northern Thai Society." *SOJOURN* 3, 2 (August 1988): 187-206. [6]
- _____. *Khrischak Muang Nua*. Bangkok: Chuan Press, 1984. [I]
- _____. "This Heathen People: The Cognitive Sources of American Missionary Westernizing Activities in Northern Siam, 1867-1889." M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1987. [I]
- _____. "This Seed: Missionary Printing and Literature as Agents of Change in Northern Siam, 1892-1926." In *Changes in Northern Thailand and the Shan States 1886-1940*, edited by Prakai Nontawasee, 175-207. Singapore: Southeast Asian Studies Program, 1988. [6]
- _____. *Towards a Clean Church: A Case Study in 19th Century Thai Church History*. Chiang Mai, Office of History, Church of Christ in Thailand, 1991. [5]
- Tambiah, S. J. *Buddhism and the Spirit Cults in North-east Thailand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1970. [5]
- Tongchai Winichakul. *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-body of a Nation*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books, 1994. [I]
- Vachara Sindhuprama. "Modern Education and Socio-Cultural Change in Northern Thailand." Ph.D. diss., University of Hawaii, 1988. [5]
- Vella, Walter F. *Siam Under Rama III 1824-1851*. Locust Valley, New York: J. J. Augustin, 1957. [5]
- Wells, Kenneth E. *History of Protestant Work in Thailand 1828-1958*. Bangkok: The Church of Christ in Thailand, 1958. [I]
- Wyatt, David K. *Thailand: A Short History*. Bangkok: Thai Watana Panich, 1984. [1]
- Zehner, Edwin. "Church Growth and Culturally Appropriate Leadership: Three Examples From the Thai Church." Unpublished paper, School of World Mission, 1987. [4]

Presbyterian History and Thought

Primary Sources

- Alexander, Archibald. *A Brief Outline of the Evidences of the Christian Religion*. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union, 1829. [3]

_____. *Practical Sermons*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1850. [2]

Alexander, Henry Carrington. "Reason and Redemption." *PQPR* New Series 4, 3 (July 1875): 409-37. [3]

Alexander, J. Addison. "The Gospel History." *BRPR* 20, 4 (October 1848): 593-616. [3]

_____. "The Plan and Purpose of the Patriarchal History." *BRPR* 27, 1 (January 1855): 24-39. [3]

_____. "Primeval Period of Sacred History." *BRPR* 32, 1 (January 1860): 90-100. [3]

_____. "The Relation of the Old to the New Dispensation." *BRPR* 23, 4 (October 1851): 635-49. [3]

_____. "What is Church History?" *BRPR* 19, 1 (January 1847): 91-113. [3] Alexander, James W. *Discourses on Common Topics of Christian Faith and Practice*, 2nd. ed. New York: Scribner, 1858. [1]

Atwater, Lyman. "Calvinism in Doctrine and Life." *PQPR* 4, 1 (January 1875): 73-106. [1]

_____. "Rationalism." *BRPR* 38, 3 (July 1866): 329-61. [2]

Craven, E. R. "The Inductive Sciences of Nature and the Bible." *PQPR* 6, 2 (October 1877): 673-88. [2]

Eckard, John R. "The Logical Relations of Religion and Natural Science." *BRPR* 32, 4 (October 1860): 577-608. [3]

Elliott, Charles. *The Sabbath*. Philadelphia: Board of Publication, 1867. [5]

Green, William Henry. "Christology." *BRPR* 31 3 (July 1859): 438-63. [3]

_____. "Of the Hebrew Prophets." *BRPR* 38, 4 (October 1866): 646-69. [3]

_____. *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895. [3]

_____. "Horne's Introduction to Scriptures." *BRPR* 29, 3 (July 1857): 375-391. [3]

_____. "Inaugural Discourse." In *Discourses at the Inauguration of the Rev. William Henry Green as Professor of Biblical and Oriental Literature in The Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J.*, 39-71. Philadelphia: C. Sherman, Printer, 1851. [1]

_____. "The Matter of Prophecy." *BRPR* 34, 4 (October 1862): 559-78. [2]

_____. "Modern Philology." *BRPR* 36,4 (October 1864): 629-52. [3]

- _____. *The Pentateuch Vindicated from the Aspersions of Bishop Colenso*. New York: John Wiley, 1863. [3]
- Hodge, A. A. *The Confession of Faith*. 1869. Reprint. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1958. [2]
- _____. *Outlines of Theology*. 1879. Reprint. Carlisle, Pennsylvania: Banner of Truth Trust, 1972. [2]
- Hodge, Charles. "Can God be Known?" *BRPR* 36, 1 (January 1864): 122-52. [2]
- _____. "Christianity without Christ." *PQPR* 5, 18 (April 1876): 352-62. [2]
- _____. *Conference Papers*. New York: Scribner's, 1879. [2]
- _____. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Philadelphia: William S. Martien, 1846. [2]
- _____. *Essays and Reviews*. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1857. [2]
- _____. "Question No. 60. How is the Sabbath to be Sanctified?" Bellefonte, Pennsylvania: Bellefonte Press Company, n.d. [3]
- _____. "Nature of Man." *BRPR* 37, 1 (January 1865): 111-35. [3]
- _____. "Notes from Lectures on Didactic Theology (1856-1857)." Taken by Henry A. Harlow. 3 vols. Papers of Charles Hodge. Princeton Theological Seminary Archives, Princeton, New Jersey. [3]
- _____. "Notes on Lectures by Charles Hodge written by C. W. Hodge and Classmate." 2 vols. n.d. Papers of Charles Hodge. Princeton Theological Seminary Archives, Princeton, New Jersey. [3]
- _____. "Sunday Laws." *BRPR* 31, 4 (October 1859): 733-67. [3]
- _____. *Systematic Theology*. 3 vols. New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1872. [1]
- _____. "The Unity of Mankind." *BRPR* 31, 1 (January 1859): 103-49. [2]
- _____. "The Unity of Mankind." *PQPR* 5, 18 (April 1876): 352-62. [3]
- _____. *The Way of Life*. Edited by Mark Noll. New York: Paulist Press, 1987. [1]
- _____. "What is Christianity?" *BRPR* 32, 1 (January 1860): 118-61. [3]

McGill, Alexander T. *Church Government: A Treatise Compiled from His Lectures in Theological Seminaries*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1888. [3]

_____. "Practical Theology." In *Discourses at the Inauguration of the Rev. Alexander T. McGill as Professor of Pastoral Theology, Church Government, and the Composition and Delivery of Sermons in The Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J.*, 37-60. Philadelphia: C. Sherman, Printer, 1854. [3]

_____. "American Presbyterianism: From the Founding of the Presbyterian Church to the War of the Revolution." In *A Short History of American Presbyterianism*, 7-64. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1903. [5]

_____. "Tenure of the Elder's Office." *PQPR* New Series 1, 3 (July 1872): 568-89. [3]

Miller, Samuel. "The Early History of Pelagianism." *BRPR*. 2, 1 (January 1830): 77-113. [3]

Princeton Theological Seminary. *Catalogue of the Officers & Students of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, Princeton, New Jersey. 1853-54*. New York: John F. Trow, Printer, 1853. [2]

Tyler, Samuel. "The Baconian Philosophy." *BRPR* 12, 3 (July 1840): 350-77. [1]

_____. "Baconian Philosophy." *BRPR* 15, 4 (October 1843): 479-506. [1]

_____. "Cosmos, by A. Von Humboldt." *BRPR* 24, 3 (July 1852): 382-97. [1]

_____. "Psychology." *BRPR* 15, 2 (April 1843): 227-50. [1]

_____. "Sir William Hamilton and his Philosophy." *BRPR* 27, 4 (October 1855): 553-600. [1]

Secondary Sources

Ahlstrom, Sydney E. "The Scottish Philosophy and American Theology." *CH* 24 (1955): 257-72. [1]

Balmer, Randall H. "The Princetonians and Scripture: A Reconsideration." *WJT* 44, 2 (Fall 1982): 352-65. [1]

Balmer, Randall, and John R. Fitzmier. *The Presbyterians*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1993. [1]

Barnhart, Marjorie. "From Elisha Swift to Walter Lowrie: The Background of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions." *JPH* 65 (Summer 1987): 85-96. [1]

Bozeman, Theodore Dwight. "Inductive and Deductive Politics: Science and Society in Antebellum Presbyterian Thought." *JAH* 64, 3 (December 1977): 704-22. [2]

_____. *Protestants in an Age of Science: The Baconian Ideal and Antebellum American Religious Thought*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977. [1]

- Brown, William Adams. "Changes in the Theology of American Presbyterians." *American Journal of Theology* 10, 3 (July 1906): 387-411. [1]
- _____. "The Old Theology and the New." *Harvard Theological Review* 4, 1 (January 1911): 1-24. [1]
- Calhoun, David B. *Princeton Seminary. Vol. 1, Faith and Learning 1812-1868*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1994. [2]
- Coalter, Milton J. *Gilbert Tennent, Son of Thunder: A Case Study of Continental Pietism's Impact on the First Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1986. [1]
- Coleman, Michael. *Presbyterian Missionary Attitudes toward American Indians, 1837-1893*. Jackson, Mississippi: University of Mississippi Press, 1985. [1]
- Conkin, Paul K. *The Uneasy Center: Reformed Christianity in Antebellum America*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1995. [2]
- Danhof, Ralph John. *Charles Hodge as a Dogmatician*. Goes, Netherlands: Oosterbaan & Le Cointre, 1929. [1]
- Fishburn, Janet. "Gilbert Tennent, Established 'Dissenter.'" *CH* 63, 1 (March 1994): 31-49. [1]
- Hewitt, Glenn A. *Regeneration and Morality: A Study of Charles Finney, Charles Hodge, John W. Nevin, and Horace Bushnell*. Brooklyn: Carlson, 1991. [2]
- Hirrel, Leo P. *Children of Wrath: New School Calvinism and Antebellum Reform*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1998. [1]
- Hoffecker, W. Andrew. *Piety and the Princeton Theologians: Archibald Alexander, Charles Hodge, and Benjamin Warfield*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1981. [1]
- Hoffecker, W. Andrew, and Gary Scott Smith, eds. *Building a Christian World View*. Vol. 1, *God, Man, and Knowledge*. Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1986. [1]
- Holifield, E. Brooks. "Mercersburg, Princeton, and the South: The Sacramental Controversy in the Nineteenth Century." *JPH* 54, 2 (Summer 1976): 238-58. [2]
- John, Richard R. "Taking Sabbatarianism Seriously: The Postal System, the Sabbath, and the Transformation of American Political Culture." *JER* 10, 4 (Winter 1990): 517-67. [5]
- Kennedy, Earl William. "An Historical Analysis of Charles Hodge's Doctrines of Sin and Particular Grace." Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1968. [1]
- Lacy, W. L. "Buffalo Church: Centennial Address 1897." Typescript copy, n.d. [2]

- Le Beau, Bryan F. *Jonathan Dickinson and the Formative Years of American Presbyterianism*. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1997. [1]
- Loetscher, Lefferts A. *A Brief History of the Presbyterians*. 4th ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978. [1]
- _____. *The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church Since 1869*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954. [2]
- _____. *Facing the Enlightenment: Archibald Alexander and the Founding of Princeton Theological Seminary*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood, 1983. [1]
- Longfield, Bradley J. *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and Moderates*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991. [1]
- McAllister, James L., Jr. "The Nature of Religious Knowledge in the Thought of Charles Hodge." Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1957. [3]
- MacCormac, Earl R. "Mission and the Presbyterian Schism of 1837." *CH* 32 (March 1963): 32-45. [1]
- _____. "The Transition from Voluntary Missionary Society to the Church as a Missionary Organization among the American Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Methodists." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1961. [1]
- Meyer, D. H. *The Instructed Conscience: The Shaping of the American National Ethic*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972. [1]
- Miller, Howard. *The Revolutionary College: American Presbyterian Higher Education 1707-1837*. New York: New York University Press, 1976. [2]
- Moorhead, James H. "Joseph Addison Alexander: Common Sense, Romanticism and Biblical Criticism at Princeton." *JPH* 53, 1 (Spring 1975): 51-65. [1]
- Noll, Mark A. "Common Sense Traditions and American Evangelical Thought." *AQ* 37 (Summer 1985): 216-38. [3]
- _____. "The Irony of the Enlightenment for Presbyterians in the Early Republic." *JER* 5, 2 (Summer 1985): 149-75. [3]
- _____. "The Founding of Princeton Seminary." *WJT* 42, 1 (Fall 1979): 72-110. [3]
- _____. *Princeton and the Republic, 1768-1822: The Search for a Christian Enlightenment in the Era of Samuel Stanhope Smith*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989. [3]
- _____. "The *Princeton Review*." *WJT* 50, 2 (Fall 1988): 283-304. [1]

_____. "The Princeton Theology." In *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*. Edited by David F. Wells, 15-35. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1997. [1]

Nybakken, Elizabeth I. "New Light on the Old Side: Irish Influences on Colonial Presbyterianism." *JAH* 68, 4 (March 1982): 813-32. [1]

Pope, Earl A. *New England Calvinism and the Disruption of the Presbyterian Church*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1987. [3]

Roberts, John K. *History of Union Presbyterian Church*. Carthage, North Carolina: Kelly Printing Co., 1910. [2]

Rogers, Jack B., and Donald K. McKim. *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach*. New York: Harper and Row, 1979. [1]

Salmond, C. A. *Charles & A. A. Hodge: with Class and Table Talk of Hodge the Younger*. New York: Scribner & Welford, 1888. [3]

Sandeen, Ernest R. "The Princeton Theology: One Source of Biblical Literalism in American Protestantism." *CH* 31, 3 (September 1962): 307-21. [1]

Schmidt, Leigh Eric. *Holy Fairs: Scottish Communion and American Revivals in the Early Modern Period*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989. [1]

Scovel, Raleigh Don. "Orthodoxy in Princeton: A Social and Intellectual History of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1812-1860." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1970. [1]

Smith, Elwyn A. "The Forming of a Modern American Denomination." *CH* 31, 1 (March 1962): 74-99. [1]

_____. *The Presbyterian Ministry in American Culture*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962. [3]

Stewart, John William. "The Tethered Theology: Biblical Criticism, Common Sense Philosophy, and the Princeton Theologians, 1812-1860." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1990. [3]

Taylor, Marion Ann. *The Old Testament in the Old Princeton School (1812-1929)*. San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992. [1]

Trinterud, Leonard J. *The Forming of an American Tradition: A Re-examination of Colonial Presbyterianism*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1949. [1]

Vander Stelt, John C. *Philosophy and Scripture: A Study in Old Princeton and Westminster Theology*. Marlton, NJ: Mack, 1978. [3]

- Vander Velde, Lewis G. *The Presbyterian Churches and the Federal Union 1861-1869*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. [1]
- Wallace, Peter J. "The Foundations of Reformed Biblical Theology: The Development of Old Testament Theology at Old Princeton, 1812-1932." Online article, www.nd.edu/~pwallace, n.d. [1]
- _____. "History and Sacrament: A Study in the Intellectual Culture of Charles Hodge and John W. Nevin." Online article [Now found (here)], www.nd.edu/~pwallace, n.d. [3]
- Wallace, Peter, and Mark Noll. "The Students of Princeton Seminary, 1812-1929: A Research Note." *AP* 72, 3 (Fall 1994): 203-15. [2]
- Webster, John Crosby Brown. "The Christian Community and Change in North India: a History of the Punjab and North India Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. 1834-1914." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1971. [I]
- Wells, David F. "Charles Hodge." In *Reformed Theology in America: A History of Its Modern Development*. Edited by David F. Wells, 39-62. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1997. [3]
- Westerkamp, Marilyn J. *Triumph of the Laity: Scots-Irish Piety and the Great Awakening, 1625-1760*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988. [1]
- Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. "Prelude to Abolitionism: Sabbatarian Politics and the Rise of the Second Party System." *JAH* 58, 2 (September 1971): 316-41. [5]

Background and General

General

- Allen, Diogenes. *Philosophy for Understanding Theology*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985. [1]
- Appleby, Joyce. "The Power of History." *AHR* 103, 1 (February 1998): 1-14. [I]
- Berger, Peter, and Stanley Pullberg. "Reification and the Sociological Critique of Consciousness." *History and Theory* 4, 2 (1965): 196-211. [I]
- Berger, Peter, and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1966. [I]
- Berkhofer, Robert F., Jr. *A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis*. New York: Free Press, 1969. [I]
- Bouwisma, William J. "From History of Ideas to History of Meaning." *Journal of Inter-disciplinary History* 12, 2 (Autumn 1981): 279-91. [I]

- Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans, 1987. [I]
- Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. *The Churching of America, 1776-1990: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992. [1]
- Flower, Elizabeth, and Murray G. Murphey. *A History of Philosophy in America*. Vol. 1. New York: Capricorn Books, 1977. [1]
- Flower, Olive. *The History of Oxford College for Women 1830-1928*. Oxford, Ohio: Miami University Alumni Association, 1949. [2]
- González, Justo L. *A History of Christian Thought*. Vol. 3, rev. ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1987. [1]
- Goodykoontz, Colin Brummitt. *Home Missions on the American Frontier*. 1939. Reprint, New York: Octagon Books, 1971. [2]
- Grob, Gerald N. "Mental Illness, Indigency, and Welfare: the Mental Hospital in Nineteenth-Century America." In *Anonymous Americans: Explorations in Nineteenth-Century Social History*. Edited by Tamara K. Hareven, 250-79. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971. [4]
- Johnson, Guion Griffis. *Ante-Bellum North Carolina: A Social History*. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina, 1937. [2]
- Lohse, Bernhard. *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*. rev. ed. Translated by F. Ernest Stoeffler. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985. [I]
- Marks, Tom. *Making Revolution: The Insurgency of the Communist Party of Thailand in Structural Perspective*. Bangkok: White Lotus Press, 1994. [C]
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Nature and Destiny of Man*. Vol. 1. *Human Nature*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941. [C]
- Ross, Dorothy. "The New and Newer Histories: Social Theory and Historiography in an American Key." In *Imagined Histories: American Historians Interpret the Past*. Edited by Anthony Molho and Gordon S. Wood, 85-106. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998. [I]
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *The Christian Faith*. Edited by H. R. Mackintosh and J. S. Stewart. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928. [2]
- Seymour, Jack L. *From Sunday School to Church School: Continuities in Protestant Church Education in the United States, 1860-1929*. Latham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1982. [6]
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books, 1999. [C]

Sweet, Leonard I. "The Female Seminary Movement and Woman's Mission in Antebellum America." *CH* 54, 1 (March 1985): 41-55. [2]

Thilly, Frank, and Ledger Wood. *A History of Philosophy*. 3d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1957. [1]

Toews, John E. "Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience." *AHR* 92 (1987): 879-907. [1]

Wickersham, J. P. *A History of Education in Pennsylvania*. 1886. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1969.[2]

Enlightenment, Scottish Philosophy, and Baconianism

Beanblossom, Ronald E. "Introduction." In *Thomas Reid's Inquiry and Essays*. Edited by Ronald E. Beanblossom and Keith Lehrer, xix-lvii. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1983. [1]

Conser, Walter H., Jr. *God and the Natural World: Religion and Science in Antebellum America*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1993. [1]

Cumins, Philip D. "Reid's Realism." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 12, 3 (July 1974):317-40. [1]

Gay, Peter. *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1966. [3]

Grave, S. A. *The Scottish Philosophy of Common Sense*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. [1]

Haakonssen, Knud. "Reid's Philosophy." In Thomas Reid, *Practical Ethics*. Edited by Knud Haakonssen, 38-85. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990. [1]

Helm, Paul. "Thomas Reid, Common Sense and Calvinism." In *Rationality in the Calvinian Tradition*. Edited by Henrik Hart, et. al., 71-89. University of America Press, 1983. [3]

Hoveler, J. David, Jr., *James McCosh and the Scottish Intellectual Tradition: From Glasgow to Princeton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981. [1]

Hovenkamp, Herbert. *Science and Religion in America, 1800-1860*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1978. [1]

Lehrer, Keith. *Thomas Reid*. 1989. Reprint. London: Routledge, 1999. [1]

May, Henry F. *The Enlightenment in America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976. [1]

Marsden, George M. "Every One's Own Interpreter? The Bible, Science, and Authority in Mid-Nineteenth-Century America." In *The Bible in America: Essays in Cultural History*. Edited by Nathan O. Hatch and Mark A. Noll. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982. [6]

Evangelicalism and Romanticism

- Buell, Lawrence. *Literary Transcendentalism: Style and Vision in the American Renaissance*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1973. [1]
- _____. *New England Literary Culture: From Revolution Through Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986. [1]
- Cross, Whitney R. *The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1950. [1]
- Curti, Merle. *Human Nature in American Thought*. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1980. [1]
- Dayton, Donald W. *Discovering an Evangelical Heritage*. 1976. Reprint. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988. [1]
- Gauvreau, Michael. "The Empire of Evangelicalism: Varieties of Common Sense in Scotland, Canada, and the United States." In *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1900*. Edited by Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk, 219-52. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. [1]
- Hatch, Nathan O. *The Democratization of American Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989. [1]
- Howe, Daniel Walker. *The Unitarian Conscience: Harvard Moral Philosophy, 1805-1861*. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1988. [1]
- Johnson, Curtis D. *Evangelicals and the Road to Civil War*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1993. [1]
- Johnson, Paul E. *A Shopkeeper's Millennium: Society and Revivals in Rochester, New York, 1815-1837*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978. [2]
- Koster, Donald N. *Transcendentalism in America*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1975. [2]
- Marsden, George M. *The Evangelical Mind and the New School Presbyterian Experience*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970. [1]
- McLoughlin, William G., Jr. *Modern Revivalism: Charles Grandison Finney to Billy Graham*. New York: Ronald Press, 1959. [2]
- Nichols, James Hastings. *Romanticism in American Theology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. [1]
- Ryan, Mary P. *Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, New York, 1790-1865*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. [2]

Wolffe, John. "Anti-Catholicism and Evangelical Identity in Britain and the United States, 1830-1860." In *Evangelicalism: Comparative Studies of Popular Protestantism in North America, the British Isles, and Beyond, 1700-1900*. Edited by Mark A. Noll, David W. Bebbington, and George A. Rawlyk, 179-97. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994. [1]

Reformed History and Thought

Breward, Ian. "Introduction." In *The Work of William Perkins*. Edited by Ian Breward, 3-131. Appleford, Abingdon, Berkshire, England: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1970. [1]

Burchill, Christopher J. "Girolamo Zanchi: Portrait of A Reformed Theologian and His Work." *SCJ* 15, 2 (1984): 185-207. [1]

Donnelly, John Patrick. "Italian Influences on the Development of Calvinist Scholasticism." *SCJ* 7, 1 (April 1976): 81-101. [1]

Klauber, Martin I. "Reason, Revelation, and Cartesianism: Louis Tronchin and Enlightened Orthodoxy in Late Seventeenth-Century Geneva." *CH* 59, 3 (September 1990): 326-39. [1]

McCoy, Charles S. and J. Wayne Baker. *Fountainhead of Federalism: Heinrich Bullinger and the Covenantal Tradition*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991. [1]

McGrath, Alister E. *A Life of John Calvin*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990. [1]

_____. *Reformed Thought: An Introduction*. 2d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993. [1]

Miller, Perry. *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century*. New York: Macmillian Company, 1939. [3]

Meeter, H. Henry. *The Basic Ideas of Calvinism*. 6th ed. Revised by Paul A. Marshall. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1990. [3]

Phillips, Timothy Ross. "Francis Turretin's Idea of Theology and its Bearing Upon His Doctrine of Scripture." Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1986. [1]

Rohr, John von. *The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986. [1]

Smith, Gary Scott. *The Seeds of Secularization: Calvinism, Culture, and Pluralism in America, 1870-1915*. St. Paul: Christian University Press, 1985. [2]

Weir, David A. *The Origins of the Federal Theology in Sixteenth-Century Reformation Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990. [1]