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I. Reconceptualizing Translation
What is translation? Although from very early times translators and critics have begun to ponder on it, this question is more a modern concern than an ancient one.
simply because translation studies is an emerging discipline, evolving from middle 20th century by gaining increasing insights from such adjacent subjects as modern linguistics, literary studies and cultural studies. Additionally answers to this question have varied wildly, however, over time, academic disciplines and from place to place. Whereas no consensus has so far been reached over what translation means exactly, a rough division of orientation in understanding the notion may be discerned: translation as a form of practice or as a trope. [1]

The idea of translation as practice is intuitively based on a technical understanding of the term. In other words, translation is primarily understood as mere linguistic transference, usually with accompanying beliefs that the meaning of a text is determinant and can be exchanged, and that what a translator needs to do is but decoding one verbal sign system and encoding in another, purely a technical operation. Modern linguistics and its various branch fields give immediate impetus to the “scientific” formulations of the regularity or law of translating, as seen in the representative efforts by Eugene Nida [2] and Wolfram Wilss [3]. Such understanding of translation, as Gideon Toury succinctly and insightfully puts it, is based on three postulates, i.e., source-text postulate, transfer postulate and relationship postulates. [4] The linguistic-oriented approaches to translation have contributed to at least two far-reaching but negative consequences. First, compared with the original writing, translation is positioned on a derivative thence secondary place, which is typically reflective in the figurative descriptions of translation as a copy, a servant or belle infidèle. Second, translator tends to be always standing in the shadow of the original writer, even to the extent of invisibility. [5] This somewhat essentialist notion of translation is not only often challenged by the existence of abundant pseudo-translations (in Toury’s sense), but also impotent in explaining the complexity concerning translation strategies. And given such a basis, the translation theories that claim to be general are more often than not partial.

At the same time, especially in the recent three decades, there is also another school of thought that treats translation in a sheer metaphorical manner, extending the concept to denote any process involving changes and exchanges of information. The early example in this regard is the designation of “cultural translation”, first proposed by anthropologists to refer to both the translation of languages and the conveyance of “mode of thought”. [6] Post-modern cultural critics push the notion to a radical as well as extreme dimension. Speaking of the imbalance of power relations, post-colonial scholars define the former colonized nation as a translation
and the former suzerain state as the "original"; feminist scholars harshly criticize the practice and the notion of comparing translation to woman, a disrespect to either women or translation; imperial studies scholars relate translation to clashes of empires, positing translation as an arena where different empires fight for symbolical dominance. Central to such studies is an obvious evasion of analysis of any specific text.

Translation is conventionally understood by most people as a process of mere linguistic transference, but actually it doesn’t necessarily mean a mere mimic. After a survey of Western literary history, Lefevere concludes that literatures are always read and received in a variety of "rewritings", of which translation is but the principal form; rewriting implies manipulation and changes of power relations. Toury holds that translation is anything considered to be as such in the target culture, discarding the essentialist tone of the traditional understanding. Theo Hermans proposes that translations are texts which have been consecrated by a translator and accepted by a community. All such descriptive definitions do shed some light on the term on one side and remain somewhat superficial on the other. Considering translation both as a process of linguistic transference and as a product defined by the receiving community, the French literary sociologist Robert Escarpit (1918–2000) precisely defines translating as an act of "creative treason", treason "because it puts the work in a system of reference (linguistic, in this example) for which it was not originally conceived" and creative "because it gives new reality to the work in providing it with the possibility of a new literary interchanges with a larger public and because it assures not only mere survival but a second existence". Escarpit’s creative treason responds in a way to Walter Benjamin’s notion of "afterlife", though on a different discursive pattern.

Following Escarpit directly and the descriptionist translation scholars indirectly, Xie Tianzhen (谢天振), a Chinese scholar on translation studies as well as comparative literature, develops an integral and systematic theory about literary translation and reception, designated Yijie Xue (Medio-translatology, a temporary English term for it). Xie argues that creative treason might be conducted intentionally or unintentionally by the mediator (translator), receptors (readers) or the receiving context; usually the creative treason caused by mediators falls into four concrete categories: (1) personalized translation (characterized by either domestication or foreignization drive) (gexing hua fanyi 个性化翻译); (2) mistranslation (wu yi 误译)and omission (lou yi 漏译); (3) partial translation (jie yi
节译) and transcompilation (bian yi 编译); 4) relay translation (zhaun yi 转译) and adaptation (gai bian 改编). More important is the fact that just because of inevitable existence of creative treason, the translated literatures are no longer “foreign works” but a special part of national literature repertoire. Seen in this light, translations shake off its subjection to original works and translators are in a position to get rid of the notorious fame as imitator and stands as certain creator in his own right.

II. Missionaries as Translators

The first encounter between Christianity and China can be traced back to early 7th century when some Nestorians, members of a sect of Eastern Orthodox Church, came to the Tang court. Yuan Dynasty (1279－1368) witnessed the arrival of both Nestorians and some catholic preachers. In the late 16th century, the Roman Catholic Church sent, under great pressure of Protestant Reformation, a large number of missionaries to Far East including China. Finally in the early 19th century, much more Christian missionaries were dispatched to China and the wave proceeded well into the 20th century. In terms of intellectual activities in general and translating in particular, the Jesuit missionaries in the early 17th century and the Protestant missionaries in the 19th century were the most prominent. The present paper focuses on the Protestant missionary translators in China.

1. The Protestant Translation Projects: An Overview

Stimulated by Great Awakening Movement and Evangelical Revival Movement in the late 18th century and early 19th century, the Protestantism Church decided to start overseas mission after its Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox predecessors. The arrival of Robert Morrison (1782－1834) at Canton (Guangzhou) in 1807 signaled the official launch of the Protestant mission to China. But due to the Rites Controversy, China had banned Christianity since the 1720s and the ban was still valid in the early 19th century. More worse was the fact that Guangzhou was the only place in the mainland of the country where foreigners were permitted to stay; in addition, the Chinese language was prohibited to be taught to foreigners and the Chinese books were also forbidden to be sold to them. Therefore Morrison began his missionary career in the guise of an employee in East Indian Company in Guangzhou and most other missionaries had to settle in Macao, Java, Malacca and Singapore, where there were also large communities of migration Chinese. Things
changed after the First Opium War (1839—1840) and the rights of preaching and inland residence were finally granted through conspiracy by a French interpreter.\[16\]

Even after the concluding of the Nanking Treaty, most missionaries found it still quite difficult to preach their evangelism to the natives, those educated in particular. On one hand the missionaries were regarded as accomplices to the colonists; on the other hand the Christian creeds run counter to the native beliefs and practices. Direct preaching thus became virtually impossible and some liberally minded protestant missionaries were determined to enlighten the heathen by translating the Western religions as well as secular knowledge, modeling themselves on their Jesuit predecessors.\[17\] As a matter of fact, long before the war their enlightenment activities had begun in places other than mainland China, in the forms of schools, printing houses, magazines and newspapers in Chinese, and bilingual dictionaries, all of which were related to translating in one way or another. To some extent, the protestant missionaries were destined to be translators out of various causes. In reality direct preaching was unsuccessful due to cultural and religious gaps; academically missionaries were the group who usually had a better education background and a better command of Chinese than other groups of Westerners then in China;\[18\] for practical ends translating was a useful way of learning Chinese for some of them and a symbol of academic achievements for some others.

Most missionary translators rendered, usually with the help of Chinese scholars, European languages into Chinese, with only a few exceptions, for instance, James Legge and William Soothill, who rendered some Chinese classics and popular literatures into English. As for the subject matter, religious tracts, Bible in particular, was always their primary concern. To enlighten the heathens and to show what the Chinese viewed as barbarians (\textit{yi} 夷) has also equal and even higher civilization, they also translated a large number of secular works including history, geography, science, medicine, engineering, manufacturing, economics and politics, etc.; Since the 1860s, some of them began to be employed by the Chinese government to work as full-time translators or teachers, where the subjects to be translated were determined by the government agents. The translated works appeared in Chinese magazines, newspapers or as monographs. The most prolific translator was John Fryer, who translated more than 120 titles, of which 77 were published.\[19\]

The early translators like Robert Morrison, Charles Gutzlaff, Walter Medhurst and Elijah C. Bridgeman, to name but just a few, began their translation work usually out of personal enthusiasm or order from home country churches. Things
became complicated since the 1850s when the most prominent missionary translators were usually dually affiliated to the mission societies and to certain Chinese agencies. W. A. P. Martin, an American Presbyterian preacher who lived in China for more than sixty years and died in Beijing, was employed as headmaster and teacher of international law with Tongwen Guan, the first foreign language and translation school set up in 1862 in the capital city, which had also a syllabus on science; Martin had translated, before getting his new post in Beijing, into Chinese the first complete version of Henry Wheaton’s *Elements of International Law* and was later granted by the Qing Government an honorable title, equal to the second highest rank of officials. Timothy Richard, a British Baptist who lived in China for 45 years, and who was the first principal of Shanxi University and the general secretary of a Christian printing house in Shanghai, translated, among many others, a third-rate history book by Robert Mackenzie into Chinese, which was well-received by the Chinese intellectuals who regarded it as a textbook on reform.\[^{[20]}\]

In half a century from the 1840s to the 1890s, the missionary translators dominated the Chinese translation projects because of not only their linguistic capability as bilinguals only available then, but their utilitarian pursuit of converting the heathens by a detour way. China was forced to open its port cities from 1842 to foreign trade and religions whereupon the missionaries swarmed from the border areas to mainland with their schools, printing houses, magazines and newspapers. For Westerners, Guangzhou, Shanghai and Beijing were not only economic centers but cultural hubs whereby translation centers. Canton Pok Tsai Hospital in Guangzhou, London Missionary Society Press in Shanghai, and The Chinese and American Holy Classic Book Establishment in Ningbo (later moved to Shanghai and renamed The American Presbyterian Mission Press) were all institutes set up by missionaries to print translated works. *Eastern Western Monthly Magazine, Chinese Serial* (in Hongkong), *Shanghai Serial*, and *The Review of the Times* were the most well-known missionary periodicals that featured translated works. In addition, some missionary translators worked in institutes sponsored by the Chinese government like Tongwen Guan in Beijing and The Translation Bureau of Jiangnan Arsenal in Shanghai.

2. Tandem Translation and Its Implications

Before the 20th century China’s recorded history of translation was characterized by a close association with introduction to foreign religions, a tandem mode of
translating with foreigners playing the primary role and a simultaneous combination of oral interpreting and written translation.\textsuperscript{21} Owing to its particular geographic surrounding and its greater national strength, China was the sole leader at least in Asia until the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, very similar to the position the United States of America stands to the rest of the world today. Actually in ancient China few educated Han people had any interest in learning any foreign language since the neighboring peoples were much more earnest in learning Chinese, and as a result, the majority of the interpreters in the government agencies were always acted by those from the minority ethnic groups within the empire or simply foreigners.

This is also true of the missionary translation projects in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. To preach among the natives, missionaries had to grasp their language, but the discrepancy between the oral Chinese and the written form was so great that they were literally two different language systems.\textsuperscript{22} Consequently most missionaries could speak Chinese fluently but could not write properly in elegant form; therefore they had to write or translate with the help of Chinese assistants, variously described as assistant pastors, teachers, pundits or senior evangelists. Usually the missionary translator gave an oral version of the text and the assistant wrote it down. The assistant in the tandem translation was “no mere scribe, however, but more of a collaborator, correcting mistakes and rendering the oral version into acceptable literary form”\textsuperscript{23}. Whereas quite a number of missionary writers or translators didn’t officially acknowledge in their published works the contribution made by the assistants, a few Chinese scholars were widely known as collaborators to the missionary translators, like Wang Tao to James Legge, Hua Hengfang to Alexander Wylie, Xu Shou to John Fryer and Cai Erkang to Timothy Richard. By contrast, the Chinese assistants in the Chinese historiography are called translators while the missionaries are seldom mentioned. Besides the conspicuous ideological agenda involved in historiographical writing, this problem points to the different understandings of what a translator is.

In addition to rare recognition of the role played by the Chinese collaborators, the implications of the tandem translation pattern itself are attached to even less attention. The particularity of tandem translation in question lies in its simultaneous inclusion of both what Roman Jakobson calls interlingual translation and intralingual translation\textsuperscript{24}, and it therefore challenges the conventional definition of what translation is. If, as Escarpit sees it, any translation is a process of creative treason, then tandem translation involves two such processes and the translated text
is even farther deviant from the so-called original thereby achieving certain independence similar to what Walter Benjamin's conception of “afterlife”. The missionary and the Chinese assistant are, in this sense, both entitled to be called translators. But viewed from a more common perspective, neither of them *per se* is qualified to be regarded separately as a translator, since each of them participates in only one of two subjective processes of semiotic transmissions involved in a tandem translation. Tandem translation mode is not, of course, peculiar to the Chinese history of translation, but it was most common and persistent in ancient China. Meanwhile, it is not only an epistemological key to the Chinese cultural attitudes towards self and the Other, but also an effective instrument to subvert the established notions about translation.

3. Translation Strategies

To some extent, the missionary translators in the 19th century China adopted a way of translating similar to that of the Roman translator St. Jerome when he claimed that “I myself not only admit but freely proclaim that in translating from the Greek (except in the case of the holy scriptures where even the order of the words is a mystery) I render sense for sense and not word for word”. In other words, like Jerome, the Protestant missionaries treated the religious texts and the secular ones differently. In translating religious texts, *Bible* in particular, they were very serious and try their best to retain the original features. One case in point was the long-debated “Term Question”. Terms like God, spirit and baptism are peculiar to Christianity and have no equivalents in the Chinese religions. As a result, since late Ming Dynasty (1368–1644) the Jesuit missionaries had been harassed by the difficulty of finding in Chinese books appropriate words for key terms of Christianity. Matteo Ricci (1552–1610), the most prestigious missionary and bishop in China, finally decided that the ancient Chinese notions like *Shangdi* or *Tianzhu* were similar to the Latin *Deus*, and composed a work in Chinese, which was entitled *Tianzhu Shiyi* (*True Meaning of God*); since then the Chinese Catholic Church had been, even up to now, designated *Tianzhu Jiao* (literally the religion of Tianzhu) and the followers called *Tianzhu Jiaotu*. However, Ricci’s idea was not universally accepted and the debate continued well into the 19th century.

Before Christianity was once again permitted through treaty in 1842, Robert Morrison had secretly finished the second complete Chinese version of *Bible* in 1823 and selected another Chinese term—*shen* (神) as an equivalent for God.
Different versions of key terms adopted in the Chinese Bibles by different churches led to confusion among the Chinese converts and this entailed a unified version of Chinese Bible. From the late 1940s to the mid-1950s the British and American missionary societies held several conferences in Hongkong and Shanghai to discuss the translation of some key terms; the debates were very hot and finally even hostile, but no consensus was reached; interestingly the missionaries finally diverged not on academic or theological basis but on nationality, resulting in two Chinese versions: the one published by the British which rendered God as *Shangdi* (上帝) while another by the Americans as *Shen*.²⁷

Apart from the religious texts, the missionary translators had little interest in discussing translating problems and took a very casual way towards their translated works. Although they always claimed in the prefaces they were faithful to the original meaning, yet textually omission, insertion, adaptation and summary were never uncommon.

On the whole, when translating European languages into Chinese, the missionaries tended to a domesticating orientation by equating the Western terms to the existing Chinese notions. For example, “president” became Chinese “*Huangdi*” (皇帝, emperor), “doctoral degree” became Chinese “*Jinshi*” (进士, the highest title for those winners in the highest level of royal examination on Confucianism classics) and “state” was Chinese “*sheng*” (省 (rougly equal to province). As for those totally new to China, transliteration was a common practice, such as *Delu feng* (德律风) for “telephone”, *Bali men* (巴力门) for “parliament” and *Gongban ya* (公班衙) for “company”. Such transliterations bring about certain foreignness.

Driven by the religious purpose, the missionaries often related the content of the works to Christianity. In translating *Ideal Suggestion Through Mental Photography* by the British psychiatrist Henry Wood, John Fryer rewrote the original prose into verse, which contained such lines as “*tianfu wu buzhi*” (天父无不知, God is omniscient) and “*tianfu wu buzai*” (天父无不在, God is omnipresent) that were totally absent in the original text; to emphasize some information, certain lines of target text would be printed in bold and large letters; to highlight certain notion, he elaborated the term in detail with lengthy words, which was “a term only mentioned in passing in the English original”.²⁸ All such operations in the missionary translations are typical practices of creative treason, which will be further elucidated in the following case studies.
III. Two Case Studies

The protestant missionaries had noticed, from the very start, the usefulness of narrative tracts for preaching. As early as 1819, William Milne (1785—1822), a Malacca-based British missionary, published in Chinese a 12-chapter novel form tract entitled Zhang Yuan Liang You Xiang Lun (《张远两友相论》, Dialogues between Two Friends Zhang and Yuan), which turned out to be a success in terms of its intelligibility on the part of the audience. Other missionaries soon followed suit and many such novels were produced thereafter, imitating the Chinese vernacular chapter novels like The Story of the Stone and Three Kingdoms; John Fryer even went so far as to hold a fiction contest in the 1890s to encourage the native scholars to express themselves in the form of fictional stories thereupon emerged the embryo of new fiction that was sheer different from the chapter novels.[29] Such novels “written” by the missionaries and their assistants were largely an integration of biblical stories into traditional Chinese literary form and in effect transcompilations of various sources.

Of all the Chinese works produced by missionaries, translations of literary works in its usual sense were of a very small proportion. Nevertheless the small percentage of their literary translations does not necessarily mean insignificant impact. On the contrary, creative treason pervasive in the processes of translating and reception would frequently result in unexpected outcomes. Gulliver’s Travels by Jonathan Swift, originally intended as a cruel satire, and Robinson Crusoe by Daniel Defoe, originally intended to be a sermon of the glory of budding colonialism, turn out to be children’s books for generation after generation.[30] As for the missionary translation projects in China, Bainian Yijiao, a Chinese version of Looking Backward, 2000—1887 translated by Timothy Richard and Cai Erkang, and The Analects, an English version of Confucius’ Lun Yu translated by James Legge and Wang Tao, were two representative examples in this regard.

1. Bainian Yijiao (《百年一觉》)

Looking Backward, 2000—1887, an utopian novel by American writer Edward Bellamy (1850—1898), was first published in 1887 and immediately became a best-seller only next to Uncle Tom’s Cabin.[31] Till 1982, at least eight editions of it had been offered by different publishers. The novel tells of a very simple story in which, “I”, the narrator, Julian West by name, fell into a dream after a date with his fiancée on May 30, 1887, but when he woke up it has been September 10, 2000; the
dream lasts 113 years and the United States of America in the year of 2000 has become a cooperative union where everyone works hard with equal pay, products are greatly abundant, and there is no gap in income, no prisons or police because everyone is well-educated and well-behaved. Except the preface and postscript. The remaining 28 chapters consist of dialogues between “I” and the family members of Doctor Leete.

Only four years after its first publication in America, a Chinese version of Looking Backward in serialized forms appeared in a missionary-sponsored Chinese magazine Wanguo Gongbao (《万国公报》), beginning in December, 1891 and ending in April, 1892. The installment translations were entitled Huitoukan Jihue (literally a brief account of looking back) and ascribed to someone named Xi Jin (析津), obviously a pseudo name. Another two years later in 1894, a monograph entitled Bainian Yijiao (A Hundred-year Sleep) was published by Guangxue Hui (广学会, The Christian Literature Society for China) and was ascribed to Timothy Richard, who happened to be the general secretary of the society. The serialized version and the monograph share much in common, the difference being that a four-character title was added to each chapter in the latter and the introductory part was slightly more detailed in the monograph. Both forms were an extremely reduced version of Bellamy's original, just a summary of the original but with many comments by the translator.

(1) Purpose of Translating

Like any action of human beings, translating is purpose-driven and different aims of translating the same text will accordingly lead to distinct results, or in Hans J. Vermeer’s term, *translatum*.[33] From a functionalist view, Justa Holz-Manttari defines translator as TT-producer which is only one of the six participants in a translational action; the other roles in translational action include the initiator, the commissioner, the ST producer, the TT user and the TT receiver.[34] Seen in this light, the purpose of translating is a combined aim of the initiator, the commissioner and the translator. Translation strategy is thus determined more by the purpose of translational action than by mere consideration of languages.

Why was Looking Backward selected? The translator stated succinctly in the preface of Bianian Yijiao that the original work was well received in the West and that it wrote extensively on ways to support people’s living and well-being. As a matter of fact, China witnessed from the 1860s onward increasing calls for reform and the calls culminated after the Sino-Japan War (1894). The missionaries found it
was an opportunity to teach the heathen Chinese and some of them began to translate or write works on economy and finance. In 1880 W. A. P Martin and his Chinese students translated into Chinese *A Manual of Political Economy* by H. Funcett. Six years later Joseph Edkins translated W. S. Jevons’ *Primer of Political Economy* into Chinese. Under such circumstances, Timothy Richard would naturally not like to lag behind his peer preachers, given his leading role in mission and the self-appointed role as the spokesman for the Chinese reformers. He published several articles on *Wanguo Gongbao*, elaborating his ideas of how to enrich the nation and its people; to further illustrate his theory, he translated two books to show how the Western nations became strong and wealthy hence the birth of *Bainian Yijiao*. Concerned solely with the economic and political agendas, Richard and his assistant never treated *Looking Backward* as a literary text but as a certain textbook. This preoccupation was decisive to their unusual way of translating.

(2) Manipulation on Various Levels

The translators manipulated the source text on various levels in varying degrees.

First and foremost, genre or text-type of the original was blurred. Doubtlessly *Looking Backward, 2000–1887* is a literary creation for the English-speaking readers, though the author is more like a social reformer than a writer and has little patience on narrative and characterization. In the original text, Julian West, the name of the protagonist as well as the narrator, appears only in “Author’s Preface” and the following chapters proceed with the first point of view “I”. In the translation, all the pronouns “I” were changed into the third person “wei” (韦, transliteration for West) or “wei jun” (韦君, literally Mr. West), which indicates that the translators were either unfamiliar with the Western way of narration or intentionally opt for the narration mode in the tradition Chinese vernacular fictions that were characterized by the third point of view. Additionally the cultural images, figures of speech, allusions, descriptions of mental activities—nearly all elements that define literariness were deleted.

Second, casual and substantial omission makes “Richard’s work can scarcely be called a translation”, simply because “it consists of a series of chapter synopses that together amount to only a fraction of the original length”. Besides the above-mentioned omission of the literary devices, the preface and postscript were completely deleted, too, although they are very critical to understanding the novel’s
narration technique. The narrator's arguments and comments, usually very lengthy and somewhat tedious, were also parts that were rewritten or simply omitted.

The third feature of the translated text is its obvious domestication to Chinese cultural norms. In chapter six of *Looking Backward*, Dr. Lecte tells Julian West there is no labor problem in US in 2000 and all citizens between 21 and 45 willingly participate in industrial or intellectual services; “The period of *industrial service* is twenty-four years, beginning at the close of the course of education at twenty-one and terminating at forty-five.”[37] The Chinese version for the quotation reads: “自幼至二十一岁，皆在学读书之日；自二十一岁至四十五岁皆作官作工之日，二十四年之久。” The Chinese text may be translated back into English like this: “The period from childhood to the age of twenty-one is the stage for schooling; the period from the age of twenty-one to forty-five is the stage to work as officials and industrial employees, lasting twenty-four years.” Clearly here “to work as officials and industrial employees” was intended to correspond to “intellectual service” and “industrial service” respectively. To work as an official was the exclusive drive and ambition for the Chinese scholars in ancient times while intellectual service denotes any work that is not manual, not confined to “work as officials”. Such domesticated examples are very common in Richard's Chinese text.

Finally many comments indicative of Christianity are added. One representative instance comes from Chapter 28, in which “I” woke up from the dream and told my strange experience in the year 2000 to the family of Edith, my fiancée, but they didn’t believe me and got angry at my description of a fair and equal society. The last four paragraphs of this chapter in the original novel read:

The cruel sights which I had witnessed in my vision, and could so well confirm from the experience of my former life, though they had, alas! Once been, and must in the retrospect to the end of time move the compassionate to tears, were, *God be thanked*, forever gone by. Long ago oppressor and oppressed, prophet and scoster, had been dust. For generations, rich and poor had been forgotten words.

But in that moment, while yet I mused with unspeakable thankfulness upon the greatness of the world's salvation and my privilege in beholding it, there suddenly pierced me like a knife a pang of shame, remorse, and wondering self-reproach, that bowed my head upon my breast and made me wish the grave had hid me with my fellows from the sun. For I had been a man of that former time. What had I done to help on the deliverance whereat I now presumed to rejoice? I who had lived in those cruel, insensate days, what had I done to bring them to an end? I had been every whit as indifferent to the wretchedness of my brothers, as cynically incredulous of better
things, as besotted a worshiper of Chaos and Old Night, as any of my fellows. So far as my personal influence went, it had been exerted rather to hinder than to help forward the enfranchisement of the race which was even then preparing. What right had I to hail a salvation which reproached me, to rejoice in a day whose dawning I had mocked?

"Better for you, better for you," a voice within me rang, "had this evil dream been the reality, and this fair reality the dream; better your part pleading for crucified humanity with a scoffing generation, than here, drinking of wells you digged not, and eating of trees whose husbandmen you stoned"; and my spirit answered, "Better, truly."

When at length I raised my bowed head and looked forth from the window, Edith, fresh as the morning, had come into the garden and was gathering flowers. I hastened to descend to her. Kneeling before her, with my face in the dust, I confessed with tears how little was my worth to breathe the air of this golden century, and how infinitely less to wear upon my breast its consummate flower. Fortunate is he who, with a case so desperate as mine, finds a judge so merciful.

The Chinese version, literally a summary, was rewritten to accommodate Christian ideas:

"Thinking of this, I kneel down to thank God for His salvation of the world" "Normally I should have not been entitled to live in such a good world and once again kneel down to confess before God" and "Edith said, 'God is most merciful and you’ll be forgiven now that you have confessed your previous sins'". Compared with the English source text, the Chinese version is literally a description of a Christian worship ceremony and all events related to confession were added by the translators.

2. Confucian Analects or Lun Yu (《论语》)

Whereas most missionary translators were engaged in translating Western languages into Chinese, a few of them chose to translate the Chinese works into European languages. Lun Yu was one of the Chinese classic works that was
preferred by missionary translators. As early as 1809, Joshua Marshman (1768–1837), a British missionary to Serampore in India, translated first half of *Lun Yu* into English, entitled *The Works of Confucius*. The first complete English translation of *Lun Yu* was offered in 1828 by David Collie, a British missionary and the principal of The Anglo-Chinese College in Malacca, as part of *The Chinese Classic Works, Commonly Called the Four Books, Translated and Illustrated with Notes*. *Lun Yu* was first translated as *Confucian Analects* by James Legge (1815–1897), who translated all Chinese classic works usually designated *Four Books* (四书) and *Five Chings* (五经) and many other Chinese works. Legge's version of *Analects* is so successful that it has always been the reference to any discussion of translated Chinese classics even up to now.

(1) Missionary, Translator and Sinologist

As a Scottish Congregationalist and a missionary to China appointed by London Missionary Society, James Legge arrived in Malacca in 1840, where he was in charge of the Anglo-Chinese College, and moved in 1843 to Hongkong, where he played a plethora of roles as missionary, translator of Chinese classics, educator and consultant to colonial government. In two outstanding biographies of Legge by Giradot and Pfitser, Legge is portrayed as a dutiful and liberal-minded pilgrim on one side, and as a conscientious scholar and great translator on the other.

While acknowledging Giradot and Pfitser “have brought forth the multi-faceted complexity and historical richness of Legge and his Chinese scholarship” by “treating Legge as representing a different style of Orientalism, i.e., sympathetic Orientalism”, Wang argues, from a perspective of Saidian Orientalism, that such a sympathetic understanding of Legge “tends to blur the imperialistic violence committed by Christian missionaries and modernizers against the ‘heathen’ ‘pre-modern’ Chinese culture”. It is true that early missionary translators held a low opinion of Chinese culture in general and Confucianism in particular out of their Christian preoccupation. David Collie stated articulately in his preface to *Four Books* that his translation might be of some use to the Chinese who were studying English, “especially in leading them to reflect seriously on some of the fatal errors propagated by their most celebrated sages”. At the beginning Legge also held a low opinion of *Confucius* because the latter is unreligious, unspiritual and open to the charge of insincerity, but later he “discovered” monotheism in Confucian works and included some of his translations in the *Sacred Books Series* initiated by
Max Müller. Despite a slight change in his attitudes over time, Legge was stubborn on his value scale by insisting that “Christianity far transcends Confucianism”\(^\text{[44]}\).

To accomplish his mission of converting the heathens, Legge found it crucial to cultivate a “familiarity with [Chinese] customs and manners” and undertake a close “examination of their history, their philosophy, their religion and their poetry”; he further developed an equation between linguistic transmission and religious conversion, “a mutually educative process of moral transformation”.\(^\text{[45]}\) To put it simply, translating Chinese classics, from the start, was a way of deciphering the Chinese heart and a medium to hyphenate West and East. Nevertheless, years of mission-oriented translating projects accumulated profound academic reputation and acquisition with Chinese language and culture for Legge, who was in 1876 appointed professor of Chinese at Oxford University, a result that was somewhat unpredicted.

(2) General Features of The Chinese Classics \(^\text{[46]}\)

Christocentric and Eurocentric in translating Confucius, Legge manipulated, in a way contrary to Timothy Richard who often conducted his Chinese translation of Western works in a reductionist manner, the texts of The Chinese Classics (hereinafter referred to as CC) by presenting the target readers a thick translation, as defined by Appiah, which “seeks with its annotations and its accompanying glosses to locate the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context”\(^\text{[47]}\). On the whole, the following features are prominent in Legge’s CC series.

First, each volume of CC begins with a preface by the translator, indicating his purpose and methods of translating. In later editions and reprints of CC after the 1860s, an introduction to Legge’s missionary career and academic achievements, usually by a prestigious scholar in certain field, would be added.

Next to the introductory words is a long exegetical and critical prolegomena to the texts contained therein, consisting of usually the textual formation, their authorship, historical changes, canonical status, content, commentarial sources, translator’s comments on the theme in relation to Christian notions, and other relevant information.

Third, the main body of each translated text consists of four layers. On the top of the page is the English title in large, bold type for the whole piece or subtitle for sections; below the English title is the Chinese text in bold type, with punctuation and marks signaling differentiation of sections; below the Chinese original is the English translations in smaller type, beginning with chapter order and section...
numbers corresponding to those in the Chinese text; at the bottom is the exegetical and critical notes in even smaller type, inserted with quite a few Chinese words and phrases amid the English text. The annotation part, though in smallest type, usually takes most part of the page space and is a clear sign of the translators’ punditry or pedantry.

Last but not the least, in CCI Legge changed the order of the Four Books stipulated by Zhu Xi (1130—1200), an epoch-making scholar on Confucianism in Southern Song Dynasty (1127—1279), who had successfully integrated certain Buddhism and Taoism ideas into traditional Ruism (Confucianism), and placed Confucian Analects instead of The Great Learning at the beginning of the series. By contrast, David Collie observed the conventional practice among the Chinese scholars and put Da Xue, or in his own term Ta Heo, in the first place. The change of order implies Legge’s different understanding of the importance of these four works from the conventional Chinese commentaries and is also a symbol of his confidence in his command of the Chinese language and thought, which served the foundation for his professorship at Oxford and his reputation as a representative missionary sinologist.

(3) Legge’s Version of Confucian Analects

The present Chinese Lun Yu consists of 20 volumes, each of which contains various chapters, amounting to a total number of 492, 444 of which are dialogues between Confucius and his disciples and contemporaries, and another 48 of which are conversations between the disciples themselves. Of the title, lun (论) means “to discuss or to edit” and yu (语) means “conversation or talk”.

Linguistically James Legge shows, compared with his predecessors, certain flexibility in his strategy of translating while keeping foreignization as the mainstay. Collie offered a translation for Lun Yu as Dialogues in the preface but simply omitted the book title in the translation proper; instead, he roughly divided the whole piece into two parts, designating the first part as Shang Lun and the second part Hea Lun. Legge rendered for the first time the book title as “analects” with a modifier “Confucian”, a practice followed by most later-generation translators. But oddly enough, Legge called each large division a “Book”, and subdivisions within each “Book” a “chapter”. While domesticating the title for the entire work, Legge transliterated the title for each “Book”. For the proper names, person’s names in particular, Legge also took both free translations and transliterations. For example, the word zi (子) in the word group zi yue (子曰) denotes Kong Zi (孔子), the great
teacher and master, and Legge rendered it as The Master all through the book; when it comes to a student of Confucius, You Zi (有子), Legge changed to the format of “generic term plus transliteration” thence “the philosopher Yú”; but to other disciples, such as Zi Qin (子禽) and Zi Gong (子贡), Legge simply transliterated them as Tsze-ch' in and Tsze-kung. He explained the difference in the annotations. In addressing person, when the word zi used alone, it refers to Confucius, but the direct rendition of Confucius would “miss the indication which it gives of the handiwork of his disciples and the reverence which it bespeaks for him”; of all disciples of Confucius, only two of them were addressed with the word zi put after the surnames, i.e., You Zi (有子) and Zeng Zi (曾子), which implies a position higher than the rest disciples, and in this case, the word zi is equal to the English “Mr.” and may be rendered as “the philosopher”, “the scholar”, “the teacher”, or simply leave it untranslated.\[30\]

Driven by similar aims and influenced by the same religious ideology, the first three English translators of Lun Yu share many features in common, most revealing in their interventionist approach to the original text as evidenced either in translation proper or in the paratexts that directly or implicitly depreciates Confucianism while extolling Christianity.\[51\]

To begin with, the English translations of some terms concerning religious beliefs are most exemplary. The Chinese the notion of tian (天) assumes something both natural and supernatural, the derivative concepts of which, for instance, tian li (天理), (the natural principle or law) applicable to the first case and tian ming (天命, destiny) to the second. This notion is also occasionally mentioned in lun yu. Here are two examples:

唯天为大，唯尧则之。 (8:19)

Vast and extensive, —equaled only by heaven. (Collie)

It is only Heaven that is grand, and only Yao corresponds to it. (Legge)

Both Collie and Legge related the Chinese tian to the Christianized heaven and showed, in their comments, contempt to Confucius’ equating Yao, a legendary ruler in ancient China, to their reverent heaven. Collie dismissed such an equation as “extravagant, unmeaning blasphemous” and Legge described it as “sufficiently absurd”.

The second problematic Chinese notion is shen (神), which also poses great challenge to the Chinese translation of Bible. Marshman rendered shen as deity,
Collie as God or gods, but Legge as "spirits" or "spiritual beings" since he believed that the Chinese notions such as Ti (帝) or Shang Ti (上帝) was equivalent to the Christian God and that shens were subjects of Shangti, like the subordination of spirits to God the only supreme being. By such equations, James Legge constructed a sort of monotheism within ancient Chinese culture and proved the universality of Christianity.

Another feature of Legge's English version of *lun yu* is his summary of main idea for each "Book". The Chinese original is made up of many axiom-style quotations and comments which are loosely categorized into different volumes, each of which is given a very succinct caption. Legge provides, in the annotation part, readers with a summary indicating the central theme of the whole "Book", either in the form of phrases or of complete sentences; to differ itself from the rest exegetical notes, the summary is printed in capital letters and placed at the very beginning.

(4) Legge's Principle of Translating

Like any pro-fidelity translator, Legge also advertises faithfulness to the original as his primary objective. In the preface to the 1893 edition of CC1, Legge mentions his principle of translating in a third-person perspective:

He determined, however, on reflection to let it stand as it first occurred to him, his object has always been faithfulness to the original Chinese rather than grace of composition. Not that he is indifferent to the value of an elegant and idiomatic rendering in the language of the translation, and he hopes that he was able to combine in a considerable degree correctness of interpretation and acceptableness of style. [52]

Legge's faithfulness to the original is in reality challenged by the tension between correctness of interpretation and acceptableness of style, an innate contradiction to any translating. To expound his solution to the tension, he quotes some remarks by Mencius and prints them on the flyleaf of each volume of CC:

Therefore those who explain the Odes, may not insist on one term so as to do violence to a sentence, nor on a sentence so as to do violence to the general scope. They must try with their thoughts to meet that scope, and then we shall apprehend it.[53]

The Mencian hermeneutic principle identifies textual meaning with authorial intention and forges a far-reaching convention for ancient Chinese commentators. On the one hand, Legge does follow a close step to the original, preserving its syntax and rhetoric, to the extent that "virtually every Chinese character or phrase can find its place in Legge's translation"[54]. On the other hand, based on his confidence in Chinese philological knowledge and modernist judgment and driven
by his missionary ideology, he adds lengthy as well as pedantic annotations to the translation proper, leaving his translation a general impression of “a fetish of literalness”\(^{[55]}\), and himself a “pundit with a very learned but dead knowledge of Chinese books”\(^{[56]}\).

IV. Impacts of the Missionary Translation Projects

As a process of linguistic transcoding, translating involves a game of transport from homogeneity to heterogeneity, conveying only fragments of meaning, be it in a displaced geographical and cultural milieu\(^{[57]}\); as one of the procedures in a translational action, translating strategy is subject to the mission of the action\(^{[58]}\); as a form of reading and interpreting, translating is inevitably governed by the translator’s vision and legitimate prejudice\(^{[59]}\); as products of intercultural negotiations, translations are the cultural facts of the target system, whose meaning or function is irrespective to the source system\(^{[60]}\). All such ideas are alternative expressions of the existence and mechanism of creative treason in translation, owing to which translations stand in their own right, generating new possibilities and functioning in new ways.

Given this rationale, the missionary translational actions had produced a result deviant, if not totally opposite, to their initial attempt to assist in converting heathens. The translated works on the one hand and the accessory apparatus like modern press on the other have contributed to disenchantment of religious teaching and simultaneous changes in world view and intellectual mentality. In other words, they have spurred on, to some extent, enthusiasm for political reform and cultural modernity.

Specifically, while bringing some converts, the religious translations, especially the biblic stories, provided new motifs, new subject matters and new narration for traditional literary creation that was under great “anxiety of influence”. Many famous writers in the early 20\(^{th}\) century, for instance, Lu Xun, Zhou Zuoren, Ba Jin, Mao Dun, Bin Xin and Xu Dishan, to name but a few, were either graduates from church schools or readers of missionary translations, and traces of Christian influence in their works are very evident. Not only the missionary translations, but their translational actions and they themselves became topics in several fictions. In the forty-third chapter of the novel *Ershinian Mudu zhi Guai Xianzhuang* (《二十年目睹之怪现状》, *Strange Things Observed over the Past Twenty Years*, 1903—1910) by Wu Jianren (吴趼人), the narrator, *Jiu Si Yi Sheng* (九死一生) by name,
harshly criticizes the Jiangnan Arsenal for its waste of money in employing so many foreigners (who were actually all missionaries) as translators, who, however, often make mistakes on such rudimentary items as historical annals.\[61\]

Translated works of non-religious content exerted more immediate and greater influence on the Chinese intelligentsia. The military failure in the Opium Wars was attributed by some Chinese observers to their ignorance of the conditions of their enemies, which gave rise to an enthusiasm for compiling books about foreign geography, institutions and history. It happened that missionaries had translated a large number of such works and they were naturally taken as primary sources for the Chinese geographic compilations, two most famous representatives of which were *Haiguo Tuzhi* (《海国图志》, *Illustrated Treatise on the Maritime Kingdoms*) and *Yinghuan Zhilue* (《瀛环志略》, *A Short Account of the Maritime Circuit*) whose influence reached as far as Japan.

Translations of science and technology were closely related to the Self-Strengthening projects launched from 1860s. Dismayed at China’s overall defeat by the Western powers, a few liberal officials advocated learning Western technologies and several Western-style factories were set up to manufacture guns, warships and the like. Affiliated to such factories were some translation agencies where bilingual foreigners, exclusively missionaries, were employed to translate technological materials. Schools were also set up to train native interpreters and diplomats, and more than half of the teaching staff were missionaries, who often participated in translating foreign textbooks. The missionary presses, schools and organizations for public ends were also engaged in all sorts of translation projects. Though far from being systematic, their translated knowledge about physics, chemistry, engineering, mining, medicine and so on, served as an initial cornerstone for modern education. Of course, in these agencies the missionaries also translated works concerning humanities and social sciences, which were more attractive to general readers than those of science and technology.

On the part of the Chinese audience, the translated information was strange and difficult to understand, but curiosity was stirred up. The significance of such translations lies rather in the new conceptions they introduce than in knowledge itself. From Sui Dynasty (581—619) onward, the only way out for Chinese scholars was to be selected as government officials after passing the royal examinations, the content of which was restricted to Confucian texts and histories. But in late Qing period, the collapsing bureaucracy system, together with social
riots as well as foreign intrusion, destroyed part of the scholars’ normal businesses on the one hand and predicted a dooming future for the nation on the other, to which the idea of reform and change was a spontaneous response. The translated conceptions provided timely intellectual resources for the reformers to cope with emerging crisis. The translated terms began to appear not only in the scholars’ daily speeches but in their works; many reformers openly or implicitly borrowed the missionary discourses on economical, political and institutional reforms\(^{62}\), but automatically filtered the imposed links between Christianity and national strength.

Deriving from translated conceptions, opinions concerning reform and even revolution was a practice conducted from the late 19\(^{th}\) century well into the 20\(^{th}\) century. Basing on such observations, some scholars promulgated the proposition of “translated modernity” of China as an alternative discourse to the Western theory of modernization\(^{63}\), but they confined their vision to the century and overlooked the fact that many translated conceptions were first produced by the missionaries and their Chinese assistants in a long span of more than fifty years in the preceding century.

As for the missionary translation projects from Chinese, they contributed largely to the formation of a new research field, viz., sinology, as a supplementary to the existing Oriental Studies. Sinology at this phase is also known as missionary sinology, implying it is only an initial stage of the prospective professional research. As evidenced in many recent studies, the missionary translational actions of oriental languages are, far from being objective and purely academic as claimed to be, subject to and part of the colonial cause of image construction.
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