

Introduction

Bernhard FUEHRER

At the beginning stage of language learning, conversation tends to revolve around practical matters, but, at a more advanced stage, a meaningful and productive exchange of ideas, knowledge, and spiritual values becomes possible. Where the word “exchange” is taken in the literal sense, it requires a dialogue in which both sides participate (equally) as donors and recipients, to create an environment in which mutual understanding becomes feasible. Any such dialogue demands considerable linguistic and cultural competence.

With the early encounters between Western missionaries and China taking place within China and her cultural sphere, the task of acquiring linguistic competence is often described as a one-sided one, with the established narratives keeping suspiciously silent about the local informants, instructors, collaborators, and interpreters on whom missionaries and merchants often relied with limited capability to verify the accuracy of what interpreters made of their words.

After Francis Xavier (1506–1552) recognized the necessity of learning local languages in order to convey the mission’s message to the Japanese, it was Alessandro Valignano (1536–1606)—the Jesuit Visitor to the Indies (1573–1603) with his vision of missionaries who mastered the language and adapted themselves to Japanese customs and etiquette—who sent the first young Jesuit to China to learn the language.¹ Michele Ruggieri’s

¹ On Valignano and the early Jesuit mission in Japan, see J. F. Moran, *The Japanese and the Jesuits: Alessandro Valignano in Sixteenth-century Japan* (London: Routledge, 1993) and Adolfo Tamburello et al., eds., *Alessandro Valignano S. I.: Uomo del Rinascimento: Ponte tra Oriente e Occidente* [Alessandro Valignano S. I.: A Renaissance man: Bridge between East and West] (Rom: Institutum Historicum Societas Iesu, 2008).

(1543–1607) engagement with the language and—given the curriculum he followed—with Confucianism made him an outstanding figure amongst the early European missionaries and the first to follow a learning strategy that not only focused on the language but also implied exposure to Zhu Xi’s 朱熹 (1130–1200) *Si shu* 四書 (Four books).² Bearing in mind that the task of missionaries was not to study indigenous belief systems but to propagate their spiritual values and to convert members of the local community, the inclusion of the *Si shu* in this learning process was significant or, as Hans Waldenfels put it, “revolutionary” in missionary thinking.³ The *Si shu*, a primer at the very heart of the traditional Chinese path to literacy and learning, offered insights into a specific world view, set of mind, philosophy, and religion that provided missionaries with the basic knowledge that any intellectual engagement with educated locals would

2 For a concise description, see Claudia von Collani, “China: Die Chinamission von 1520–1630” [China: China mission 1520–1630], in vol. 8 of *Die Geschichte des Christentums. Religion, Politik, Kultur* [The history of Christianity: Religion, politics, culture], ed. J.-M. Mayer et al. (Freiburg: Herder, 1992), pp. 933–956. As he was stationed in Macao whilst embarking on his lonely language learning exercise, Ruggieri who started out learning Nanjing Mandarin, found it difficult to identify suitable local language instructors in his primarily Cantonese speaking surroundings. It was only in summer 1582 that, upon return to Macao, he found himself in the company of Francesco Pasio (1554–1612) and Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) and in an environment that was more beneficial to the diligent study of Chinese language and culture. On Ruggieri, his curriculum, and his language studies, see Yu Liu, “The True Pioneer of the Jesuit China Mission: Michele Ruggieri,” *History of Religions* 50, no. 4 (2011), pp. 362–383. For some recent work on Ricci, see Po-chia Hsia, *A Jesuit in the Forbidden City: Matteo Ricci (1552–1610)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), and Isabelle Landry-Deron, ed., *La Chine des Ming et de Matteo Ricci (1552–1610). Le Premier Dialogue des Savoirs avec l’Europe* [China of the Ming and of Matteo Ricci (1552–1610). The first dialogue of knowledge with Europe] (Paris: Éditions de Cerf/Institut Ricci, 2013).

3 Hans Waldenfels, “The Jesuits’ Mission in China and Its Significance for the Time Thereafter” (unpublished paper presented at the International Conference Europe Meets China. China Meets Europe held in Bonn, 10–12 May 2012), p. 4. Unfortunately this paper is not included in the proceedings of this conference, Shu-Jyuan Deiwiks, Bernhard Fuehrer, and Therese Geulen, eds., *Europe Meets China. China Meets Europe* (St. Augustin: Institut Monumenta Serica, 2014).

have required. In terms of missionary history, this was the beginning of what would later be described as “accommodation” or “inculturation” by Catholics, and “contextualization” by Protestants.

Whereas the first pioneers relied on indigenous material that they often studied as autodidacts or that was taught in a way that we may describe as linguistic and cultural immersion, subsequent generations of early learners of Chinese languages profited from vocabulary lists, primers, draft translations, grammars, and dictionaries which were compiled by their predecessors and circulated in draft manuscript copies.⁴ However, these manuscript wordlists, dictionaries, phrasebooks, and grammars were notoriously “difficult to obtain, tedious to copy, expensive to purchase, and highly coveted by scholars.”⁵ Notwithstanding the practical inconveniences of early Western language material on Chinese languages and despite some notable exceptions, for centuries to come the main texts used in the linguistic and cultural curriculum remained based primarily on the traditional selection of texts through which education was delivered in late imperial China.

Long after the capital was moved to Peking under Emperor Yongle 永樂 (r. 1402–1424), Nanjing remained the cultural centre during the Ming period (1368–1644), and the pronunciations associated with Nanjing coined the Mandarin (*guanhua* 官話) that most learners would have acquired in those days.⁶ This emphasis on Nanjing Mandarin can

4 It is worth noting that Ruggieri initiated the compilation of a first dictionary (1598) that was later published under the names of Matteo Ricci, Lazzaro Cattaneo (1560–1640), and Sébastian Fernandes (1591–1622). On the various manuscripts of the earliest grammar, written by Martino Martini (1614–1661) and presented to scholars in 1653, see Giuliano Bertucciolo (1923–2001), “Martino Martini’s *Grammata Sinica*,” *Monumenta Serica* 51 (2003), pp. 629–640. After these pioneering efforts it took the language learning community—missionaries and laymen—quite some time until Francisco Varo (1627–1687) published his grammar *Arte de la Lengua Mandarina* in 1703, and it took even longer until Basilio Brollo da Gemonà’s (1648–1704) dictionary (1696–1699) was finally published as *Dictionnaire Chinois, Français et Latin* in Paris in 1813 under the name of Chrétien-Louis-Joseph de Guignes (1759–1845).

5 Bertucciolo, “Martino Martini’s *Grammata Sinica*,” p. 629.

6 For some of the characteristics of Nanjing Mandarin, see W. South Coblin, “A Diachronic Study of Ming Guanhua Phonology,” *Monumenta Serica* 48 (2000), pp. 267–335.

be gauged from the writings of Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) and Nicolas Trigault (1577–1628), as well as from early learning aids such as Francisco Varo’s (1627–1687) grammar *Arte de la Lengua Mandarin* (1703; completed in 1682) or his *Vocabulario de la Lengua Mandarin*.⁷ And even during the Qing period (1644–1911) the majority of works by missionaries active in central and southern China such as Joseph Prémare’s (1666–1736) *Notitia Linguae Sinicae* (1831; completed c.1730) or Robert Morrison’s (1782–1834) *Dictionary of the Chinese Language* (printed 1815–1823) showed a tendency to adhere to pronunciations associated with Nanjing.⁸ As W. South Coblin observed, it was only in the mid-nineteenth century that a new group of language specialists, primarily consisting of members of the British diplomatic and consular services, advocated the use of Peking Mandarin.⁹ At around the same time, we observe that, in addition to learning Mandarin, the acquisition of regional languages was identified as a necessity to propagate spiritual values, to convert members of the local communities, to trade, and to deal with daily life in southern China. Southern Hokkien and Cantonese were an integral part of the language

-
- 7 On the language described by Varo, see W. South Coblin, “Francisco Varo and the Sound System of Early Qing Mandarin,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 118, no. 2 (1998), pp. 262–267.
- 8 Much has been written about Morrison but for an excellent recent contribution, see Christopher A. Daily, *Robert Morrison and the Protestant Plan for China* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2013), which discusses Morrison’s endeavours as an attempt to implement educational guidelines he received at the missionary college in Gosport from David Bogue (1750–1825). On his dictionary, see Timothy H. Barrett, “A Bicentenary in Robert Morrison’s Scholarship on China and His Significance for Today,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 25, no. 4 (2015), pp. 705–717.
- 9 See W. South Coblin, “A Brief History of Mandarin,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 120, no. 4 (2000), pp. 537–552, esp. 539–540. Note also that W. South Coblin, “Phonological Notes on a Variety of Eighteenth-century Standard Chinese,” *Monumenta Serica* 55 (2007), pp. 439–446 and W. South Coblin, “On the Origin of the Eighteenth-century ‘Dictionarium Sinico-Latinum,’” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129, no. 1 (2009), pp. 113–114 show this dictionary, which may date from the Yongzheng 雍正 period (1722–1735), as an early example of lexical work which primarily records southern Nanjing pronunciations with some characteristics of northern Peking Mandarin pronunciations.

training established in Malacca and Batavia;¹⁰ and learning Cantonese would have been a natural option in Macao and Hong Kong. Though the Qing court tried to establish Mandarin as a *lingua franca*, Canton and some of the southern Hokkien-speaking areas resisted these pressures and continued reading and teaching the traditional curriculum, including the Confucian canon, in their languages. Foreign language learners in those areas were thus exposed to the use of regional languages not only in everyday activities but also in intellectual endeavours that went far beyond the typical realm in which colloquial languages were used. A list of missionaries and scholars who engaged in lexicographical and grammatical descriptions of regional languages reads like a “Who’s who” of the foreign community in China in those days. Robert Morrison’s pioneering *Vocabulary of the Canton Dialect* (1828), Elijah Coleman Bridgman’s (1801–1861) *Chinese Chrestomathy in the Canton Dialect* (1841), and Ernst Johann (Ernest John) Eitel’s (1838–1908) *Chinese Dictionary in the Cantonese Dialect* (1877), which was based on Samuel Wells Williams’ (1812–1884) glossary *Tonic Dictionary of the Chinese Language in the Canton Dialect* (1856), attest to the newly recognized need for proficiency in regional languages, the acquisition of which soon became an integral part of the linguistic training.¹¹ Similarly, Walter Henry Medhurst’s (1796–1857) *Dictionary of the Hok-Kèen Dialect* (1832), Carstairs Douglas’ (1830–1877) *Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy* (1873), and Elihu Doty’s (1809–1864) *Anglo-Chinese Manual with Romanized Colloquial in the Amoy*

¹⁰ On language training in Malacca, see Brian Harrison, *Waiting for China: The Anglo-Chinese College at Malacca, 1818–1843, and Early Nineteenth-century Missions* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1979).

¹¹ For an interesting compendium of pronunciations that facilitates the switching between regional languages, see Samuel Wells Williams, *Syllabic Dictionary of the Chinese Language: Arranged According to the Wu-fang Yuen Yin, with the Pronunciation of the Characters as Heard in Peking, Canton, Amoy, and Shanghai* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1889). Samuel Wells Williams (1812–1884) was an American missionary, interpreter, diplomat, and influential author on China who wrote extensively on the Cantonese language; cf. also Samuel Wells Williams, *Easy Lessons in Chinese: Or Progressive Exercises to Facilitate the Study of That Language, Especially Adapted to the Canton Dialect* (Macao: Office of the China Repository, 1842).

Dialect (1853) reflect the fundamental shift of missionary activities caused by the strengthening of the Protestant mission.¹² As missionaries set up language programmes in various parts of China, the increased production of language teaching material ensured more effective language training and a swift implementation of their educational and evangelical mission. Though written primarily by missionaries for missionaries, the lexical and grammatical descriptions of languages and their variants also aimed at the wider community of those who wished to engage with the Chinese languages so as to enable them to conduct their business in China.

In terms of historical linguistics, this teaching material provides invaluable insights into the linguistic development of and the interaction between Chinese languages and their variants. In more practical terms, it provided subsequent generations of language learners with tools that enabled them to efficiently acquire the proficiency required for the job that is a precondition for intercultural exchanges, i.e. the task to translate between languages and cultures.

As a consequence of the dramatic shifts in the political landscape during the nineteenth century, the complex diplomatic relations between China and European powers required a substantial quantity of trustworthy translators and interpreters able to deal with the urgent necessity for intricate negotiations between conflicting interests. With the number of potential candidates trained in private commercial establishments soon identified as insufficient, the growing need for solid translator and interpreter training was ascertained as a policy matter of vital importance, a development that led to the establishment of language training facilities for future officers of the foreign and colonial services, and to the institutional recognition of the study of Chinese languages (and cultures) in academia throughout Europe.¹³

12 For remarks on some of the early descriptions of southern Hokkien, see Bernhard Fuehrer and Niki Alford, “Carstairs Douglas (1830–1877) and His *Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy* (1873),” *Journal of Translation Studies* (forthcoming).

13 On the British endeavours to establish the translator and interpreter training for the Foreign Office and for the Colonial Office, see Uganda Sze Pui Kwan 關詩珮, “Fanyi zhengzhi yu Hanxue zhishi de shengchan: Wei Tuoma yu Yingguo waijiaobu de

Many of those who received training in structured language programmes in China (or even in Europe) later became eminent diplomats, scholars, and chair holders in academic institutions, yet the nineteenth century still saw a considerable number of Sinologists—most of them stationed in Europe with little chance of travelling to China—who mastered Chinese languages through essentially self-taught studies. Together with those who accomplished their linguistic skills *in situ*, they formed an ever increasing group of language specialists who acted as negotiators of colonial interests and—via their translations from texts of cultural significance—as mediators between cultures.¹⁴ Following traditional European language learning

Zhongguo xuesheng yiyuan jihua (1843–1870) 翻譯政治與漢學知識的生產：威妥瑪與英國外交部的中國學生譯員計畫 (1843–1870)” [The politics of translation and the production of Sinology: Sir Thomas Francis Wade and the student interpreter programme (1843–1870)], *Zhongyang yanjiuyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo jikan* 中央研究院近代史研究所季刊 [Bulletin of the Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica] 81 (2013), pp. 1–52; Uganda Sze Pui Kwan, “Daying diguo, Hanxue, fanyi: Li Yage yu Xianggang fanyiguan xuesheng jihua 大英帝國、漢學、翻譯：理雅各與香港翻譯官學生計畫” [British Empire, Sinology and translation: James Legge and the interpreter cadetship in Hong Kong (1860–1900)], *Fanyishi yanjiu* 翻譯史研究 [Studies in translation history] 2 (2012), pp. 59–101; and Uganda Sze Pui Kwan, “A Requisite of Such Vital Importance: The Want of Chinese Interpreters in the First Anglo Chinese War 1839–1842,” in *On Translation History*, vol. 3 of *Towards a History of Translating: In Commemoration of the 40th Anniversary of the Research Centre for Translation, CUHK*, ed. Lawrence Wang-chi Wong (Hong Kong: Research Centre for Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2013), pp. 389–417. For similar attempts set up by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, see Georg Lehner, “Chinesisch für den auswärtigen Dienst: Zwei Dolmetsch-Eleven an der k.u.k. Gesandtschaft in Beijing in den Jahren 1897–1900” [Chinese for the foreign service: Two student interpreters at the imperial delegation in Beijing, 1897–1900], *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Staatsarchivs* [Communications of the Austrian state archive] 46 (1998), pp. 107–124.

¹⁴ For translators as mediators in conflict situations, see Mona Baker, *Translation and Conflict. A Narrative Account* (London: Routledge, 2006). Cf. also Lawrence Wang-chi Wong, “The Translators/Interpreters in the Opium War between Britain and China, 1839–1942,” in *Translating and Interpreting Conflict*, ed. Myriam Salama-Carr (Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2007), pp. 41–60, and Uganda Sze Pui Kwan, “Fanyi yu tiaojie chongtu: Di yi ci yipian zhanzheng de Yingfang yizhe Fei Lun 翻譯與調解衝突：第一次鴉片戰爭的英方譯者費倫 (Samuel T. Fearon, 1819–1854)” [Translation and resolving conflict: The first Opium War interpreter of

practices, translation of text material was considered an integral part of the language learning process. As the learning and teaching of Chinese languages was no exception in this respect, language learners produced substantial quantities of translations from Chinese texts. With the passage of time, the quality of published translations from Chinese texts improved, and the range of texts made available in translation widened.

Interpreters, in their roles as diplomatic go-betweens, had to navigate knotty issues of loyalty and, equally importantly, had to face up to questions regarding the linguistic accuracy, cultural suitability, and political correctness of their renditions.¹⁵ Differences in political persuasions among members of diplomatic and consular services often became transparent in how situations and terminologies were perceived and how potential avenues of translation were interpreted and evaluated.¹⁶ And even those who had no direct engagement in the conflict-laden discourse between political powers, but translated—in seemingly more innocent settings—from literary or philosophical works could hardly escape the limitations that dominant perceptions of China, her population, and her cultural heritage had established. Though the large majority of translations prepared by early Sinologists is nowadays of primarily historical relevance, one of the most important features of the community of scholars who engaged with China in those days was the sheer rivalry and open animosity between individuals and factions that, often enough, clouded the judgement of translation work and the evaluation of contributions to the field.

* * *

the British Empire, Samuel T. Fearon (1819–1854)], *Zhongyang yanyuyuan jindaishi Yanjiusuo jikan* 76 (2012), pp. 41–80.

- 15 On the wider issues, see Ruth Roland, *Interpreters as Diplomats. A Diplomatic History of the Role of Interpreters in World Politics* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1999), and Lydia H. Liu, *Tokens of Exchange. The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1999).
- 16 For recent publications on some of these perceptions, see Ross G. Forman, *China and the Victorian Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), and Peter J. Kitson, *Forging Romantic China. Sino-British Cultural Exchange 1760–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

This volume brings together selected proceedings from two conferences that aimed at merging the study of the history of Sinology with translation studies through extensive archive studies and a focus on translation hermeneutics. The first of these conferences, titled “Sinologists as Translators in the 17–19th Centuries” was organized by the Research Centre for Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) and held at CUHK in October 2011. The second conference was sponsored by the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange and took place at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in London in June 2013 under the same title but with an additional focus on “Archives and Context.”

Both conferences focused on the historical context of contributions by early Sinologists and their translations of works in Chinese. In particular they aimed at exploring why certain works were chosen for translation in those particular historical moments, how they were interpreted, translated, or even manipulated, and what impact they made. The conferences also examined the ways in which such translation activities helped to establish the discipline of Sinology in various countries. Most importantly, we were keen to investigate the relation between translation and base text (including Chinese reading traditions or commentaries and editions), translation hermeneutics, and exegetical aspects of translations from Chinese. Further to this, we aimed to explore translator and interpreter training and reference material such as dictionaries in order to reconstruct the wider historical and intellectual context from which certain translations emerged, and to further deepen insights and expand the field through historical and intellectual contextualization and extensive use of hitherto overlooked archive material so as to open up fresh avenues and cover aspects of interest that may have been neglected in previous studies.

A second series of papers presented at these two conferences is to be published in the *Journal of Translation Studies*. Timothy H. Barrett’s keynote lecture, delivered at SOAS under the title “The Importation of Religion into China: Some Protestant Prehistory,” investigates how British Protestant translators, even if working from the Greek New Testament, dealt with passages where the King James Version of the Bible used the English term “religion.” Bernhard Fuehrer and Niki Alsford, using primarily archive

material, discuss the biography and achievements of Carstairs Douglas (1830–1877), a missionary of the Presbyterian Church of England at Amoy (Xiamen), and provide an appraisal of his *Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy* (1873). Uganda Sze Pui Kwan looks into diplomatic deception and mistranslation of the Treaty of Nanking and George Thomas Staunton's (1781–1859) role in the institutionalization of Chinese Studies in London. Thierry Meynard, as part of his ongoing work on the *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (1687), discusses the Jesuits' translation of the *Zhongyong* 中庸 (Doctrine of mean) from the point of view of Western spirituality. He demonstrates how the early missionaries selected a specific reading among those available in the Chinese hermeneutical tradition and how their interpretation was partly shaped by Stoic and Christian spiritualities. Richard J. Smith, in his paper on Albert Terrien de LaCouperie (1845–1894), the *Yijing* 易經 (Book of changes), and the debates in Europe and Asia over Western origins of the Chinese civilization, discusses a scholar who not only played a significant role in the nineteenth-century debates in Europe over the provenance of the Book of Changes, but who also influenced in very significant ways the discourse about “race” in late Qing China (including Taiwan) and Meiji Japan. At the conference at SOAS in 2013 Patricia Sieber discussed Peter Perring Thoms (1790–1855) and the genesis of a Chinacentric Sinology. As this paper has meanwhile been published elsewhere,¹⁷ our series in the *Journal of Translation Studies* will include her more recent research on Carl Friedrich Neumann (1793–1870), a Bavarian scholar, who visited Guangzhou in 1830/1831 with the express purpose of building a Chinese collection. Sieber's paper examines the political implications of that traffic in books and translations with regard to imperial (China), imperialist (Britain), and revolutionary politics (Bavaria).

With the exception of the contributions by Wolfgang Behr and Claudia von Collani which were presented at SOAS in 2013, all the papers in this volume were first delivered at CUHK in 2011.

17 See Patricia Sieber, “Universal Brotherhood Revisited: Peter Perring Thoms (1790–1855), Artisan Practices, and the Genesis of a Chinacentric Sinology,” *Representations* 130 (2015), pp. 28–59.