

Introduction

Bernhard Fuehrer

School of Oriental and African Studies, UK

After publishing a first bundle of papers on this project in *Sinologists as Translators in the Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries*, we take great pleasure in making available a further six papers from our “Sinologists as Translators” project in this special issue of the *Journal of Translation Studies* 翻譯學報.¹ This project culminated in two conferences. The first “Sinologists as Translations in the 17th to 19th Centuries” conference was organized by the Research Centre for Translation at The Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) and held at CUHK in October 2011. A follow-up conference was held at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in June 2013 under the same title but with an additional focus on “Archives and Context.” Early drafts of the papers published here were presented at the second conference at SOAS in London.²

In recent years, the famous Jesuit translation of three of the *Four Books*, the *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus* (1687), has been the subject of a number of major contributions by Thierry Meynard whose paper here focuses on the Jesuits’ understanding and translation of the *Zhongyong* 中庸.³ Meynard discusses the problems encountered by the Jesuit translators who had to balance philological and philosophical requirements against the intellectual foundations of missionary strategies, while at the same time achieving their goal to unfold a Confucian spirituality in the light of Zhang Juzheng’s 張居正 (1525–1582) lectures on the *Four Books* which functioned as their exegetical guide within the Chinese tradition.

Since the acquisition of the Manning Archive by the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland in 2015, we have access to substantial material that fills in gaps in our knowledge of the activities of the early British explorer Thomas Manning (1772–1840), his travels to China, India and Tibet, his endeavours to master the Chinese language, to act as an interpreter, and to establish Chinese language teaching in Britain. With

plenty of references to material in this archive, Lawrence Wang-chi Wong retraces the activities of one of the widely overlooked figures in early Sino-British relations.

Techniques and practices of nineteenth century Anglophone translators are often discussed with reference to examples such as whether *zongjiao* 宗教 is a suitable translation for “religion” or whether *yi* 夷 should be read as “barbarian” or simply as “foreigner.” Focusing on translations into Chinese, T. H. Barrett looks at Anglophone translators, including their options in the target language and the choices they took, their readings of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, their preferences for and familiarity with diverging versions of the Bible, and the way in which they engaged with terminological precedents in Chinese literary and religious material, and scholarly traditions in China.

Largely using archive material, Niki Alsford and Bernhard Fuehrer trace the life of the Scottish missionary Carstairs Douglas (1830–1877) from Kilbarchan, Renfrewshire, to Amoy (Xiamen 廈門) where he became one of the leading figures of the local mission, and where he died of cholera and was buried at the foreign cemetery on Gulangyu 鼓浪嶼.⁴ Alsford and Fuehrer also provide an evaluation of the pioneering dictionary of the Amoy dialect of Southern Hokkien (Minnanyu 閩南語) by Douglas, a trusted reference work and linguistic guide that quickly established itself as a *vademecum* for missionaries in Fujian and on Taiwan.

Uganda Sze-Pui Kwan discusses the role of George Thomas Staunton (1781–1859) as an unassuming patron of Chinese Studies in Britain. She emphasizes his commitment and contributions to establishing the first Chinese programmes in England, and to setting up professorships in Chinese at University College London and at King’s College London. Heavily based on archive work, this paper sheds light on Staunton’s role in early attempts to establish institutionalized Chinese Studies in England, and the lack of support he and his plans received from the British Empire.

Having worked on the *Yijing* 易經 for many years, Richard J. Smith discusses the debates in Europe and East Asia on the Western origins of Chinese civilization, a hypothesis emphasised by Albert Étienne Jean-Baptiste Terrien de Lacouperie (1845–1894) in his work on the *Yijing* and elsewhere. In addition to examining Terrien de Lacouperie’s reading of the *Yijing*, Smith explores the reception of his hypothesis (or parts of it) in Japan and China and how these ideas were instrumentalized by Chinese intellectuals from the early 1900s onwards.

Finally, I wish to express my gratitude to the Chiang Ching-kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange who made possible the conference at SOAS in 2013 with a generous grant. I also wish to thank the editors and staff of the *Journal of Translation Studies* for their patience with these papers. Without their unfailing support and assistance, the publication of these six papers in the current format would not have been possible.

Notes

- 1 For those papers and further information on the project see Lawrence Wang-chi Wong and Bernhard Fuehrer (eds.), *Sinologists as Translators in the Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2016).
- 2 With the exception of Lawrence Wang-chi Wong's paper on Manning, which was first presented at the "Translators in the Making of Chinese Translation History: The First International Conference on Chinese Translation History" on 17–19 December 2015 at The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- 3 In addition to his various papers on this subject, Thierry Meynard's two most notable monographs on the early Jesuit translations are *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus (1687): The First Translation of the Confucian Classics* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2011) and *The Jesuit Reading of Confucius: The First Complete Translation of the Lunyu (1687) Published in the West* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).
- 4 Although there has been increased interest in the local history of Gulangyu Island in recent years, neither the journal *Gulangyu yanjiu* 鼓浪嶼研究 nor the book series *Gulangyu lishi wenhua xilie* 鼓浪嶼歷史文化系列, appears to carry any major contribution on Douglas and his activities as a missionary or as a lexicographer of Southern Hokkien.