

# Encounters with the Remote and Strange: Protestant Missionaries in China as Translators of the *Dao De Jing*

**Artea Panajotović**

Alfa BK University

## Povzetek

Več tisoč protestantskih misionarjev iz Evrope in Severne Amerike je med leti 1807 in 1953 živelo in delovalo na Kitajskem. Njihova poglavitna naloga je bila širitev krščanstva, poleg tega pa so pomembno vplivali tudi na izmenjavo medkulturnih stikov med Vzhodom in Zahodom. V pričujočem prispevku orišemo obseg dela protestantskih misionarjev, pri čemer se še posebej osredotočamo na njihovo prevajalsko dejavnost, v nadaljevanju pa predstavimo angleške prevode Laozijevega dela *Dao De Jing* prevajalcev Johna Chalmersa (1868), Jamesa Leggea (1891) in Dwighta Goddarda (1919 in 1939).

Pri analizi prevodov primerjamo naslove, uvodne besede prevajalcev ter angleške ekvivalente za nekatere temeljne koncepte daoizma ter nekatere druge kulturne reference v izvirniku. Ob primerjavi diahronih vzorcev podomačitvene in potujitvene strategije in prevajalčevega odnosa do izvirnika je namen raziskave ugotoviti, v kolikšni meri ti elementi odražajo spremembe v zahodni perspektivi in misijonarskem delu, ki je potekalo na prelomu stoletja.

**Ključne besede:** misionarji, potujitvena strategija, podomačitvena strategija, John Chalmers, James Legge, Dwight Goddard

## 摘要

1807至1953年间，数千名基督新教传教士自欧洲、北美来到中国生活和工作。除了传播基督教的首要任务外，这些传教士在东西方文化交流方面亦起到了重要作用。本文立足对新教传教士，特别是学者型传教士的工作范围及其译著的介绍；并以此为基础，着眼于老子《道德经》的四个译本，即：湛约翰 (*John Chalmers*) 的1868年译本，理雅各 (*James Legge*) 的1891年译本，德怀特·戈达德 (*Dwight Goddard*) 的1919年及1939年译本，着重比较上述译本在标题选择、译者简介以及对《道德经》原文中哲学、文化基本概念的英译这三方面的异同。通过确定其中归化和异化的历时模式并考察不同译者的表达立场，从而考察上述因素所反应的西方观念之转变程度，以及传教士之工作在20世纪初所带来的观念转变程度。

**关键词：**学者型传教士，异化，归化，湛约翰，理雅各，德怀特·戈达德

## 0 INTRODUCTION

The nineteenth century witnessed the explosion of a peculiar form of migration – the waves of religious revival that swept through Europe and the United States sent hundreds of thousands of zealous evangelists on a journey to “benighted” and “heathen” parts of the world. Among their most prominent destinations was China with its unreached millions. The opening up of China was a long, complex and occasionally violent process, in which missionaries played a significant role. This paper deals with one aspect of their widely ramified work. After an overview of the broader cultural context and the significance of translation as one of the activities performed by the Protestant missionaries, the focus shifts to their English translations of the foundational text of Daoism, Laozi’s *Dao De Jing*. In a diachronic comparison of certain elements of these translations I then endeavour to ascertain whether and how exactly they reflect the paradigm shift characteristic of missionary work in China in general, from a strong emphasis on evangelizing to the more secularly-oriented activities that marked the beginning of the twentieth century. Translations of Daoist texts are particularly appropriate for such analysis because of the status of this religion-philosophy in the eyes of the West. Unlike Confucianism, China’s long-standing official ideology, whose basic tenets were closer to the principles of Christian ethics and could be brought into connection with them, the mysticism and elusiveness of the teaching of Dao, compounded by the extravagant and superstitious practices of Daoist folk religion, often resulted in dismissive attitudes towards this philosophy (Clarke 2000: 37–45). The encounter of the translator with a tradition so, in Max Müller’s words, “remote and strange” (Girardot 2002: 3), so foreign to the understanding of life, value system and basic beliefs of a Christian missionary, brings into focus the underlying assumptions both of the translator and the spirit of the time in which the translation was made. According to Kučič (2016:70) “large language cultures such as the Germanic, Romanic, Russian or Chinese try to reflect a part of their ideological power in their translations.”

## 1 PROTESTANT MISSIONARY ACTIVITY IN CHINA

Robert Morrison, the first Protestant missionary in China, set foot on the ground of Macao in 1807. Due to the strict anti-foreign policy of the empire, neither he nor the small number of pioneering missionaries who followed him in the decades to come would have much success in coming anywhere near achieving their goal, the Christianization of China. In *A New History of Christianity in China*, Daniel Bays (2012: 68) notes that in 1860, after more than fifty years

of missionary activity, there were barely a hundred missionaries in China. Only after the defeat of China in two Opium Wars in 1842 and 1860 was the entire territory of the country opened up, making it possible for foreigners to travel, settle and evangelize without let or hindrance. The great surge in the number of missionaries which followed the opening up of China also resulted in a diversification of their activities. Having focused initially on the very practical and rather exhausting tasks of finding language teachers (teaching Chinese to foreigners was forbidden on pain of death), translating and printing basic Christian texts, furtive preaching (Christianity was prohibited by law until 1844) to a small number of largely uninterested natives in the extremely limited areas of Macao and Canton, and not infrequently fighting for sheer survival, Western missionaries now had much greater opportunities. They started engaging in humanitarian and social work – numerous hospitals and educational institutions were established, as well as organizations for famine relief, for the rehabilitation of opium addicts, against foot-binding, etc. Scholarship became an important part of missionary work, developing in two directions – bringing the West to China and bringing China to the West. Thus, on the one hand, because of the practical needs of evangelism, linguistic and lexicographical work thrived, the missionaries developed writing systems for dialects that did not have a script and advances in Chinese printing were made. On the other hand, missionary scholarship progressed in the direction of acquiring knowledge and understanding of China, and sharing it with the Western world. Numerous publications from the pens of Protestant missionaries discussed Chinese history, geography, society, politics, culture, philosophy, religion, etc. In this way, missionary-scholars took on the role of agents of cultural exchange between East and West, substantially contributing to the understanding and study of Chinese culture in the West.<sup>1</sup>

Translation as “a primary mode of transcultural representation and interpretation” (Girardot 2002: 10) had an important place in this process. The amount and range of translations reflect the general direction and aims of missionary endeavour. Since the primary task was evangelization, the quantity of translations into Chinese by far exceeds translations into English. As one of the fundamental Protestant principles is *sola scriptura*, the translation work of Protestant missionaries in China was focused largely on the translation of the Bible into Chinese, and this was the only area of translation work in which missionary effort was coordinated and planned. Besides the Bible, a variety of Christian texts were translated, as were works needed for medical and educational missionary activities. All other types of texts are markedly less numerous.

The corpus of translations into English is significantly smaller. Missionaries translated the following types of works: (1) Chinese philosophical and religious

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that the scholarly work of Protestant missionaries was largely uncoordinated and depended almost exclusively on the personal choice and effort of individuals.

works. Unlike their Jesuit predecessors, who focused almost exclusively on Confucianism, Protestant translations were more or less equally distributed in their focus among the three Chinese religions. Even though the number of these translations is not great, their influence was considerable as they drew the attention of the Western scientific community to Chinese language and philosophy, which led in turn to the establishment of the first university departments for the Chinese language; (2) political texts, particularly during the period of the Republic (1912–1949); (3) fiction, especially fiction dealing with historic events in which missionaries were involved, such as the Boxer Rebellion or the Japanese occupation; (4) works of Chinese Christian leaders; and (5) some minority literature.

## 2 TRANSLATIONS OF THE *DAO DE JING*

Among the translations of philosophical-religious texts, the foundational text of Daoism, Laozi's *Dao De Jing*, holds a special place. Protestant missionaries in China produced as many as four English translations of this work,<sup>2</sup> making it the only Chinese text to generate so many versions by Protestant missionaries.<sup>3</sup> John Chalmers's<sup>4</sup> 1868 work was the first translation of this classic into the English language. The second version was made in 1891 by Prof. James Legge.<sup>5</sup> Finally, there are two translations by Dwight Goddard<sup>6</sup> – the first published in 1919 and the other in 1939.

The temporal distribution of the translations offers an opportunity of examining the extent to which the work of translators reflects the changes that the turn of the

2 The analysis covers translations by English-speaking missionaries who served in China, regardless of whether the translations themselves were made during their Chinese service or after it.

3 Such an interest in Laozi's text is not confined to missionaries. Written in the 6<sup>th</sup> century BCE and consisting of only 5000 Chinese characters, it is the second most translated book in the world after the Bible.

4 At the beginning of his forty-five years of missionary career, John Chalmers (1825–1899) worked with James Legge in Hong Kong (Cordier 1900: 67). While Legge translated the Confucian classics, Chalmers made the first translation of the *Dao De Jing* into English. He also had an important role in translating the Bible into Classical Chinese, and wrote several lexicographical publications and works on the Chinese language (Anderson 1999: 123).

5 James Legge (1815–1897) spent over thirty years as a missionary in China. In this period, he undertook the monumental task of translating the Chinese classics. Upon his return to England, Legge became the first Professor of Chinese at Oxford, where he remained until his death. There he joined Max Müller's project *The Sacred Books of the East*, and published his translations of Confucian classics together with the new translations of Daoist texts as *The Sacred Books of China*. During his long missionary and academic work, Legge authored numerous other translations, studies on religion (especially comparative) and the Chinese language, as well as Christian texts. Arguably, Legge is "the most important sinologist of the nineteenth century" (Lao 1994: iii).

6 Goddard (1861–1939) differed significantly from his predecessors. This American priest went to China in 1894. During his initial years as a missionary, "he became increasingly frustrated at the failure of the Christian missions to accomplish their spiritual goals. He was convinced that although the Christian propaganda had been successful in influencing educational and social conditions it had failed in its purely religious aspects" (Starry 1980: 3). This set him off on an onerous spiritual quest, which would eventually lead to his conversion to Zen Buddhism in 1928. Goddard is best known for his anthology *A Buddhist Bible* which contains his translations of the fundamental texts of Mahayana Buddhism.

century, when Victorian complacency and superiority gave way to a more open and sympathetic outlook, brought to the Western worldview and the missionary enterprise.<sup>7</sup> My hypothesis is that the translations, dependent on their historical context, will exhibit a diachronic shift from the strategy of domestication to foreignization and be progressively more devoid of Christian influence. The analysis first focuses on the translation of the title, and then on the examination of the translators' general attitude towards the text as expressed in their introductions and commentaries. It then moves on to the discussion of the translation of two key Daoist concepts, *dao* and *de*, and finally explores English equivalents provided for some of the cultural references in the text. The scope of the analysis is, thus, clearly limited: in its focus on the authors' attitudes and translation equivalents of individual concepts, it does not pretend to a comprehensive comparison of translations, nor does it take into account their relative quality, as this would by far exceed the scope of this text. It is, however, hoped that the exploration of the patterns of foreignization and domestication and the authors' expressed attitudes will provide a revealing perspective for a better appreciation of the complexity of the identities that the missionary enterprise produced.

## 2.1 Different approaches to the translation of the title

The name commonly used for Laozi's text is 道德經 (*Dao De Jing*). *Dao* and *de* are the key concepts of Daoist philosophy which have no equivalent Western terms, while *jing* means a classic. Chalmers's edition offers as many as four translations of the title: The cover reads *The Speculations of "the Old Philosopher" Lau Tsze*, the half title *Tau Teh King*, and the title page *The Speculations on Metaphysics, Polity, and Morality, of the Old Philosopher, Lau-tsze*. On the opening page, he offers yet another variant – "Tau Teh King; or the Classic of Tau and of Virtue." Legge's translation is published in the thirty-ninth volume of Max Müller's *Sacred Books of the East* series, together with the first part of Zhuangzi. The cover of the book reads *Sacred Books of the East: Texts of Taoism, Part I*. The title page of the publication is *The Sacred Books of China: The Texts of Taoism, Part I: the Tao Teh King; the Writings of Kwang-tze*. At the beginning of the translation, Legge gives "The Tao Teh King. Or the Tao and Its Characteristics." Both Goddard's versions are titled *Laotzu's Tao and Wu Wei*, and the opening page "Tao Teh King". (The term *wu wei*, a fundamental Daoist concept, is included in the name of the book as it is the title of Henri Borel's study of Laozi's philosophy, which accompanies Goddard's translation.)

<sup>7</sup> Goddard's unusual life is part of this cultural landscape. Although it can be argued that his second translation does not belong to the category of Protestant translations, its omission would be a deliberate simplification of the complex picture of missionary movement and identity.

All four translations incorporate the transliteration of the original into their titles, but they do this in different ways. Chalmers opts for creating a descriptive main title for his publication, in which he translates even Laozi's name (Old Philosopher), while Legge's choice is to echo the name of the Sacred Books series, relegating Laozi to the subtitle. This decision clearly was not a result of the publisher's editorial policy, since of the fifty volumes which make up the Sacred Books series, only Legge's translations were given a descriptive title, and all others are named after the texts they contain. Whereas both Chalmers and Legge provide a translation of the title of Laozi's text, the twentieth-century versions make a point of an exclusive use of transliterated Chinese terms. The diachronic movement from the strategy of domestication and striving towards making the title conform to the culture of the target language to the strategy of foreignization and retaining information from the source text is thus here clearly discernible.

## 2.2 Translators' introductions

All the translations come with introductions which provide valuable insight into the attitude of the translators towards the text. Chalmers gives a thirteen-page introduction in which he expresses his admiration for Laozi, calling him "*the* philosopher of China" (Chalmers 1868b: vii) and stating that "Confucius no doubt excelled all his contemporaries as a casuist, a ritualist, and a litterateur, but not more than Lau-tsze excelled him in depth and independence of thought" (ibid.). He gives an overall positive account of the "Old Philosopher," pointing to passages that could be interpreted in the Christian spirit and to the moral ideas in the book which are close to Christian virtues.

Legge includes a twenty-two-page preface and a forty-four-page introduction in his edition. His introduction is a work of serious scholarship, the result of a meticulous study of the history of the text, its extant and lost commentaries as well as contemporary scholarship on the subject, combined with his own thorough analysis. According to Julia Hardy (1998: 166), whereas he "avoided attempts to impose Christian theology onto [Laozi's] text", in both his introduction and commentaries which accompany each chapter he "made his sympathies clear and proclaimed Lao-tzu wrong about many things about which Christian doctrine was right, not actually interpreting the text but simply measuring it against preconceived standards" (ibid.). Similarly to Chalmers, he emphasizes Laozi's morality as the most valuable aspect of his philosophy: In his comment to the line "(It is the way of the Tao) to recompense injury with kindness," for example, Legge (1962a: 107) states: "[This] is the chief glory of Lao-tze's teaching, though I must think that its value is somewhat diminished by the method

in which he reaches it.” For Legge, clearly, Laozi’s greatest strengths lay in the places where his writings bore inferior resemblance to Christian thought. He is also unequivocal about favouring Confucianism over Daoism – the fact that he published his translation of Confucian texts twelve years before the Daoist classics is highly indicative, and his introduction leaves no room for doubt: while “[Confucius] recognized the nature of man as the gift of Heaven or God,” “we can laugh at [Laozi’s views on knowledge]” (Legge 1962b: 31), and “[Confucius] proved in the course of time too strong for Lao as the teacher of [the Chinese] people. [...] [Daoism’s] overthrow and disappearance will be brought about ere long” (ibid.: 33).

Goddard’s 1919 version gives six pages of introduction and a two-page biographical note on Laozi. He begins his introduction with “I love Laotzu! [...] I want you to appreciate this wise and kindly old man, and come to love him” (Goddard 1919b: 1). Similarly to his predecessors, he emphasizes the coincidences of outlook between Laozi’s philosophy and Christianity, depicting him as someone who (despite all Goddard’s sympathies) gave a still rudimentary expression to the truth that was brought to perfection in Christianity: “Laotzu saw in a glass darkly what Jesus saw face to face in all his glory, the Divine Tao, God as creative and redemptive Love” (ibid.: 6) and points out that “Laozi has much in common with Jesus and the apostolic times – when nonviolence, simplicity and quietness prevailed” (ibid.). A much less disparaging attitude than Legge’s is obvious, and the significant equation of God with *dao*, which would be absolutely unacceptable for Legge, should also be noted.

In their introductions, all three translators point out the fallacy of the impersonality of the *dao* and Laozi’s failure to envision a personal god. Chalmers (1868b: xv) writes: “Probably most readers will think it would have been well if he [...] recognized a personal God as the highest existence, instead of placing an indefinite, impersonal, and unconscious Tau before Him and above Him.” In his explanation of chapter 25, Legge (1962a: 69) asks

Was he groping after God if haply he might find him? I think he was, and he gets so far as to conceive of Him as “the Uncaused Cause,” but comes short of the idea of His personality. The other subordinate causes which he mentions all get their force or power from the Tao, but after all the Tao is simply a spontaneity, evolving from itself, and not *acting* from a personal will, consciously in the direction of its own wisdom and love.

Goddard (1919b: 3) is the mildest in his accusation; he tries to vindicate Laozi by stating that *dao* is so benevolent and wise as to be almost personal.

In his 1939 translation, Goddard added a new five-page introduction, in which he informs us that he has become a Buddhist and that he made the translation



with the help of a Buddhist-Daoist monk. There are no references to Christianity in this text, but he reprints the first introduction in this new version.

The authors' Christian attitude is noticeable in the first three introductions, but their axiological and affective evaluations differ: despite his scientific approach, Legge exhibits a pronounced bias towards Christianity and Confucianism and a lack of particular appreciation of Laozi and Daoism, whereas Chalmers and Goddard in his text of 1919 are comparatively less disparaging and reveal a much more positive attitude towards Laozi. Goddard's second text focuses entirely on Daoism and Buddhism.

## 2.3 Translations of philosophical concepts

*Dao* is the fundamental concept of Daoism and one of the most significant concepts in Chinese philosophy in general. Like other great philosophical, religious and mystical concepts, it does not lend itself to easy explanation. The basic meaning of the word is "way." For Laozi it is a name for the unnameable source of all existence which reason cannot fathom and words cannot hold, but without which nothing in the world of phenomena could exist. Zhuangzi describes it as follows:

Tao cannot be regarded as having a positive existence. The name Tao is a metaphor, used for the purpose of description. To say that it exercises some causation, or that it does nothing, is speaking of it from the phase of a thing – how can such language serve as a designation of it in its greatness? If words were sufficient for the purpose, we might in a day's time exhaust the subject of the Tao. Words not being sufficient, we may talk about it the whole day, and the subject of discourse will only have been a thing. Tao is the extreme to which things conduct us. Neither speech nor silence is sufficient to convey the notion of it. When we neither speak nor refrain from speech, our speculations about it reach their highest point. (Legge 1962b: 15)

Such a concept is certain to put the translator to task, and the term has been variously translated as the Way, Reason, Providence, the Logos, and even God (Watts 1981: 40). In their introductions, all the Protestant missionary translators opt for the use of the original term and do not try to identify *dao* with some of the more familiar western concepts<sup>8</sup> (even though they do not always follow this in practice). Chalmers (1868b: xi) explains his decision in the following way:

<sup>8</sup> Unlike the Jesuits, who translated *dao* as God, Protestants were generally uneasy with similarities between Chinese religions and Christianity.

I have thought it better to leave the word *Tau* untranslated, both because it has given the name to the sect – the *Tauists* – and because no English word is its exact equivalent. Three terms suggest themselves—the Way, Reason, and the Word; but they are all liable to objection. Were we guided by etymology, “the Way,” would come nearest to the original, and in one or two passages the idea of a *way* seems to be in the term; but this is too materialistic to serve the purpose of a translation. “Reason” again seems to be more like a quality or attribute of some conscious being than *Tau* is. I would translate it by “the Word,” in the sense of the Logos, but this would be like settling the question which I wish to leave open, viz. – what amount of resemblance there is between the Logos of the New Testament and this *Tau*, which is its nearest representative in Chinese.

In his translation of the opening chapter, Chalmers transliterates the word, but adds the unsuitable “reason” in brackets, which greatly impoverishes the meaning of this key Daoist concept. He only does so in this opening chapter, though. Elsewhere he keeps to the original, and in one place gives “Way” in brackets. Legge also gives a lengthy discussion of the word *dao* and how it should be translated and concludes: “The best way of dealing with it in translating is to transfer it to the version, instead of trying to introduce an English equivalent for it” (Legge 1962b: 15). Therefore, he too transliterates the word, and in some places uses Way, Method and Course in brackets along with the transliteration. Goddard (1919b: 3) writes in his introduction:

The simple meaning of Tao is “way,” but it also has a wide variety of other meanings. Dr. Paul Carus translates it, “Reason,” but apologizes for so doing. If forced to offer a translation we would suggest Creative Principle, but much prefer to leave it untranslated.

In both his texts, he consistently uses only the transliteration of the term, offering additional explanations in some places.

The second part of the title of Laozi’s book, and another vital concept of Daoism, *de* can be understood as the power of the *dao* in the phenomenal world. Guan Yin Zi writes: “it is never possible to master the *dao*. What we can master is not called the *dao*, but *de*” (Lisevič 2014: 16). Thus, *de* can be defined as “the realization or expression of the Tao in actual living” (Watts 1981: 107). Although often translated as virtue, “it is not virtue in the sense of moral rectitude” (ibid.). Chalmers consistently renders *de* as virtue, providing no explanation that would make the meaning of this complex concept clearer. Legge, aware of the difficulty of the term, keeps reminding the reader that it should not be translated as virtue, and varies his translation of the term greatly, but he does not give the original term along with his various versions, which is a definite drawback to his approach to the translation of this term. His translations include: attribute, attributes or

characteristics (of the Tao), the Quality, active force, manifestation of (Tao's) force, (Tao's) outflowing operation, virtue, and kindness. In both his translations, Goddard keeps to the original term *de*, also offering vitality, power or virtue along with *de* in some instances.

Therefore, when it comes to the concept of the *dao*, the translations are more or less uniform: all translators agree in principle that the method of foreignization should be adopted and leave the term in its original form, providing additional explanations in certain places. The situation is different with the concept of *de*: the older translations employ the method of domestication, and the newer ones that of foreignization.

## 2.4 Treatment of cultural references

The final element in this analysis are the equivalents Protestant missionary translators provide for concepts unique to Chinese culture: 玉 (*yu* – jade), 𪛗狗 (*chu gou* – straw dogs), 冊 (*ce* – bamboo slips for counting), and 里 (*li* – 0.5 km). The special place of jade in Chinese culture dates back to the late Neolithic period: it has been revered as “the fairest of stones” and embodiment of the virtues of benevolence, integrity, wisdom, courage and steadfastness (Childs-Johnson 1998: 55). Chalmers translates it as gem or jewel, Legge as jade, Goddard in both his translations as gem or gems. Straw dogs of the fifth chapter of the *Dao De Jing* are objects made of straw in the shape of dogs, used as sacrificial offerings in the rite of praying for rain. When the rite is finished, they are discarded. Chalmers (1868a: 4) translates them as “sacrificial grass dogs (figures of grass made for a temporary purpose),” Legge (1891: 50) as “dogs of grass” and provides an explanation in the commentary, Goddard in his first translation gives “insignificant playthings made of straw; alike and unimportant” (1919a: 13), and in the later version “dogs and plants; equal value” (1939a: 27). Bamboo slips used for counting appear in chapter 27. Chalmers renders them as “arithmetic,” Legge as “tallies,” pieces of wood scored across with notches for the items of an account and then split into halves – exact equivalents of the Chinese bamboo slips. Goddard's first translation is “abacus,” and his 1939 text gives “rules or diagrams.” Finally, they translate the Chinese unit of measurement *li* (0.5 km or 0.3 miles) as follows: Chalmers and Goddard as mile, whereas only Legge leaves the original *li*. In this part of the analysis a departure from the expected pattern of domestication and foreignization is observed. Only Legge adheres to the principle of foreignization, whereas the other translations domesticate or paraphrase Chinese concepts, with Goddard, especially in his 1939 translation, exhibiting significant deviation from the original.

### 3 CONCLUSION

The religious attitudes and prejudices of the Protestant missionary translators of the *Dao De Jing* are generally not found in the translations themselves. What Julia Hardy said of Legge's translation applies to Chalmers's version and Goddard's first translation as well: they all avoided attempts to impose Christian doctrine onto the text. Their ideological presuppositions are visible in their introductions and commentaries, but their goal in translating was to present the text to the Western audience as faithfully as possible, and not to try to make it Christian or unchristian, to embellish or vilify it. In the introductions, a shift from a pro-Christian attitude can be discerned in diachrony, but it does not occur with the turn of the century as predicted. The translators' estimation of Laozi's value and their affective attitudes also do not fit into the expected pattern, with the second translator expressing the most unfavourable opinion. In the comparison of titles, though, the analysis confirmed the initial hypothesis. In the sphere of philosophical terms, the expectations were also to a large extent met, and a diachronic shift towards greater regard for the source culture can be discerned. The nineteenth-century translators, Chalmers and Legge, partially follow the principle of domestication when Daoist concepts are concerned: they find English equivalents for *de*, but leave *dao* in its original form. Goddard in both his translations systematically employs the strategy of foreignization, as he retains original Daoist terms. When it comes to the concepts specific to Chinese culture, Legge conscientiously adopts the strategy of foreignization, using *li* instead of mile, retaining jade where other translators use jewel or gem, and using tallies for bamboo strips. The analysis thus reveals his high regard for Chinese culture, but also his lack of particular esteem for Daoism, which is made plain in his introduction and commentaries as well as in his treatment of Daoist terms. Goddard's twentieth-century translations show the opposite tendency: while retaining the philosophical terms and doing them more justice, Goddard is not so careful with the cultural elements, revealing his preference for religious and mystical ideas over cultural contents.

In the encounter with the unknown which cannot or can only precariously be reduced to the familiar, acceptable and accepted, the missionary translator faced multiple dilemmas which sometimes probed deeply into the field of his personal identity: to what extent and in what way should a text so far removed from its intended readership be made approachable and understandable; where is the boundary between translation and interpretation; what is the responsibility of the translator and how to protect the reader from what is perceived as the potentially harmful influence of the text; should I be faithful to the text or to my faith, i.e., am I primarily a scholar or a missionary? The answers to these questions and the outcomes of these encounters are different, and sometimes altogether surprising,

as in the case of Dwight Goddard. Therefore, even though the translations of the Protestant missionaries do reflect the general end-of-the-century cultural shift and the transition of missionary work in China from proselytism in the initial phases to the increasingly secular character of its later activities, the fact that it is not possible to come to clear-cut answers even in such a limited selection of elements of analysis points at the complexity of the missionary migration movement and the identities it produced.

## References

- Anderson, Gerald H. (ed.), 1999: *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*. Grand Rapids and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Bays, Daniel H., 2012: *A New History of Christianity in China*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Chalmers, John, (trans.), 1868a: *The Speculations on Metaphysics, Polity, and Morality, of the Old Philosopher, Lau-tsze*. London: Trübner & Co.
- Chalmers, John, 1868b: Introduction: *The Speculations on Metaphysics, Polity, and Morality, of the Old Philosopher, Lau-tsze*. London: Trübner & Co.: vii–xix.
- Childs-Johnson, Elizabeth, 1998: Jade as Material and Epoch. Lee, Sherman (ed.): *China, 5000 Years: Innovation and Transformation in the Arts*. New York: Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum. 55–68.
- Clarke, J. J., 2000: *The Tao of the West: Western Transformations of Taoist Thought*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cordier, Henri, 1900. Nécrologie. *T'oung Pao* 1/1. 67.
- Girardot, Norman J., 2002: *The Victorian Translation of China: James Legge's Victorian Pilgrimage*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Goddard, Dwight, (trans.), 1919a: *Laotzu's Tao and Wu Wei*. New York: Brentano's Publishers.
- Goddard, Dwight, 1919b: Introduction: *Laotzu's Tao and Wu Wei*. New York: Brentano's Publishers. 1–6.
- Goddard, Dwight, (trans.), 1939a: *Laotzu's Tao and Wu Wei, Second Edition*. Thetford: Dwight Goddard.
- Goddard, Dwight, 1939b: Introduction: *Laotzu's Tao and Wu Wei, Second Edition*. Thetford: Dwight Goddard. 13–17.
- Hardy, Julia, 1998: Influential Western Interpretations of the *Tao-te-ching*. Kohn, Livia and Michael Lafargue (eds.): *Lao-tzu and the Tao-te-ching: Studies in Ethics, Law, and the Human Ideal*. Albany: State University of New York Press. 165–188.
- Kučiš, Vlasta, 2016: *Translatologija u teoriji i praksi*. Zagreb: HKD.

- Lao, Tze-Yui, 1994: *James Legge (1815–1897) and Chinese Culture: A Missiological Study in Scholarship, Translation and Evangelization*. PhD Dis., University of Edinburgh.
- Legge, James (trans.), 1962a: *The Texts of Taoism, Part 1*. New York: Dover Publications.
- Legge, James, 1962b: Introduction: *The Texts of Taoism, Part 1*. New York: Dover Publications: 1–44.
- Lisevič, I. S., 2014: *Književna misao Kine*. Belgrade: Prosveta.
- Starry, David, 1980: Dwight Goddard – the Yankee Buddhist. *Zen Notes* 27/7. 2–8
- Watts, Alan, 1981: *Tao: The Watercourse Way*. London: Penguin Books.