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Abstract—Based on ‘translation as rewriting’ from Lefevere as theoretical framework, this article delves into Morrison’s translation of the four gospels in 1820s. Morrison’s translation strategies will be examined and the motivations behind will be explored. Lefevere identifies three elements in his patronage: ideological, economic and status, and this article proposed a fourth component: pragmatic component, which affects Morrison’s translation method.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The nineteenth century witnessed a substantial change which took place in interstate relations. As the West was striving to acquire wealth, power and prestige in the context of the industrial revolution, China, on the other hand, unwilling to participate in the new world order, was regarded as backward and thus in need of modernisation and reformation.

According to mainstream Chinese scholars (Mao, 2014, p. 1; Xiao, 2017, pp. 318-320; Li, 2014, pp. 84-85), the turning point in interstate relations was the outbreak of the First Opium War (1839), which took a heavy toll on the fortunes and vigour of Chinese society. From that point onwards, China suffered constant military interventions by the West and Japan. Kaufman (2010, pp. 2-3) notices that China’s elites and general populace continue to reference the ‘century of humiliation’: the period from the First Opium War to the end of the Second World War. Since modern Chinese history is a compulsory part of the Chinese younger generation’s education, this term—‘century of humiliation’—has been used as a strategy designed to arouse feelings of nationalism among the Chinese people, to deflect the attention away from China’s domestic problems, such as corruption, human rights etc. This is prominent the case since the outbreak of Covid 19 in 2019, since when ‘nationalism’ has been a useful ‘chess piece’ in handling charges from foreign authorities. According to Kaufman (2011, p. 3), the notion of 'national humiliation' serves as a pivotal legitimising factor for the rule of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). It portrays the CCP as the sole contemporary Chinese political party that effectively resisted foreign aggression. In the name of ‘never forgetting the shame of the past’, anti-foreign sentiment is strengthened and belligerent actions on the international stage are justified.

It can clearly be seen that the Opium War has for a long time been one of the most controversial subjects in the Sino-Western relationship. In terms of the ethical and political question of moral culpability, it is subtle and sensitive. The significance of this particular aspect within the historical period has generated the interest of this essay in studying it. Since a study of this period would not just be a piece of historical research, it is also linked to Sino-Western relationship.

In China’s nineteenth century relationship with the West, Protestant missionaries were among the most significant actors on the scene. Compared to diplomats and merchants who communicated or collaborated with the Chinese by the nature of their profession, Protestant missionaries were often ‘aggressive individualists’. They sought direct contact with the Chinese common people and often in conflict with the established order of Chinese society. They were the only foreign group at that time that attempted to change Chinese minds and hearts completely. They were also the only group of foreigners in China at that time who reported most fully and frequently on China to the West. Protestant missionaries transmitted their image of China to the West while also shaping Chinese views of the outside world. This leads to the conclusion that a study of the Protestant missionaries, together with their educational backgrounds and their work, is vital, if one wishes to obtain a clear picture of China in the nineteenth century.

Among all the Protestant missionaries, Robert Morrison was the first arriving in China. He was a pioneering sinologist and translator considered the ‘Father of Anglo-Chinese literature’ (Thom, 1840, preface). Morrison is most notable for his work in China. After twenty-five years of work, with the help of his assistants, this presbyterian preacher translated the whole Bible into the Chinese language (Townsend, 1890, appendix). Morrison pioneered the translation of the Chinese Bible, and unlike his Jesuits predecessors whose works have never been published, Morrison planned broad distribution of Scriptures, and seeking direct contact with Chinese common people to preach gospel (Townsend, 1890, appendix). It can be said that he set a solid foundation for the exchange between China and the West, moreover,
he set a fundamentalist pattern for Protestant missionaries in China in the 19th century, as his works were influential on his colleagues.

This essay delves into the first Protestant missionary, Robert Morrison, his upbringings, and Chinese translations of the four gospels. Based on Lefevere’s rewriting theory, this essay will explore how ideological tensions around the text affect Morrison’s translation and how he conveyed the image of China to the West. The first part of this essay will focus on Morrison’s training in his early career, then it will move to his translation strategy in translating four gospels. The final part will analyse his motivations.

II. IDEOLOGICAL AND POETOLOGICAL INFLUENCE ON MORRISON’S VIEWS ON CHINA

A. Lefevere and His Rewriting

In his book Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame (1992), Lefevere focuses particularly on ‘issues such as power, ideology, institution and manipulation’ (p. 2). The people involved in such power positions are seen as ‘rewriting’ literature and they govern its consumption by the general public. Lefevere (1992, p. 8) argues that the motivation for such rewriting can be ideological (conforming to or rebelling against the dominant ideology) or poetological (conforming to or rebelling against the dominant poetics). He further states that:

Translation is the most obviously recognisable type of rewriting, and since it is potentially the most influential because it is able to project the image of an author and/or a (series of) work(s) in another culture, lifting that author and/or those works beyond the boundaries of their culture of origin. (1992, p. 9)

For Lefevere, there are two factors which control translation functions: professionals within the literary system, who partly determine the dominant poetics; and patronage outside the literary system, which partly determines the ideology (1992, p. 15). Patronage, which may be differentiated or undifferentiated, consists of three components: an ideological, an economic, and a status component (Munday, 2016, p. 201). Lefevere adopts a definition of ideology that is not limited to the political sphere; rather, ‘that grillwork of form, convention, and belief which orders our actions’. (Munday, p. 201) He sees patronage as being mainly ideologically focused. The interaction between poetics, ideology and translation leads him to make the following claim:

On every level of the translation process, it can be shown that, if linguistic considerations enter into conflict with considerations of an ideological and/or poetological nature, the latter tend to win out (1992, p. 39).

For Lefevere, the paramount consideration is the ideological one. This refers to the ideology of translator or the ideology imposed on the translator by the patronage (Munday, p. 203). The poetological consideration refers to the dominant poetics in the TL culture. Together, ideology and poetics determine the translation strategy and the solution to specific translation problems (Munday, p. 203).

Based on this theory, this essay will examine if there was a patronage of Morrison, and the answer is affirmative, since it is assumed that he was sponsored during his activities in China. How Morrison was influenced ideologically is also worth studying, and it may be linked to his strategies in translating the Bible.

B. Robert Morrison: The Scholar and the Man

In The Chinese Repository (Bridgman, 1834, p. 11), it was written that:

Previous to the embassy of Macartney, not more than one individual of that nation, so far as we know, ever undertook to acquire a knowledge of this language. …at that time, and chiefly with a view to translate the sacred Scriptures, two individuals, Morrison in China and Marshman in Bengal, were successfully engaged in studying the language: both of those men still alive, and with others of their countrymen, not to omit Milne and Collie who rest from their labors, are doing very much to promote and extend a knowledge of the Chinese language and literature, and are far in advance even of the French.

Although Morrison made significant contributions to Chinese studies in the West, this study finds that in doing so he was merely following his tutor’s instructions. In reading his memoir—Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison, written by his widow, Eliza Morrison, it can be found that his tutor, David Bogue, played a significant part in guiding his activities in China.

Robert Morrison was born in Northumberland in 1782 and grew up in Newcastle1. He joined the Presbyterian Church in 1798. In 1803 he was admitted to the Hoxton Academy, and soon moved to the Missionary Academy at Gosport, from where he was transferred to London in 1805 to study medicine and astronomy (Daily, 2013). He took up the study of the Chinese language at the same time, since the London Missionary Society (LMS) had decided to send him to China. According to Daily (2013), The Gosport Training Academy was founded by David Bogue, who belonged to the LMS. There, Bogue taught his students a three-pronged approach to missions:

1. learn the language,
2. translate the Scriptures,
3. establish a seminary (Daily, 2013).

Morrison attended Bogue’s Gosport Academy for a period of fourteen months before he was assigned to China to acquire the language and translate the Scriptures (Daily, 2013). Having been influenced by the philosophical school of Scottish Common Sense Realism founded by Thomas Reid, Bogue believed in the concept of common sense (Daily, 2013). This theory held that all humans possessed common sense (or the ability to identify reality and truth), and that if people were just given access to texts containing knowledge (specifically, the Scriptures), they would recognise the truths contained in them (Daily, 2013). As a consequence, Bogue thought that translating the Scriptures and giving people the tools to read those Scriptures was of the utmost importance, which distinguished his students from the Jesuits in the 16th century (Daily, 2013). Once people had access to the Gospels and the ability to read them, Christianity would begin to grow in foreign countries (Daily, 2013). Bogue argued that the LMS must address ‘civilised countries’ before proceeding to the conversion of ‘barbarous countries’. According to Bogue, it is possible to recognise a ‘civilised nation’ when:

1. Great numbers speak the same language, and the language is written and the books common; 2. the people are accustomed to reading, and to mental improvement and pursuits; 3. there is much intercourse of a social nature through a large country…where they have much intercourse with other nations…where the influence is extensive and reaches to all the surrounding nations. (Daily, 2013, p. 83)

Therefore, it can be seen that China became an ideal starting point for Bogue and Morrison’s evangelical work: the country had a large number of Chinese speakers and a unique system of written symbols, in addition to the influence it exerted on neighbouring countries.

According to Lefevere’s theory, it would seem to imply that Morrison’s ‘patronage’ is his tutor, David Bogue, together with LMS where he received training. In terms of the ideological task from the patronage, Morrison was asked to preach the gospel, together with translating the Bible into Chinese; Lefevere (1992, p. 16) argues that the status component occurs in many forms, and in Morrison’s case, he was expected to conform to Bogue’s expectations. The influence from Bogue and LMS affected Morrison’s narratives on China as well.

During Morrison’s stay in Bogue’s Gosport Academy, he received preliminary tutoring in Chinese from his first Chinese teacher, ‘Yong Sam-tak’ (容三德), who had just arrived from Canton to study English, and was living at a boarding school in Clapham (Morrison, 1839). An arrangement was made whereby the young Chinese came to reside with Morrison and became his teacher. Together they transcribed the whole of a Chinese manuscript in the British Museum, and a manuscript Latin and Chinese dictionary lent by the Royal Society (Morrison, 1839).

From Eliza’s memoirs, the implication is that Morrison had complicated feelings for his Chinese teacher. Morrison ‘took great pleasure in learning the Chinese’, and ‘by no means exclude poor Sam’s assistance’. Morrison admitted that Yong first gave him ‘insight into the subject’, and his heart ‘much knit to him, notwithstanding all his obstinacy and contempt of me (Morrison, 1839, p. 149).’ During his stay with Morrison, Yong was fond of talking of ‘God as the great Governor of the universe,’ but Morrison endeavoured to talk of ‘God’s creating the heart, and how ungrateful it was not to love him.’ Morrison put in his diary as: ‘O that the Lord may open his heart to receive the truth as it is in Jesus!’ (Morrison, 1839, p. 81).

Due to the cultural difference, Morrison already had some negative comments on Chinese religions, and this stereotype did not change until his arrival in China.

On 8th September 1807, he finally landed in Canton. He wrote in his diary ‘The good hand of God has at length brought me to the place of my appointed labour. … It was truly the most uncomfortable Sabbath that I had spent from the time of leaving you. … I said to myself O what can ever be done with these ignorant, yet shrewd and imposing people?’ (Morrison, 1839, p. 152).

These ‘ignorant, yet shrewd and imposing’ people were unwilling to tutor Morrison in Chinese, as it was forbidden to teach the language to foreigners then (Daily, 2013). Morrison asked George Staunton, an official of the East India Company, for assistance, and Staunton helped Morrison connect with a Chinese convert to Roman Catholicism, who became Morrison’s language instructor (Daily, 2013). With the aid of this tutor, along with his Chinese servants, Morrison gradually acquired fluency in Chinese (Daily, 2013). Since then, he started to converse with some thoughtful Chinese on their religious beliefs. From the selections below, it can be seen that Morrison encountered difficulty in convincing Chinese heathens to accept Jesus:

I asked them why the Chinese were more civilised, and had many temporal blessings which some of the barbarous nations around them had not? They could not tell; but they thought Jesus and Confucius were alike — the one intended for Europe, and the other for China. I urged the striking difference that appears in one atoning for the sins of men, and teaching so largely the way of a sinner’s being accepted of God, whilst the other never mentioned God’s name, nor taught any thing respecting him. Observing that there was blame on the part of those who were unwilling to learn the right way, - here the conversation dropped. (Morrison, 1839, pp. 227-228)

My assistants conversed with me at length this evening on the subject of the religion. They were of opinion [sic] that the notions of foreigners and of the Chinese are very similar in religious concerns. I acknowledged that there were many truths common to both, particularly respecting the duty of one man to another; but respecting God, our duty to him, and the way in which a sinful creature is accepted of God, they were widely different. I said that they burned candles, offered incense, slew sheep, &c., to make God propitious; but Jesus
gave himself a sacrifice, to make atonement for sin. They remarked, with contempt, that those who abounded in those offerings were bad people: good people had no occasion to do so - Kung-foo-tsze did not teach it. There was no occasion to worship God daily, if the heart were good: many of those who worshipped were bad notwithstanding. – that some who worshipped were bad people, was true; but it would not make those good who neglected it. And to speak of those who did not worship God as having a good heart, was unreasonable; it was like saying that a man was a good son, though he neither loved his parents nor obeyed them. They were here rather at a loss for an answer; and asked me if I thought all the men in China were bad men? I said all the men in the world had offended God; that a man might fulfil many duties to his fellow-men, but we owe duties to God, the performance of which is necessary to constitute us good men. They asked me why the Chinese had not the doctrines to which I adhered, and why they were not sent to them of God? (Morrison, 1839, pp. 227-228)

In dealing with questions from thoughtful Chinese, Morrison could only ascribe all the achievements of the Chinese to ‘God’, though the people were ‘ignorant’, ‘shrewd’ and ‘imposing’ to him. Unlike Jesuits, Morrison was not in favour of the ceremonial rituals, such as burning candles and incense. Compared to Jesuits’ way in preaching the gospel, Morrison adopted a more radical approach. Morrison developed growing attention to Confucian thought in order to communicate with thoughtful Chinese. Confucius’s wisdom set a moral and intellectual standard in China, and his writings, to Morrison, were ‘given the most unlimited assent, as though inspired by God.’ Morrison read the Four Books from Confucius, reaching conclusion as ‘much that is excellent, and some things erroneous. Taken altogether they are, of necessity, miserably defective’ (Morrison, 1839, pp. 281-282), Morrison turned his fire on Confucius and the Jesuits’ tolerance of Chinese converts paying tribute to Confucius, however, it is worth mentioning that Morrison and his followers later changed their position by pulling Confucianism to the side of the Christian camp, quoting Confucianism statements to attack Buddhism. It can be seen from Morrison’s translation of four gospels, as there are several terms from Confucianism in his target text. Confucianism was too influential to eradicate in China, but Buddhism contradicted Protestantism more sharply. In retrospective, Protestant missionaries adopted the same strategy which the Jesuits used in China several centuries earlier, called ‘drive out Buddhism and come closer to Confucianism’ (驅佛近儒). Although Protestant missionaries attacked their predecessors before they arrived in China, they had no alternative but choose the same pathway as the Jesuits.

In 1824, Morrison returned to Europe. He visited France, Ireland, Scotland and the principal towns of England, chiefly with a view to exciting more interest among literary and religious circles in the moral condition of the heathen - especially those inhabiting the regions of Eastern Asia (Morrison, 1839). He advocated an attitude of sympathy and benevolence on the part of the Christian churches (Morrison, 1839). One or two examples of the spirit and style of these public addresses may afford the reader some idea of the impression they were calculated to produce. With regard to the intellectual and spiritual condition of the Chinese, Morrison remarks:

To that people, the God of heaven has given an extensive territory, containing large portions of fertile, salubrious, and delightful country; and they possess a knowledge of useful arts, to a degree which supplies all the necessaries, and most of the luxuries, of life. In these respects, they require nothing from Europe. (The Congregational Magazine, 1825, p. 478)

As what he stated before, Morrison attributed the prosperity of the Chinese empire and people to God’s will. Though Morrison mentioned the fertility of the country and indicated China ‘required nothing from Europe’, in The Chinese Repository (1840, p. 615), his previous statements were quoted by his colleagues, that ‘the trade is a reciprocal exchange of benefits’, and the imperial court of China was criticised for its unwillingness to trade. Following the paragraph quoted above, Morrison turns his attention to the other side of the coin, beginning his arguments as follows:

‘What, then, do the Chinese require from Europe? ……they require that only which St. Paul deemed supremely excellent, and which it is the sole object of the Missionary Society to communicate –they require the knowledge of Christ. For with all their antiquity, and their literature, and their arts and refinement, they are still infatuated idolators; and are given up to vile affections, working at that which is unseemly. Not liking to retain God in their knowledge, they worship and serve the creature rather than the Creator; they are haters of the true God, are filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, and wickedness. With all their civilisation, still, envy and malice, deceit and falsehood, to a boundless extent with a selfish, ungenerous prudence, and a cold metaphysical inhumanity-are the prevalent characteristics of the people of China’. (The Congregational Magazine, 1825, pp. 478-479)

Morrison continued by stating that the philosophy of ‘their celebrated ancient sage, Confucius, acknowledges no future state of existence; and, concerning the duties of man to his Maker, presents a complete blank’ (Morrison, 1839). He argued that it presents nothing ‘beyond the grave’ and that ‘present expediency is the chief motive of action’ (Morrison, 1839). He stated that ‘of the great and glorious God who is infinitely above, and distinct from, the heavens and the earth, the teaching of Confucius makes no attention; it rises not superior to an obscure recognition of some principle of order in nature, which, when violated, induces present evil’ (Morrison 1839).

In his narratives on Chinese philosophy, Morrison first tried to familiarise his Western audience with Chinese culture by making comparisons with Western philosophy. For instance, he found that, according to Chinese culture, the universe operates according to some internal principle. Heaven is the highest power in nature; earth is second to it, and
both heaven and earth are superior to the gods. Heaven, earth, gods and men, is the order recognised by the Chinese. However, at other times, the gods are excluded, and then heaven, earth and men are the three, great and co-equal powers. This atheistical theory, Morrison concluded, ‘is at the foundation of the public belief, and influences also the superstitions of the religionists of China, induces in the human mind great pride and impiety, even when superstitious observances are attended to’ (Morrison, 1839). Morrison agreed that in some of the most ancient written documents in China, which Confucius collected and edited, ‘there is a more distinct recognition of the supreme God, than is to be found in anything that he has thought as his own, or that the learned of China, in subsequent ages, have advanced’; and he believes that ‘it is a fact that man, when left to himself, sinks into, never rises from, atheism or idolatry; and the written word of God is necessary to bring him back’ (Morrison, 1839). He pointed out that, in addition to the system of Confucius, there were in China two other systems, which make much more use of gods than the Confucian system, and which acknowledge a future state of rewards and punishments (Morrison, 1839). These systems ‘enjoin fastings, and prayers, and penances, and masses for the dead, and threaten the wicked with varied punishments, in different hells, in a separate state; or with poverty, or disease, or a brute nature, when they shall be born again into this world’ (Morrison, 1839).

Through his speech, we can see that Morrison criticised Chinese people and religion for the purpose of propagating Christianity. The Chinese were depicted as envious, malicious, deceitful and selfish, and the tenets of Buddhism and Taoism were regarded as ‘lies, vanities, and things wherein there is no profit’. Morrison’s severely critical attitude towards the Chinese people, expressed on many occasions in his diaries and speeches, requires further examination here. There appear to be three reasons for this attitude:

1. His unpleasant memories of Chinese people. There were occasions when he was provoked by Chinese, and it started when he was studying with Yong in England.
2. The restrictions from the Chinese imperial court: foreigner’s residence was forbidden. In his letter to Joseph Hardcastle (1807), he complained ‘it only remains for the Chinese to forbid me staying here’.
3. His religious belief. Morrison believed Christianity to be the only orthodox religion.

Indeed, these typical representations of the Chinese religions set a tone for his colleagues who arrived in China later, and they spared no efforts to find negative sides to these religious sects. From the selections above, it is concluded that Morrison was critical on Chinese religions, which was caused by both his personal experience and Bogue’s influence. The economic component and status component also bolstered his criticism. However, given the influence of Confucianism in China, Morrison at times, had to accommodate to this sect for the sake of wider acceptance of Christianity in China. This dilemma is revealed in his translation of four gospels.

III. MORRISON’S TRANSLATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS

‘In my translation [of the Bible], I have studied fidelity, perspicuity, and simplicity: I have preferred common words to rare and classical ones; I have avoided technical terms, which occur in the pagan philosophy and religion. I would rather be deemed inelegant, than hard to be understood. In difficult passages I have taken the sense given by general consent of the gravest, most pious, and least eccentric divines, to whom I had access.

To the task I have brought patient endurance of long labour and seclusion from society, a calm and unprejudiced judgment; not enamoured of novelty and eccentricity, nor yet tenacious of an opinion merely because it was old; and, I hope, somewhat of an accurate mode of thinking, with a reverential sense of the awful responsibility of misinterpreting God’s word. Such qualifications are, perhaps, as indispensable as grammatical learning in translating such a book as the Bible’. (Whyte, 1988, p. 96)

Bible translation is slow, painstaking and hard work for Morrison when working alone. In 1813, Morrison finally completed a translation of the New Testament in Chinese. In the same year, his assistant, William Milne, also of the London Missionary Society, joined him in the work. Together, they completed the translation of the whole Bible in 1819. The quotation above is Morrison’s own evaluation of his translated Bible.

In studying the four gospels translated by Morrison, it is found he followed the rules of ‘fidelity’, ‘perspicuity’ and ‘simplicity’. ‘Fidelity’ is the top concern to Morrison, which was affected by the ideological component from his patronage. At the same time, he endeavoured to use common words, following the sentence structure of the source text. In order to present Morrison’s translation clearly, the translation from the Chinese Union Version (CUV) will be listed in the table below.
### Formal Equivalence From Morrison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST (New International Version/NIV)</th>
<th>Morrison’s version</th>
<th>Back translation of Morrison’s version</th>
<th>CUV</th>
<th>Back translation of CUV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The angel went to her and said,</td>
<td>且使者進與之，曰，萬</td>
<td>The messenger went towards her, said,</td>
<td>天使进去，对她说：</td>
<td>The Angle went in,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Greetings, you who are highly</td>
<td>稿大驚獵主倍爾馬，女</td>
<td>joy you received great favour from</td>
<td>「蒙大恩的女子，我</td>
<td>spoke to her: women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favored! The Lord is with you.”</td>
<td>中為福矣。</td>
<td>Lord. You woman</td>
<td>问你安，主和你同在</td>
<td>who is blessed, I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Luke: 1:28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>are lucky.</td>
<td>了！」</td>
<td>greeting you, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lord is with you now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If that is how God clothes the</td>
<td>神既知是秀今日在田</td>
<td>Since God clothes the</td>
<td>你们这小信的人哪，</td>
<td>You little faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grass of the field, which is</td>
<td>明日以補之而來，豈非要</td>
<td>grass of the field, which</td>
<td>野地里的草今天还</td>
<td>people, the grass of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here today, and tomorrow is</td>
<td>裏，豈非要</td>
<td>is here today, and</td>
<td>明天就丢在炉</td>
<td>the field is still here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thrown into the fire, how much</td>
<td>穿衣，少信輩故。</td>
<td>tomorrow is thrown</td>
<td>上帝还给它这样</td>
<td>today, but tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more will he clothe you—you of</td>
<td></td>
<td>into fireplace, how much</td>
<td>的装饰，何况你们</td>
<td>will be thrown into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>little faith!</td>
<td></td>
<td>more will be clothe you, you</td>
<td></td>
<td>fireplace, God still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Luke: 12: 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td>generation of little faith.</td>
<td></td>
<td>gives it such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of his fullness we have</td>
<td>又由其之滿我眾受寵子</td>
<td>Also, out of his fullness</td>
<td>From his full grace,</td>
<td>From his full grace,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all received grace in place of</td>
<td>窮受寵子</td>
<td>we all received his</td>
<td>we have all received,</td>
<td>we have all received,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grace already given. (John: 1:16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>hamp from his hampmer.</td>
<td>furthermore, grace</td>
<td>furthermore, grace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on top of grace.</td>
<td>on top of grace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus did many other things as</td>
<td>其餘耶穌另行多功，若</td>
<td>Moreover, Jesus did</td>
<td>Things Jesus did has</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well. If every one of them were</td>
<td>其其——寫錄，想天下不</td>
<td>many accomplishments,</td>
<td>many as well, if every</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were written down, I suppose</td>
<td>夠載將所作之書矣，嘆</td>
<td>if every one of them</td>
<td>one of them were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even the whole world would not</td>
<td>閣。</td>
<td>were written down, imagine</td>
<td>were written down,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have room for the books that</td>
<td></td>
<td>the whole world would not</td>
<td>imagine,我想，所写</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be written</td>
<td></td>
<td>have room for the books</td>
<td>的书就是世界也容不下</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(John: 21: 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td>written.</td>
<td>了。</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They worship me in vain; their</td>
<td>惟伊等拜我無益，因教</td>
<td>They worship me in no</td>
<td>They take human</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachings are merely human rules.</td>
<td>獨人所命之之誡</td>
<td>good, because they</td>
<td>orders as rules to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mark: 7:7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>merely teach human</td>
<td>teach, so</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rules.</td>
<td>拜我也是枉然。</td>
<td>worshipping me in is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In observing Morrison’s translation, it is found that there tends to be keenly oriented towards the ST structure, which exerts influence in determining accuracy. His ‘fidelity’ rule is close to the ‘formal equivalence’ named by Nida in the 1960s, which focuses ‘attention on the message itself, in both form and content’, and ‘the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language’ (Nida, 1964, p. 159). The table above shows how Morrison tries to achieve ‘equivalence’ in sentence structure. Furthermore, Morrison also used more literal translation strategy in his translation:

1. It is like a mustard seed, which is the smallest of all seeds on earth (Mark: 4:31).
   Morrison translates it as ‘為似芥種子一粒，被播地時為萬種在地之至小。’ Compared to the CUV, which translates ‘smallest of all seeds’ as ‘比地上的百种都小’ [smaller than hundreds of seeds on earth], Morrison’s version sticks to literal translation.

2. Jesus answered them, ‘Have you never read what David did when he and his companions were hungry? (Luke: 6:3).
   Morrison translates it as ‘耶穌答伊等曰，爾總無讀大五得並隨之者既餓所行。’ Compared to CUV which added ‘经上记着’ [which is written on script], there is no addition in Morrison’s version.

3. “Lord, don’t trouble yourself, for I do not deserve to have you come under my roof” (Luke: 7:6).
   Morrison translates ‘don’t trouble yourself’ as ‘勿煩己’, while in CUV it is translated as ‘不要劳动’ [don’t labour]. Morrison’s translation is more accurate.

4. As the time approached for him to be taken up to heaven, Jesus resolutely set out for Jerusalem (Luke: 9:51).
   Morrison skilfully translates ‘taken up to heaven’ as ‘起移’, linking Jesus to an Emperor in China, while CUV translates it as ‘被接上升’ [was taken to ascend], which is somewhat unnatural in Chinese.

5. Provide purses for yourselves that will not wear out. (Luke: 12:33).
   Morrison translates ‘not wear out’ as ‘不渐旧’, while CUV translates it as ‘永不坏’. Morrison’s translation renders the connotations better.

   The classical Chinese Morrison uses is more concise: 且神使自天現堅之 (CUV: 有一位天使从天上显现，加添他的力量)

---

2 For Morrison’s version, it can be accessed by: https://www.bible.com/bible/2283/LUK.1.%E7%A5%9E%E5%A4%A9%E8%81%96%E6%9B%B8
In order to match as closely as possible the elements in the source language, Morrison adopts the strategy of transliteration plus notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>Morrison’s translation</th>
<th>Back translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Today in the town of David a Savior has been born to you; he is the Messiah, the Lord. (Luke: 2:11)</td>
<td>蓋為爾今日生大五得之邑生救者即主彌賽亚者。 (彌賽亞希伯耳字音耶穌之別稱與基利士督希伯耳字音同義通用即是被傅油者古 권리王祭者首掌及先知聖受神命時被傅油者也。)</td>
<td>Today in the town of David, a saviour is born, and he is the ‘Mi Sai Ya’ (Messiah). (Footnote: Mi Sai Ya, Hebrew pronunciation, alternative name of Jesus, and the same meaning of Jesus Christ…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where the forty days he was tempted by the devil. (Luke: 4:2)</td>
<td>彼四十日問亞波羅攻誘之。是日內尚無食、惟日滿後、即餓。 (亞波羅者厄利革之音意是冤枉稱也。)</td>
<td>Where the forty days he was tempted by the ‘Di Ya Bo Lo’ (devil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then he went down to Capernaum, a town in Galilee, and on the Sabbath he taught the people. (Luke: 4:31)</td>
<td>拿撒勒之邑加百耳拿翁諸教之于口(口撒)告日。 [口撒] 昼日。 (口撒) 昼日每七日之稱安息之日是。(口撒) 以是銀子之名。</td>
<td>Went to ‘Jia Li Li’’s town, ‘Jia Bai Er Na Wen’, and on the ‘Sa Bai’ day he taught the people. (Footnote: ‘Sa Bai’ day, the rest day in every seven days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people owed money to a certain moneylender. One owed him five hundred denarii, and the other fifty. (Luke: 7:41)</td>
<td>所以債主有二債者、一負欠五百氏拿利以一負欠五十氏拿利以。 (氏拿利以是銀子之名)</td>
<td>One debt collector has two people who owed him money. One owed him five hundred ‘di na li’, and the other fifty ‘di na li’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So Jesus called them over to him and began to speak to them in parables: “How can Satan drive out Satan? (Mark: 3:23)</td>
<td>且其喚伊等來至自、而以比喻諸伊等曰、[口撒] 告日。 [口撒] 告日否可交予 [口撒] [口但] 乎。 (口撒) [口但] 即是魔鬼也。</td>
<td>So Jesus… how can ‘Sa dan’ drive out ‘Sa dan’? (Footnote: ‘Sa dan’ is demon.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who went ahead and those who followed shouted, “Hosannah!” “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!” (Mark: 11:9)</td>
<td>而伊等前行與伊隨後呼曰、啞啞啞、其來主之名祝矣。 (啞啞啞即我求今救也)</td>
<td>Those who went ahead… ‘He Sa Na!’… (Footnote: ‘He Sa Na’, meaning I am asking for help.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why wasn’t this perfume sold and the money given to the poor? It was worth three hundred denarii. (John: 12:5)</td>
<td>此香油為何不賣去得價三百呧呧呧呧、而施與貧者。 (三百呧呧呧呧即三十兩銀子)</td>
<td>Why wasn’t… three hundred ‘Di Na Li’? (Footnote: three hundred ‘Di na Li’ is thirty silver taels.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem. (Matthew: 2:1)</td>
<td>畝耶蘇生於如氏亞之畢利恆後於王希羅得之時、卻有或嗎咥自東邊來至耶路撒冷去。 (嗎咥乃大學問輩之一門)</td>
<td>After Jesus… ‘Ma Zhi’ from the East came to Jerusalem. (Footnote: ‘Ma Zhi’ means the generation who has great knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to the CUV, Morrison’s translation tends to use more transliteration, such as ‘Di Ya Bo Lo’ for ‘devil’, ‘Sa Bai’ for ‘Sabbath’, and ‘Ma Zhi’ for ‘Magi’ etc. It is a practice for translators then to add a ‘mouth’ radical in the Chinese character if the translation for specific names of place or people. It is worth noticing that some of Morrison’s transliterations are still being used in the Chinese Bible today, such as ‘Ye Lu Sa Leng’ (Jerusalem), ‘Di Ya Bo Lo’ (devil), ‘Sa Bai’ day (rest day in every seven days), ‘Ma Zhi’ (generation) etc.

Morrison’s literal translation, to some extent, is ‘perspicuity’ and ‘simplicity’. Compared to the CUV, it is more concise and conveys the meaning of ST correctly. It is worth mentioning that Morrison even considered the ‘time difference’ in his translation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NIV</th>
<th>Morrison’s translation</th>
<th>Back translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was now about noon, and darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon (Luke:23:44)</td>
<td>自約六時到九時有黑在全地。</td>
<td>…about 6…until 9…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was the day of Preparation of the Passover; it was about noon. (John: 19:14)</td>
<td>且當時為吧[口撒] 吧撒之準備約六時、其請如大能日、視視王矣。</td>
<td>It was about six…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was nine in the morning when they crucified him. (Mark: 15:25)</td>
<td>且當時為吧[口撒] 吧撒之準備約六時、其請如大能日、視視王矣。</td>
<td>It was three when they crucified him…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At noon, darkness came over the whole land until three in the afternoon. (Mark: 15:33)</td>
<td>而施與貧者。 (三百呧呧呧呧即三十兩銀子)</td>
<td>…until nine in the afternoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are six hours’ time difference between Morrison’s translation and the ST.

IV. CONCLUSION

It can be seen that Morrison follows the principle of ‘fidelity, perspicuity and simplicity’ in his translation of the four gospels. Some examples above clearly show the successful part of his translations. Compared to the CUV, some of Morrison’s translations are more precise, which reveals the success of his translation strategies. However, there are some limitations in Morrison’s translations:

1. Given the ‘material deprivations’ in the 19th century, Morrison turns to transliteration in translating some materials, such as ‘又昔夜上到耶穌之尼可氐母亦來帶咗喺同啞囉之雛香約有一百斤。’ (John: 19: 39), where he translates myrrh and aloes as ‘咗喺’ (mi er) and ‘啞囉’ (ya luo). There are voids in Morrison's translations on items.

2. Morrison turns to terms from Chinese religions during his translation. He translates ‘spirit’ as ‘wind’/‘風 (feng)’, as The Chinese say, ‘天地之使曰風’ (tian di zhi shi yue feng), the messenger of heaven and earth is called wind or spirit.\footnote{See John: 1:32; Mark: 1:26; 1:39; 3:11; Luke: 1:15.} Morrison translates ‘power’ as ‘德’ (moral), such as ‘且耶穌即自知有德出之，轉身向眾曰，誰摩我衣乎。’ (Mark: 5: 30) He translates ‘compassion’ as ‘慈悲’ (mercy) in Chinese, a common expression on Buddha.

At times, Morrison could not stick to the ‘fidelity’ principle and turned to terms from Chinese religions, which was done to make the Bible easier for Chinese readers to understand and accept. Based on Lefevere’s three elements to his patronage (the ideological, economic and status component), this article proposes a fourth one: ‘pragmatic component’. Certain translations from Morrison were rendered for practical reasons. Different from the previous three elements, pragmatic components are decided by the milieu where translators are in, not the patronage.
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