1 Introduction

From May 1 to October 28, 1893, the Columbian World Exposition was held in the city of Chicago to celebrate the 400th anniversary of Christopher Columbus’ “discovery” of the American continent. Many international conferences were held during the exposition, but probably the most remarkable was the World Parliament of Religions. Deputies from ten different religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Zoroastrianism, Taoism, Confucianism, Shintoism, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) gave speeches or presented papers. After the end of the World Parliament, organizer John Barrows published these texts in two volumes.1

Certainly, there have been discussions on the impact of the World Parliament of Religions on the field of religious history. In U.S. religious history studies, scholars have been concerned with how American society has looked at the issue of religion. For example, Donald H. Bishop has observed that American Christians take the view that there are

1 Barrows 1893, 19.
three different approaches to religious diversity: exclusion, inclusion, and pluralism. Richard Seager has pointed out that the World Parliament encouraged the birth of religious pluralism in the U.S. In addition, scholars have also studied the World Parliament with regard to the acceptance in the U.S. of Eastern religions. Suzuki Norihisa 鈴木範久 and Mori Koichi 森孝一 summarized the Japanese religious personages who attended the World Parliament in a religious study about Japan; and James Edward Ketelaar discussed the influence of the World Parliament on Japanese Buddhism. In contrast to the above-mentioned studies, Chen Xiyuan 陳熙遠 and Murata Yūjirō 村田雄二郎 focused on the essay titled “Confucianism” written by the Chinese diplomat Pung Kwang Yu (Peng Guangyu 彭光譽), and discussed how Pung understood religion.

The organizing of the World Parliament of Religions was related to the situation of Christianity in the West. At the end of the 19th century, evolutionism spread in Western society and impacted theology. In the meantime, Christianity was also impacted by the translations of central works from other religions published by Friedrich Max Müller (1823–1900) founding a basis for comparing religions.

“Religion is the greatest fact of history.” This was John Barrows’ (1847–1902) first sentence in his preface to the collected works of the World Parliament. It implied the intention to confirm the significance of Christianity, both historically and as an everyday reality. Nonetheless, Christianity’s ordained representatives and its laity have different or even widely divergent understandings of religion. Thus, when we look back at the World Parliament one century later, we are still faced with the same old question: “What is religion?”

This question informs my own interest in the World Parliament of Religions. Specifically, I aim to examine how “Chinese religions” were represented at the World Parliament. Besides Pung Kwang Yu’s “Confucianism”, there were eight other articles presented by Chinese scholars and by Christian missionaries from China. Some of these articles were read by the authors in person, while others were disseminated at the World Parliament to explain the respective stances of Confucianism, Taoism, and Christianity. The meeting was also attended by Chinese and foreign missionaries. The similarities and dif-
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ferences that they represented in the “Chinese religions” deserve to be looked at more closely.

In recent years, the word *zongjiao* (Chin.) resp. *shūkyō* (Jap.) 宗教 has been the translation of “religion”. As a concept, it has attracted the attention of many scholars. When discussing the characteristics of conceptual history research, Koselleck compared “conceptual history” in its methodology to the “history of ideas”, and argued that while a word representing an idea might remain constant, a concept could, by contrast, be represented by different words.9 When scholars ponder how “religion” came to be translated in a particular way, we therefore have to study which Chinese words were translated as “religion” and its related concepts. After analyzing the connotation of the term “Chinese religions” as it was used at the World Parliament, I will discuss problems connected with the translation of the word “religion”.

2 Confucianism’s Understanding of Religion

On September 11, at 10:00 a.m., the bell of the Columbian World Exposition rang ten times. Fifty-six deputies then entered onto the platform of the World Parliament of Religions before an audience of thousands to initiate the seventeen-day-long World Parliament.

A remarkable episode supposedly occurred at this opening ceremony, when Barrows made a brief speech instead of Pung, whose knowledge of English was very limited. When Barrows took the paper from Pung’s secretary, he was surprised to notice that it was precisely the same sheet of paper which had come from his own typewriter. Barrows later reflected: “As I read my own words, the people cheered and Mr. Pung bowed low.”10 The group photo of the opening ceremony shows that Pung was slightly overweight and short. Barrows himself observed: “The Honorable Pung Quang Yu, the rotund, big-headed, and ever-smiling representative of the Celestial Empire. He was a man of very capacious and vigorous mind, as may be discovered from his treaties on Confucianism.”11 Although we know that Pung was a junior official, there is otherwise little record of him. It has been confirmed that he was born in Chong’an County, Fujian Province, in 1844, and had participated in diplomatic negotiations in Korea before going to the U.S.12

On the third day of the World Parliament, it was Pung’s turn to speak. His speech was read by William Pipe. The lengthy article “Confucianism”, containing more than 30,000 words, was translated by Yong Kwai, translator of the Chinese Legation in the

9 Koselleck 2002.
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In addition to the English version that Pung submitted to the World Parliament, there was also a Chinese version, entitled *Shuo jiao*. Zongli Yamen submitted it to the emperor in 1896 and it was later published by the Imperial Tungwen College. The Chinese version also included the emperor's instructions and the report of Yang, the Chinese Ambassador in the U.S., Japan and Peru, to the emperor.

Why did a Chinese diplomat attend the World Parliament of Religions? It turns out that when the U.S. government invited China to attend the Columbian World Exposition, Li Hung Chong (李鴻章) rejected it, stating that China would have no exhibition at Chicago. Afterwards, however, following repeated invitations from Barrows, the Premier's Office decided to send Pung to attend the World Parliament. Ambassador Yang reported to the emperor that Pung arrived in Chicago on August 9 and stayed for nearly two months until October 1. Pung remarked: "I went to America in 1886 as an envoy, and came back after the end of the World Parliament in 1893".

Pung felt great pride in being able to attend the World Parliament. He even stressed that he was "the first one to preach Confucianism to Westerners across the ocean".

---
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What exactly did Pung preach to Westerners? Here, the Chinese and English tables of contents to Pung’s speech is instructive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>說教</td>
<td>Confucianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>說教</td>
<td>To Rev. John Henry Barrows, D.D., Chairman of the Committee on Religious Congresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>帝教篇第一</td>
<td>Instruction by Rulers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>師教篇第二</td>
<td>Instruction by A Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>天道篇第三</td>
<td>The Laws of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>神道篇第四</td>
<td>The Doctrines of Orthodox Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>人道篇第五</td>
<td>Heterodox Doctrines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>儒學篇第六</td>
<td>The Laws of Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>異學篇第七</td>
<td>The Laws of the Spiritual World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>外篇上</td>
<td>Supplement, part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>外篇下</td>
<td>Supplement, part 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the sequence of the English version’s fourth to seventh chapters is incorrect, the remaining part is nonetheless consistent. Pung’s supervisor, Ambassador Yang, revealed in his memorial to the throne that

[Pung] described the sources of China’s Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism and their differences from and similarities with Christianity, and (wrote) sarcastically about Western missionaries.18

Indeed, Pung’s article was divided into three parts: Part 1 discussed the concept of religion and whether there was religion in China from a Confucian perspective; Part 2 introduced the core Confucian thoughts; Part 3 discussed the “missionary problem” that had occurred when proselytizers went to China to preach Christianity. In the following, I will focus on Part 1.

Although Pung’s English version was intended for Westerners, reference to the Chinese version (provided in the accompanying notes) can help us understand the context in which the term “religion” was used. At the beginning of the Chinese version, Pung expressed a view that was completely opposed to that of the World Parliament organizers. He called “The World Parliament of Religions” “The World Parliament on Nestorianism”. In Chinese, the name “Nestorianism” refers to a branch of the Christian Church, Nestorianism, that was introduced into China during the Tang Dynasty. Pung noted the following below the word “Nestorianism”:

18 “Chu Shi Mei Ri Mi Guo Dachen Yang Zou”; 詳言中國儒释道源流及與景教異同之故，以隱諷歐墨兩洲傳教之士。
Nestorianism in The Nestorian Monument in China refers to an ancient religion in the West, which differs from today’s religion. The English name of today’s religion is “Erlili-jing”. “Jing” is used here to translate religion to mean homophonic and comprehensible.19

This paragraph is not found in the English version. Two points are worth emphasizing here: First, Pung transliterated religion into erlilijing 尔釐利景 using the pronunciation of 景 (jing) in jingjiao 景教 (Nestorianism). Second, religion’s translation into erlilijing is not only an instance of transliteration, but it also concerns the interpretation of religion. As Pung wrote:

Now take the word “Religion”, which is the subject under discussion. Toward the close of the Ming Dynasty, the Europeans in China used the word “kao” [jiao 教] in the sense of Religion. But “kao” signifies properly “to teach”, if used as a verb, or “instruction”, if used as a noun.20

Pung pointed out that Europeans translated religion as jiao at the end of the Ming Dynasty, which was a mistranslation, because jiao is the verb “to teach” or the noun “instruction” in Chinese, and is thus different from the word “religion” as it is used by Europeans. Pung thought that this misunderstanding was connected to Buddhists, Taoists and even Mohammedans. He wrote:

Even the term “Yu kao” [rujiao 儒教], or Confucian school, is employed only by the Taoists and Buddhists to distinguish the established system of instruction founded upon the principles of social relation, from their own systems of belief, which they call “Taokao” [daojiao 道教] and “Foh-kao” [fojiao 佛教], respectively, by prefixing the word “yu” [ru] to the general term “kao” [jiao]. To these three systems of doctrine they sometimes give the name of “San-kao” [sanjiao 三教], or three systems of instruction. But Confucians refer to the two sects only as a “heterodox system of doctrine”. Mohammedans call the Confucian system of doctrine “ta-kao” [dajiao 大教], or the great system of instruction. All these terms, however, can be traced to those who desire to separate themselves by a distinctive name from the general body of the people. They are not of a Chinese origin. The only term that is of a Chinese origin is “li-kao” [lijiao 禮教], or the proper system of instruction.21

19  Peng Guangyu 1893, 1: 按西學凡所載景教流行中國碑之景教, 系西方古教, 已與今教不同, 英文名今教曰爾釐利景, 此仍用景字譯之, 取其音同易知, 但用本字尾音者, 如同文館丁冠西總教習, 其姓本爲馬爾丁, 入中國止用尾音, 日丁, 是其例也。
20  Pung 1893, 375. Cf. Peng Guangyu 1893, 3a: 按此會所議者, 於英文為爾釐利景 (阿依而藹基藹窩恩)。明末歐羅巴人譯為華文, 曰教者是也。然華文敎字之義, 虛字, 為英文題赤 (梯依愛西鴟), 實字為英文音司黜廬克慎 (藹恩司梯阿尤西藹窩恩)。
If Confucianism is not a religion, then, is there religion at all in China? Pung’s answer is negative. He explained:

I find “religion”, as defined by Webster, to be “the recognition of God as an object of worship, love and obedience, or right feelings towards God as rightly apprehended”, “prophet” to be “a person illuminated, inspired or instructed by God to speak in his name or announce future events”, and “priest” to be “one who officiates at the altar, or performs the rites of sacrifice, hence, one who acts as a mediator between men and the divinity of gods”, pastors, ministers, missionaries being only different names for persons who perform functions quite similar to those of a priest. Now, according to these definitions, “Religion” has its proper Chinese equivalent in the word “Chuh” [祝]. As for those persons who can foretell the future events, they can find their associates in China in those who are versed in sooth-saying.22

In Pung’s eyes, religion is a form of witchery. It is called zhu when applied to shamans, who were popular during the Han Dynasty. He further said that the genesis myth and religious thought of Christianity are similar to those of Taoism and Buddhism.

When Europeans first made their way into China, toward the close of the Ming Dynasty, they found it difficult to hit upon a proper Chinese word for God. They made use of the terms “Shangti” [Shangdi 上帝] (Ruler of the Upper Religions), “Shen” [神] (Spirit), “Chan Shen” [Zhenshen 真神] (True Spirit), “Tuh-i-chi-Shen” [Duyi zhi shen 獨一之神] (Only Spirit). Sometimes they merely translated the word “Pater” and “Jehovah” by means of Chinese characters. In their worship they made use of images. They had certain tradition on the subject of cosmogony. Their religious beliefs seemed to bear a strong resemblance to those held by Buddhist and Taoist priests.23
Pung finally pointed out:

There are some Western scholars who say that the system of doctrines of Confucius cannot be properly called a Religion, and there are others who say that China has no Religion of her own. That the ethical systems of Confucius can be called a Religion may be admitted without fear of contradiction, but that China has no Religion of her own must be taken as not well founded in fact.²⁴

In Pung’s mind, Confucianism was clearly superior to all religions, whereas religion *per se* was a kind of folk shamanism and more or less equivalent to Buddhism and Taoism. Pung stressed at the end of the article that Christianity was only one of various schools of thought in China and Asia. He further argued that the continual disputes surrounding Christianity in China were due to the fact that

[...] the foreign missionaries that have for the past thirty years labored in China have come into contact only with the lowest element of Chinese society.

Pung added:

They make no attempt to study the political institutions and educational principles of the Chinese people, and aim only to carry out their own notions of what is right.²⁵

This was the general view of the Qing government about the missionaries of the 19th century.

At the World Parliament of Religions, Pung’s article stood out because he pointed out that *jiao* in Chinese was not religion and that Confucianism was not a religion. In translating “religion”, he created the new noun *erlilijing* on the basis of both transliteration and a free translation that took poetic license. In general, the so-called World Parliament of Religions was but a parliament of “Christianity”. He was thus “the other” who represented the stance of Confucianism to this parliament of Christianity.

3 Translated Confucianism and Taoism

The collected works that John Barrows compiled included two articles that were both marked “prize essay”: one was “Confucianism” by Kung Hsien Ho,²⁶ and the other was

---


²⁶ Kung 1893.
entitled “Taoism”. When we trace the origins of the two articles, we learn that the former was “Ru lun” 儒論 (Confucianism) by Kong Xianhe 孔憲和 from Shanghai, and the latter was “Daojiao lun” 道教論 (Taoism) by Li Baoyuan 李葆元 from Zhenjiang. They were published in the journal Wanguo gongbao 萬國公報 (A Review of the Times) run by missionaries in Shanghai. At the conclusion of Kong Xianhe’s “Ru lun”, Timothy Richard (1845–1919), English translator and missionary of the English Baptist Mission, added a translation note:

The World Exposition in Chicago was an unprecedented event that exhibited various things. It was held in memory of the great achievement made by the Spaniard Columbus in his first arrival in America, which laid a foundation for America’s four centuries of history. No one equals him; in reputation he was unsurpassed. At the [World] Parliament, different countries not only showed their handiworks but also introduced their important religions. Before [the World Exposition], the organizers sent me a letter, hoping that I would ask famous intellectuals to write articles on Confucianism and Taoism, translate good ones into English, and send them to the [World] Parliament for discussion. Many good articles were received. After I read through these articles, I asked two friends to help select the best and second best ones, which have been published on Shun Pao [Shenbao 申報] (Shanghai News).

Timothy Richard clearly explained the origin of the two articles. At that time, Dr. Allen, editor-in-chief of Wanguo gongbao returned to the U.S. for an extended period, and Dr. Edkins, the other Sinologist working for this newspaper, was in Europe. Richard translated the two articles after assuming the role of editor. The two articles were awarded a prize for having concisely expressed the core elements of Confucianism and Taoism, and also because they reflected what the missionary Richard knew about Confucianism and Taoism. The translation of the two articles brings out the issue of re-creation through translation.

27  Anon. [= Li Baoyuan] 1893.
28  Kong Xianhe 1893.
29  Li Baoyuan 1893.
30  Wanguo gongbao 54 (1893.7), 3: 美國西加哥地方, 設立博物大會, 巨集其規模, 廣其物類, 誠亘古未有之盛舉也。按設是會者, 原為西班科侖布首至美洲起見, 追念科君一人之奇勳, 而開四百年之基業, 其聲名卓越, 竟無出其右者。除各國賽珍外, 又會講五洲各國大教。前承會董函致於餘, 轉請中華名士, 作儒教道教二論, 擇其佳者, 嘗余翻譯西文, 寄至大會, 以資講論。宏篇巨制, 美不勝收, 餘統閱一過, 再請二友互相考訂, 評定甲乙, 已錄《申報》。Cf. Chen Jianming 2014, 217.
“Confucianism” was featured on the fifth day of the World Parliament, but the article’s author Kung was not present. Nonetheless, Kung’s article had the same focus as Pung’s, namely, to publicize the importance that Confucianism attaches to ethics. However, its mood and style differed greatly. Kung began by writing:

The most important thing in the superior man’s learning is to fear defying heaven’s will. Therefore, in our Confucian religion the most important thing is to follow the will of heaven.32

Then, he began to demonstrate the vitality of Confucianism in its relationship with the Confucian classics and Chinese history. He pointed out:

That is what has caused Confucianism to be transmitted from the oldest times till now, and what constitutes its superiority to other religions is that it does not encourage mysteries and strange things or marvels. It is impartial and upright. It is a doctrine of great impartiality and strict uprightness, which one may bring forth in one’s person and carry out with vigor in one’s life. Therefore we say that when the sun and moon come forth (as in Confucianism), then the light of candles can be dispensed with.33

By comparing the Chinese and English versions, we learn that although Richard translated the original text literally, there are nevertheless some problems. Two paragraphs are chosen here for consideration, and the relevant words are underscored.

程子曰: 鬼神者天地之功用, 而造化之跡也。朱子曰: 以二氣言, 則鬼者陰之靈也, 神者陽之靈也, 以一氣言, 則至而伸者為神, 反而歸者為鬼。

Cheng Tsze [Chengzi] says the spirits are the forces or servants of Heaven and earth, and signs of creative power. Chu Fu Tsze [Zhuzi] says: “Speaking of two powers, the demons are the intelligent ones of Yin, the gods are the intelligent ones of Yang; speaking of one power, the supreme and originating is called God, the reverse and the returning is Demon.”

中庸引孔子曰: 鬼神之為德, 弗其盛矣乎? 視之而弗見, 聽之而弗聞, 體物而不可遺, 使天下之人, 齊明誠服, 以承祭祀, 洋洋乎如在其上, 如在其左右, 鬼神之情狀如此。所以易重卜筮, 取決於鬼神, 知鬼神實天地之氣, 雖無形而有氣, 若難憑而易知。特世間之大聖大賢忠臣義士孝子節婦, 乘天地浩然之正氣, 生而為英, 没而為神, 其氣歷久不散, 能有功於世。

32  Kung 1893, 596. See Kong Xianhe 1993: 君子之學, 首在畏天命, 故吾儒之學, 首在畏天命。
33  Kung 1893, 604. Cf. Kong Xianhe 1893: 而儒之所以垂於古今, 勝於他教者, 則以不為索隱行怪, 無偏無倚, 均大中至正之道, 可以身體而力行, 所謂日月出而燭火之光自息也。
The Chung Yung [Zhongyong], quoting Confucius, says: “The power of the spirits is very great! You look and cannot see them, you listen and cannot hear them, but they are embodied in all things without missing any, causing all men to reverence them and be purified, and be well adorned in order to sacrifice unto them.” All things are alive as if the gods were right above our heads or on our right hand and the left. Such being the gods, therefore the Yih King [Yijing] makes much of divining to get decision from the gods, knowing that the gods are the forces of Heaven and earth in operation. Although unseen, still they influence; if difficult to prove, yet easily known. The great sages and great worthies, the loyal ministers, the righteous scholars, the filial sons, the pure women of the world, having received the purest influences of the divinest forces of Heaven and earth, when on earth were heroes, when dead are the gods. Their influences continue for many generations to affect the world for good, therefore many venerate and sacrifice unto them.

As the above examples shows, Richard used different words to translate shen, gui shen, and gui. Shen was translated as “God”, “gods” or “spirits”; guishen as “gods” or “spirits”; and gui as “demons”. This flexible translation expressed the translator’s understanding of Confucian terms in different contexts. This was also reflected in his understanding of religion. Consider the following examples, which present the various terms that are used concerning religious practices and ideas.

故吾儒之學,首在承天命。 
Therefore, in our Confucian religion the most important thing is to follow the will of Heaven.

中庸所謂修道之為教也。 
The Chung Yung [Zhongyong] calls the practice of wisdom religion.

吾儒既深知天命,故其視天下猶一家。 
Our religion well knows Heaven’s will, it looks on all under Heaven as one family.

辭讓之心,禮之端也。 
[...] a yielding disposition is the beginning of religion.

若仁又包夫義禮智。 
As to benevolence, it also includes righteousness religion and wisdom.

[孔子]刪詩書,定禮樂,贊周易,修春秋,而言治國。 
[Confucius] edited the odes and the history, reformed religion, made notes on the “Book of Changes”, wrote the annals of spring and autumn, and spoke of governing the nation.

自後,雖時代變更,斯道昭於天壤。 
After this, although the ages changed this, religion flourished.

朱子集其成,斯道燦然大明。 
Chu Fu-Tsze [Zhuzi] collected their works and this religion shone with great brightness.
On looking at it down the ages there is also clear evidence of results in governing the country and its superiority to other religions.

Then the Han dynasty arose (B.C.206–A.D.220). Although it leaned towards Taoism, the people, after having suffered so long from the cruelties of the Tsin, were easily governed. Although the religious rites of the Shu Sun-tung do not command our confidence, the elucidation of the ancient classics and books we owe mostly to the Confucianists of the Han period.

When the first Emperor of the Ming Dynasty (A.D.1368–1644) arose, and reformed the religion and ritual of the Empire, he called it the great peaceful dynasty.

As the text above indicates, religion, according to Richard’s understanding, had three characteristics: First, it refers to an ideological system; second, it refers to 礼 or liyüe 礼樂, institutions; third, it refers to xiù dao 修道, the way of practicing a faith.

Wánguó gōngbào published “Daojiao lun” soon after “Ru lun”. The English translation of “Daojiao lun” was put in the “scientific section” of the collected works. Compared to the Chinese version, the English version was very reductive; it was a selected translation of the original text.

At the beginning of “Taoism”, its author complained about the tradition’s decline:

Alas, why has our religion declined to this situation today?34

This question, however, was entirely omitted from the English version, which read:

Taoism and Confucianism are the oldest religions of China. Taoism originated with the originator of all religions.

When did Taoism begin to decline? The English version explained:

[...] Chang Lu (ca. A.D. 385–582?) used charms in his teaching, and employed fasting, prayer, hymns and incantations to obtain blessings and repel calamities; and Taoism’s fundamental doctrines had utterly disappeared.35

__________________________

34 Li Baoyuan 1893, 13775: 嗟乎何吾教之式微, 迄今日而一至於斯哉。
35 Anon. [= Li Baoyuan] 1893, 1356; Cf. Li Baoyuan 1893, 13777: 及張魯立教, 以符錄祈禱教人; 北魏寇謙之等又以齋醮章兄求福禳災, 怪誕支離, 每況愈下, 而吾教中之宗旨全非矣。
Although this text differed slightly from the original Chinese text, it essentially had the same meaning. We would do well to now look at how Richard translated religion:

惟吾教與儒教為最先。
Taoism and Confucianism are the oldest religions of China.

吾教起初實創於元始。一再傳之老聃，老聃生於東周時，為柱下史。
Taoism originated with the originator of all religions. He transmitted it to Lao-tsze [Laozi], who was born in the Chow [Zhou] dynasty (about B.C. 604), was contemporary with Confucius, and kept the records.

考漢志所錄，道家三十七部，神仙家十部，本不相同。
In the Han dynasty Taoism had thirty-seven books and the genii religion ten. These are different at first.

吾教中有好異者，以為清靜無為之說，不足動人之聽聞，乃以修煉內丹外丹諸術，以炫耀其奇靈。
Taoism ceased to think purity and peaceableness sufficient to satisfy men, it became the genii religion (magic and spiritualism), though still called Taoism.

何謂承天命？蓋道之大原出於天，人身一小天地也。禀陰陽二氣以生。
What does Taoism mean by the phrase, carry out heaven’s will? It means that heaven is the first cause of religion, that man is produced by two forces, Yin and Yang.

真心學道之人，養其性，存其神，斂其氣，收其心。
Those who really study religion, cultivate their spiritual nature, preserve their souls, gather up their spiritual force, and watch their hearts.

又吾教中微妙之造詣，有非他教中所能及者。
Comprehension of the hereafter is one of the mysteries in which no religion can equal Taoism.

綜論吾教之興衰，知道家與神仙家已合為一。
Taoism and the genii religion have deteriorated.

誠有一人焉，以振興吾教為己任。
Oh! That one would arise to restore our religion.

Here, *wu jiao* 吾教 and *dao* 道 (Taoism) are translated as “religion”, while religion, in turn, generally refers to “Taoism”. In addition, besides religion, there is also the translated term “genii (genie) religion”. As the latter refers to “alchemists” and “immortals”, it has a lower status than religion proper. Richard argued that Taoism went into decline following the Han Dynasty and thus turned from a religion to a genie religion. Through his translation, Confucianism and Taoism in the eyes of Western Christians were systems of thought located between spiritual faith and atheism.
4 Chinese Religions Represented by Missionaries

The collected works of the World Parliament included articles by six missionaries from China – Issac T. Headland, W. A. P. Martin, George T. Candlin, Y. K. Yen, Ernst Faber, and Henry Blodgett. The articles of the first four authors were discussed in the formal agenda of the World Parliament, while the latter two articles were compiled into the scientific section in abstracts and apparently not included in the agenda. In addition, I have not been able to confirm whether all six missionaries were present. In fact, some missionaries, such as the missionary Calvin W. Mateer, visited the exposition but did not attend the World Parliament of Religions. He appears to have stayed at the exposition for nearly one month.36 It is helpful to examine the way in which the six missionaries represented Chinese religions according to the use of the word “religion”.

On the eighth day of the World Parliament, Issac Headland (1859–1942), a professor at Peking University, presented a report titled “Religion in Peking”.37 The author used “religion” twice in his article to refer generally to all the religions of China, especially the four major religions of Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism. The author says at the beginning that foreigners were greatly mistaken to believe that China was too poor to support Christianity. In fact, without regard to the four major Chinese religions, Headland felt that anyone who takes a glance at any town or village would see that there is sufficient reason to believe that “whatever the Chinese want to do, they have enough ability to do that.” There were poor people everywhere in Peking City, and 400 had frozen to death outside of Qianmen (one of the great city gates) the previous winter. However, there was more to the city than poverty: the number of temples in Peking exceeded the number of the churches in Chicago. There were giant Lamaist, Confucian, and Taoist temples, and even twenty-one mosques. In addition there were state monuments, such as the Temple of the Sun, the Temple of the Moon, and the Temple of Agriculture. Headland also mentioned the Biyun Temple and especially Miaofeng Mountain. He observed that Chinese temples were built luxuriously, while monks remained beggars. One thing was also noticeable to people who passed through the country villages. The houses, namely, were all built of mud, mud walls, mud roof, paper windows, and dirt floors. But no matter how poor the people, or what the state of their houses, may have been, the village temple was nonetheless made of good brick. Based on the estimate of missionary Mateer, Headland thought that the Chinese spent about US$120 million on ancestral worship per annum, which he deemed a great waste.

36 Fisher 1911.
37 Headland 1893.
William Alexander Parsons Martin (1827–1916) presented his famous article entitled “America’s Duty to China” at a symposium on the thirteenth day. As the title indicates, this president of the Imperial Tungwen College clearly had a different agenda than the other missionaries. Aiming at the rift in China-U.S. relations that arose from the “Chinese Exclusion Act”, he asserted that “China is our neighbor” and that the U.S., moreover, had a duty to China, for it was precisely where American interests lay. He also made a final appeal to

Let a wise diplomacy supersede these obnoxious enactments by a new convention which shall be fair to both parties; then will our people be welcomed as friends, and America may yet recover her lost influence in that great Empire of East.

As a missionary of the Presbyterian Church, Martin thought that “it is unnecessary to stop to prove that religion is our chief good” at this Parliament of Religions. In his article, he explained his view on Chinese religions. The term “religion” that he used referred generally to all religions. However, when designating Christianity, the author thought it was beyond the scope of any of the Chinese religions. With regard to Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism, he made only concise statements. For instance, in reference to Confucianism, he described a Chinese professor in the Imperial Tungwen College who taught mathematics and was proficient in Western learning:

He was a Confucian and believed in an over-ruling power, which he called “Shang-Ti” [Shangdi] or “Tien” [Tian]. He also had some faint notion of a life to come, as evidenced by his worship of ancestors; but his religion, such as it was, was woefully wanting in vitality and marked by that Sadducean indifference which may be taken as the leading characteristic of his school, despite the excellence of its ethical system.

For Taoism, he differentiated it from Laozi, and thought that

Lao Tsze [Laozi] did indeed express some sublime truths in beautiful language.

He added:

His followers have become sadly degenerate; and not to speak of alchemy, which they continue to pursue, their religion has dwindled into a compound of necromancy and exorcism.

About Buddhism, he said, “Buddhism has a nobler record”, however

Its priesthood has lapsed into such a state of ignorance and corruption that in Chinese Buddhism there appears to be no possibility of revival.”

38 Martin 1893.
39 Martin 1893,1144.
Displaying knowledge of Japanese Buddhism, Martin emphasized that it “appears to be more wide-awake.” Finally, he summed up:

The religion of the state is a heterogeneous cult, made up of ceremonies borrowed from each of these three systems. [...] To the august character of Shang-Ti [Shangdi], the Supreme Ruler, known but neglected, feared but not loved, Christianity will add the attraction of a tender Father, bringing him into each heart and house in lieu of the fetishes now enshrined there.

By the time this article was published, Martin had lived in China for over 40 years. His aforementioned views about the three Chinese religions are expressed in greater detail in his works. His basic views about Taoism and Buddhism in the report were from his famous work *Hanlin Papers*.40

On the fifteenth day of the World Parliament, the missionary George T. Candlin (1853–1924) from the British Methodist Church in Peking held a speech.41 Although the missionary was dressed in the Confucian style and had arrived from China, his speech had little to do with China. His main aim was to appeal to different Christian organizations in order to unite them in their common aims. He thought that

Religion wherever we find it makes an appeal to the human conscience, addresses itself to the faculty of worship and makes a stand, effective or ineffective, against evil. However ineffective, to make the attempt at all is better than to let the flood roll irresistibly. China is better than Africa because she has better religions. China without Confucius would have been immeasurably worse than China with Confucius.

Candlin had some positive thoughts about Confucianism, but emphasized that Confucianism endowed only the Chinese Empire with an external integrating force – “P’ing T’ien Hsia” [ping tianxia 平天下] – which pacified all under heaven, while what Christianity would bring to China was not external peace but a Christendom that believed in itself as a religion and not as a national agenda.

On the seventeenth day of the World Parliament, the Chinese priest Y. K. Yen from Shanghai also talked about his views on Chinese religions.42 He referred to “religion” nine times in total, and thought that Chinese religions, which included Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism, could be combined into one religion called “national religion”. He said:

Under the providence of God, this religion has fulfilled a very important function in the civilization of our country. It has kept alive in our people the ideas of God, of the evil of sin, of retribution, of the need of pardon, of the existence of the soul, and has given all the

40  Martin 1880, 126–162.
41  Candlin 1893.
42  Yen 1893.
blessings which flow from these ideas. Like the law of the Jews, though in a less degree, it has been a schoolmaster leading our people to Christ. The relation of Christianity to our National religion is the same as its relation to natural religion in general. It comes not to destroy, but to fulfill.

This suggests that the national religion of China had accomplished its historical mission. Yen thought, on the other hand, that Christianity was significant in China for two reasons: First, it had spiritual and moral benefits. The idea of God presented by the national religion, he asserted, was vague and rudimentary, and, moreover, had degenerated into the basest materialism. Christianity could bring new ideas about God to China, that encompassed the profane existence on earth to the spirituality of heaven. Yen thought that Christianity could improve the sense of morality of the Chinese and ameliorate the lack of mutual trust and the discrimination against women. Indeed, Yen pointed out, certain issues had arisen in the political and social life of China because “the religion which has shaped our character is surely amiss.” Second, there were ideological and material benefits. Chinese education was focused on learning about ancient times and lacked knowledge about human welfare. The Christian Church introduced Western “liberal sciences”, published many books, and also popularized medicine by establishing 105 hospitals in China (1890).

The German missionary Ernst Faber (1839–1899) in Shanghai wrote the article “The Genesis and Development of Confucianism” for the Parliament. The original text, entitled “Confucianism”, was shortened by the editors in the collected works. After Faber’s death, P. Kranz discovered the original text and included it in the republished work. According to Kranz, Faber read this article at some point during the World Parliament.

Ernst Faber came to China in 1865, and gained fame among missionaries for his views on China and the West, which are elaborated upon in his Zi xi cu dong 自西徂東 / Civilization: China and Christian, published under his Chinese name: Hua Zhi’an 花之安. This work was serialized in Wanguo gongbao during 1879–1883. This series of essays was subsequently compiled into a single volume and published in Hong Kong in 1884 under the same title. The book puts forward ways of social improvement from the Christian standpoint. In comparing the advantages and disadvantages of Chinese and Western civilizations, Faber argues that the root problem is Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism:

These three religions are not clear about the foundation of worship at all. As a result, they make (their followers) very uncultivated.
In his book, Ernst Faber did not use the word *zongjiao* (religion). All the same, what he discussed was related to religion.

In his article, Faber discussed the religious factors of Confucianism, which he dated back to several centuries before the birth of Confucius. In the pre-Confucius era,

Mankind was regarded as subject to a superior power called Heaven, the supreme ruler (Shang-ti [Shangdi]), or God (Ti [Di]). Under him many minor deities ruled as ministering spirits over lesser or larger spheres. [...] Under the Chow [Zhou] dynasty (B.C. 1123?), ancestor-worship became the most prominent religious service.

Finally, he pointed out that not only were the ideals of Confucius and Mencius not realized in China, but the gods worshiped in the temples were not even advocated by them.

The last article related to China in the collected works was written by missionary Henry Blodgett (1825–1903) of the America Board from Peking. It outlined the Chinese translation of the “holy name” (Elohim, Theos, God), which was much disputed among the missionaries in China. Protestant missionaries had been divided into two schools since the beginning of the nineteenth century. One was composed mainly of British missionaries, who thought that the translation should be Shangdi, as recorded in ancient Chinese books; the other was composed mainly of American missionaries, who thought the only possible translation was Shen. Blodgett had translated the Bible together with Mateer et al. and knew quite a bit about this issue. He wrote:

> At present there are three ways of representing the word God in translation of the Scriptures into Chinese, and large editions are published with each. One has used Shen, which many Protestant and all Roman and Greek missionaries use for Spirit when speaking of the Holy Spirit. Another uses Shang-Ti [Shangdi], which the Roman Catholics after long controversy rejected as inconsistent with doctrinal purity, and to which the Greek Church does not use. The third way is to use Tien-Chu [Tianzhu 天主], which is used by the Latin and Greek Churches.

In light of the three views mentioned above, Blodgett concluded that the eighty years of experience since Dr. Morrison had proven that Shen was insufficient as a translation. In addition, the word Shangdi had always been the name of the chief object of worship in the national cult. Finally, he thought that Tianzhu should be used for the following reason:

> No word in Chinese language has more of religious reverence attached to it than Tien [tian] (Heaven). To this Chu [zhu] (Lord) has been added by Christianity to make it personal, and to show that not the creature, but the Creator of all is to be worshiped. Thus Tien-Chu [Tianzhu] will ever stand in Chinese as a protest against nature worship, and significant of the true God.

---

48  Blodgett 1893.
Thus, Blodgett did not use “Shen” for the holy name like most American missionaries, but rather concurred with Matteo Ricci, who went to China at the end of the Ming dynasty and favored “Tianzhu”. However, over many years of controversy, the translations “Shen” and “Shangdi” had both become widely adopted in the world of missionary work, and were considered valid alternative translations in different versions of the Bible. Blodgett was thus unable to arouse any controversy.

What conclusions can be drawn from the preceding overview of the six missionaries’ articles? First, as to whether there was religion in China and whether the Chinese had a religious mind, the six missionaries agreed on both accounts that the answer was yes. At the same time, with the exception of the ethical function of Confucianism, they assessed China’s own Confucianism – directly or indirectly based on their Christian points of view – negatively. Some stressed that Confucianism and Taoism deviated from the religious spirit of ancient times. Another common concern of missionaries in China was whether there was any similarity between the Chinese religions and Christianity, for this related to whether they could carry out their missionary work successfully. At the World Parliament, the favorable comments of Martin, Candlin, and others on Confucianism reflected a consensus that there was in fact a similarity. However, there were some differences among the missionaries about how to translate the Bible using Confucian concepts. Blodgett’s article shows that even if the missionaries compromised on the translation of “God” as “Shangdi” and “Shen”, there was nonetheless an irreconcilable gap between the different religions, specifically, as it pertained to monotheism and polytheism.

5 From Religion to Zongjiao

The World Parliament of Religions ended on September 27, the seventeenth day. The significance of the World Parliament for the history of religious thought must be judged according to whether any meaningful exchanges took place between the different religions and their representatives. Borrowing Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s paradox “He who knows one language, knows none”, Friedrich Max Müller once said, “He who knows one [religion], knows none.”

From a comparative religion perspective, what messages did the “Chinese religions” communicate at the World Parliament in Chicago?

It is well known that the missionaries who went to China in the nineteenth century translated “religion” with jiao.

教， called [rujiao] 儒教, the Philosophists; [shijiao] 释教, the Buddhists; [daojiao] 道教, the Alchymists", and as a “founder or head of a religion” with jiaozhu 教主. “The Christian religion is known by the name [tianzhu jiao] 天主教 [Catholicism]; and sometimes [xiyang jiao] 西洋教 [Western religion].”

Later, Walter Henry Medhurst (1796–1857) and Wilhelm Lobscheid (1822–1893) in their Chinese and English Dictionary resp. English and Chinese Dictionary followed the same translation strategy. However, as Pung pointed out, it is incorrect to translate religion as or jiao 教, because jiao in Chinese means education and civilization, while religion is a faith. The two terms are therefore not inter-translatable. This was not an isolated point of view among Chinese intellectuals. In 1899, the famous translator Yan Fu 嚴復 (1854–1921) commented when translating Alexander Michie’s Missionaries in China (1892):

Religion is to believe in Heaven or God and all inapprehensible things before birth and after death. [...] Therefore it is obvious that Confucianism in China cannot be referred to as a religion together with Taoism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism and Nestorianism.

The missionaries also knew this. For example, Rev. John Ross pointed out in “Our Attitude towards Confucianism”, an article published 1887:

Confucianism is usually designated a religion. It is, however, open to question whether Confucius himself would have been willing to accept this term in our sense of it as a correct classification of his system. The term seems to have been adopted from the fact that Confucianism is called with Buddhism and Taoism the Three Chiao [jiao] of China. But the term means, not “religion”, but “instruction”, a “system of teaching”.

Ross concluded:

We therefore desire to classify Confucianism not with the religion but with the moral systems of the world.

It is interesting to note that Pung transliterated religion as erliling 爾釐利景 after realizing that jiao 教 could not be translated as “religion”. From the perspective of word construction, its meaning connotes “making clear and being good to Nestorius”. Here, the jing 景 refers to “Nestorianism”. Pung’s understanding of religion is fundamentally Confucian and limited to Christianity. He is not unique in this regard.

__________________________
50 Morrison 1815–1823, vol. 3:2, 358.
51 Medhurst 1842–1843; Lobscheid 1866–1869.
52 Yan Fu 1986, vol. 4, 850: 名教者，必有事天事神及一切生前死後幽杳難知之事，非如其字本義所謂文行忠信；授受傳習已也。故中國儒術，其必不得與道、釋、回、景並稱為教甚明。
53 Ross 1887, 4.
In the early twentieth century, when translating Adam Smith’s (1723–1790) *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Yan Fu wrote that

Religion referred to in Western countries today is *lulizheng*. Its original meaning is the same as “proclamation” in Buddhism. Therefore, any so-called religion in the world must involve demons and spirits, and there also must be compulsory disciplines in litanies in order to unite and constrain followers.”

The Chinese meaning of *lulizheng* 魯黎禮整 is to “impose etiquette on those uncivilized to regulate them.” In Confucianism, *li* 礼 and *zheng* 整 connote “civilizing”.

It is telling that unlike Pung and Yan, Kang Youwei 康有為 (1858–1927) emphasized that Confucianism was a religion and used the transliteration *lilijin* 釐利盡, which means “to remove all interests”. He said,

*Lilijin* means the ability to establish a tenet for calling on followers.

Indeed, this word has a hint of Confucian thinking.

It is clear that since *jiao* 教 means education and civilization in Confucianism, it is not commensurate with religion. Even if Pung and Yang realized this with their respective terms *erlilijing* and *lulizheng*, which used transliteration, they still entailed describing religion with Confucian concepts. Thus, it is not surprising that Kang Youwei, who wanted to create a form of Confucianism by imitating Christianity, chose *lilijin*. In fact, whether or not people approve of the linguistic linking of *jiao* and “religion”, they still have to use *jiao* to translate religion. In Richard’s translation, we not only see how missionaries translated Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism as religions, but also that what was sometimes translated as religion was in fact simply *li* or *liyue* that stemmed from ancient Confucianism, referring to court and (also broader) institutions of hierarchic symbolism and regularized music and choreographic formations used at state services.

From the perspective of Confucianism, translating “religion” as *jiao* is inaccurate, and, as explained below, the conversion from instruction to religion involves the special term “Buddhism”. It is generally thought that *shūkyō* (religion) emerged as a new term soon after the 1868 Meiji Restoration, and was generally accepted in the 1880s. This can be seen from a comparison of several versions of James Curtis Hepburn’s (1815–1911) *A Japanese and English Dictionary*, where the first and second edition (published in

54 Yan Fu 1986, vol. 4, 910: 今西國所謂教者, 其文曰: 魯黎禮整。考其故訓, 蓋繇釋氏依之義矣。故凡世間所立而稱教者, 則必有鬼神之事, 祷詞之文, 又必有所持受約束,而賜之以爲宗門徒黨之眾。

55 Kang Youwei 2007, vol. 8, 34: 厘利盡者, 謂凡能樹立一義, 能倡徒眾者之意。

56 Inoue Tetsujirō 1882, 77.
Shanghai 1867 resp. 1872) used *oshie* 教, *michi* 道 and *hō* 法, and the terms *kyōbō* 教法, *kyōmon* 教門 and *shūkyō* 宗教 were not added until the third edition (published in Tōkyō 1886).\(^{57}\)

The term *shūkyō* (Jap.) resp. *zongjiao* (Chin.) originated from Chinese Buddhist classics and means tenet or school. Inoue Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 (1856–1944), one of the founders of the science of religion in modern Japan, stressed this very clearly. Indeed, not only was religion understood through Buddhist concepts in early Meiji Japan, but also *shūkyō*, as the translation of “religion”. Implying the doctrine of one specific school, it referred specifically to Christianity.

It was because of this relationship that *shūkyō* in Japanese caused both positive and negative reactions when it returned to China. Huang Zunxian 黄遵憲 (1848–1905) mentioned *zongjiao* in his *Riben guozhi* 日本書志 (The History of Japan, 1887)\(^{58}\) and Kang Youwei used *zongjiao* as category in his *Riben shumu zhi* 日本書目志 (Bibliography of Japanese Books).\(^{59}\) However, when it came to the origin and semantic formation of *zongjiao*, the primary voice that translated “religion” as *jiaozong* 教宗, namely, Yan Fu’s, was opposed by Kang, who refused to use *zongjiao*.\(^{60}\)

When looking at the articles of the missionaries at the World Parliament in Chicago, it becomes clear that analyzing which Chinese concepts were translated as religion is an important issue for research. When missionaries called Christianity a religion, they also used it to label Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, thereby introducing a diverse range of meanings into religion. Although the missionaries effectively compromised by finally using both “Shangdi” and “Shen” concurrently to translate “God”, Blodgett’s mentioning of “Tianzhu” at the World Parliament indicates that no one translation was satisfactory. The term “religion” has a definite meaning, but when viewed as a concept its meaning becomes vague. Although some Chinese intellectuals eschewed *jiao* and *zongjiao* as translations of “religion”, *jiao* has not only become the preferred term in translations from Western languages, but it has also been commonly used in Chinese speech since the early twentieth century. In 1908, *zongjiao* appeared in a major dictionary for the first time. It was defined as “a mode of thinking”, “feeling”, “acting for the holiness or God worshiped”\(^{61}\). It is highly interesting to note that the dictionary’s editor Yan Huiqing later became the famous Minister of State of the Republic of China, and that his father, Priest Yen, had spoken at the Chicago World Parliament of Religions fifteen years earlier.

\(^{57}\) Hepburn 1867; 1872; 1886.
\(^{58}\) Huang Zunxian 1887, vol. 32.
\(^{59}\) Kang Youwei 1887, vol. 32.
\(^{60}\) Huang Xingtao 2009.
\(^{61}\) Yan Huiqing 1908.
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