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Robert Morrison (1782–1834), the first Protestant missionary to operate in China, was sent alone to his East Asian post by the London Missionary Society (LMS) in 1807. He spent more than half of his life (he died at his station in Guangzhou, China) planting a foothold in China for the benefit of the Protestant missionary movement, and, consequently, established the foundation upon which all subsequent Protestant missions to China rested. To list but a few of his achievements, Morrison composed the first Chinese translation of the New Testament, produced the first Chinese-English dictionary and grammar, recorded the first conversions of Chinese to Protestantism, translated the first version of the Confucian Classics directly to English, and established the first Anglo-Chinese educational institution. Subsequently, his pioneering mission planted Protestantism in China and his translations provided the foundation for the emergence of Anglophone sinology. Although over the past century sinology has produced a number of fruitful studies on the history of Protestant missionaries in China, the field has failed to generate a large-scale, critical study on Morrison, who remains one of the most important western figures in the history of Chinese Protestant Christianity.

However, Morrison is not the only important missionary whose work remains unexploited by contemporary sinologists. William Milne (1785–1822), Morrison’s first LMS colleague in East Asia, also fares poorly in contemporary sinological discourse. Although Milne, who arrived in China in July 1813, had a very short missionary career (he died less than a decade after arriving in East Asia), he was instrumental in administering key components of Morrison’s missionary enterprise such as the Ultra Ganges Mission station and
the Anglo-Chinese College, both of which were headquartered in peripheral Malacca. Additionally, overcoming his struggles to master the Chinese language, Milne assisted Morrison in their ground-breaking, co-translated publication of the New Testament and composed a number of Chinese translations of his own. Accordingly, he played an integral role in Morrison’s pioneering mission and it would be fruitful to examine their careers concurrently.

Why have sinological missionary historians persistently avoided engaging with the earliest Protestant mission to China? Any explanation would be mere speculation but to proceed anyway: the primary resources are remote, as they are unpublished and confined to archives in London and East Asia; the materials require a great deal of patience, as the handwritings of Morrison, Milne, and the LMS founders are challenging to read; and the plot is seemingly less exciting, as the missionaries’ activities in China were restricted by an edict, issued by the Chinese government, forbidding Christian missionaries from walking upon Chinese soil. Nevertheless, Morrison, with Milne’s assistance, planted the necessary foothold that allowed for the dissemination of future Protestant missions in East and parts of Southeast Asia. Consequently, a critical study of this mission is overdue.

This book analyses the foundation of the mission to China which was led by Morrison, paying particular attention to the training and strategy provided to him by the LMS. The current project belongs to a growing field of scholarship\(^1\) that takes a detached view in order to critically analyse various aspects of Morrison and his China Mission; in this case the research will target his mission strategy. At first glance Morrison’s mission appears extraordinarily accomplished, but for that reason alone it deserves critical investigation. In order to delve beyond the surface of the events, this book employs a critical method in order to ask what led to Morrison’s goals and outcomes. Such an approach exposes the intellectual and theological foundations upon which his efforts rested. Subsequently, one becomes aware of the influence of Dr. David Bogue (1750–1825), who served as the LMS missionary tutor from 1802 to 1825 at the Society’s training seminary, Gosport Academy, and consequently who provided Morrison with his preparation and field strategy. This book, then, concerns itself with illuminating the preparations, assumptions, and strategies that influenced the planning of the first China Mission and, consequently, that shaped Morrison’s goals and
achievements whilst in China. Such an approach demonstrates the influence of Bogue on the planting of Protestantism in China, calls into question the originality of Morrison as a missionary and administrator, and complicates the generally accepted notion of Robert Morrison as the ‘beginning’ of the Chinese Protestant religion.

A Note on Sources

Where possible my research confines itself to archival materials—deriving from libraries in London, Edinburgh, and Hong Kong—some of which (particularly those that relate to Gosport Academy but also Morrison’s non-Chinese library in Hong Kong) have too rarely been exploited for academic research. This book demonstrates the value of these archival materials by bringing them into conversation with each other in order to explore the ways in which they call into question conventional understandings of Morrison’s pioneering efforts and contributions. While the contribution of this project is to make use of these frequently disregarded archival sources, it would be unfair to ignore completely all of the secondary literature available on Morrison because, in fact, there is a great amount. In total, there are at least nine published biographies of the missionary. Furthermore, a number of scholars have compiled studies on the history of Protestant missionaries in China that devoted sections or chapters to Morrison and Milne’s mission. Additionally, a handful of journal articles have appeared, in both Chinese and English, on the subject of Morrison and his mission. Yet while there is published material on the topic, problematically many of the works rely upon the same resource for information about Morrison’s mission: Eliza Morrison’s Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison, D.D. This popular dependency is problematic not simply because it implies that the bibliographies of most of these studies lack diversity and creativity but also, and more importantly, because the Memoirs composed by Morrison’s widow contain a series of hagiographic touches which beg one to question whether her text responds to the needs of sinologists—or to the needs of any scholarly study for that matter. As a result, many of the works that use her Memoirs accept and even repeat her biased view. To support this questioning of the intellectual benefits of Eliza Morrison’s reverential Memoirs, it will prove fruitful to expose the conditions
under which her two-volume text was composed. Such a description is provided in the following section.

The current project, therefore, has a critical objective: to analyse Morrison through the lens of his missionary training. This is an approach that has not previously been considered. Of the secondary material published on Morrison or Milne, roughly only half of the authors mention Gosport Academy at all, even less name David Bogue as his tutor. Of the works which do record Morrison’s time at Bogue’s academy, none go beyond briefly noting that he attended prior to his deployment to East Asia. These publications are eager to begin, instead, listing his seemingly miraculous accomplishments in China. This was the narrative path that Eliza Morrison took, too. In contrast, this book will demonstrate that, by closely studying his time at Gosport Academy and the details of his missionary training, we not only discover a new way of viewing the first LMS China Mission but we can better understand those accomplishments which Morrison achieved in China—and perhaps, by default, we can also better understand Chinese Protestant Christianity.

A Concern: Eliza Morrison’s Memoirs

During the final decade of his mission, Morrison’s relationship with the LMS had dwindled to a degree. A new approach to mission strategy, arriving after the death in 1825 of the LMS missionary tutor David Bogue, had become popular with the Home Office in London and the new generation of LMS directors grew sceptical of Morrison’s style of communicating the Gospel, particularly regarding his liberal approach to religious education at the Anglo-Chinese College. As a consequence, the LMS decreased its support for Morrison’s mission, leaving him desperate for letters and financial assistance. Adding to his loneliness, on December 14, 1833 Morrison’s ailing wife left for England, taking with her all but one of their children. The only member of Morrison’s family that remained in China with him was his son, John Robert (J. R.) Morrison, who was then employed as a translator for the East India Company in Canton. Demonstrating the extent to which the LMS had distanced itself from Morrison and his mission, even on this urgent family medical issue he could not obtain the LMS’s administrative, financial, or emotional support. In a letter to London not long before his family’s
departure, he wrote, ‘I am very much grieved and have after been depressed by the Society delaying to answer, or evading a question . . . The Society has not time, it is said . . . to give me answer whether or not they will assist my sick wife and helpless children, after seven years’ absence, to return home.’

With the LMS losing interest in his mission (or his welfare) during the mid-1820s, Morrison was forced to operate almost independently until his death in 1834. He begged for a pension, missionary companionship, or letters of support, but a response from the LMS never arrived. Due to the financial uncertainty that he faced, he decided to give up his house in Macau to provide his monetary savings with a much needed boost, but this move left him confined to a small ‘unhealthy residence in Canton,’ having a negative impact upon his overall health. One of his final letters to London recorded his gloomy situation:

The delay in replying to the subject of my letter of November 1832 [see above] is to me painful and unsatisfactory. The Directors do not seem to ‘know the heart of a stranger,’ nor feel for an anxious Parent, and an aged Servant in a foreign land . . . The American Brethren here are zealously supported from Home. China alas! seems to be losing ground in England. The merchants and government are busy enough about it; [but] the Lord’s servants seem yearly to grow more cool and indifferent respecting it. May their zeal be received! May the love of Christ constrain us all! Farewell!

The directors still advertised Morrison’s accomplishments for their own mission fundraising needs, but, in reality, their support (emotional or financial) for Morrison had come to a painful end. Morrison only wrote once more to the LMS before he died: another short letter to remind the directors of his declining health and to express his desire for correspondence from London. On August 17, 1834, Morrison’s son, J. R. Morrison, wrote to inform the LMS of his father’s death.

Upon Eliza Morrison’s return to England in early 1834, she attacked the LMS for their lack of support for her husband and his China Mission. She was not so much concerned with the spread of Protestantism in China as she was with her husband’s depression, health, and feelings. In an angry letter to the Board of Directors, she emotionally wrote:

—the letters that he received from Mr. Ellis [an LMS director] last year mentioned that more important affairs caused the Society to defer answering his questions respecting the China mission, till another opportunity! But
another opportunity if it ever did arrive was too late—in this painful state of suspense, Dr. Morrison had to part with his family! Uncertain respecting even their future support—and being obliged to raise a large sum of money (for to him £1000 is a large sum) to defray the expenses of their voyage. While by one . . . Director he was advised of the inexpediency of laying any claim for assistance of a pecuniary nature on the Society, unless he was in a state of absolute destitution—and recommending my remaining abroad although I was at the time apparently dying! And no one to commit my children to, either for care or education—except pagan domestics!! Now sir, while I lately heard Dr. Morrison eulogized in public, I grieved to think what were his feelings—desolate and unsupported in a foreign land—by either public or private friends at home! In proof of which I will quote some passages from his private letters, which in justice to the cause to which he is devoted, I cannot suppress, although they were never intended for any other perusal than my own—

‘Our Mission to China seems given up by the people of England—for the Straits they still think a little—but for Canton there seems no thought . . . I am hindered by the recollection that of late, no measures seem even to have been thought of how the mission in China—i.e., the English mission—is to be continued in the event of my removal. I do feel a little desolate . . . I wish I could get up an Independent Chapel in Canton but I have no helpers, and I am afraid to undertake it alone.’

Now Sir to my knowledge the Directors have had these subjects urged upon year after year, and yet Mr. Ellis tells me they don’t know what Dr. Morrison’s wishes are—that he writes vaguely—but such is not the manner in which the American missionaries are treated . . . I could only add that although Dr. Morrison has been deeply wounded by the neglect of the Society to the interests of the mission in China and the Anglo-Chinese College, still I know his attachment to it is strong and inalienable!

The directors never had an opportunity to respond to Eliza’s concerns by changing their attitude towards the China Mission because Morrison died shortly after this letter was received in London. However, while his death left the LMS without a missionary in China—temporarily casting a shadow over the LMS’s attempts to convert the East Asian empire—it also provided fire for Eliza’s campaign to exalt her husband.

As a widow Eliza attempted to employ someone, either J. R. Morrison or one of Robert Morrison’s surviving friends, to compile a memoir of the pioneer missionary’s life, but to her disappointment everyone refused her request. Determined to share her admiration for her husband, she decided to undertake
the project herself.15 The result was a two-volume biography which drew attention to and glorified Robert Morrison’s efforts and accomplishments, omitting mention of most of the obstacles and problems that he encountered during the mission. As a result, the text is not only uncritical of Morrison but it does not engage with or, consequently, accurately portray some of the difficult parts of his experience in China. Yet to be fair her aim was not to produce an objective biographical account of his life but to acclaim his labours and mission as an extraordinary triumph and, hence, to compose a hagiography that protected his reputation.

Eliza Morrison’s Memoirs were successful because it effectively inflated the Christian public appreciation for her husband’s mission by painting him in virtuous light. The title page of the book foreshadowed the legacy of the biased biography with the biblical verse ‘He being dead yet speaketh’ (Hebrews xi: 4). The widow’s account of Morrison’s private experiences was written indirectly and published posthumously but, as time would tell, the narrative would be allowed to speak on behalf of the missionary, overtaking any personal or archival account that he left for the mission. It followed that her Memoirs served as the foundation for a series of hagiographical studies, mentioned above, that repeated Eliza’s story and, hence, also idolised Morrison’s life and mission. Consequently, while the LMS directors may not have been kind to Morrison during the final stage of his life, history has taken an alternate path, thanks, in part, to his widow, by publicly revering him as a triumphant and creative pioneer.

Hagiography was all the rage in the nineteenth century, so Eliza Morrison cannot be blamed for embracing this style of writing. In addition to succumbing understandably to the public demand for this genre of study, she had her added reasons, some of which are noted above, for protecting her husband’s reputation. For these personal motives, too, she should not be criticised. And there are even, perhaps, other reasons, of which we are still unaware. It should also be noted that Morrison was an impressive character and that his mission was generally successful. He depended upon the creativity and intellect of others for the planning of the China Mission, yet in the hostile environment of China the implementation of the LMS missionary strategy required a great deal of patience as well as ingenuity. Therefore, the missionary deserves some credit for the execution of his impressive chain of accomplishments, which required an immense level
of persistence and bravery especially given the brutal conditions he faced in Qing China. Perhaps some of his wife’s hagiographic praises might thus be well deserved.

Even so, the Memoirs that Eliza Morrison published went to such great extremes to paint her husband in favourable light that an uncritical and unbalanced, if sometimes dishonest and misleading, history was presented. Only after careful archival work can one measure the value of each of her claims. The current project will make use of archives to evaluate the extent to which she was fair in giving her husband the credit for being the designer and planner of the earliest Protestant mission to China. It is true that, for a glimpse of Morrison’s early life, Eliza’s Memoirs appear, at present, to be the only resource available. But for a reading of his all too important mission which introduced Protestantism into East Asia, untapped archival sources abound. Some of these special collections are utilised in the chapters that follow in order to shine light upon his mission strategy. Further engagements with Morrison’s archival collections are bound to help us better understand this episode from the early modern history of Protestant Christianity in China.

Robert Morrison, Humble Beginnings

Robert Morrison, born January 5, 1782, at Buller’s Green, Morpeth, in the county of Northumberland, spent his childhood in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Born to a Scottish father, James Morrison, and an English mother, Hannah Nicholson, he was the youngest of his parents’ eight children. James Morrison, an active Presbyterian and elder of a Scotch church in Newcastle, administered his family by ‘the fear of God; maintaining family worship, and instructing his children in the duty of a strict observance of the Sabbath day’. Like most dissenting Protestant children who grew up during this era, Morrison regularly attended catechetical exercises and studied the Bible. In addition to this average level of engagement with the church, he attended school and served as an apprentice to his father, who owned a last and boot-tree making business.

According to Eliza Morrison, Robert Morrison’s ‘youthful conduct was not entirely free from outward improprieties’, but, she sympathetically added, ‘over these he mourned deeply after the light of divine truth had penetrated into the
recesses of his mind’.

Allegedly, his behaviour at home was pristine or at least so good ‘that his father was rarely obliged to rebuke him’.

Morrison’s widow even went so far as to say that ‘he was not conscious of having ever uttered a deliberate falsehood, except once; and then, although there were no probability of detection, he could not rest until he had acknowledged his fault’.

As a result of the Evangelical Revival, during the latter half of the eighteenth century evangelical Protestants dispersed throughout Britain in an attempt to impress their theologies onto every aspect of culture and society. In 1797, nearly fifty years after the initial gale of conversions that sparked the Evangelical Revival, this prolonged evangelical momentum reached Robert Morrison in Newcastle who, following a sudden call from God, first began exploring a vocation in the dissenting ministry. According to his Memoirs, during that year he ‘became the subject of that great change which the Saviour describes as the new birth, and pronounces essential to admission into “the kingdom of heaven”’.

The text continued, ‘No remarkable circumstance led to this conversion. By parental instruction his mind had been full early stored with the principles of scriptural truth; and his regular attendance on public worship . . . tended still farther to enlighten his mind . . . ’

The following year, 1798, Morrison joined the Presbyterian Church and ‘commenced those habits of study which, by the blessing of God, he maintained with ever increasing effect to the end of life, by learning a system of short-hand writing’.

In 1799 he began to study texts popular within evangelical circles, such as William Paley’s Evidences of Christianity, and by 1800 Morrison had access to the Evangelical Magazine, studied the Bible daily, conducted domestic worship at his parents’ house, and devoted his Sabbaths ‘to the instruction of poor children, or employed in administering consolation to the sick and the aged’.

In 1801, Morrison’s religious fervour grew to new heights and he came to the conclusion that he needed to begin a vocation within the field of evangelical ministry.

Although no ‘remarkable circumstance’ was thought to instigate this ‘great change’ in Morrison’s lifestyle that began in 1798, one cannot help but speculate upon what could have coincided with such a dramatic ‘awakening’.

Providing his own reflection upon this mysterious, sudden change, Morrison, in an 1802 letter of application addressed to the Committee of Hoxton Academy in London,
to whom he was applying for admission into the school’s Christian Ministry Programme, wrote:

It was, perhaps, about five years ago, that I was much awakened to a sense of sin, though I cannot recollect any particular circumstance which led to it; unless it were, that at that time I grew somewhat loose and profane; and more than once being drawn aside by wicked company (even at that early time of life), I became intoxicated. Reflection upon my conduct became a source of much uneasiness to me, and I was brought to a serious concern about my soul. I felt the dread of eternal damnation. The fear of death compassed me about, and I was led to cry mightily to God, that he would pardon my sin; that he would grant me an interest in the Saviour; and that he would renew me in the spirit of my mind. Sin became a burden. It was then that I experienced a change of life, and, I trust, a change of heart too. I broke off from my former careless companions and gave myself to reading and meditation and to prayer.30

Although for Morrison no clear explanation ever transpired for his sudden religious revival (except the suggestion that he became ‘intoxicated’ one too many times for his own moral comfort), the Committee of Hoxton Academy appreciated his account of the awakening, for he was, in fact, offered a position in their theological programme.31 In spite of his father’s wishes for him to remain at home and to provide support for the family boot-tree business, Morrison, following his instinct that he should devote his life to God, accepted this offer of admission and departed for Hoxton Academy the following year, arriving on January 7, 1803.32 Morrison did not complete the Hoxton programme, but his time at the London-based academy did act as a springboard for his missionary career; in 1804, roughly sixteen months after he arrived at Hoxton, he withdrew in order to begin training with the LMS, a formative transition of the utmost concern to this project. And it is precisely at this stage of his life where the historian can also meet him in the archives because it was his introduction into the LMS which resulted in the great deal of written documentation produced in relation to him.

Approach, Method, and Plan of the Book

The current project introduces a new and fruitful approach via archival materials to the beginnings of Protestant missions in China. This new method examines and understands Morrison and William Milne through the lens of their
missionary training, which encompasses the instructions and strategy provided to them by David Bogue, director and tutor of the LMS’s training programme. In doing so it places their efforts and accomplishments into perspective by showing the ways in which the missionaries successfully implemented Bogue’s mission template in China. As a consequence, this research goes against the grain of the hagiographies in order to produce a critical narrative, which the reader may find deflates the self-importance of Robert Morrison, in particular, but also of Milne. Furthermore, it deconstructs the foundation of Chinese Protestantism—a religion planted by a very unique, evangelical strand of British Protestant Christianity.

Chapter 1 provides essential background information that will shine light upon the environment in which the planning of Morrison’s mission took place. It begins with a brief survey of the history of English Dissent and British evangelicalism in order to sketch the historical and theological frameworks within which the LMS formed. Next, it explores the inaugural overseas investment of the LMS: the South Seas Mission, established in 1795, which deployed missionaries to Tahiti, Tonga, and the Marquesas Islands. My intent in drawing attention to the earlier mission to Polynesia is threefold: firstly, to narrate the LMS’s blind adoption of Thomas Haweis’s ‘godly mechanic’ strategy for their inaugural mission; secondly, to illustrate how such an approach, upon arrival in the South Seas, proved to be insufficient and, consequently, led to disappointment in Polynesia; and, thirdly, to demonstrate how the traumatic failure of the missionaries in the South Seas directly affected Morrison’s mission to China. The concurrent LMS mission to South Africa suffered from the same planning and had a similar result, so it will also be surveyed to support further the objectives of the chapter. After the letdown from this wave of missions, Haweis’s mission strategy was shed and the LMS looked to Bogue to plan the mission to one of its next targets, China. Bogue, a rival of Haweis, promoted a lengthy programme of educational preparation for the LMS missionaries.

The second chapter analyses the training programme of David Bogue, who served as the LMS missionary tutor from 1802 to 1825 at the Society’s training seminary, Gosport Academy, and consequently who provided Morrison and Milne with their preparation and field strategy. Transcribing and analysing Bogue’s lecture notes, I will plot the three-part strategy provided to the
missionaries at Gosport: to master the Chinese language, to translate and publish a particular list of texts, and to establish an academy modelled upon Gosport for converts. The main aim of this chapter, therefore, will be to excavate a mission template that Bogue provided to his students at the academy which, in turn, will foreshadow many of the results of Morrison’s China Mission. Chapter 3 provides further commentary upon Morrison’s preparation by narrating the final stage of the missionary’s training in London, undergone immediately prior to his departure for China.

The final two chapters bring these historical and ideological contexts into conversation with the earliest Protestant mission to China in order to observe how the Gosport scheme impacted, even dictated, Morrison and Milne’s work abroad. Chapter 4 considers the missionaries’, especially Morrison’s, approach to learning the Chinese language and translating Protestant texts. The aim of this chapter is to note the degree to which Bogue influenced the strategy for communicating the Gospel to the Chinese, especially in the areas of propagating and publishing. Importantly, these actions—to master the Chinese language and to translate texts, such as the Bible, into Chinese—comprised the first two parts of Bogue’s three-step mission template. Therefore, this chapter will compare Morrison’s performance with these first two aspects of Bogue’s assignment.

Next, Chapter 5 analyses the ways that Morrison and Milne followed Bogue’s third and final requirement—for the missionaries to pass the Gosport programme to converts—at their Anglo-Chinese College. In addition to seeing the missionaries build a European library that mirrored the one held at Gosport, this chapter also witnesses Milne, under Morrison’s command, translating Bogue’s lecture notes into Chinese. Through this Gosport-like academy they also recorded conversions and successfully instilled Bogue’s template upon a handful of locals, who themselves produced evangelical texts in Chinese, founded an additional, short-lived academy in mainland China, and converted a new generation of converts. This was the culmination of Bogue’s mission template, so these events show that the missionaries were successful in executing the entire plan. Separately from the Anglo-Chinese College, Milne became involved in child education for reasons that were also developed at Gosport, further demonstrating his dependency.
Together these two chapters not only provide an archive-based narrative of the earliest Protestant mission to China, but they also demonstrate the reasons for which Robert Morrison and William Milne must be seen within the historical context of the LMS and the intellectual context of David Bogue’s Gosport Academy. Bluntly put, the duo followed Bogue’s three-part mission strategy to the letter and they did very little off this track. Narrating their China Mission through the lens of Bogue’s training regimen demonstrates the missionaries’ dependency upon the Gosport template, effectively calling into question their contribution to the design of the mission. However, while the missionaries may have followed Bogue’s instructions to the letter, it is not the intention of the project to ignore the fact that, in the hostile environment of China, the implementation of this missionary strategy required a great deal of patience as well as ingenuity. Nevertheless, the large-scale success of this mission and the foundation of the Chinese Protestant religion rested upon Bogue’s mission template, which the missionaries followed closely. This important aspect of the mission, where Chinese and British religious histories meet, has not previously been explored.

The archives deployed in this book force us immediately to re-evaluate our understanding of Robert Morrison and his mission. That much is certain. Yet it cannot be predicted how this reassessment will affect the picture in the longer term. The impact that these materials have upon our understanding of early Chinese Protestantism will be established over time and with consensus; that is, when other members from the larger community of academics concerned with early Protestant missions to China join in the attempt to get to grips with the previously ignored primary materials. Given that Chinese Protestantism is over 200 years old and there are now many more Protestants in China than there are in Great Britain, a large-scale critical engagement with Morrison’s mission is embarrassingly overdue.
Conclusion

After Robert Morrison’s death in 1834, his pioneering mission became the focus of a hagiographical discourse. Such writings narrated the pioneering mission as phenomenal, drawing attention to its chain of accomplishments, whilst failing to get to grips with the complex processes through which they were obtained by the missionary. Surprisingly, the participants in the idolising discourse were not met with any major competition from the academic disciplines of sinology, history, or religious studies. The disengagement and resulting ignorance on the part of the scholarly world is unfortunate because, as a consequence, the hagiographies have been entrusted by academics with the responsibility of interpreting and speaking on behalf of the mission. To the detriment of the academic study of Chinese Protestantism, their readings are not always consistent with the untapped primary materials related to the topic, meaning that they have led unknowing scholars off course in many ways. As a result, the hagiographical appraisals of Morrison’s mission continue to inhibit our understandings of the beginnings of Protestantism in China, a veiled religious tradition that remains one of the largest yet least understood Protestant churches in the world.

While hagiographers base their reading of Morrison’s mission upon Eliza Morrison’s Memoirs, there survives in Britain and East Asia an array of archival resources that would allow us to move beyond the biased discourse that has plagued Morrison Studies. Among these archives are Robert Morrison’s Chinese library as well as his personal papers, letters, and journals—all held in London at the School of Oriental and African Studies; documents that shine light upon his missionary training contained within archives at Dr. Williams’s Library and the Congregationalist Library in London, at the University of Edinburgh, and
at the University of Wales Lampeter; and what survives of Morrison’s non-Chinese book collection, now housed at the University of Hong Kong. There is plenty within these libraries to inspire a number of fruitful new projects on early Protestant missions in China, but it is also probable that other related archival resources, which have yet to be identified, exist in other institutions. The point is that we are not trapped within the hagiographical game of ‘Chinese whispers’; there are materials readily available to help scholars take control of the discourse.

To commence work in this scholarly area, this book brought into conversation archival materials related to Gosport Academy and primary resources from Robert Morrison and William Milne’s pioneering mission to China. While the hagiographical assessments have done well to boast lists of what the missionaries achieved (the first Chinese Bible, a Chinese-English dictionary and grammar, Chinese converts, an Anglo-Chinese education centre, and so on) the aim of this project was not to refute the existence of these accomplishments altogether but to engage critically with the mission in order to ask why and how Morrison and Milne may have done some of these things. Such an approach led us to examine the programme of the LMS training seminary, Gosport Academy, in order to illuminate the preparations, assumptions, and strategies that influenced the planning of the first China Mission and, consequently, that had an effect upon Morrison and Milne’s goals and achievements whilst in China.

From Gosport to Canton: A New Analysis of Robert Morrison and William Milne

In order to examine Robert Morrison and William Milne’s missionary training, it was first necessary to develop an understanding of the roots of British missionary education in order to identify the distinguishing characteristics of the LMS approach to missions. However, such a discussion required a deconstruction of the complex category of ‘Western Protestantism’ since one quickly discovers that the roots of British missionary education are entangled in a theological soil that incorporates the concerns of several denominations of the British Protestant church. While it is tempting and, indeed, easy to overgeneralise our understandings of ‘Western’ Christianity, as was demonstrated at the start of the first chapter, the ‘Western’ Protestantism imported into China by missionaries
during the early nineteenth century was representative only of a very small strand of British Christianity. The LMS missionaries that belonged to this community favoured a distinct conservative, evangelical outlook on the world. These evangelicals hardly comprised a majority of the British population, but they were extremely active and determined. Since the London Missionary Society, but a small evangelical representative of the complex tradition of British Protestant Christianity, planted its unique theologies in China, understanding its theological beliefs proved pertinent to the project at hand.

When the LMS deployed its first mission to the South Seas in 1796, it did so blindly—following the advice of one LMS director, Thomas Haweis, by exporting a large group of ‘godly mechanics’ to convert the Pacific Islanders by impressing them with their technological and mechanical skills and, thus, civilising them. Much to the surprise of Haweis, the LMS, and the ‘godly mechanics’, however, the locals reacted, at first, with disinterest and later with opposition; the missionaries found themselves victims of robberies and attacks. While the mission struggled from the beginning, by 1809 all of the original ‘godly mechanics’, without recording a single conversion, had either committed suicide, gone native, been excommunicated, or abandoned their original posts. In a subsequent mission to South Africa, commenced in 1798, equally disappointing results came from a deployed duo of British missionaries, both of whom deserted their assignments within a year of arriving in South Africa.

In an attempt to revamp their approach to communicating the Gospel, the LMS chose to follow a new mission strategy, David Bogue’s educationalist theory—to send highly trained missionaries to communicate the Gospel to the ‘heathen’ in their own languages by translating the scriptures and providing them with local, dissenting academies. Bogue’s approach required the missionaries to undergo training prior to departing Britain, so the LMS looked to him to develop an in-depth preparatory programme. On August 4, 1800 he founded an LMS training college at Gosport Academy. At Gosport, Bogue’s students engaged in a training programme that covered nine volumes of lecture notes. Topics studied included theology, the Old and New Testaments, Jewish antiquities, the duties of the pastoral office, rhetoric, metaphysics, logic, history, geography, languages (Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and sometimes French), and church government. In addition, the students participated in a special seminar, which addressed the
labours of a missionary and provided a step-by-step mission template which the students, in turn, were expected to implement abroad. The normal length of the Gosport programme was three years, but Bogue also prepared an expedited route for students needing to commence their mission imminently. Robert Morrison was one such missionary.

The spine of Bogue's mission model had missionaries mastering the relative languages, translating the Bible, composing a dictionary and grammar, and establishing a local version of the academy for converts. If time allowed, the missionaries were to continue producing texts by translating other helpful theological manuscripts—a list of which Bogue provided. Near the conclusion of Bogue's template, with the founding of the school, the missionary was to pass the programme onto a trustworthy convert who, in turn, would establish a nearby sister station and reproduce the Gosport outline. It was Bogue's hope that this cycle repeat indefinitely, creating an expanding spiral wherein his portrait of Christianity would begin to take over the region.

Robert Morrison enrolled at Gosport Academy in 1805 and completed the programme on Bogue's intensive fast track, finishing just over fourteen months later. As was the case with all Gosport graduates, Morrison left the academy equipped with a transcribed set of the tutor's comprehensive lecture notes and, consequently, prepared to implement the Gosport programme abroad. Afterwards, the missionary spent roughly twenty months in London in order to learn as much Chinese as was possible. He also received an induction into mathematics and astronomy, before departing for China on January 31, 1807.

When Morrison arrived in China he was confronted with obstacles, the most visible of which was a Chinese government edict that forbade Christian missionaries from operating within the confines of the country. Nevertheless, Robert Morrison persisted with the pioneering mission and did everything possible to implement Bogue's programme by first mastering the Chinese language. Overcoming all of the challenges, Morrison obtained fluency, and he continued to follow Bogue's advice by next translating the Bible and composing a Chinese-English dictionary and grammar. These tasks were more difficult than expected and, as a result, he requested assistance, which came in the form of William Milne, another Gosport-trained LMS missionary who arrived in Canton on July 4, 1813.
Together Morrison and Milne worked on their Chinese translation of the Bible, which they completed in November 1819. Afterwards, Morrison devoted his time to the composition of the dictionary, grammar, and theological texts whilst Milne searched for an effective means of printing their work and an appropriate place to establish their academy. Composing a Chinese-English dictionary proved to be the most challenging of Morrison's translation projects, but the missionary persisted and eventually concluded the work in February 1822. Skilled in the art of multitasking, in the meantime he impressively completed Chinese and English grammars as well as a series of supporting theological texts, including but not limited to a catechism on the life of Jesus, a tract on divine redemption, an abstract of the Scriptures, a survey of Old Testament history, a collection of theological essays, and a dictionary to explain the Bible. Not coincidentally, all of these translations were recommended by Bogue, and Morrison completed them in the chronological order in which they were suggested.

Whilst Morrison completed the bulk of the translation work, Milne contributed to the LMS project by establishing a new mission station in Malacca, at which he instituted a printing press and founded a training academy. Malacca was a strategic choice for the location of this secondary station because it would afford them a safe refuge at which they could print and distribute texts whilst also allowing them to communicate with overseas Chinese and Chinese traders who were in transit. In addition, if China ever opened its doors to foreigners the missionaries would be prepared to move their operation inward without delay. Thus, from this new Ultra Ganges post Milne printed and distributed Morrison's translations (as well as a few publications of his own) and mingled freely with locals and overseas Chinese, recording converts along the way. Although the publications he printed could not be distributed freely in China, only in Southeast Asia, the experience afforded him the opportunity to sharpen his printing skills so that he could operate a more efficient press upon China's opening. Furthermore, he was able to found an academy, the Anglo-Chinese College, at which he would train other LMS missionaries as they prepared for their East and Southeast Asian posts and impress Bogue's curriculum upon converts. To equip the college with the best curriculum possible, under Morrison's advice, Milne translated his transcription of Bogue's lecture notes so that he had both English and Chinese copies.
The Anglo-Chinese College got off to a slow start, mostly due to a lack of Anglophone textual resources, but after Milne’s death Morrison was forced to address this issue. Consequently, he returned to England on March 20, 1824. Whilst at home, he worked towards creating support for his new college but he also purchased a library of Anglophone books that would allow him to execute at Malacca a curriculum that modelled itself upon the example provided by Bogue at Gosport. Upon his return, this English library was deposited and, consequently, the Anglo-Chinese College was finally able to fulfil this liberal objective.

Through the college, the missionaries were able to put a Gosport-like education into the hands of the Chinese. More importantly, however, they were able to pass the torch of their mission by following another of Bogue’s suggestions: they converted, baptised, and educated Liang Afa, who, in turn, was trained to reemploy Bogue’s programme by publishing evangelical-approved texts, propagating to other Chinese people, and founding an academy in mainland China, all on his own. Liang did all of these tasks with success and trained other converts along his way, specifically Keuh Agong and Keuteenching, but also all of the students who attended his free college in mainland China.

Morrison and Milne devoted their missionary careers to the planting of a unique strand of evangelical Protestant Christianity in China. They laboured tirelessly and eventually succeeded, completing a number of pioneering accomplishments in the areas of translation, printing, education, and, later, propagation. Later missionaries who underwent different forms of preparatory training, for example James Legge, deviated from Morrison and Milne’s approach to communicating the Gospel to the Chinese and often criticised the pioneering duo, but it would be impossible to refute the indebtedness of later missionaries to the foundation constructed by Morrison and Milne. The legacy of the missionaries, therefore, cannot be ignored. Without their efforts or even, perhaps, their textual-biased approach, later missions would not have been as successful.

In sum, the planning of Robert Morrison and William Milne’s mission belongs to a particular historical moment from the timeline of the LMS’s evolution of missionary training and mission strategy. Both missionaries were influenced by the ideologies of this era in terms of their approach to establishing a Protestant church in China. By viewing their mission within these historical and ideological contexts, scholars can gain a deeper appreciation for the strategy supporting
the missionaries’ efforts. By analysing the missionaries from the viewpoint of this scheme, handed to them by David Bogue, we produce a reading of their mission which goes against the grain of the typical hagiographical narratives, which do little but list the missionaries’ accomplishments, classifying them as phenomenal. In effect, the new archival approach introduced in this book calls into question the missionaries’ originality and their contribution to the overall design of their mission. Perhaps, in turn, this shifts some of the credit for the success of the mission to Bogue and cuts the missionary ‘pioneers’ down to size, although Morrison and Milne certainly did their part to break new ground. The archives deployed in this book force us to re-evaluate this important mission, but further studies are needed which assess how these materials permanently alter our understanding of the beginning of Protestantism in China.

Unarguably, the pioneering missionaries accomplished a lot and the execution of these feats required bravery and creativity. It is not the intent of this research to underplay their struggles or successes or to dismiss the agency of the missionaries during the process of the mission. Although they were certainly following Bogue’s template to the letter, the execution of the Gosport strategy in a hostile China indeed required patience and ingenuity. The aim of this project, in contrast, is to uproot and shine light upon the original and unique mission strategy—itself a synthesis of Scottish, dissenting, and evangelical influences—that inspired their accomplishments. In the process, a fruitful new approach via archival materials to early Protestant missions in China is introduced. Through this method, sinologists and missionary historians can excavate an untold aspect of the narrative concerning the planting of a unique strand of Protestantism in China. As a consequence of taking into account the perhaps unexpected theological, ideological, cultural, and historical factors that lie at the foundation of the powerful Chinese Protestant church, scholars can only sharpen their understandings of this major world religion.
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