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As much as the writings of a person extrapolate and delimit their public presence after they die, so the deaths experienced around a person - perhaps we could call them the "public absences" they experience - these "public absences" often give form to that person's private world of meanings and influence the directions of their life's later years. Regularly, though probably not always, the public realm of writings and the private sphere of felt deaths intersect. In the life of a Scottish Victorian missionary-sinologist and and pastor, these two dimensions often collided in scribbled correspondence, mission reports, literary reflections, and the biographical sketches others made from these sources about those public absences.

Across the eight decades of James Legge's (1815-1897) active life it is not hard to identify the power and presence of this sphere of public absences, especially during his hyphenated missionary-scholar experience in Hong Kong from 1843 to 1873. He was indeed a "pastor" in the full sense of the Dissenter traditions he represented, not seldom found describing, in linguistic forms stereotyped across the Victorian era's professional clergy from many denominations, the deathbed scenes of missionary colleagues, their family members, and elderly members of the Chinese congregation he co-pastored with Ho Tsun-sheen (1817-1871). Colonial life led him also to the soldiers' barracks for occasional worship services, and to the jails, where death was calculated into the normal conditions of life far more frequently than among "normal" social settings. But the more personally felt deaths can also be numbered - there were fourteen which shook his consciousness with varying degrees of starkness, most coming from his large and extended family ties. Among the four
deaths of Chinese persons within these fourteen personal absences Legge experienced, one stood out over time because it became so formative in shaping Legge’s public image in Hong Kong. The images of both Legge and this seminal Chinese figure were first promoted through extracted letters and reading literature of missionary journals where the story about Ch’ēa Kam-Kwong first appeared. After Ch’ēa’s murder, however, it became a festering and frustrating element within the larger political scenario of the unequal treaties period in foreign policy between the Qing Manchurian empire in China and the newly established British ambassador. Legge made the issue all the more prominent in 1863 by publicly challenging British officials’ complacence about the matter and condemning attempts by Sir Frederick Bruce (1814-1867), the first British ambassador to the Qing empire, to defuse the whole tragedy by general claims about missionary incompetence.

The period from 1861 to 1863 was pivotal in Legge’s missionary-scholar career because of three books and two supremely “felt” public absences. In February and November 1861 he published the first two of the eight-tome-five-volume series he entitled the *Chinese Classics*. In October and at the very beginning of 1862 he faced news about the deaths of Ch’ēa Kam-kwong and his eldest brother George respectively, writing special memorials to both men in the subsequent months. In the latter case, James Legge edited and introduced his brother George’s selected lectures and sermons (an introduction of just over 100 pages!), an act of filial respect simultaneously Scottish Nonconformist, Ruist/Confucian, and Victorian in style and content.²

Yet Ch’ēa’s death in October 1861 and its consequences had a power over Legge’s career he himself could not fully anticipate. So influential was it that in the balance of the decade of the 1860s Legge was regularly referred to in local Hong Kong and overseas missionary literature as “James Legge of Hong-kong and Poklo.” Here we will explore the meaning of Ch’ēa’s death for Legge’s life, and the broader implications it had on a surprising range of “larger issues” in the study of cross-cultural interactions during the later decades of the Manchurian Qing dynasty. Part of the significance is shown in a negative fashion in Paul Cohen’s early work of the
1960s, China and Christianity: the Missionary Movement and the Growth of Chinese Antiforeignism, 1860-1870. There the singularly public murder of Ch’ēa is never recorded in the Zōngli yámén records, even though the Zōngli yámén itself had been established in January 1861. There was a particular kind of embarrassment and frustration in both the British and Qīng bureaucracies in having to face an event of such large proportions during this early period — and so in fact the case was never officially handled at the highest levels. This is doubly ironic since in the missionary literature of the day Ch’ēa’s “martyrdom” was seen as a beacon of a new era in Chinese Protestant Christianity, one in which, to cite Tertullian’s famous words, “the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church.” It was openly compared with similar indigenous sufferings in contemporary Madagascar, and so was understood to have a broad, even global, significance for all those who followed the developments of Protestant missions in China. All this being said, the fact that Ch’ēa’s story has been all but forgotten is a historical anomaly which calls out to be thoroughly readdressed.

Before entering more fully into the context of this major event in Legge’s life, a sidenote about the literature on Ch’ēa is advisable. It is very scattered and troubled by skewed transliterations of personal and place names as well as misrepresentations made through repetitions (notably in William Canton’s A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society and in Helen Edith Legge’s hagiographic book on her father’s life). Fortunately there is a unique translation from “Chinese” (Hoklo dialect) of Ch’ēa’s own dictated self-referential account in 1857 as well as Legge’s own extended journal of a missionary tour up the East River in May 1861 to draw upon. The sketch on “Che’a Kim-Kwong” in a typescript in the SOAS collection, copying a manuscript original now held in the Bodleian, is a relatively good account — much better than the one found in Helen Edith Legge’s chapter written for the book dedicated to James Legge: Missionary and Scholar. All these are pieced together and thoroughly evaluated here for the first time, extra research details being added in the Chinese glossary and attached endnotes.
PART ONE: Out from the darkness of forgotten history

Growing interest in James Legge’s missionary-scholar career reflects a more general trend initiated in the 1970s towards re-examining the impact and contribution of various kinds of missionaries in modern history. Yet it remains one of the ironies of the specialized study of missionary history that it has largely forgotten the converted while emphasizing the converter. Certainly the early 19th century missionary chronicles in Europe and North America dealing with Chinese missions mentioned occasionally the names of indigenous believers, especially those who later became prominent in church leadership. Still, most converts remained hidden under unpronounceable and misspelled transliterations, vague references spiced with evangelical rhetoric, abbreviated names, and, later on, a growing trend to employ comparative statistics with a modicum of personal details.

As Legge’s own pivotal role in exploring Chinese contributions to comparative philosophy and comparative religious studies becomes clearer, it is all the more necessary to re-examine his relationships with those Chinese students, scholars, officials, and collaborators who responded to and enriched his life and work. These include a sizeable number of students from the Anglo-Chinese College (Yīnghuá shānyuàn), the workers at its associated press under the leadership of Wong Shing (M. Huáng Shèng, 1825-1902), and the Chinese scholars he met and worked with during his missionary-scholar career (1840-1873) – especially the Cantonese official from the district of Huílái, Luó Zhòngfān (d. circa 1850), and Legge’s academic companion for the last ten years of work on the Chinese Classics (1862-1872), Wáng Tāo (1822-1897). Wáng was also a member of the small group of Chinese Christians with whom Legge identified as pastor and scholar. Among these Hong Kong Christians over the years were students, Bible colporteurs, some of the first Chinese Christian families, apprentice evangelists, full time evangelists, and one ordained Chinese minister. These included the venerable evangelist who trained under Robert Morrison (1782-1834), Liáng Gōngfā (commonly known as Liáng Āfā, 1789-1855), the
capable apprentice Hóng Réngān (1828-1864) who later died as the Shield King among the Tàipíng insurgents, and Legge’s co-pastor of the Chinese congregation at Union Chapel (later Union Church) for twenty-five years, the first modern Chinese theologian, Ho Tsun-sheen (P. Hé Jinshàn, known in the 20th century by his sobriquet among Chinese Christians, “Ho Fuk-tong,” 1817-1871). Among the many forgotten persons whom Legge knew in his role as a missionary-pastor is a Cantonese resident more than 20 years Legge’s elder, Ch’ēa Kam-Kwong (P. Chē Jīnguāng, c. 1800-1861). In the Hong Kong newspapers of the early 1860s it was Ch’ēa’s life and fate which catapulted Legge into the status of a folk hero among the expatriate and Chinese Christian communities. Yet Ch’ēa’s own unusual conversion, his subsequent career as a self-determined missionary, and his tragic murder years later by a local Chinese vigilante squad have been almost completely overlooked in English and Chinese sources. To Legge’s credit Ch’ēa was the subject of many letters and reflections in various places, so that it became one of three post-mortem memorials for notable Christians associated with his missionary career. Consequently, it is largely on account of the Scottish missionary’s writings that Ch’ēa’s name and story can be rescued from the dustbins of forgotten Chinese history.

PART TWO: Walking through shadowlands: Ch’ēa’s transition across major traditions

The town of Poklo (P. Bóluó) was the leading city in a district of the same name, about 40 miles east of the capital city of Canton (Guāngzhōu) and about 20 miles southeast of the impressive mountains of Lo-fow (or Laufu, P. Liúfǔ or Luófǔ) range. Those mountains were already made famous after the end of the Hán dynasty (4th century A.D.) by Gé Hóng (283-363), a famous Daoist priest who made his retreat on the slopes of Mount Lo-fow when in search of special materials for an immortality elixir. Four or five temples of both Daoist and Buddhist traditions were well established on its slopes in the 19th century, and were visited by Legge and his younger Scottish colleague, John
Chalmers (Zhán Yuēhàn, 1825-1899) in 1861. The dominance of the “Confucian” or Ruist traditions was symbolized by the central place that temples to Master Kǒng (“Confucius”) held in all the major towns. So it was very appropriate that in the city of Poklo there was a large and impressive temple to the “Master of myriad generations.”

From the brief description of the Fūzi miào (“Temple of the Great Master [Kong]”) recorded by Legge in 1861 as well as from some descriptions preserved in other contemporary sources a scenario of Ch’ēa’s role as a “keeper” can be partially reconstructed. Situated in a place lacking both “large population” and “flourishing trade” because of the more competitive neighbouring cities of Shek-lung (M. Shǐlóng) and Wye-chow (M. Huīzhōu), Poklo was a relatively poor walled town of about 15,000 inhabitants. In spite of its obvious shabbiness, the town’s “temples and ancestral halls” were regularly maintained and attractive. Within the relatively elegant “temple of Confucius” were “images of the sage, of his four assessors, and of the twelve more distinguished of his followers.” (Having published his first volume of the Chinese Classics only a few months earlier, Legge knew very well who these were because he had described them in detail in one of his essays in the prolegomena.) These were probably life size sculptures of each figure, the Sage himself seated while the others were standing in his presence.

Temple rites offered in the presence of the Chinese Master Teacher were often described in local gazettes, and were intimately woven into the fabric of the civil examination system and the literati codes of honour. Ch’ēa, as the keeper of the temple in Poklo, most likely had to maintain the temple’s appearance and may have sometimes even offered the regular sacrifices at the first (“of fruits and vegetables”) and fifteenth (“a solemn burning of incense”) of each month. Similar ceremonies would be performed in the adjacent school to the Poklo temple, where students were tutored in the Ruist canon by a qualified teacher. Twice in each lunar year all the temples to Master Kǒng throughout the Qing empire were filled with successful graduates, their teachers, and
ruling authorities, including the emperor in the temples of the imperial college. Then very solemn ceremonies of reverence and adoration were performed, marking the Sage as the ultimate exemplar for all who aspired to any level of leadership within Chinese society.18

The Poklo temple to Master Kǒng was, indeed, more impressive than those in nearby villages, such as the one at Lung Ch’un (literally, the “River of the Dragon,” M. Lóngchuān) also visited by Legge and others in 1861. There the temple had no images at all, but only the spirit tablet (shénpái) of the Sage along with a large plaque citing the sixteen maxims of the Sacred Edict (Shèngyù) of the Kāngxī emperor (ruling from 1662-1722).19 Both temples at Poklo and Lung Ch’un were dwarfed by the massive grounds set aside to honour the sage in the capital city of Canton. There the image of the Sage was in a hall elevated from the grounds six to eight feet above the preceding courtyards, the roof made of “those splendid burnished tiles” constituting imperially-sponsored buildings, garnished with mystical beasts balancing on the upper beams. Seated on a large rock dais, the thick paper-maché-like image of Master Kǒng was taller and larger than life. Postured as if leaning over a tablet in his hands, the Sage appeared immersed in the study of the text before him.20

How Ch’ēa came to take his place in this Confucian institutional and ritual system is never explained. Whether he had been a student at one time or not is also not made explicit, but he was able to read, and so had probably spent at least part of his youth as a student, one of large majority who had obviously not been elevated by successful results in the examination system. When the two colporteurs from Hong Kong met him, Ch’ēa was already in his fifties, had been married, and had at least one son.21 Because no direct mention is made of Ch’ēa’s wife in any of the documentation after his conversion, there is the possibility that Ch’ēa had become a widower even before the pair of colporteurs met him in Poklo.

If conversion is a multiform and processual event,22 then all of the above cultural, social, personal and religious factors have a
part in shaping the openness Ch’ēa expressed once he had heard about the Christian message from these two Chinese colporteurs. Would he have rejected it if the speakers were Scottish missionaries? It is highly probable that he would have resisted such an obvious foreign intrusion. But as he began to read the Delegates’ Version of the New Testament presented to him by A-Wye, Ch’ēa read a Sacred Sutra (Shēngjīng) very different from the texts read by Hōng Xiūquán (1814-1864) twenty years earlier. Previous translations had been prepared primarily by foreign missionaries, always in consultation with some “native informants,” but hardly proper persons qualified to act as “expert consultants” on translation problems. The Delegates’ Version, on the contrary, was the result of a rigorous process of interaction between foreign missionaries and traditionally trained Chinese informants, among them the young scholar, Wáng Tāo. Among their translation goals was the concern to create a translation attractive in style to a relatively educated Chinese person, in essence, a Bible with a Ruist flavour. When Ch’ēa read the Delegates’ Version of the New Testament, he felt the influences of a Ruist mind shaping the ideas of the text in numerous obvious and more subtle ways. In addition, and this very much due to Legge’s personal commitments regarding the so-called “term question” debates, Ch’ēa read a Shēngjīng which referred to “God” as shàngdǐ, the classical term in the Ruist canonical texts of the Book of Historical Documents (Shūjīng or Shàngshū) and Book of Poetry (Shījīng) for the supreme “Lord on High.”

No precise record of the dialogue between A-Wye, the colporteur, and Ch’ēa, the keeper of the Poklo temple to Master Kōng, was ever made. What is relayed through a letter conjointly written by Legge and Chalmers in 1856 is the following. Since A-Wye and his colleague intended to leave Poklo very soon for other areas in eastern Guǎngdōng, they presented Ch’ēa with a copy of the Delegates’ Version of the New Testament and then proceeded eastward, promising to return sometime later. Their discussion had apparently focused in part on passages describing Jesus’ dialogue with the Jewish literatus, Nicodemus (John 3: 1ff) and the Samaritan woman (John 4), dealing with the question of
being “born again” (P.chóngshēng) and the nature of true worship. After reading and pondering over the meaning of some New Testament passages, he became convinced that the “worship of his ancestors was contrary to the word of God,” probably another topic discussed at some length with the colporteurs. Consequently, he “defaced the tablet” for his family’s ancestral spirits with a chisel, and committed himself to a God to be worshipped, as described in one of the above passages, “in spirit and truth.” Through these undoubtedly painful steps in the initial process of intellectual conversion, primarily through his dialogue with A-Wye and reading the Delegates’ Version of the New Testament, Ch’ēa began walking in the shadowlands between major religious traditions.

When the pair of colporteurs returned to Poklo in early May and sought out Ch’ēa to follow up their initial interview, they found a man already wanting to be “more fully instructed and baptized.” On this basis, the colporteurs apparently urged Ch’ēa to come with them to Hong Kong, bringing along evidences of his spiritual transition. Taking along “in a napkin two small idols”, one having been in the Ch’ēa family for three generations, Ch’ēa followed them to Hong Kong and met for the first time “Pastors Li (Li Yāgè, James Legge) and Ho.”

What kind of a person did Legge and Ho meet? Unlike an octogenarian Daoist priest who had visited Hong Kong in 1854 from one of the Daoist temples on Mount Lo-fow, a man who sought out Legge and returned instructed but not baptized, Ch’ēa was a “plain-looking man, without much education” but “sincere in his profession and honest in the statements he made” (“as far as we are able to judge,” Legge carefully qualified in addition). After some discussion and six weeks of instruction, Legge confirmed for his English audience the normative evaluations typical of Christian religious conversion, stating that Ch’ēa “gave us, indeed, much reason to believe that he was born of the Spirit.” What Legge and Chalmers did not tell at this time, and is only recalled much later as part of a small set of Reminiscences of Prof. Legge at Oxford, is the kind of religious insistence driving Ch’ēa to Hong Kong.
After some initial interviews in May, pastors Legge and Ho apparently agreed that Ch’êa required more instruction before being baptized. This refusal of baptism was bound to reap some resentment, and was a calculated risk Legge in particular insisted on taking in order not to be tricked like the Prussian missionary, Karl Gützlaff (also known as Charles Gutzlaff, 1803-1851), by needy and less honest persons. In fact, Ch’êa was obviously not wealthy, and had been considering leaving his job at the temple of Master Kông, so he was probably also asking for some alternative form of work. None of this is stated directly, but Legge and Chalmers add in their initial letter two straightforward statements near the end of their account: “[Ch’êa] had no capital to set up in business here. We had no employment for him.” Then what convinced them of his sincerity? In his later recollection, Legge tells how Ch’êa continued on in Hong Kong to receive Christian instruction, but the more Legge hesitated about his being baptized the more eager Ch’êa became about having the matter settled. Finally, one evening after a prayer meeting where Ch’êa had participated, as others were dispersing into the rainy summer evening, the Poklo man waited for Legge. When Legge finally emerged, he was startled by an unexpected sight.

It was raining, and [Ch’êa] stood in the rain and said, “You don’t believe in me, and are afraid to baptize me, but I am a true man, and God, whose rain is now falling on me, knows it — see,” and here he took off his cap and let the rain fall on his bare head, “see,” he said, “God is baptizing me.”

Once he was more formally baptized and provided with adequate books to feed his new religious interests, Ch’êa returned to Poklo having experienced the worship services led by Pastors Ho and Legge. His official bond with the Chinese congregation of Union Chapel because of his training and baptism was taken very seriously, though it is not clear that he was ever associated with Union Chapel as a registered member. Having risked the association with “foreign devils” (yânggûî) because of his intellectually driven religious quest, Ch’êa left Hong Kong with an affectional bonding to Union Chapel, its pastors, people, and style of worship.
Promises were made that other colporteurs would continue to stop by Poklo, and so Ch'ëa left his Hong Kong connections to return to an uncertain future.

PART THREE: Darkness outside, light within: Chinese cultural rejections of Ch’ëa’s Christian way

No further contact with Ch’ëa occurred for nearly a year after he left for Poklo, partly because of changing circumstances in Hong Kong that prevented any more aggressive strategies from taking shape. Legge himself had already been living as a widower since October 1852, his wife Mary Isabella (1817-1852) succumbing to what was probably advancing tuberculosis during a burdensome delivery of a stillborn child.\(^{34}\) Longing to see his children who had been receiving their education in Scotland since 1853, but also anxious to show the first fruits of his plans for the Chinese Classics to the London Missionary Society Directors, Legge was predisposed to staying close to Hong Kong and not taking trips into the nearby mainland. The Arrow Lorcha affair in October 1856 heightened the political tensions over supposed conflicts in treaty provisions between the Qing and British empires, lending just enough reason for British officials to initiate full scale war in December. Whatever plans there were for “nurturing” and “supporting” Ch’ëa, the declaration of war made travel inside China for foreigners literally impossible.

In the meantime, Ch’ëa had to make his own way. Soon after he returned to Poklo he officially gave up his “employment in the sacred temple [of Master Kông]” and apparently devoted his free time to reading the books brought with him from Hong Kong.\(^{35}\) Family members charged him with following a foreigners’ religion, suggesting that he had given up his allegiance to the Manchurian empire. Neighbours and others considered him either to be mad or possessed, the latter group throwing water on him (blessed in one of the Daoist temples?) to cast out the demons. What is significant, and may not be fully understood at first notice, is that these reactions occurred months before any outright military hostilities had begun (the so-called Second Opium War). “Following
foreigners’ religion” took on special weight not only because the ancestral rites central to traditional Chinese village life were set aside, but also because the commentaries to the Sacred Edict of the Kängxì emperor explicitly forbade citizens of the empire from following “strange doctrines.” The step from a charge of adhering to foreign teachings (wàijiāo) to supporting heretical doctrines (yídùān) was not a large one in the minds of Chinese people or their officials. Having already rejected his lowly position in an imperial institution on the grounds of a “strange” teaching, Ch’ēa was particularly susceptible to being charged with political and religious heresy.

The charges of madness and demonic possession are actually linked very closely to the former charge. Reconstructing the traditional justifications, the reasoning must have run something like the following: A person is “mad” who acts in bizarre and unexpected ways; so, one who pursues “strange teachings” which cause them to react in abnormal ways cannot be “sane,” “healthy,” “rational,” or “ritually proper.” Furthermore, one who rejects the ritual sacrifices to ancestors for whatever reasons would be seen as committing a kind of cultural and spiritual suicide. Everyone would expect that this kind of a person would degenerate into an animal, cursed by the cosmic spirits who govern the length of life and means of death. Maybe his associations with foreigners had complicated him with their own spiritual powers, so that he was actually possessed by their demons. Since in fact Ch’ēa did not suffer this fate in any immediately visible manner, persisting instead in spreading this new teaching and its style of life throughout the region, there may well have been some who considered it their duty to get rid of him because of the cultural chaos his chosen way engendered among the people. Facts known about Ch’ēa’s subsequent career would appear to warrant this kind of interpretation.

Yet this does not fully explain the cultural role of demonology and the inherent “discourse of race” which was deeply imbedded in late Qing society. To declare a human person a demon was to catapult them outside of normal human relationships,
to justify any kind of violence against that “other” as a form of cultural and social self-preservation. “Foreign demons” were constructs of a political discourse which played on the common people’s fears, even to the point of instituting extensive studies in teratology (the study of monstrous forms of animals and plants) as a way of explaining the foreign “things.” In taking a “China-centred approach” to studying the implications of Ch’üa’s Christian conversion, these factors should be explored in two areas: the teratologisation of Jesus and the whiplash of an earlier imperial racism expressed in Manchurian campaigns against any intellectuals who strongly supported Hân cultural motifs.

In a rare picture of the transmogrification of “foreign teachings” in order to mark them out for vilification and destruction, Paul Cohen has illustrated how one Qing scholar, Tiân Xîngshû(1837-1877), produced a blistering lampoon of Christianity in publicly displayed placards during the 1860s. The “Lord Jesus” (Zhū Yēsū) was depicted in cartoon-like caricatures as the “Pig Jesus” (Jū Yēsū), worshipped by “foreign devils” in bizarre and salacious rites. Christian “devils” are depicted as cannibalizing unsuspecting children and religious seekers, using their religious rites as a cover-up for the most immoral and inhumane forms of treatment that a Chinese person could imagine. Near the end of his book, Bîxîé jîshî (The Truth about Records of Exorcising Evil Spirits), Tiân depicts a righteous mandarin ordering the “shooting of Pig [Jesus] and the beheading of the Goats [foreigners].” But this is not the end. Following long traditions found in many Chinese Buddhist or Daoist temple reliefs, Tiân capsulizes the defamation by illustrating the terrible purgatorial punishments deserved by the “Pig Incarnate” (jījīng) in some lower level of Chinese hells. Any partially literate and sensitive Chinese citizen would obviously want to be rid of such a terrible menace to their own society. How could any Chinese person, convinced that these claims were false and purposefully misleading derisions, seek to redirect mobs angered by these putative evils of “foreign torturers”?

Yet an even deeper level of antagonism and racism had been instigated from the highest imperial offices during the 17th and
18th centuries. It is well documented now that the Manchurian despots who militarily overcame the weakened and corrupt Ming court were adamant in their efforts to rewrite the history of their forefathers in “angelic” terms. Perhaps more than in any other previous dynasty, the Manchurian emperors destroyed pro-Ming and pro-Hán culture books and documents, burning also any books which stood against their Manchurian ancestors, and censoring portions of books which touched on these topics. In numerous cases the contemporary relatives of earlier authors were themselves detained, tortured, and given death sentences. Sometimes the penalties were completely inordinate, causing not only racial tension among the Hán elite (between those supporting and those fearing this Manchurian method of “intellectual cleansing”) but also a deep seated resentment among the common people. Understanding the harshness, breadth, and persistence of this long-term policy of the Qíng government, the Tàipíng Insurgents’ anti-Manchu ideology appears to be a long submerged political whiplash against a racist regime. Yet it remained another facet of Qíng social life during this chaotic period that “the people become willing partners in their own subjection,” very much in order to save their own lives as well as those who support them.

Ch’ëa’s armoury against these tremendous cultural pressures and political dangers was his newly obtained Christian library and the inherent attractions of his alternative form of life. No precise details about what he brought back with him to Poklo in 1856 are available, but later records suggest that he and others had access to at least Ho Tsun-sheen’s *Introduction to a Comprehensive Commentary to the New Testament* (Xīnyuē quánshū jiēshǐ xù), the Christian version of the *Three Character Classic* (Sānzhì jīng), and a translation of the first volume of Bunyan’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, rendered by another Scottish missionary of note, William C. Burns (using the family name Bào, 1815-1868). This third work was given the Chinese title *Tiānlù líchéng* (lit., *The Course along the Heavenly Road*), and was probably read with a great amount of empathetic understanding by Ch’ëa as he faced these daunting forces in opposition to his Christian associations and beliefs.
More fundamental to Ch’ëa’s self-defence was a claim inherent in those translations of the Shèngjīng, the Chinese Christian Bible, which employed shàngdì as the key term for the Christian God. When Jesus spoke about “conversion,” the Chinese phrase suggested a “return” (gùxìàng) rather than a “turning.” One who “turned” to the Christian God through the sacrifice of Christ was “returning” to the Lord on High (shàngdì) worshipped by the ancient sages as mentioned in the Book of Historical Documents and Book of Poetry. For a Chinese to become a Christian was, in the final analysis, to return to the religious worldview of the sage kings and to experience a new fulfilment of their own Ruist cultural heritage.49

Perhaps it was this strain of Chinese Christian theology which was partially influential, though never stated explicitly, in sparing Ch’ëa from civil punishment. Probably some months after he had left his post at the local temple, Ch’ëa was arrested by government officials and his Christian books were seized. Ostensibly the charge was that he had “been deceiving the people with heretical doctrines,” but there were probably other concerns also motivating the officials’ harshness. After the initial battles of the new Sino-British war, issues probably not fully known by Ch’ëa, all suspicious citizens with obvious foreign connections were being questioned. The threat of foreign invasion determined by the outcome of war and not restrained by any other known international legal institution greatly threatened the Qing hierarchy and Chinese citizens in the Manchurian empire.50 As a consequence, Ch’ëa had this additional complication to face in addition to other, probably more expected, cultural oppositions. After “squabbling for about three hours” and trying to “practice extortion” on Ch’ëa, who “fearlessly” did not “answer them a word,” nothing could be found as evidence to place him in either a cangue or chains. Did the officials peruse the books and come up with other conclusions? Or was it merely that they found Ch’ëa was a poor man without money, and so “they pretended to be in a great rage” and let him go?51
PART FOUR: From the golden light within: Ch’ëa’s creative embodiment of a Chinese Christian way

In spite of the political risks in continuing his connections with the Hong Kong Chinese Christians and their foreign missionary associates, Ch’ëa returned to Hong Kong with a convert responding to his own preaching in May, 1857. To claim that Ch’ëa’s arrival was unexpected is a facile understatement. Hostilities had forced many Chinese to leave Hong Kong because of Qing official threats of punishment hanging over the heads of their relatives in Guǎngdōng and elsewhere. In addition, earlier that year in January an attempt at poisoning the expatriate community in Hong Kong through seasoning the daily bread with arsenic had been attempted, failing only because the amount of arsenic was too much, causing vomiting rather than fatalities.\(^{52}\) These political and terrorist realities put the colony on a state of high alert. Somehow Ch’ëa and Kot A-Yuk, the new convert, passed through the opposing military lines without being stopped. And this was not the only time Ch’ëa returned. Each year in the following three years he returned at least once, carrying reports that his “apostolic ministry” was influencing a larger and larger number of self-conscious converts in the district of Poklo. Adopting a pattern of “itinerant ministry” in various parts of the district, preaching and teaching from the materials he had been given in Hong Kong and sharing with his contacts in Poklo and neighbourhood villages what he had experienced in Hong Kong among Chinese Christians there, Ch’ëa initiated what Legge and others considered to be a “spontaneous Christian agency,” “as genuine as it is unique.”\(^{53}\)

Sometime in late 1859, after Legge had returned from a brief furlough in England and Scotland with his new wife, Hannah Mary (1821-1882), and their children (two daughters from the widower James Legge’s first marriage and a step-daughter from his new wife’s first marriage), the Chinese congregation at Union Chapel agreed to support Ch’ëa for three months as their travelling evangelist in the area.\(^{55}\) In April, 1860, John Chalmers and Ho Tsun-sheen made a missionary tour in the Poklo district, baptizing converts prepared by Ch’ëa and others who had become active in
propagating the Christian message. Later in May, 1861, Legge joined Chalmers and six others, including two Chinese evangelists, meeting Ch’ëa and then touring the area. During this period they examined and accepted 101 applicants for baptism, performing the rites oftentimes in the vicinity of the local temples where they also preached.56

What deserves further attention, however, is the ways in which Ch’ëa himself pursued these kind of “Christian duties” when left to work on his own during this period of Sino-British conflict.

Already by the time he returned to Hong Kong in May 1857, Ch’ëa had developed his own pattern of a Christian form of life. This was largely based on his own feel for how to proceed, even though he had previously been instructed for six weeks in Hong Kong (during the period from May to June, 1856). Consequently, he did choose not to respond to his Catholic maternal uncle who “advised me to worship my ancestors,” choosing instead to face “men’s reproach or persecution” rather than follow “the doctrines of the Papists.” Here it is evident that the Scottish Dissenter Protestant leanings of Legge and Ho, who had adopted them, had influenced Ch’ëa.57 Also, when some educated men, possibly other local gentry not in the civil service, urged Ch’ëa to “be revenged for [the] hostility on the part of the officials,” Ch’ëa refused, saying that “the disciples of Jesus do not strive with men.” Clearly this emanated from his reading of the Shèngjìng and the Dissenter attitudes Legge and Ho had taught him, but stood in stark contrast to the military intrusions of the British in the area of Canton. As might be expected, images of the early Christian apostles in the New Testament and probably stories from the colporteurs and missionaries who passed through Poklo moved Ch’ëa to itinerate outside the Poklo city walls. As he described his tours in 1857, he first headed west, then north, and finally east, preaching the message of the Christian religion he had learned to anyone willing to hear.58

Under these situations Ch’ëa seemed to move largely out of a
spontaneous concern for people, first assessing their willingness to enter sincerely into the Christian life he advocated, and then following up those who manifested sincere intentions. Like the accounts of many evangelists, Ch’ëa emphasized the most notable and “promising” encounters. There was the 50 year old teacher Cheong of the little village of Mooey Lung (M. Méilóng) near the foot of Mount Lo-fow, who after hearing Ch’ëa for a full day and night responded, “Your coming has been my salvation!” In another case near the town of Kum Ky Ngan (P. Jínjí yàn, literally “The Eye of the Golden Rooster”) Ch’ëa met a man named Tsül Moo Sow, heading toward a local temple with a large meat offering to present in sacrifice. Noting both the poverty of the place and the man, Ch’ëa engaged Tsül in conversation, moving him into a “wayside tea room” to convince him that he was “not to worship idols, but to worship God the Lord of heaven and earth and all things.” Responding positively to Ch’ëa’s instruction, Tsül opened his home, treating him with “respect and kindness,” claiming that “Heaven had sent me there to save him.”59 These stories one would expect from an evangelist who himself had faced decisive moments of transition, but they do not portray the full range of communicative means Ch’ëa employed. Undoubtedly, some Poklo residents found his ways to be strangely attractive, while others grew to consider them as offensive and unacceptable.

Several independent sources present pictures of Ch’ëa’s methods and lifestyle, making a partial reconstruction of his modus vivendi possible. Kot A-Yuk had first met Ch’ëa during the eighth month of the lunar calendar, probably during the Chôngyáng festival, Ch’ëa attending to his ancestors’ gravesite like many other residents during that holiday.60 Since this was fully expected for all village residents, something else had obviously caught Kot’s attention. At the gravesite Ch’ëa had cut the grass following conditions of ritualized filial duty, but had brought “neither meat nor wine for sacrifice.” Even more curious were the dozen people who were sitting on the grass, listening to Ch’ëa speak about numerous religious themes. But after talking at some length Ch’ëa mentioned that he had learned these things from “divine books,” and so some who had been listening took Ch’ëa to be “mad”
because of this specific claim.

Several points of interest should be underscored in this account. Although Ch'ëa had stopped the rituals of ancestral veneration at home and during the festival seasons, he continued to live in accordance to other accepted norms, including “cleaning the graves” of his ancestors. Apparently wanting to be with people and to share his message, Ch’ëa had obviously worked through the ethics of which traditional practices did not hinder his Christian life and so developed means of approach to others through them. Kot was very specific about the themes Ch’ëa spoke about, some which he might have heard from Ho and Legge in Hong Kong in the spring of 1856. What Kot remembered were themes on “the bounty of God in creation and providence,” the latter an issue expressed in Legge’s sermons and most likely in Ho’s elegant Chinese homilies, as well as elaborations on the nature of the soul, why people should not worship idols, and “the propitiation made by Jesus Christ for the sins of men.” In spite of the disbelief of many listeners in the cemetery after Ch’ëa mentioned that he had the “divine books” in his possession, Kot kept note of where he lived and made it a point to visit him nearly a month later.

Certainly the fact that Kot waited a full month before attempting to visit Ch’ëa suggests that he did not feel very comfortable or highly motivated to do so. Apparently Kot had begun questioning his village neighbours about many of the issues Ch’ëa had raised, and so a greater curiosity about Ch’ëa’s actual “domestic arrangements” prodded Kot to see if this local preacher lived by what he taught. Once he found Ch’ëa’s home, Kot was invited in and saw, perhaps to his surprise, that “there was in his house neither Koon Yum (Guányīn, the famous Chinese female Boddhisatva), nor Kwan Ty (Guāndì, the spirit guardian, often the image placed on doors as a protector of homes), neither ancestral tablets, nor incense pot.” Willingly receiving Christian literature from Ch’ëa at that time, Kot returned to his village only to find his neighbours still taking Ch’ëa “to be mad.” After intermittent reading of the books and later repeated visits by Ch’ëa (in “my house three or four times”), Kot began to join Ch’ëa in “worship[ping] God” and “convers[ing]
on the doctrines" written in the books. Kot himself visited Ch’ëa twice more in the latter’s home, sharing again in worship and conversation. Sometime later, he claimed, “I was six tenths of a believer.”

Rather than base his methods on a strict adherence to intellectually understood doctrines, Ch’ëa took a more traditional Chinese approach in inviting “seekers” to join him in an experience of prayerful worship. Understanding doctrines might come only after a concrete experience of “worshipping in spirit” had opened new religious vistas for the seekers. Kot admits that he was “still kept back by the influence of worldly custom,” probably threatened by neighbours who told him that if he followed Ch’ëa’s radical departure from traditions, he and the village would suffer a spiritual blight from higher powers. Gradually convinced by Ch’ëa’s “great earnestness and reverence,” Kot himself in the end chose to risk further incriminations by joining Ch’ëa in travelling to Hong Kong. There he was notably impressed not by the doctrines expounded but by “such pious worship, and such excellent rites, surpassing even what Mr. Ch’ëa himself said and did.” Though it is not clear that Kot represents the only kind of positive response to Ch’ëa’s evangelistic methods, it is significant that his approach to Christian doctrine came through a complex interaction of experiences including private worship, friendly discussion, earnest exhortations, and extensive reading. What seemed to impress him most him was the form of life expressed in Christian Sabbath culture more than the “essential doctrines” of the Christian religion, though these were undeniably expressed and discussed as well.63

Another picture is offered later in 1859 by two German missionaries who passed through Poklo. Recognizing them as Christians, Ch’ëa became their intermediary among the local people and the “mandarins,” suggesting that Ch’ëa’s boldness was increasing over time.64 (Germans at this time were given some special privileges since their nation was not involved in the prolonged military problems centred on Canton. At this time there was still an official state of war being actively pursued by groups of QIng and Cantonese militia using “gorilla warfare tactics” against British and French troops stationed in the area of Canton.) The European travellers noted that
Ch’ëa was also in the “habit of going about with a board on his back,” announcing by this means certain “striking sentences of the New Testament” written in large Chinese characters. One can imagine that if these “striking sentences” were considered offensive by neighbours and acquaintances, a complaint would also travel back quickly to the civil leadership.

Legge himself recorded numbers of comments about Ch’ëa’s evangelistic zeal and preaching as they travelled together in the Poklo district in May, 1861. Since several weeks were spent together on boats travelling up and down the East River, there was much time to reflect on their shared missionary project, pray over problems, and work together during various periods of literature distribution and preaching. Overall, Legge was impressed with Ch’ëa’s consistency in character and genuine interest in others.

In addition, Ch’ëa acted as their interpreter before the Poklo magistrate, Wáng Shouren, causing “astonishment and exaltation among the people,” because the “gauntlet of scorn” he had often passed through in other settings was now surprisingly forgotten, even to the point that he was given a position of relative honour.

Often Ch’ëa and Leung Man-shing (Liáng Wénchéng), one of the Chinese colporteur-evangelists, went into a new town first to present the cards and map-sized travel documents of the foreign missionaries to the local mandarin, facing any threats that might come their way for associating with British citizens. This was a very sensitive problem because, although new treaty provisions promised free and safe travel for all foreigners entering China, there were still at this time British and French troops bivouacked in the city of Canton. In fact they had remained in Canton for more than three years, maintaining their military posts since taking the city after a major offensive move in 1857. In addition, the British attack on the emperor’s Summer Palace in Béijing during the summer of 1860 only heightened fears and resentment, even though it squashed Qing opposition and brought about their compliance at the treaty table. Undoubtedly all of this was common knowledge among the Cantonese citizens, a warrant for making any attacks on foreigners or their associates in spite of the treaty conditions. Besides, these signs of
foreign military strength prevailing against the Qing regime, calculated by the British and French to force compliance with the new treaty conditions, also actually caused greater threat to those foreign travellers who moved outside the provincial capital. Still, all this being recognized by Legge and his travelling companions, including Ch’ea, they pursued their missionary goals and tested the reliability of the Qing forces to uphold the treaty conditions. In the end it was clear that local Qing authorities could only be partially successful in maintaining public order during their travels. This fact was highlighted during the missionary tour. Legge explicitly mentions in his journal published in Hong Kong in June 1861 – issues almost always deleted from the edited versions published in the missionary journal accounts produced for English audiences – the troubles they faced at certain places where crowds had stones and bricks nearby and available to attack their party. One of the harshest responses came in the district city of Wye-chow, a large walled city not very distant from Poklo. Stonings there caused noticeable damage to the main boat rented for the trip. In another district town up the river by the name of He Yuán, the “rain of stones” became “exceedingly unpleasant.” In order to avoid further physical threat on their return through the alleys of the walled city, Legge and Chalmers with their attendant soldiers finally climbed up on the city walls where the attackers had their point of advantage. By this means they surprised the stone slingng “rabble” so that they quickly dispersed without presenting any further threats until the group had entered their boats. Legge was nonplussed: “I did not think that we should have experienced such treatment so far away from Canton.” The political reality that antiforeigner feelings were running high and spread broadly throughout the region could not be denied.

Added to this was a deeper, more persistent strain of demonology which continued to erupt in the curses yelled at the missionaries in any place that was “inhospitable.” One single record in Legge’s journal illustrates the visceral level at which this demonology worked. At one point northeast of Poklo as they were travelling up the East River, the boat passed through a herd of water buffalo “luxuriating”
in the muddy shallows of the river. Dusk had already come, the air was “cool and refreshing,” and the cowherd responsible for the water buffalo was washing their bodies as they lounged in the cool environment after a hard day’s labour. Neither the cowherd nor the buffalo responded to the sight of the strange men. But once the boat rounded the next corner in the river, they silently came up to a “girl driving home two or three cows.” When she peered through the darkening light into the boat and realized she was gazing at strange faces and forms,” she spontaneously shrieked and ran away from her cows, yelling that “demons” were coming up the river! To her the word was not simply a casual derogation, but was actually descriptive of what she saw. Certainly it was also believed by many who were her neighbours. There may be other ways to respond to demons, such as lying quietly on the water buffalo you are cleaning and not looking into the faces of suspected ghosts or demons, but the belief remained the same. This demonisation of foreigners easily increased the common people’s tendency to fear and despise them, and could erupt into destructive violence, especially if political and military reasons prodded them to express their fears and hatreds more openly.

Still later on the return trip, when the Chinese members of the missionary group had gone ashore during the evening to sleep on firmer supports than the floating boats could offer, those on land were attacked by a mob of “lewd fellows of the baser sort” who obviously spent most of their fury on Ch’ea. It is clear that Ch’ea’s methods had threatened and offended others in the Poklo region, to the point that some were willing to hire or incite young thugs to hinder his activities. Legge and others nevertheless remained impressed by Ch’ea’s consistent character, emphasizing instead the positive reports of those influenced by him to embrace Christian traditions. In many ways they considered him an authentic “Golden Light” (Jinguāng, which also was his personal name) shining within China, a miraculous hope during a period made dark and bleak by the ensuing war. Yet by the spring of 1861 it was more and more obvious that Ch’ea was already a marked man in Poklo. Even if Legge and other missionaries hoped otherwise, they did so in spite of the evidence of the antagonisms vented against Ch’ea in
very direct and personal ways during the 1861 missionary tour.

PART FIVE: Legge’s risk and Ch’ēa’s Via Dolorosa

Having expected some signs of local discontent and not sensing that the level of antiforeignism was high enough to obstruct further developments, Legge arranged to purchase a house in Poklo for the establishment of a chapel and missionary coordinating office the following July. Although these arrangements were protected by the new treaty conditions, a controversy soon arose in which a local gentry claimed previous rights to the house, refusing to admit that the London Missionary Society representatives had the prior option to purchase the place. Consequently, though money had been sent for the purchase, the deeds for the house were never turned over to the missionary society. Social tensions between the district authorities and the opposing gentry rose, so that Legge appealed to both the British and Qing provincial authorities in Canton to help them resolve the problem. All this particular appeal seemed to produce was further obstacles in the way of a normal sale, the provincial authorities refusing to make any independent actions on their own. The issue must have become controversial enough that most active citizens in the Poklo region knew about the problem, making it a heated topic of debate among gentry and common people. In the meantime, as Legge explained in a letter of mid-October, “[One of the gentry] took violent possession [of the house] and proceeded from one act of aggression to another, till affairs wore a very threatening aspect as concerns the safety of our Native Brethren.”

So desperate was the situation that Ch’ēa and others “fled to Canton to ask advice and help from the missionaries.”

Frustrated over the intransigence of both Qing and British authorities, Legge left Hong Kong for Canton in early October, seeking to resolve the problem by making a personal appeal to the presiding British official there. It was a significant move for several reasons left unstated in the missionary publications which followed the event. Certainly, the fact that active threats of persecution against local Chinese Christians in Poklo were now known heightened the stakes of the sale of the house, for the protection of Chinese
believers was also one of the explicit conditions mentioned in the new treaty. Here was a prime test case for compliance to the new treaty, one which would force both Qing and British bureaucracies to express public support for the most recent treaty regulations. On this score Legge felt he and the London Missionary Society were on solid legal ground. But Legge also felt obliged to move because it was probably told him by colonial officials he knew in Hong Kong that the regiments currently residing in Canton would soon be leaving. 76 Once they left, there would be no easy recourse to a militarily supported British official in the region, and so Legge sought to resolve the case before it became essentially a matter of working directly with the Qing provincial authorities. Expecting that those authorities would be less responsive, Legge probably felt he had no real option but to make a personal and immediate appeal to the British authorities in Canton.

After an initial interview over the problem in Canton, Legge was recalled to the British Governor-General’s office there and offered an unexpected compromise. A British military escort would be sent to oversee the proper transaction only if Legge himself would go. In the accounts published for the British public nothing is explained about Legge’s response except that he decided to go. Having offered to try to resolve the issue by going to Poklo himself and using “a blended firmness and conciliatoriness to get over our difficulties,” Legge was asked if he could leave immediately to pursue this approach. Reflecting first about his family and then on his sense of religious duty to Christ and to the Chinese Christians in Poklo, he confirmed his willingness to go under escort while still in the office. What he did not tell others is the content of a message he left with John Chalmers, who had come with him to the Governor-General’s office. 77 It read as follows:

It is possible that I may be beheaded at Pok-lo. If news comes that I have been murdered, go at once to the English consul and tell him that it was my wish that no English gun-boat should be sent up the river to punish the people for my death.

Nothing could have been more risky or bold, Legge trusting that
his knowledge of the language, sensitivity to ritual propriety, and the impressions of his previous visit among Poklo residents when he and Chalmers had spoken publicly to the mandarin and people would all help to overcome the boiling tensions. The only caution remaining in his mind was one of military reprisals for his own death, a Scottish Protestant Dissenter value he insisted on upholding, though he would on the same basis uphold judicial processes which charged persecutors of the local Chinese Christians. Taking the risk and hoping not to jeopardize the situation so that a further landslide of anti-Christian persecutions resulted, Legge soon afterwards headed to Poklo.

As was expected, land messengers from the Qing bureaucracy were sent hastily to Poklo once news was sent them about the British envoy headed in that direction. Ch’ēa joined the boat party as well, filling in Legge on all the most recent news about the disturbances and threats. Consequently, by the time Legge arrived at the small Poklo dockyard in his slow boat ride along the East River, he was better informed and the matter on shore, very much catalysed into action by the boldness of his coming, was in the final stages of resolution. The local superintendent of police had been sent down the river to inform Legge and his party that the matter “was settled”, the mandarin Wáng having left for Wye-chow (to “finalize” matters?), but planning to participate in a public ceremony the following day when the “title deeds of the house, regularly stamped” would be placed in Legge’s possession. During the public ceremonies and discussions which formalized the sale of the house, involving nine Chinese public officials along with Legge and his military escort, Legge pursued more than just the transfer of the deed. News had reached him through Ch’ēa and others that “placards against foreigners and Christians” had been posted throughout Poklo and Wye-chow. These he insisted had to be taken down with public proclamations replacing them, “containing the 8th and 12th Articles of the English Treaty” which dictated terms regarding the “protection of Chinese Christians” and a sizeable list of missionary privileges on Chinese soil. In addition, Legge’s sources had provided the name of the recalcitrant and deceptive gentry person who had fomented much of the trouble, a
person named “Soo Hoy-tü.” Once again Legge insisted that Soo be dealt with “in some way which should mark their sense of the enormity of his conduct.” Both conditions were acknowledged and accepted by all of the officials Legge spoke to. Things went so smoothly, both in ritual form and placid acceptance of what must have been very difficult conditions for the officials, that Legge was both elated and disgusted. In his own mind at the time, the display of timely submissiveness under pressure appeared only little more than blatant baliios. Cohen rightly points out how this kind of situation in the decade of the 1860s placed any Qing official between the Scylla of imperial duties to follow the treaty stipulations and the Charybdis of the anti-foreignism of local gentry who carried much popular support. Having bent over backwards for months previous to Legge’s arrival, trying to use more humane means to obtain compliance from the literatus Soo and his supporters, the district magistrate had to battle at cross purposes with the popular demonology supporting anti-foreignism and the additional shame of recent military defeats. To act too abruptly or harshly would earn the magistrate the epithet of being a “friend of foreigners,” and so even risk his imperial role as an appointed civil authority. On the other hand, any blatant refusal to respond to the treaty conditions would merit imperial disfavour and severe reprimand, possibly including imprisonment. The double bind working on officials in this Guangdong setting could not have been any stronger.

Early in the morning after the handover ceremonies Legge was woken by the River Superintendent (“Hoppo”) and urged him to get an early start in his boat headed toward Canton. After the ceremonies the day before Legge had left the keys of the house in Ch’êa’s hands, nominating the former keeper of the temple of Master Kông now the keeper of the new chapel dedicated to shângdi. When Legge mentioned to the Hoppo that he wanted to leave parting words with Ch’êa, the Hoppo apparently promised to pass on any message, and so Legge compliently entered the waiting boat and headed off before sunrise.

What motivated the Hoppo to treat Legge in this manner is
not fully known. There was apparently some disturbing news passed along unseen lines of communication that a large group of unruly men, nearly 5,000 in all, had been rounded up in Wye-chow and urged on by Soo and another gentry collaborator, Wong Chik-wai, to sneak into Poklo and capture the district magistrate, Legge, and Ch’ea. Their intentions were apparently malevolent, fully inclined toward “punishing” all three if they were found. In fact, their progress toward Poklo was slower than the Hoppo anticipated. On October 10th, the day Legge left to return to Canton and then on to his young family in Hong Kong, the vigilantes had already “made prisoners” of the Prefect of Wye-chow and the District Magistrate of Wye-sheen, capturing them as they returned from the previous day’s festivities in Poklo.

Ch’ea himself, Legge reflected, “was full of joy, as I was, and unsuspicious of danger.” Apparently sometime during the evening of the 12th or 13th, a group of men surrounded the London Mission’s house in Poklo and provoked Ch’ea to come to the door by having a small child knock on it. Having tricked him by this means, they grabbed him, beating him till they could control him by other means. Soon afterwards this kind of aggressive physical persecution spread to all the places where residents had become Christians, neighbours saving themselves by becoming informants, causing a desperate exodus from many places. News that finally did filter down to Hong Kong came from the mouths of a handful of refugees who managed to escape from the area.

Legge’s daughter, Helen Edith Legge, put together a series of letters including translations of notes and verbal news received by Chalmers in Canton as well as passages from letters of her father to reconstruct the final days of Ch’ea’s persecution. Even though one local Christian named Wong Shan Yen, possibly a wealthy farmer Ch’ea had often met over the years, offered a large ransom to have Ch’ea released, the vigilantes had other purposes in mind. First tortured with fire, and then later moved to another hamlet where he was hung overnight to a beam by his thumbs and big toes, reawakened into the consciousness of his pain by water dashed in the face, Ch’ea’s enemies were merciless. Only if he promised to
reject the Christian form of life and its teachings he had followed for five years, proving it by “go[ing] to a temple and burn[ing] incense before some idols,” would he be spared further torture. Refusing to bend to their manhandling, the patience of his enemies grew thin.  

Other letters tell that as he still refused to give up Christianity, his persecutors carried him to the banks of a river [near the village of Kong Tung on the evening of October 16th] and swore that if he would not then and there deny Christ, they would put him to death. He only answered, “How can I deny Him who died for me?” Infuriated by his steadfastness [sic] they rushed on him, struck him down, cut off his head and threw his body into the river.  

For a number of weeks after this murder the rioters continued to rampage the district of Poklo, but gradually the vigilante dream faded, and the seriousness of their offences weighed on the leaders’ minds. Attempts at compromise were offered, asking for clemency in return for the mission society’s free use of the house in Poklo. To this Legge is claimed to have responded that the missionaries “would take no measures to bring them to justice,” but as missionaries they could not interfere if the Chinese government itself charged them with serious offences.  

PART SIX: Confused lights in the dark halls of foreign affairs

By the end of October, two weeks after Ch’êa’s murder, Legge wrote not only about the limited details he had heard regarding Ch’êa’s sufferings, but also characterized the vigilantes themselves. For him and others there was much “not easy to understand.” On the surface, they seemed to be supporting the Qing empire, and even carried a flag with the inscription, “Security to the Government, and Extermination for Barbarians” (possibly using the derogatory term, fênyî). But from the extensive description of the larger picture given here it is undeniable that they acted “in defiance of the authorities,” even taking prisoner a number of the local Qing officials (whose fate was never clarified). During this same period the occupation
forces of the British and French armies were departing Canton, so that whether these events had any correlation may be an additional issue. Nothing seems to have been consciously planned as an attack on the Governor-General, though he felt threatened by the riot (the events in Poklo being some 40 miles east of Canton). At the very least the vigilantes were acting “in flagrant violation of the stipulations of the [1860] Treaty,” “stirring up the hatred of the people to[ward] foreigners, and their dislike to Christianity.” Whether they had other “ambitious ends” hidden under the banner and their rhetoric remained a serious, but moot, question.

Following normal protocol for this kind of emergency, Chalmers acting on behalf of the London Missionary Society presented their complaints to the consul at Canton. The missionaries had been given no indication of the Governor-General’s intentions, but Legge specifically adds that, if all else failed, they could refer the matter “to our Ambassador at Peking.” His attitude toward the Qing bureaucracy was unqualified and negative: “The [Qing] Government is effete. The foundations are destroyed.” Although this might seem like an overstatement, the feelings reflected a fairly realistic evaluation of the disarray of an empire overcome by foreign powers in the capital and unable to handle the massive Tàipíng Rebellion which continued to defy imperial armies and ruled over much of the centre of the empire at the time. Other means for dealing with the crisis were also at hand. Daily prayer about the whole situation and its continuing problems became the self-imposed discipline by the Chinese Christians in Hong Kong, prompting Legge to compare this “painful and discouraging” situation in Poklo with the “primitive forthgoing of Christianity” where persecution was also a stimulus for expansion.

It was part of the “cunning of history” that Legge’s life and name for the next decade were identified with two major issues of the year of 1861: Poklo and his Chinese Classics.³⁹ In missionary publications he became “Dr. Legge of Hong Kong and Poklo,” and in Hong Kong itself, the memories were more vivid and even more powerful in creating around him a kind of aura as a “folk hero” in the Carlylean sense of the term. At least one major event later in
1863 added to this heroic penumbra, one which should be mentioned only after some further evaluations of the "martyrdom of Ch'ëa" are considered.

From all appearances it seems that Ch'ëa's murderers unwittingly added fuel to the image of his heroic martyrdom. But there are some reasons to question the accounts quoted extensively above. Where did the testimony of Ch'ëa's last words come from? The only possible source would be the murderers themselves, but we have no confirmation that Legge had gotten this information from them when he later had correspondence with their more demure and frightened leaders. Information Chalmers had received came from trusted Chinese co-workers such as A-Wai (A-Wye?) and those fleeing the area, but how much could they have known for certain? That Ch'ëa was probably under the threat of losing his life for not returning to worship "ancestors and idols" fits with all the previous elements of his own conversion, the scorn he received for his association with foreign Christians, and the local fears tied to spiritual repercussions from such stubborn defiance against the invisible authorities in the spirits of the land and the revered ancestors. That he had also lived much of his life in self-conscious reflection on passages of the Chinese New Testament and other Christian literature also should not be denied, but the hagiographic stereotype of his final words before his murderers, even though certainly possible, seem more a product of hopeful Christians than eyewitnesses. This is particularly important in the light of the unreliable data evident in the writings of Legge's daughter on the event.91

What is another puzzling aspect of the whole scene is that nothing was done about it in the higher echelons of either British or Qing bureaucracy. Already by the end of January 1861 the Zōngfù yánmén, the Qing empire's first attempt at institutionalizing a Foreign Affairs Bureau, had been given imperial approval.92 "Religious affairs" (zōngjiào àn) were part of their responsibilities, and proved to be a set of extremely sensitive and difficult issues to resolve. Cohen has listed a large number of them for the period from 1861 to 1870, but refers to the first Protestant case only in 1867.93 If Cohen's summary is meant to reflect the cases on file in
the Zōnglǐ yāmén, he cannot be faulted for missing this major tragic event among Chinese Protestants in southeast China, because it was apparently never reported or discussed by British and Qīng officials.

Maybe the “oversight” happened because the turn of events shifted attention to the military problems associated with the resistance of Tàipíng forces during the next three years before they were destroyed. They had become the target of a common effort by the Qīng armies as well as some foreign (and particularly British/Scottish) militia under General Gordon, probably causing a host of special problems demanding the “immediate attention” of the British Ambassador, Sir Frederick Bruce. Nevertheless, it was against the Ambassador that Legge expressed his most piercing salvo of Protestant Dissenter displeasure in 1863, nearly two years after the riots in Poklo and Ch'ēa’s murder had taken place.

In a brief note leaked to the public a year after it had been written, Sir Bruce explained his opinion to Lord John Russell (1792-1878), then Secretary of State, that missionaries should not be permitted to enter into China because of the troubles they caused and the dangers they faced. His arguments stood in blatant opposition to the conditions codified by the 1860 treaty, but were nevertheless read with approval by Lord Russell. This occasioned an outburst of righteous anger from Legge, who took Bruce’s letter apart piece by piece, and showed its insensitivity to missionary work as well as its incoherence in the face of the recent treaty conditions. In and of itself, this letter written by Legge, first published in the Patriot in London and soon afterward in the local China Mail in Hong Kong, was one of the most perceptive and articulate pieces of political analysis he ever wrote. But the coup de grace came in the end, where the level of frustration Legge felt against British bureaucratic reticence and its discounting of missionary and Chinese Christians’ rights had grown to a new height.

I will conclude this long letter by referring to a case in point,
and in doing so will avail myself of a rough copy of some remarks which I addressed to Her Majesty’s Consul in Canton [Harry Parkes, 1828-1885] upon it in January of the present year [1863]. The outrages complained of were then of more than twelve months’ standing; the Consul had been more or less in correspondence with the Chinese authorities about them during all that time; he had submitted the case, he told me, to Frederick Bruce, but had got no reply; nor has he got any, I suppose, up to this time. Everything provided for by the treaties has been broken at Pok-lo; Christians pursuing their calling peaceably were interfered with and persecuted; our Catechist was torn from the house which has been purchased to be converted into a place of worship, and barbarously put to death, because he would not renounce Christianity; placards were issued offering rewards for the head of any Foreign Missionary who should visit the district, and for the heads of all Chinese Christians who should assist him in his measures. These and other violent proceedings were taken, and the Government has yet done nothing effectual to show its regard for the treaty stipulations. I should be sorry now, after the lapse of time, if life were to be taken, even by justice, for the life that was sacrificed for Christ, and still more sorry if the district were to be visited with the scourge of military operations in avengement of the deeds done. But can nothing at all be done? I do not doubt that you represented gravely, again and again, to the Governor-general here, how serious the offences were. Since those representations have proved ineffectual, Her Majesty’s Representative at Peking will surely bring the case before the high officers of the Imperial Government. Her Majesty is committed — may I not say so? — by the articles of the Treaty not to let the matter rest, without signifying by Sir Frederick Bruce her strong displeasure, and entering her solemn protest at least against the impunity allowed to such despite to her subjects, and such persecution of Chinese Christians.

So Legge voiced his protest, full of Dissenter concerns opposed to military escalation, but based on treaties purchased at the price of military muscle. The irony of this situation would play itself out in the multitudinous problems encountered by missionaries and Chinese Christians within the subsequent decades of the Qing
dynasty, shattering any sense that forceful treaties could ever provide a lasting spiritual peace between the former combatants.

PART SEVEN: After the golden light has shined . . .

It is only right to return to the Chinese Christians in Poklo once more and ask what, if anything, ever transpired in their tragic situation. In fact, there is much to say. Sometime in 1867 the house in Poklo and its keys were once more handed over to the London Missionary Society, and the former colporteur, Leung Man-shing, equipped with some lengthy experience as a hospital apprentice, entered the town both as a part-time physician and evangelist. By the beginning of the 1870s, another missionary under the London Mission Society, E. J. Eitel (1838-1908), took up residence in the area and, along with Chinese Christian help and support, soon had five functioning churches in the district. It should also be noted that, back in Hong Kong, the “son of the martyr of Poklo” was registered in the late 1860s as one of the baptized members of the Chinese congregation of Union Chapel under the pastor leadership of Ho Tsun-sheen. The Qing dynasty finally fell in 1911, and in the rest of the 20th century there were changes of such devastating power that most of this past Chinese Protestant history in Bōluó has been completely lost and forgotten. In the most recent gazette for the Bōluó district published in 1988 there is information about some late 19th and 20th century activities and five churches maintained by German-speaking Lutherans from the Basel Mission Society in the region, but the editors humbly admit nothing else is known. Personal visits to the area and to pastors of the Three-Self congregation in Huizhōu in 1994 verified that no knowledge of these 19th century events remains even among the clergy now working in the region. Outside of the official congregation in Huizhōu, only one or two acceptable meeting points currently exist for Christians in the two districts of Bōluó and Huizhōu.

Clearly, this essay offers much new light on these things from the not-so-distant past, allowing the “Golden Light” once more to shine within the thoughts and memories of Chinese Christians and others in that region, also for the sake of Christian missiological
research and cross-cultural studies on an international scale. There is much of lasting value which has been gained here. For the light of this story is full of mottled shades, helping to expose the cultural complexities of the second generation of missionaries and indigenous Christians among Protestants in China as well as highlighting the work of one of their most creative and unexpected indigenous missionaries. Furthermore, it reveals a purposefully hidden event in the very early era of the post-Opium War treaty situation which has been all but forgotten. Now there is even more evidence to consider, far more than has previously been available, to indicate how and why the interacting forces of foreign military, local mandarin, Hong Kong missionary and Chinese local populations struggled through this very murky period in modern Chinese history.

NOTES

1. Further details about Legge’s missionary-scholar career can be culled from my two volume work entitled Striving for "The Whole Duty of Man": James Legge and the Scottish Protestant Encounter with China (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), forthcoming in May or June 2003. Images of some of the other deaths surrounding Legge’s later life while a professor in Chinese language and literature at Oxford can be culled from Norman J. Girardot’s The Victorian Translation of China: James Legge’s Oriental Pilgrimage (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002). An earlier version of this paper was read at the International Conference on James Legge held in the University of Aberdeen in April 1997.


3. In the five volume set of William Canton’s A History of the British and Foreign Bible Society (London: John Murray, 1904-1910), only two pages are devoted to recounting the basic elements of Ch’ea’s Christian life and martyrdom, all being completely dependent on previous published sources in English. While a full chapter is devoted to Ch’ea in Helen Edith Legge’s James Legge: Missionary and Scholar (London: Religious Tract Society, 1905), her account suffers from a lack of chronological consistency, some misrepresentation of facts, and a lack of understanding of the broader circumstances influencing the events leading to his murder.

4. An immense amount of literature in the general area of Protestant missionary studies, for example, and two monumental works on Legge’s two distinct careers as a missionary for the London Missionary Society in Hong Kong and as the first professor of Chinese language and literature at Corpus Christi College in Oxford (by Pfister and Girardot respectively), have highlighted these matters. For those interested in the more general trends of missionary studies

5. See examples of this oversight in articles of the *Chinese Repository* (1831-1850), which was edited for most of its existence by the American missionary, Elijah Bridgman (Bei Zhiwen, 1801-1861), and the longer running *Evangelical Magazine And Missionary Chronicle* (below simply *EMMC*) edited from the 1820s to the 1850s by Legge’s father-in-law, John Morison (c. 1795-1859). Special efforts in recent years have sought to correct this irregular normality in missionary literature and missionary studies, including more recently published works by Irene Eber on Bishop Joseph Schereschewsky, Michael Lazich on Elijah Bridgman, Jost Zetsche on Chinese Bible translation and translators, and Lauren Pfister on James Legge’s missionary career, as well as more general historical studies on Chinese Christians in English works by Carl T. Smith, Jessie Lutz, and Daniel Bays, as well as extensive Chinese studies in Hong Kong written by Lee Kam-keung, Timothy Wong Man-kong, Leung Ka-lun, and Ying Fuk-tsang. A new generation of younger scholars in mainland China are also writing new accounts of the early Roman Catholic and Protestant missionary histories, but while the Catholic studies often refer to the Chinese Christians involved, the Protestant studies are still largely hampered by lack of research into the Chinese converts, missionaries, and pastors during these earlier periods.

6. The early History of Anglo-Chinese College has been the subject of a monograph by Brian Harrison, *Waiting for China: The Anglo-Chinese College at Malacca, 1818-1843, and early Nineteenth Century Missions* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1981), and special biographical details about a good number of students are found in Carl Smith’s two major works, *Chinese Christians: Elites, Middlemen, and the Church in Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1985) and *A Sense of History: Studies in the Social and Urban History of Hong Kong* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Educational Publishing Co., 1995). In these works Smith briefly describes among others the three Chinese students who joined Legge in an interview with Queen Victoria and Prince Albert in February 1848: Lee Kim Leen, Song Hoot Kiam, and Ng Mun Sow. See *Chinese Christians*, pp. 82, 148-149 and *A Sense of History*, pp. 339ff. This event was memorialized in a painting of 1848 that later became part of a commemorative
stamp in Hong Kong in 1994. For those who have purchased a copy of this book, the author is willing to send a copy of this stamp. Those with philatelist interests who have not been able to obtain a copy may also contact the author.

7. See the numerous references to Wong Shing in Carl Smith’s *Chinese Christians*, and Legge’s reference to Wong’s Christian character in 1859 to counter public doubts in Britain about the authenticity of the conversions of Chinese Christians (*EMMC*, April 1859, pp. 266-267). After Legge departed for the last time from Hong Kong for England in 1873, Wong Shing and Wang Tao purchased from the London Missionary Society the Anglo-Chinese Press through Legge’s arrangements, and so initiated the first major Chinese language newspaper published by Chinese editors.

8. Nothing previously was known about Luo Zhongfan until research in Legge’s personal library uncovered his work. It has been discussed in two essays by Lauren Pfister, “Some New Dimensions in the Study of the Works of James Legge (1815-1897): Part 11,” *Sino-Western Cultural Relations Journal* 13 (1991), pp. 33-46, and in a more extensive manner in the essay, “Discovering Monotheistic Metaphysics: The Exegetical Reflections of James Legge (1815-1897) and Lo Chung-fan (d. circa 1850)” in Ng On-cho, Chow Kai-wing, and John B. Henderson, eds., *Imagining Boundaries: Changing Confucian Doctrines, Texts and Hermeneutics* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1999), pp. 213-254. Wang Tao passed through different jobs as an aid to Walter Medhurst in Bible translation during the Delegates’ Committee meetings (1847-1852), later working with Legge on the *Chinese Classics* (1862-1873). In the period between 1868 and 1870 Wang spent nearly two years with Legge and his family in Scotland collaborating on the *Chinese Classics* and learning much about English and European cultures. How much Wang’s work actually influenced Legge’s translations and interpretations of the Ruist canon has been discussed in detail in my article, “王韶與理雅各對新儒家憂患意識的回應” 戲林啓彥, 黃文江主編《王韶與近代世界》(香港: 香港教育圖書公司, 2000), 頁 117 至 147, an English version being published a year later as “The Response of Wang Tao and James Legge to the Modern Ruist Melancholy”, *History and Culture* (Hong Kong) 2 (2001), pp. 1-20. Wang Tao’s writings on those European experiences and advocacy of institutional change in China catapulted him into the status of a well known reformist figure in the 1870s and 1880s, making it possible for him to return to Shanghái as a leader in non-traditional education. His career was chequered by covert associations with the Taiping insurgents and habits which called his character into question in some circles. A substantial and earlier study of Wang’s life has been written by Paul Cohen, *Between Tradition and Modernity: Wang Tao and Reform in late Ch’ing China* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974). It now is also available in a Chinese version, published by a mainland Chinese press.

9. Numerous details about these people have been provided by Carl Smith in his *Chinese Christians*.

10. A moving depiction of Liang’s early role as the first Chinese evangelist and of some of his sufferings has been published in the first volume of the series of books by A. J. Broomhall entitled *Hudson Taylor And China's Open Century*
(Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton, 1981), the first volume subtitled Barbarians At The Gates, pp. 143-147, 174-175, 224-225.

11. Both Hong Rengan and He Jinhuan have been discussed in detail in Pfister’s Striving for “The Whole Duty of Man”, especially chapters 4-6. A more thorough study of He Jinhuan’s contribution to Chinese Christian history by Lauren Pfister is an essay entitled “A Transmitter but not a Creator: The Creative Transmission of Protestant Biblical Traditions by Ho Tsun-sheen (1817-1871)” in Irene Eber, et. al., eds., Bible in Modern China: The Literary and Intellectual Impact (Nettertal: Steyler Verlag, 1999), pp. 165-197.

12. The name of Ch’êa Kam-Kwong is constituted by particular Chinese characters Legge described as the “Golden Light Chariot,” a way of expressing in English what the common meaning of each character is. Unfortunately, two misspellings have predominated in other literature, one in English and one in Chinese. In English, we surmise that Helen Edith Legge put together the typescript entitled “Che’a Kin-KWâng,” horribly mixing up the transliteration with something like the proper name in Hoklo dialect, but the given name in Mandarin. Legge never uses these transliterations in his own writings. In Chinese, WANG Tao wrote the wrong characters for the name in his personal diary for 1862 when he had first come to Hong Kong, showing also his struggle in understanding Cantonese pronunciations, making his given name “Embroidered River” (M. Jinjiâng, C. Gam-gong) presumably by guessing from the sounds he heard from other Hong Kong Chinese Christians who referred to him. Consult Fang Xing and Tang Zhijun, eds., WANG Tao riji (WANG Tao’s Diary) (Beijing: Zhonghua Book Store, 1987), pp. 196-197, record for the date of the 10th month and 15th day of the lunar calendar (or a day in September, 1862).

13. There is no study of Ch’êa Kam-Kwong in Chinese language sources as far as I know, and very little published about him in English after the 1860s. Part of the reason, as will be argued below, is that his murder became an embarrassment to both the British embassy and the Qing dynasty at the time.

14. Legge wrote memorials for his elder brother, an important Congregational minister in Great Britain, George Legge (1802-1860), and his co-pastor, Hê Jinhuan, published in 1863 and 1872 respectively. See the typescript on the “Sketch of the Life of Ho Tsun-sheen” in SOAS/CWM/South China/Personal/Legge/Box 7, the original manuscript on Ch’êa being held in the Bodleian Library (the second item in MS Eng. misc. c. 865, fol. 1-19). Consult the long introduction written for George Legge’s Lectures on Theology, Science and Revelation already mentioned above. The text of “Che’a Kin-Kwâng” is a compilation done most likely by his daughter, Helen Edith Legge. It uses many original and secondary sources citing her father’s and other missionaries’ writings, but also includes some perspectives and interpretations which may not portray the full story.

15. The story of their visit to Daoist and Buddhist sites on Mount Lo-fow is described in Legge’s “Journey of a Missionary Tour along the ‘East River’ of Canton Province,” China Mail, Supplement to #853 (June 20, 1861), p.4 (covering events of May 22-23, 1861). This is the full text from which extracts were made and published in EMMC/MM, No.304 (New Series, No. 21) for September 2, 1861, pp. 249-260.
A recently prepared description of the area from local sources can be seen, along with fuller descriptions of this famous mountain and its history, in Bōluóxiàn zhì (The Gazette of Bōliú District) (Bōluó: Guǎngdōng Provincial Cultural History Research Library, 1988), pp. 69-79, 325-329.

16. These are drawn from Legge's notes in "Journal of a Missionary Tour" and materials from 19th century gazettes (fangzhì) from the Nanhai district of western Guǎngdōng province.

A description of the refurbishing and building up of the temple complex dedicated to Master Kōng in Poklo, initiated in the seventh year of the Kangxi emperor (1668) is rehearsed in Bōluóxiàn zhì, pp. 315-316. In the third year of the Qianlong reign (7138) yellow tiles were added to the roof reflecting imperial honour and a decorative sign was added to the main temple, honouring Master Kōng as one yù Tiān Di cān ("a Partner with Heaven and Earth"), a phrase from the Zhōngyōng which Legge translated "[Confucius] may with Heaven and Earth form a tenion" (Ch. 22, CC1, p. 416). Three other similarly adulatory signs were added in the fourth year of the Jiaqing emperor (1800), during the Dàoguāng reign (1821-1850), and the second year of the Tôngzhì reign (1863).

17. See Chinese Classics, Volume 1 (CC1), prolegomena, pp. 112-127. The following footnote (p. 113) provides the necessary details for understanding the layout and furnishing of the "temples (diàn) of Confucius". [Transliterations replace characters in the original text, which can be looked up in the attached glossary. Here I use standard Pinyin for the sake of easier identification.]

The principal hall, called Dàchéng diàn, or 'Hall of the Great and Complete One,' is that in which is his own statue or the tablet of his spirit, having on each side of it, within a screen, the statues, or tablets, of his 'four Assessors.' On the east and west, along the walls of the same apartment, are the two xiū, the places of the shì'ér zhé, or 'twelve Wise Ones,' those of his disciples, who, next to the 'Assessors,' are counted worthy of honour. Outside this apartment, and running in a line with the two xiū, but along the external wall of the sacred inclosure, are the two wū, or side-gallerks, which I have sometimes called the ranges of the outer court. In each there are sixty-four tablets of the disciples and other worthies, . . . Behind this principal hall is the Chōng shèng diàn, sacred to Confucius's ancestors, whose tables are in the centre, fronting the south, like that of Confucius . . .

From a rubbing of a stele portraying the arrangement of the sacred tablets in the Bereing temple dedicated to Master Kōng, it is seen that the "four Assessors" are (from left to right when facing the Sage) Měngzǐ ("Mencius," c. 372 B.C. - c. 289 B.C.), Zēngzǐ (noted for his filial piety, 505 B.C. - 436 B.C.), Yānhuí (noted for his humane virtue, the Master's favourite student, 521 B.C. - 490 B.C.), and Zǐfēi (a grandson of the Sage who edited and/or wrote the Zhōngyōng, one of the four books Legge first called it the Doctrine of the Mean, but later gave it the more preferable title, the State of Equilibrium and Harmony (see CC1, p. 383).

18. See Legge's descriptions of these ceremonies and some of their paeans to the Sage in CC1, prolegomena, pp. 91-93.

19. According to the journal record, Legge and Ch'ēa had preached in the grounds of the Confucian temple at Lung Ch’un on May 15, 1861.
Kangxi was an earlier Manchurian emperor who had followed the movements of Catholic missionaries with great interest, both impressed by some and later revolted by others. His imperial son and successor, the Yongzheng emperor (ruling from 1723-1736), castigated those following the "Lord Of Heaven" as heretics (yiduan) in his commentary to the seventh maxim of his father. Legge translated and commented on Yongzheng's authoritative interpretations of the Sacred Edict in lectures presented at Oxford's Talor Institute in 1877, and later published them in Hong Kong under the title "Imperial Confucianism" in the sinological journal, China Review 6:3-6 (1878), pp. 147-158, 223-235, 299-310, 363-374. A good discussion of the impact of the Sacred Edict as part of the educative dimension of the Qing dynasty's civil servants is provided in Victor H. Mair, "Language and Ideology in the Written Popularizations of the Sacred Edict," in David Johnson, et. al., Popular Culture in Late Imperial China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), pp. 325-359.

20. See the description and reflections of a British journalist at the scene in China Mail #803 (July 5, 1860), pp. 106-107.

21. His age was given in Legge's writings on Ch'ea. The fact that he had a son is verified through the records of the Chinese congregation of Union Church in Hong Kong, where a man named Che who joined the church in the late 1860s is identified as "the son of the martyr." This information was gleaned from Carl Smith's archives.

22. Following Lewis Rambo's lead, we will assume that conversion is a "dynamic, multifaceted process of transformation" including, at the very least, elements of "cultural, social, personal, and religious systems." See Lewis R. Rambo, Understanding Religious Conversion (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), pp. 6-7.

23. This is one possible literal rendering of the translated title for the "Bible", the phrase also being used as a general reference term in traditional China for the Ruist canon. In contemporary China that latter association is almost completely lost.

24. One Chinese scholar believes that Wáng's influence on Walter Medhurst's translation commitments in the Delegates' Committee were very extensive, but offers no precise historical documentation to support the claim. It is certainly sufficient to know that Wáng was Medhurst's "native informant," for the influences could not help but be there, especially when questions of style and phrasing more suitable to Ruist tastes were raised. See Lee Chi-fang, Wáng T'ao (1828-1897): his life, thought, scholarship, and literary achievement (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1992, printing 1973).

25. This is very generally confirmed in l-Jin Loh's essay, "Chinese Translations of the Bible", published as part of An Encyclopedia Of Translation: Chinese-English, English-Chinese, eds. Chan Sin-Wai and David E. Pollard (Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1995), pp. 54-69. Loh explicitly states, "It is generally agreed that the literary style of this version [in both Old Testament and New Testament], which had the benefit of help from a Chinese scholar by the name of Wáng Tao, was superior to the rival version [later prepared by American missionaries]" (p. 57). The "literary style" was the form of literary conventions
and phrasing typical of Ruist discourse in the late Qing period.

26. Although Legge held this position by 1848 and argued for it in his extensive study of 1852, The Notions of the Chinese Concerning God and Spirits, he did make slight changes in the position later on in his Oxford years. Shāngdi was for Legge a high name for any monotheistic vision of God, but it was a composite term. Later in 1865 when he for the first time published a translation of the Book of Historical Documents (CC3), Legge shifted his position to claim that the single term, *dī* (the second character in shāngdi) carried the essential meaning of “God” in certain contexts. Shāngdi was only its “intensified form.” For this he had to develop a further justification, which he published in two different settings. For further details of these arguments see James Legge, The Sacred Books of China: The Texts of Confucianism, Part I: The Shu King, The Religious Portion of the Shih King, The Hsiao King (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1879), pp. xxiii-xxix, and A Letter to Professor F. Max Muller Chethwynd the Translation into English of the Chinese Terms Ti and Shang Ti in Reply to a Letter to him by ‘Inquirer’ in the Chinese Recorder and Missionary Journal for May-June 1880 (London: Trübner & Co., 1880). The first text appears as the third volume in the Sacred Books of the East series edited by F. Max Müller in Oxford.

27. For the letter written by Legge and Chalmers on July 9, 1856, see the incoming letters for CWM/South China/Box 5/Jacket C/Folder 4. Later when meeting Legge in Hong Kong, Ch’ēa said that “he wished to receive the ordinance of baptism] because it was commanded, but it was not the baptism with water which regenerated the soul, but the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Being asked where he had learned that, [Ch’ēa] said that it was in the New Testament; he could not tell the book and the Ch., but if he had a book he knew where to find it. A New Testament being given to him, he soon turned up to the third Ch. of the Gospel of John.” See EMMC/MM (October 1856), p. 215.

28. Rambo describes “intellectual conversion” as the result of a person who “seeks knowledge about religious or spiritual issues via books, television, articles, lectures, and other media that do not involve significant social contact.” Then the person “actively seeks out and explores alternatives.” He adds, “Belief generally occurs prior to active participation in religious rituals and organizations” (Rambo, Understanding Religious Conversion, pp. 14–15).

29. The letter describing Legge’s encounter with the Daoist priest from Mount Luofu is dated February 22, 1854 (CWM/South China/Personal/Legge/Box 8), and confirmed in a later report to the London office by John Chalmers in his letter dated March 24, 1854 (CWM/South China/Box 5/Jacket E/Folder 3). EMMC/MM 21 (September 1857), p. 206. The original quotation is in the plural, describing both Ch’ēa and a more recent convert named Kot A-Yuk. David Johnson also notes that in the late Qing period . . . there must have been a substantial number of individuals whose limited schooling had made it possible for them to grasp the meaning of many texts but not to write easily or well. Such persons had some access to the literary tradition and hence had transcended the confines of local oral culture, but were unable to use writing to order and record their thoughts. The distinction between those literates who could not write, or at
any rate habitually did not, and those who did, is one of the most significant within the literate realm, perhaps as important as the distinction between those who did and did not have full access to the literary tradition.

The fact that Ch’ea later had others write down what he dictated about his experiences suggests that he was one of these people in the middle: able to read, but not yet able to write well. See the further discussion in David Johnson’s article, “Communication, Class, and Consciousness in Late Imperial China”, in Popular Culture in Late Imperial China, pp. 34-72, here p. 38.

32. This story is part of the collection of vignettes in a typed manuscript entitled Reminiscences (pp. 15-18, quotation from p. 15) held in the Bodleian Library (Ms. Eng. misc. c. 812). Many of these stories show signs of an aging man not remembering particular details of dates and places, but there appears to be no good reason to doubt the authenticity of this encounter between Legge and Ch’ea itself. It appears nowhere else in Legge’s writings, and serves as one of the basic texts for Helen Edith Legge’s typescript, “Che’a Kin-Kwáng.”
33. Rambo refers to this as a further motif in conversion initially identified by John LoFland and Rodney Stark. It involves the “direct, personal experience of being loved, nurtured, and affirmed by a group and its leaders” (Rambo, Understanding Religious Conversion, p. 15).
34. For a helpful summary of Mary Isabella Legge’s life see the section related to “Mary Isabella Morison” in Wong Man-kong, “Hidden in History: London Missionary Society Missionary Wives in Nineteenth Century China (1807-1877)”, in Li Hanjii, ed., Dì shì cuíngdò (Reading History: Extant Documents) (Hong Kong: Xuéfèng wénhù Co., 1998), esp. pages 156-160.
35. The timing of Ch’ea’s leaving his post at the Pokk) temple was not certain in an earlier letter, but Ch’ea himself dictates this fact in a letter translated into English for overseas readers. See EMMC/MM (September 1857), p.207. The following descriptions come from this and another translated statement (pp. 207-209) prepared by another convert led back to Hong Kong by Ch’ea, as will be described below.
36. This is the intent of the seventh of the sixteen edicts, translated by Legge as “Discountenance and put away strange principles, in order to exalt the correct doctrine” (chù yídùn yì chóng zhèng xué). Among the “strange principles” regarded as unacceptable were Buddhist and Daoist extremities, rebellious groups like the secret societies of the White Lotus, and the Catholic religion. Legge makes clear that the condemnation of Catholicism “must be understood simply of Christianity” as a whole. See James Legge, “Imperial Confucianism” (Lecture II), China Review, 6:4 (October 1877), pp. 232-235.
37. In a similar way Hóng Xiùqún was seen as “mad” by his family and neighbours, but had experienced a physical breakdown after repeated failures in the civil examinations during the time he began having visions. The experience of Ch’ea on this score is quite different, in that he apparently maintained a relative engagement with his local lifeworld until he returned from Hong Kong in the summer of 1856. Compare Hamberg’s account taken down from Hóng Régán’s
recollections, Jonathan Spence’s depiction of Hóng Xiūquán’s madness in God’s Chinese Son, and the argument of Robert P. Weller where he suggests the Tàipíng king’s responses did maintain an appearance of sensibility to those in 19th century Guǎngxī and Guǎngdōng (Resistance, Chaos, and Control in China: Tàipíng Rebels, Taiwanese Ghosts and Tiańannîn (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994)).

38. No recognition of this kind of cultural logic is explained or addressed in any direct manner within any of the materials published about Ch‘êa. Wherever Legge hints at this kind of problem in his 1861 “Journal of a Missionary Tour,” the new editors of the EMMC/MM in London (Legge’s father-in-law having died in 1858) consistently deleted it from his original text.

39. This rarely mentioned factor in late Qing political movements is hardly given the attention it rightly deserves, but has been recently readdressed in Frank Dikkötter, The Discourse of Race in Modern China (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1992), especially the section on “Race As Type (1793-1895)”, pp. 31-60.


42. The book title was also translated by Christian missionaries who exposed the content of the volume in a tamer manner as Death Blow to Corrupt Doctrines. See Paul Cohen, China and Christianity, pp. 277-281.

43. Whether or not these exact images were being employed in the ideological opposition to Ch‘êa’s conversion is not certain. In fact, Legge himself possessed one copy of Bixie shihu only later in his life, possessing it only after 1884 when he received an “LLD” from Edinburgh University. The copy he received in Oxford originally was owned by Alexander Wylie, if the signatures on the cover portray the story. This same copy was later donated to the Bodleian Library by “H. Corbett”, and is a text without pictures (Ms. chin. d. 23).

44. This is the argument of An Pingqü and Zhāng Pēihéng, editors of Zhōngguó jūnhū dàguān (A Complete Introduction to [the History of] Chinese Censored Books) (Shànghái: Cultural Pub. Co., 1990), esp. pp. 102-144, and also illustrated with extensive detail in Okamoto Sae’s new publication, Shindai kinsho no kenkyu (The Prohibited Books in the Qing Dynasty) (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1996), where she discusses the kinds of books censored, the contents of these volumes, the authors and their fates.

45. And so the Taping in their own demonology cast the Manchurians into the role of demon devils in response to these intergenerational racist oppressions. Spence notes the presence of the demonology, but does not point out the connection with the previous imperial tactics oppressing intellectuals (God’s
For a fuller account of Taiping demonology, see the article on “Taiping Tiānguó de móguì” (“The ‘Devil’ in the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom”) by Wáng Qíngchén in his book, Taiping Tiānguó de lishi hé shìxiàng (The History and Ideology of the Taiping Heavenly Kingdom) (Beijing: Zhōngguó Book Co., 1985), pp. 328 ff.

From another perspective it must be remembered that Christian missionaries in the 19th century also regularly employed demonology to express their frustrations with obstructive Qing officials, Chinese cultural attitudes, and opposing religious alternatives.

46. Quoted in David Johnson, “Communication, Class and Consciousness in Late Imperial China,” p. 47.


48. First published in Amoy (now Xiāmén) in 1853 and repeatedly published in various revisions in Hong Kong, Canton, and Shānghāi for many years, the copy of this work I have seen is entitled Tiānhū lǐchēng tūnhū (Pilgrim’s Progress in the Local Language [Cantonese]) (City of Sheep [i.e. Canton]: Huishi lìtāng, tenth year of the Tóngzhì reign [i.e. 1871]).

49. This Chinese conception of conversion has also been discussed in Lauren Pfister’s “A Transmitter but not a Creator.”

50. According to Paul Reuter, international standards and institutions for settling treaty disputes were first put into place in Europe in the 1870s, and so the only formal way of advancing political agendas at this time was through war. This single and often overlooked historical fact manifestly shaped the whole situation, so that local Chinese residents could only consider the foreign military presence as a prelude to a full invasion by an even “more foreign” power than the Manchurian elite. Consult the initial pages of Paul Reuter, Introduction to the Law of Treaties, trns. José Miro and Peter Haggenmacher (London and New York: Kegan Paul International, 1995).

51. EMAC/MM (September 1857), p.207, the quotations coming from the translation of a dictated document prepared by Ch’èa for Legge and Ho in May 1857.

52. Legge himself had vomited twice from consuming some of the bread, one of the first to feel its effects because it was his habit to rise early and work on his project related to the Chinese Classics. See reports of the trial against Cheong Alum in the China Mail, a three page “Extra Edition,” dated February 7, 1857, and Legge’s own recollections in his public lecture (presented on November 5, 1872) entitled “The Colony of Hong Kong.” Legge’s lecture was later published in the China Review 1:3 (1872-1873), pp. 163-176. An edited version of this essay was published as a centennial recollection in the Journal of the Hong Kong Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 11 (1971), pp. 172-193. A helpful article revealing details about this event is “Cheung Ah-lum: A Biographical Note”, Journal of the Hong Kong Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society 24 (1984), pp. **.

53. The last phrase is quoted in Helen Legge, James Legge: Missionary and Scholar, p. 103, from an unknown letter she claims came from a missionary in
Henan province to Legge in Hong Kong. It is very unclear who that might be, since the London Missionary Society did not have regular workers in inland China, or even more north along the eastern coast of China, until after the settlement of the second Opium War in 1860. Nevertheless, the writer speaks about “old Chow” (loor Zhôu, accepted as an intimate expression between friends and not merely descriptive of age), an elder Chinese Christian in their church, who became so interested in the Poklo movement that he visited Ch’êa independently in 1858 and found what had been said to be the case.


55. Legge wrote, “Since his baptism in 1856, Ch’êa has spent a large portion of his time in travelling, and making known the things which he believes, entirely without fee or reward. Our Church came to the conclusion that we ought, in accordance with the principle that the labourer is worthy of his hire, to do something for him; and he has gone back home the Agent or Missionary of our Chinese brethren here, for a period of three months. At the end of that time we are to see him again, when it may be advisable to take measures to prosecute the work in Pok-lo on a larger scale than the small means of my people can attain to.”


56. These statistics are summarized from the annual report of Legge and Chalmers written on January 14, 1861 (CWM/South China/Box 6/Jacket B/Folder 3) and Legge’s “Journey of a Missionary Tour”.

57. The subtleties of translation here are also important. Did Ch’êa actually use a word for “Papists,” or was this derogatory term the European translators’ replacement for a more neutral phrase for “Catholics” like Tiânzhìjiào ti? See EMMC/MM (September 1857), p. 207 for details. It should be mentioned, though it may be obvious to some, that the previously described persecutions of 1856 when Ch’êa self-consciously remained silent before his “persecutors” in the government was also an imitation of Christ’s silence before the Sanhedrin.

58. Selected from EMMC/MM (September 1857), p. 208.

59. This scene and the subsequent information from Mr. Kot appear in the translation of the dictated account of his conversion published in EMMC/MM (September 1857), pp. 208-209.

60. There are later examples of sermons dealing with the topic of providence, for example, which probably reflect earlier teachings at Union Chapel. For Legge’s sermons touching themes of divine providence see “The Review and Meaning of the Past” (on Deuteronomy 8:2; dated January 1, 1871, found in CWM/South China/Personal/Legge/ Box 4), “The Rationale of the Divine Judgments” (on Psalm 119:75, dated September 17, 1871), and “The Doctrine of a Particular Providence” (on Psalm 37:38-40, dated January 28, 1872, both this and
the former found in CWM/South China/Personal/Legge/Box 5). There is no written record of Ho’s sermons, but one could search certain passages of his commentaries to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark for suggestions.


63. “Sabbath culture” is a technical term I developed in Striving for “The Whole Duty of Man” in order to describe the Chinese Christian form of life which had been adopted and transformed from Scottish Dissenter precedents. It involved resting from all normal work on the Christian Sabbath, devoting oneself to church worship in Christian community for part of the day, and doing works of charity and witness at other times, whether with family, church friends, or by one self.

64. In his “Reminiscences” Legge tells how Chê’ēa at first found the German missionaries being treated meanly by a group of local people, and so he rushed up to the crowd, yelling at them not to disturb them but to listen, because “they are servants of the Most High God”. See Reminiscences, p. 15.


66. Days before Chê’ēa’s murder the two men were together again in a boat, and Legge noted how Chê’ēa made it his personal goal to speak to each of the crew members about spiritual matters. His evangelistic approach was thorough and consistent, positively impressing Legge especially during the time when his own reappearance in Poklo was taken as a self-conscious risk (as will be described below). The very same zeal, however, was evaluated in very different terms by Chê’ēa’s enemies. See Legge, Che’a Kin Kwâng, typed manuscript, p. 6.

67. When in the presence of the mandarin Wâng, Legge and Chalmers spoke Cantonese, and this was assumably translated into either Mandarin or guanhua by Chê’ēa (a more literary form of the Mandarin used among the Chinese entry
especially in official rituals such as this interview with foreign guests). “Friendly conversation” and longer “speeches” constituted the interview, Ch’ea continuing to interpret even though “his Honour evidently understood us well enough.”

68. A sensitive reading of these events from both Qing and British sides with the implications for missionaries and their Chinese followers is provided in A. J. Broomhall’s *Hudson Taylor & China’s Open Century: Over the Treaty Wall* (Book 2) (Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton, 1981).

69. See notes for May 7th, 1861, in Legge’s *Journal Of A Missionary Tour*.

70. Taken from notes for May 12th, 1861, in Legge’s *Journal Of A Missionary Tour*.

71. Described candidly in Legge’s *Journal of a Missionary Tour*, notes for May 9th, 1861.

72. This incident occurred on May 19th, Ch’ea’s being “rudely handled” by what some elders in the town (who later came to apologize) called a “few heady youth”. Yet when Legge sought out the sexagenarian Ch’ea’s response, suggesting that the beating was severe enough to consider a formal response to the authorities, Ch’ea’s principles were unmoved, “I only pray our Heavenly Father to have pity on them!” said Ch’ea, and there the matter rested. See Legge, *Journal of a Missionary Tour*, notes for May 9th, 1861.

73. Ch’ea had suggested two places, one next to the Fūzǐ miào temple complex and a house located on a main thoroughfare in the town. The fact that Ch’ea had formerly been a keeper of the temple probably influenced his opinions as well as the sense of a suitable location for the first Christian church in the area. See comments made by Legge about Ch’ea’s suggestions in his *Journal of a Missionary Tour*, notes for May 9th, 1861.

74. Letter to Arthur Tidman, Secretary of the London Missionary Society, dated October 14, 1861, and published with commentary in *EMMC/MM* 26 (January 1862), pp. 13-17, here esp. p. 15. Helen Edith Legge refers to another source (no details provided) where it is claimed that the obstructing gentryperson “led a body of men to make a tumult at the house, assailed it with a quantity of filth, made a violent entry, plundered it of its goods, took possession of the house and threatened to put to death Ch’ea [sic] and other Christians.” Actions reflecting anti-foreign attitudes follow this event, heightening the tension. See Helen Edith Legge, *James Legge: Missionary and Scholar*, pp. 114-115.


76. The *China Mail* in Hong Kong actually described the ceremonies attending the formal evacuation of the British and French forces in its number for October 24, 1861. The event had taken place on October 21st. See *China Mail* #871 (October 24, 1861), p. 171.

77. Recorded in Legge’s essay, “Che’a Kin KWáng,” the typescript found in CWM/South China/Personal/Legge/Box 7, p. 5.

78. During one point in this tense trip Legge caught Ch’ea sitting down in the corner of his room on the boat with his eyes closed, thinking at first sight that Ch’ea was exhausted from the ordeals he had been facing. Able to see the humour in the serious situation they all faced, Legge playfully chided the elder Chinese
man with a classical Ruist phrase, "Rotten wood! You cannot be carved" (see Analects 5:9, CCl, p. 176). The implication was immediately understood by Ch’ea, who flashed back his response, "Teacher, I was not sleeping; I was praying." Both Legge’s self-deprecating irony and Ch’ea’s response manifest much about the character of each man. See Legge, Che’a Kin Kwâng, typescript, p. 6, also Helen Edith Legge, James Legge: Missionary and Scholar, p. 117.

79. See EMMC/MM 26 (January 1862), p. 15.

80. Later Legge received a “copy of part of a placard posted in Wye-chow” which offered “50 dollars” for the “death of every foreigner coming among them” and “20 dollars” for the “death of every Chinese aiding in bringing the foreigner there, or in circulating his books.” Quoted from EMMC/MM 26 (January 1862), p. 18.

81. These mixed emotions Legge states in the context of his own missionary goals. “I was really overwhelmed with astonishment at the course of things, and could hardly arrange my thoughts to acknowledge aright the wonderful ordering of events in the providence of God. Never was I so disgusted with the deceit in which the higher classes of the Chinese are steeped; never did I feel so much the renewing work which is necessary for all the people.” This was a particularly poignant statement on the ethics of Ruist officials since Legge had only months before charged Master Kön with moments lacking in truthfulness, moments that had become standards of behaviour among the Chinese literati. See EMMC/MM 26 (January 1862), p. 16, and CCl, prolegomena, p. 101 (the 1861 first edition being much harsher in its judgments at this point than the 1893 second edition).

82. Described with clear logic and suitable illustrations in Paul A. Cohen, China and Christianity, pp. 149-169.

83. See the description in Legge, Che’a Kin Kwâng, p. 7, and Helen Edith Legge, James Legge: Missionary and Scholar, p. 118.

84. In a letter to Arthur Tidman, Secretary of the London Missionary Society, dated October 31, 1861, and published in EMMC/MM 26 (January 1862), pp. 17-19, here p. 17. This letter is still very tentative in its allegations, Legge only indicating what he has heard from various secondary sources, and fearing that the worst had come to past. In the typescript, Che’a Kim Kwâng, the tone is far more certain and reflects on details not accessible to Legge at the end of October that year.

85. On May 8th, 1861, the missionary group including Ch’ea and Legge had travelled to the small hilly area named Nam-poon-leng where a wealthy farmer named Wong (M. Huang) lived with his extended family. Ch’ea had visited them many times, and the colporteur had spent a significant amount of time with them in 1860. As a consequence, when Legge and Chalmers joined the others in returning to the area, they found seventeen of the extended family ready to be baptized. See Legge, Journal of a Missionary Tour.

86. This bit of information came to Chalmers through “A-wai,” apparently the colporteur who first met Ch’ea in 1856. This and the subsequent details are drawn from Legge, Che’a Kin Kwâng. See also Legge, Reminiscences, p. 15.

87. This quotation and the previous information comes from Legge, Che’a Kin Kwâng, pp. 8-9.

88. See Legge, Che’a Kin Kwâng, pp. 9-10, and the same wording in Helen
Edith Legge, *James Legge: Missionary and Scholar*, p. 120.

89. Legge’s letter to Arthur Tidman, Secretary of the London Missionary Society, dated October 31, 1861, also printed in the *EMMC/MM* 26 (1862), pp. 18-19.

90. The first and second volumes comprising Legge’s translations and commentaries to the *Four Books* had been completed in February and November that year.

91. The essay, *Che’ a Kin Kwáng*, must be a pastiche prepared by Helen Edith Legge in preparation for her larger book on her father, *James Legge: Missionary and Scholar*. It is particularly evident in the last few pages, when letters from Chalmers and others are quoted (without notes or details, typical of her style in the book as well). A comparison of the typescript and the chapter in Helen Edith Legge’s book on “Che’a” (notice the same error in transmitting the name of the martyr, pp.102-121) show that she was using the typescript liberally, the last pages of both documents being exactly the same except in one final addition within the book. That addition is a final, short paragraph, hagiographic to the extreme, summarizing how Ch’ea had received the “salvation and strength and the kingdom of our God and the power of His Christ” so that he “loved not his life unto the death”. Though its sentiment could be shared by all sympathetic Christians, Helen Legge’s writing also had other purposes in mind.

A careful reading of the chapter in her book on Ch’ea reveals numerous factual errors -- wrong timing, mixing up place and person names, confusing original situations -- but also contains some new material from her mother’s letters (Hannah Mary) received from her father that provide little cameos of other dimensions of the situation. Unfortunately, she used these sources only selectively, and then apparently destroyed the originals. It is quite significant, therefore, that it is only in the typescript mentioned above and in her chapter in the book that a defence of her father’s leaving Poklo in the early morning before the vigilantes attacked the city is presented. (She may, however, be referring to the content of a letter by her father to her mother, or to the later portions of the *Reminiscences* which I could not check.)

92. See a historical description of the development of this very important institution, one which continued on for forty years as the major bureau for foreign affairs in China, provided by Masataka Banno, *China and the West, 1858-1861: The Origins of the Tsungli Yamen* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1964).

93. See his Appendix I, “Incidents Mentioned in Text, 1861-1870” in Paul A. Cohen, *China and Christianity*, pp. 275-276. In spite of the title of the table, it seems that the summary is supposed to include all major incidents among the religious affairs documents within the files of the Zónglǐ yàmén. Another important gap in the record is the burning of the newly built chapel in Buddha Hill City (Fat-shan, M. Fóshān) in September 1870, a malevolent act perpetrated by crowds who opposed the erection of the building and threatened all those who were there with severe bruisings. Ho Tsun-sheen was one of the Christian officials present at the meeting, escaping through a rear window and finding his way back to Hong Kong independently. The event was so traumatic for him, that within six
months he had physically broken down, and was dead in April, 1871. The loss for Chinese Protestants at the time was irreparable, for he was the only ordained Chinese pastor with lengthy experience and a notable record of creative publications in all of China at the time. Details on this event are given in Pfister's "A Transmitter but not a Creator".

94. The fact that Bruce was the younger brother of Sir Elgin, who ordered the burning of the imperial Summer Palace in 1860, is of some importance especially for impressing and reminding the Qing officials at the time of the destructive power of the British and allied forces.

95. See Legge's long letter including copies of the offending note sent by Bruce to Russell and Russell's response in China Mail #955 (June 4, 1863), p. 90. It is quite by coincidence that at the end of the 20th century in Chinese language the date "June Fourth" (liust) also immediately brings up images of persecution.

96. Much evidence for this exists in the South China correspondence with the London Missionary Society Directors for this period.

97. A note gleaned from the archives of Carl T. Smith in Hong Kong.

98. See Bōhuóxiàn zhi, p. 330, where it simply states, "[We are] lacking any other materials." The total number of Chinese believers associated with the church work initiated by the Basel missionaries was over 300 in 1941.
CHINESE AND JAPANESE GLOSSARY

Amoy (see Xiamen)

An Pingqiū 安平秋

A-Wai unconfirmed

A-Wye unconfirmed

Béi Zhīwén 傢之文

Bào 鮑

Běijīng 北 京

Bóluó 博 羅

Bóluóxiàn zhì 博羅*志

Canton (see Guangzhou)

Chē Jīnguāng 車金光

Ch’ēa Kam-kwong 車金光

Cheong A-lam 張阿霖

chóngshēng 重 生

Chóng shèng cídiàn 崇聖祠殿

Chóngyáng 重 陽

chù yìduàn yǐ chóng zhèngxué 雕異端以崇正學
Da chéng diàn 大成殿
Dàoguāng 道光
dì 帝
Dú shì cónggǎo 論史存稿
Fānyí 番夷
Fāng Xíng 方行
Fatsaan (see Foshan)
Fóshān 佛山
Fūzǐ miào 夫子廟
Gé Hóng 葛洪
Guāndì 關帝
Guǎngdōng 廣東
Guǎnggōng 關公

Guǎnggōng mínjiān zǎoxīng zhī yánjiū: 關公民間早型
zī yì Guānggōng chuánshuō wèi 以關公傳說為
zhōngxīn de kāochá 中心的考察
Guǎnggōng xīnyáng 關公信仰
Guǎngzhōu 廣州
觀世音菩薩本蹟因緣

觀音

觀音: 半個亞洲的信仰

歸善
歸向
漢
何進善
何福堂
洪仁玕
洪淑苓
洪秀全
香港
河 *
黃勝
惠來
惠州
嘉慶
Jīnjī yǎn  金雞眼
Jīnjīāng  錦 江
Kāngxī  康 熙
Kōng  孔
Kōng Tōng  not confirmed
Kōt-A Yūk  not confirmed
Kūm Ky Ngān  (see Jīnjī yǎn)
Kwye-sheen  (see Guīshān)
Lǎo Zhōu  老 周
Lēe Kān-kēung  李金強
Lēe Kīm Lēēn  李劍麟
Lēūng Gōngfā  梁公發
Lēūng Kā-lūn  梁家麟
Lēūng Mān-shīng  (see Liāng Wēnchéng)
Lǐ Hānjī  李漢基
Lǐ Yā gé  理雅各
Liáng Āfā  梁阿發
Liáng Wēnchéng  梁文誠
Liúfú  流 浮
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Characters</th>
<th>Pinyin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>龍川</td>
<td>Lóngchuān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>羅浮</td>
<td>Luófú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>羅仲藩</td>
<td>Luó Zhōngfān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>梅 龍</td>
<td>Méilóng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>孟 子</td>
<td>Mèngzǐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>明</td>
<td>Míng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see Méilóng)</td>
<td>Mui-loong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>吳文秀</td>
<td>Ng Mun sow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>岡本 之</td>
<td>Okamoto Sae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>乾 隆</td>
<td>Qiánlóng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>清</td>
<td>Qīng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>三字經</td>
<td>Sānzi jīng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>上 帝</td>
<td>Shàngdì</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>尙書</td>
<td>Shànghǎi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>神 脾</td>
<td>shénpái</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>聖 經</td>
<td>Shēngjīng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>聖 論</td>
<td>Shēngyù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>十二哲</td>
<td>shí ěr zhé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>詩 經</td>
<td>Shījīng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shılóng</td>
<td>石龍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shindai kinsho no kenkyu</td>
<td>清代禁書*研究</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shūjīng</td>
<td>書經</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soo Hoy-u</td>
<td>not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song Hoot Kiam</td>
<td>宋旺相</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tàipíng</td>
<td>太平</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tàipíngtiānguó dē lǐshì hé sīxiāng</td>
<td>太平天國的歷史和思想</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāng Zhijūn</td>
<td>湯志鈞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tián Xīngshù</td>
<td>田興恕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiānhù lichéng</td>
<td>天路歷程</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiānhù lichéng tūhuà</td>
<td>天路歷程土話</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiānzhǔjiào tū</td>
<td>天主教徒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tóngzhì</td>
<td>同治</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsu Moo Sow</td>
<td>not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wàijiào</td>
<td>外教</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wáng Qingchéng</td>
<td>王慶成</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Shouren</td>
<td>not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wáng Tāo</td>
<td>王韜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang Tao riji</td>
<td>王韜日記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen Guangxi</td>
<td>溫光熹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong Chik-wai</td>
<td>not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong Man-kong</td>
<td>黃文江</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong Shen yan</td>
<td>not confirmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong Shing</td>
<td>(see Huang Sheng)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wu</td>
<td>廠</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye-chow</td>
<td>(see Huizhou)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiamen</td>
<td>廈門</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xinyuè quanshu jièshi xù</td>
<td>新約全書解釋序</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xu</td>
<td>序</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xuefeng wenhua</td>
<td>學峰文化</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Hui</td>
<td>顏回</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yanggui</td>
<td>羊鬼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yiduan</td>
<td>異端</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying Fuk-tsing</td>
<td>鄧福增</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yinghua shuyuan</td>
<td>英華書院</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yongzheng</td>
<td>雍正</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yu Tian Di can</td>
<td>於天地參</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zèng *Zan</td>
<td>曾 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhàn Yuēhàn</td>
<td>湛约翰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhāng Péihéng</td>
<td>章培恆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhèng Sēngyí</td>
<td>鄭僧一</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhèng Tǔyǒu</td>
<td>鄭士有</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhōngguó jīnshū dàguān</td>
<td>中國禁書大觀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhōnghuá</td>
<td>中華</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhōngyōng</td>
<td>中庸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zǐ Sī</td>
<td>子思</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zōngjiáo àn</td>
<td>宗教案</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zōnglí yámén</td>
<td>總理衙門</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhūjīng</td>
<td>豬精</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhǔ Yésū</td>
<td>主耶稣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhū Yésū</td>
<td>豬耶穌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>