


STATE OF THE FIELD ESSAY

Studies on the History of Dutch Sinology: A Bibliographical Essay

Wilt L. Idema* 

Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA, and Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands

*Corresponding author. Email: idema@fas.harvard.edu

(Received 13 October 2021; revised 11 November 2021; accepted 12 November 2021)

Despite the long Dutch presence in Taiwan (1624–1662) and the active trade between Batavia and China in the eighteenth century, the Dutch tradition of academic Sinology got underway only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when the training of future officers for Chinese affairs in the Dutch East Indies was moved to Leiden. This training (often including an extended period of stay in China) remained the main task of Chinese teaching at Leiden until 1949, when Indonesia achieved independence. The earliest phase of Chinese teaching at Leiden has received an encyclopedic coverage in the work of Koos Kuiper. Scholars of the second generation who have received monographic treatment include J.J.M. de Groot and Henri Borel. The best-known Dutch Sinologist of the middle of the twentieth century was Robert Hans van Gulik who was not only a successful diplomat and highly original scholar, but also established an international reputation with his Judge Dee crime novels. His work has given rise to considerable scholarship in English and Chinese.

Keywords: overseas Chinese; colonial administration of the Dutch East Indies; Gustaaf Schlegel; J.J.M. de Groot; Robert Hans van Gulik

The Chinese and the Dutch share a history of direct contacts of more than four centuries.¹ As soon as the Dutch East India Company (VOC) had established a foothold on Java, it also tried to obtain such a foothold on or off the China coast to support its trade. When its attempt to conquer Macao had failed, and the Ming authorities had told them to abandon the Pescadores where they were building a stronghold, they followed their

The author wishes to express his thanks to Leonard Blussé, Maghiel van Crevel, and Barend ter Haar for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

¹Leonard Blussé, *Tribuut aan China: Vier eeuwen Nederlands-Chinese betrekkingen* [Tribute to China: four centuries of Sino-Dutch relations] (Amsterdam: Onno Cramswinkel Uitgever, 1989). This work is also available in Chinese and Japanese translations. An updated version appeared as Leonard Blussé and Floris-Jan van Luyn, *China en de Nederlanders: Geschiedenis van de Nederlands-Chinese betrekkingen* [China and the Dutch: A history of Sino-Dutch relations] (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2008). Tristan Mosterd and Jan van Campen, *Silk Thread: China and the Netherlands since 1600* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum, 2015) provides a gorgeously illustrated survey of the relations between the Dutch and Chinese, with an emphasis on the related objects in the collection of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam.

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press

advice and settled on Taiwan. If the Ming officials had hoped to control barbarians by barbarians, they did not achieve their purpose. The Dutch developed Tainan into a flourishing base for their trade in East Asia, pacified the local population, and attracted a large Chinese immigration from Southern Fujian. That Chinese population was happy to support Zheng Chenggong 鄭成功 (1624–1662) when he retired from the mainland and conquered the Dutch colony.

For the remainder of the seventeenth century and also the eighteenth century, the VOC focused its efforts on expanding its power in South- and Southeast Asia. While it continued to play a major role in the China trade, it left the leading role in Canton to the British. On Java, the Dutch encountered an established community of Chinese traders and immigrants. For most of this period, the Chinese were happy to collaborate with the Dutch in expanding their control, even though on occasion the two communities fell out with each other, for example in 1740 when the Chinese population of Batavia (modern Jakarta) was massacred when the Dutch authorities panicked after an attack on the city by Chinese migrants from the countryside.²

In the nineteenth century as well as the early decades of the twentieth century up to World War II, the Chinese continued to have a privileged position in the Dutch East Indies when compared with the mass of the indigenous population. The colonial administration continued to rely on their services, and from the final years of the nineteenth century took an active part in the importation of coolies. But with the intensification of colonial administration in the wake of the opening of the Suez Canal, the Dutch became more and more suspicious of the loyalty of the Chinese,³ a suspicion that only increased when they became aware of the growing nationalism in China and among overseas Chinese.⁴ Unwilling to rely exclusively on the services of the local Chinese headmen, the colonial administration set about to train specialists in Chinese affairs who would be experts in the language, laws, and customs of the Chinese, so they could read Chinese business accounts and assist the Dutch residents in dealing with problems involving Chinese. After several experiments in training such specialists in the Dutch East Indies had failed, the initial training of the interpreters was moved to Leiden—their training was to be completed by a lengthy stay in China.

²Following the massacre, the leadership of the Chinese community in Batavia was more formalized as the Kong Koan 公館. Its extensive archives in Chinese and Malay have been largely preserved and now are kept at Leiden University. These minutes of the Kong Koan's regular meetings have been fully edited in fifteen volumes as *Bacheng huaren gongguan (Baguo gongtang) dang'an congshu* 吧城華人公館(吧國公堂)檔案叢書 (Xiamen: Xiamen daxue chubanshe, 2002–). For a first introduction to these materials, see Leonard Blussé and Chen Menghong, eds. *The Archives of the Kong Koan of Batavia* (Leiden: Brill, 2003). For an evaluation of studies on the Kong Koan archives, see Nie Dening 聂德宁, "Bacheng huaren gongguan dang'an wenxian ji qi yanjiu xianzhuang" 吧城華人公館檔案文獻及其研究現狀, *Nanyang wenti yanjiu* 128.4 (2006), 63–70.

³Jealousy and suspicion were the main motivations for the continuous changes in the laws concerning the legal status of the Chinese community. See Patricia Tjiook-Liem, *De rechtspositie der Chinezen in Nederlands-Indië 1848–1942* [The legal status of the Chinese in the Dutch East Indies 1848–1942] (Leiden: Leiden University Press, 2009).

⁴To counter the influence of nationalism among the Chinese in the Dutch East Indies, the colonial administration facilitated their access to Dutch-language education (including entrance to Dutch universities) by the establishment in 1908 of Sino-Dutch schools (Hollands-Chinese scholen). See M.T.N, Govaars-Tjia, *Hollands onderwijs in een koloniale samenleving: De Chinese ervaring in Indonesië* [Dutch-language education in a colonial context: The Chinese experience in Indonesia] (Afferden: De Vijver, 1999). This study was published in English as *Dutch Colonial Education: The Chinese Experience*, trans. Loree Lynn Trytten, foreword by Wang Gungwu (Singapore: Chinese Heritage Center, 2005).

These China specialists originally were located in those places that had a large Chinese population. Caught between the Dutch administrators and the Chinese headmen (none of whom wanted to relinquish any power), the function of interpreter never developed to the full satisfaction of the central administration in Batavia or of the interpreters themselves, and early in the twentieth century the China specialists were concentrated in the Office for Chinese Affairs (later the Office for East Asian Affairs), while the tasks of the China specialists became more focused on political surveillance and intelligence work.

To the extent that Dutch Sinology had its own characteristics it was during the final decades of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century when the practical aim of the teaching program was to train specialist bureaucrats for the colonial administration of the Dutch East Indies.⁵ The teaching faculty involved might include some great scholars, but their teaching aimed to produce bureaucrats, not scholars. After World War II, when Indonesia had become independent, the teaching program at Leiden had to be redesigned so as to prepare the students for academic careers. Since the final decades of the twentieth century the program in Chinese Studies has been swept up in a flood of changes that affected universities throughout the Western World: the explosive growth in student numbers, the corresponding expansion of the teaching faculty, and a pressure to shorten the curricula. Chinese programs were further affected by the sudden arrival of China on the world stage following the conclusion of the Cultural Revolution, which resulted in an explosive growth of students majoring in Chinese studies and a demand for a more practical training as the overwhelming majority of students hoped for a career in business in China.

The history of Chinese studies in the Netherlands has been described a number of times. There are a number of articles in English that provide descriptions from the earliest beginnings up to the time of the author, by J.J.L. Duyvendak, A.F.P. Hulswé, Erik Zürcher, Harriet T. Zurndorfer, and me.⁶ There are also a number of articles in

⁵American readers should keep in mind that European universities of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries did not know a liberal arts system and that teaching programs were organized along the lines of chairs and departments. They also should keep in mind that European Sinology established itself as an academic discipline long before the modern social sciences did, and, in many cases, long before the proliferation of “language and literature” departments. The closest model for fields like Sinology and other Asian studies was provided by Oriental studies and by Classical studies, fields that employed philology as their dominant method in the study of ancient and foreign cultures.

⁶J.J.L. Duyvendak, “Early Chinese Studies in Holland,” *T'oung Pao* 33 (1937), 268–294; J.J.L. Duyvendak, *Holland's Contribution to Chinese Studies* (London: The China Society, 1950); A.F.P. Hulswé, “Chinese and Japanese Studies in Holland,” *Chinese Culture* 10.3 (1969), 67–75; Wilt L. Idema, “Dutch Sinology: Past, Present, and Future,” in *Europe Studies China: Papers from an International Conference on the History of European Sinology*, ed. Ming Wilson and John Cayley (London: Han-Shan Tang Books, 1995), 88–110 (also available in Chinese translation as Yi Weide 伊维德, “Helan hanxue: guoqu, xianzai yu weilai” 荷兰汉学过去现在与未来, *Chuantong wenhua yu xiandaihua* 1993.1, 79–86 and 1993.2, 89–91); Wilt L. Idema, *Chinese Studies in the Netherlands*, European Association of Chinese Studies Surveys 6 (1996); Erik Zürcher, “East Asian Studies,” in *Tuta sub Aegide Pallas: E.J. Brill and the World of Learning* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 62–66; Harriet T. Zurndorfer, “Sociology, Social Science and Sinology in the Netherlands before World War II: With Special Reference to the Work of Frederik van Heek,” *Revue européenne des sciences sociales* 84 (1989), 19–32. For a survey of Dutch translations and retranlations of pre-modern Chinese literature, see Wilt L. Idema, “Dutch Translations of Classical Chinese Literature: Against a Tradition of Retranslation,” in *One into Many: Translation and the Dissemination of Classical Chinese Literature*, ed. Leo Tak-hung Chan (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003), 213–242. For a survey of China as a theme in Dutch literature, see Arie Pos, “Het paviljoen van porselein: Nederlandse literaire chinoiserie en het

Chinese.⁷ More ambitious are the monograph by Xiong Wenhua 熊文华, *Helan hanxue shi* 荷兰汉学史 [A history of Dutch Sinology] (Beijing: Xueyuan chubanshe, 2012), and my own *Chinese Studies in the Netherlands: Past Present and Future* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).⁸ The latter is an edited volume which tries to present a comprehensive survey by a combination of some historical and, reflecting the disciplinary diversification of recent decades, several thematic chapters.⁹ My aim here is not to summarize the findings of these general surveys, but to introduce those publications on Dutch Sinology that focus on limited periods or specific individuals, emphasizing those that have been published since the beginning of this century. As they are living scholars and their works have not yet enjoyed monographic treatment, this essay will focus very much on the earlier periods when Dutch Sinology very much had its own characteristics.

Justus Heurnius, Pieter van Hoorn and Nicolaas Witsen

During the seventeenth century, China was very much on the mind of the Dutch, especially during the third quarter of the century. Chinese blue and white porcelain was eagerly copied by Delftware. The collapse of the Ming and the conquest of China by the Manchus inspired no less than two Dutch tragedies after *De bello Tartarico* (1654) had been published by the returned Jesuit missionary Martino Martini, who had his atlas of China printed in Amsterdam. The reports on the first (1655–1657) and second (1666–1668) VOC embassies to the court in Peking were published in gorgeously illustrated folio editions.¹⁰ The high visibility of China in the Dutch Republic

Westerse beeld van China” [The porcelain pavilion: Dutch literary *chinoiserie* and the Western image of China] (PhD thesis, Leiden University, 2008).

⁷See for instance the contributions on Dutch China studies in He Peizhong 何培忠, ed. *Dangdai guowai Zhongguoxue yanjiu* 当代国外中国学研究 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 2006), 214–42, and in Huang Changzhu 黄长著, Sun Yueheng 孙越生, and Wang Zuwang, comps. *Ouzhou Zhongguoxue* 欧洲中国学 (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 2005), 420–45. Also see Zheng Haiyan 郑海燕, “Helan Zhongguo yanjiu de lishi fazhan” 荷兰中国研究的历史发展, *Guowai shehui kexue* 2005.3, 61–65, and Zheng Haiyan, “Helan Zhongguo yanjiu de zhuyao jigou” 荷兰中国研究的主要机构, *Guowai shehui kexue* 2005.6, 70–73.

⁸This is available in an Chinese translation as Yi Weide 伊维德, ed. *Helan de Zhongguo yanjiu: guoqu, xianzai yu weilai* 荷兰的中国研究过去现在与未来, trans. Geng Yong 耿勇, Liu Jing 刘晶, and Hou Ji 侯喆 (Shanghai: Shanghai shehuikexueyuan chubanshe, 2021).

⁹These thematic chapters are Rint Sybesma, “A History of Chinese Linguistics in the Netherlands” (127–58); Frank N. Pieke, “Contemporary China Studies in the Netherlands” (159–90); Mark Leenhouts, “Between Money and Curiosity: On the Study and Translation of Chinese Literature in the Netherlands and Flanders” (191–210); and Oliver Moore, “China’s Art and Material Culture” (211–50). Albert Hoffstädt contributed “Dutch Sinology and Brill” (251–62). Maghiel van Crevel surveyed the situation of Chinese studies at the time in his “China Awareness, Area Studies, High School Chinese: Here to Stay, and Looking Forward” (263–73). When planning for the volume I also tried to commission a contribution on the study of Chinese law in the Netherlands but failed to find an author.

¹⁰Johan Nieuhof’s diary of the first embassy had been edited by his brother Hendrik with many supplementary materials. The highly influential engravings that accompanied the text were based on much simpler sketches made during the trip. Leonard Blussé and R. Falkenburg, *Johan Nieuhofs beelden van een Chinareis* [Johan Nieuhof’s images of his China trip] (Middelburg: VOC publicaties, 1987) includes a modern edition of Johan Nieuhof’s manuscript diary of the first embassy and reproduces the original sketches. A Chinese translation by Zhuang Guotu 庄国土 was published as *Heshi chufang Zhongguo ji yanjiu* 荷使初访中国记研究 (Xiamen: Xiamen daxue chubanshe, 1989). Nieuhof’s sketches and the etchings based on them are studied by Jing Sun, “The Illusion of Verisimilitude: Johan Nieuhof’s Images of China” (PhD diss., Leiden University, 2013). See also Jing Sun, “Joan Nieuhof’s Drawing of a Chinese Temple in the

has recently been studied in a research project at Utrecht University and the University of Amsterdam, directed by the art historian M.A. (Thijs) Weststeijn. Funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research, this project was titled “The Chinese Impact: Images and Ideas of China in the Dutch Golden Age” (2014–2019). One of the results of this project was Thijs Weststeijn, ed., *Foreign Devils and Philosophers: Cultural Encounters between the Chinese, the Dutch, and Other Europeans, 1590–1800* (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

If, however, Sinology refers more specifically to the study of the Chinese language and the study of its culture on the basis of sources in that language, there are few Dutch activities from the seventeenth century that can be characterized as “Sinological.” The VOC was a strictly commercial venture and in general did not sponsor missionary activities, as these costed money and could easily lead to disturbances among the local population. The major exception was Taiwan where the protestant missionaries targeted the local Taiwanese population in their own language. In Batavia the local protestant minister Justus Heurnius (1587–1652) hoped to proselytize among the Chinese community there. To this end he worked on the compilation of a Dutch–Chinese dictionary and other materials. Heurnius was assisted in his studies by a Chinese schoolteacher from Macao who knew Latin. Heurnius’s missionary efforts met with little success, and his writings, which have survived in manuscript, would appear to have had very little impact. These manuscripts, which had attracted some attention earlier, most recently have been studied in detail by Koos Kuiper, as “The Earliest Monument of Dutch Sinological Studies: Justus Heurnius’s Manuscript Dutch–Chinese Dictionary and Chinese–Latin Compendium *Doctrinae Christianae* (Batavia, 1628),” *Quaerendo* 35.1–2 (2005), 109–39. When later in the seventeenth century the learned Amsterdam burgomaster Nicolaas (Nicolaes) Witsen (1641–1716) wanted to know the meaning of the seal-script inscription on an ancient Chinese bronze mirror discovered in Siberia, an extensive international correspondence resulted, as we learn from Willemijn van Noord and Thijs Weststeijn, “The Global Trajectory of Nicolaas Witsen’s Chinese Mirror,” *The Rijksmuseum Bulletin* 68.4 (2015), 324–61,¹¹ but the translation that was eventually produced upon writing to Canton was far from perfect.¹²

Throughout the seventeenth century the Jesuit missionaries in China had been working on the finalization of their Latin renditions of the Four Books. Eventually the dedicated efforts of generations of missionaries would appear in Paris in 1687 as *Confucius Sinarum Philosophus*, but parts of the project had been published before (Heurnius’s manuscripts also already contain translations of several chapters from the *Lunyu*). Unfortunately, it is not clear where Pieter van Hoorn (b. 1619) who served as VOC ambassador to the Manchu court in 1667–68 picked up his knowledge of the

Rijksmuseum,” *The Rijksmuseum Bulletin* 63.4 (2015), 400–407. The report on the second embassy was edited by Olfert Dapper. For a review of his geographical writings and his sources, see John Wills Jr., “Author, Publisher, Patron, World: A Case Study of Old Books and Global Consciousness,” *Journal of Early Modern History* 13.5 (2009), 375–433. Wills praises Dapper for his evenhandedness and open mind.

¹¹For a recent biography of Witsen, see Marion Peters, *De wijze koopman: Het wereldwijde onderzoek van Nicolaes Witsen, Burgemeester en VOC-Bewindhebber van Amsterdam* [The well-informed merchant: the world-wide researches of Nicolaes Witsen, burgomaster and VOC-director of Amsterdam] (Amsterdam: Bakker, 2010). Whenever he could obtain them, Witsen included relevant Chinese materials in his *Noord en Oost Tartarye* [North and East Tartary], his massive description of Asia north of the Great Wall first published in 1692 and collaborated with visitors to Amsterdam who knew Chinese.

¹²As the text is actually quite problematical, this should not surprise us. See Lien-sheng Yang, “An Inscribed Han Mirror Discovered in Siberia,” *T’oung Pao* 42 (1953), 330–40.

Lunyu which he displayed in his *Eenige Voornamen eigenschappen Van de ware Deugd, Voorsichtigheid, Wijsheid ende Volmaecktheit, Getrokken uit den Chineeschen Confucius, en op. Rijm gebracht* [Some major characteristics of true virtue, carefulness, wisdom, and perfection, drawn from the Chinese Confucius and put in rhyme] of 1675. In this long rambling poem in alexandrines at least twenty-five entries from the *Lunyu* can be identified, even though some have been rendered very freely by the inexperienced versifier. Almost all of the twenty books of the *Lunyu* are represented, but it is clear that Van Hoorn had a preference for short statement on virtue and that he avoided more complex dialogues, items involving numerous participants, and statements requiring historical annotation.¹³ Van Hoorn may have encountered a Latin version of the *Lunyu* in China when he stayed in that country in the period 1666–68 (dedicating the poem to his family, he called it “something beautiful I have brought you from China”), but he also may have been in contact with literate Chinese in Batavia, as is argued by Trude Dijkstra and Thijs Weststeijn, “Constructing Confucius in the Low Countries,” *De Zeventiende Eeuw. Cultuur in the Nederlanden in interdisciplinair perspectief* 32.2 (2016), 137–64.¹⁴ Printed in small numbers in Batavia, there is no evidence, however, that Van Hoorn’s poem ever reached the Netherlands in colonial times; despite its originality, its impact must thus have been negligible—even on the author himself, as he was fired in 1677 from his position as member of the council for the East Indies for corruption.

Jean Theodore Royer, Isaac Titsingh, and Karl Gützlaff

China as a country administered by *philosophes* may have been attractive to French intellectuals of the eighteenth century as a means to attack the absolutism of French monarchs, but it failed to attract the attention of Dutch intellectual circles. While the Dutch, too, drank tea, bought armorial china, and followed the French fashion of *chinoiserie* for home decoration, China made no appearance in the Dutch representatives of the popular genre of the oriental tale.

For a serious intellectual engagement with China we have to wait until the years 1765–1780, when Jean Theodore Royer (1737–1807) set out to build a collection of Chinese objects and visual materials on Chinese life that would give as complete a picture of contemporary China as possible in Europe. His “Chinese museum” in The Hague was accessible to visitors and achieved international fame. Even though Royer’s collection also included some Chinese books, his attempts to acquaint himself with the language did not get very far in the absence of a teacher. Royer’s life and his collection have been studied by Jan van Campen in his *De Haagse jurist Jean Theodore Rovers (1737–1837) en zijn verzameling Chinese voorwerpen* [Jean Theodore Royer

¹³Wilt Idema, “Confucius Batavus: het eerste Nederlandse dichtstuk naar het Chinees” [Confucius Dutchified: The first Dutch poem based on a Chinese source], *Literatuur* 16.2 (1999), 85–89.

¹⁴See also Trude Dijkstra, “Confucius at ‘De Batavische Mercurius’: Governor-General of the Dutch East Indies Pieter van Hoorn and the first Vernacular Translation of the Chinese Confucius,” in *Cultural Encounters: Cross-Disciplinary Studies from the Late Middle Ages to the Enlightenment*, ed. Désirée Cappa (Wilmington: Vernon Press, 2019), 109–24. “De Batavische Mercurius” was the business name of the print shop that produced Van Hoorn’s poem. It was not Pieter van Hoorn but his son Johan van Hoorn who ended his career as the governor-general of the Dutch East Indies. Dijkstra’s discussion of Pieter van Hoorn’s reception of Confucius is part of her larger research on China and Confucius in seventeenth-century Dutch print culture, to be published as *The Chinese Imprint: Printing and Publishing Chinese Religion and Philosophy in the Dutch Republic, 1595–1700* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

(1737–1807), lawyer at The Hague, and his collection of Chinese objects] (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2000). Van Campen's study includes a reconstructed catalogue of the collection which has largely been preserved in the collections of the Rijksmuseum at Amsterdam¹⁵ and at the National Museum of Ethnography at Leiden.¹⁶ A "slightly edited" translation of Van Campen's monograph that tries to strengthen the European context of Royer's activities and provides more detail on his Chinese contacts has been published as *Collecting China: Jean Theodore Royer, Collections and Chinese Studies* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2021), but this edition does not include the illustrations of the original Dutch publication.

One of the scholars with whom Royer collaborated was Isaac Titsingh (1745–1812). Titsingh spent decades in Asia as a VOC employee. He is best known for his writings on Japan, where he served from 1779 to 1784 as "Opperhoofd" (chief) of the Dutch trading post at Dejima in Nagasaki. When about to return to Europe in 1794, he was appointed to lead a VOC embassy to Peking. During this embassy he was accompanied by Andreas Everardus van Braam Houckgeest (1739–1801) who would replace him in case of his death. Studies on this embassy often are based on the report and the later publications of Van Braam, but the original of Titsingh's own diary during the trip has been rediscovered and edited by Frank Lequin as *Isaac Titsingh in China: Het onuitgegeven Journaal van zijn Ambassade naar Peking* [Isaac Titsingh in China: the unpublished diary of his embassy to Peking] (Alphen aan den Rijn: Canaletto, 2005).¹⁷ The embassy's largely overland trip from Canton to Peking in the middle of the winter was quite an ordeal; the return trip in the spring was largely by boat and more comfortable, yet at all times the members of the embassy only had limited contacts with the local population. This is a pity, as Titsingh was an eminent scholar who could show surprised Chinese officials in Peking books on Japanese history written in Japan in classical Chinese.¹⁸ Titsingh's knowledge of Japanese and Chinese may have been modest, but when living in Paris upon his return to Europe, he was an important source of information for Jean Pierre Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832), the first professor of Chinese at the Collège de France, who also published some of Titsingh's writings upon his death.¹⁹ Both Titsingh and Van Braam returned from East Asia with large collections of orientalia.²⁰

¹⁵Jan van Campen, "De verzameling van de amateur-sinoloog J.Th. Royer in het Rijksmuseum" [The collection of the amateur-sinologue J.Th. Royer in het Rijksmuseum], *Bulletin van het Rijksmuseum* 43.1 (1995), 3–35.

¹⁶On the early Dutch collections of Chinese objects, also see Moore, "China's Art and Material Culture," 213–19.

¹⁷For a biography of Titsingh, see Frank Lequin, *Isaac Titsingh (1715–1812) een passie voor Japan: leven en werk van de grondlegger van de Europese Japanologie* [Isaac Titsingh's passion for Japan: Life and work of the founder of European japanologie] (Alphen aan den Rijn: Canaletto, 2002).

¹⁸Tonio Andrade, *The Last Embassy: The Dutch Mission of 1795 and the Forgotten History of Western Encounters with China* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2021), 63–65 describes Titsingh's strenuous but often disappointing efforts to learn Chinese.

¹⁹On the relation between Titsingh and Abel-Rémusat, see Barend ter Haar, "Oosterse lotus en Fries pompenblad: boeddhisme in het veld" [Eastern lotus and Frisian water lily leaf: Buddhism in the field], in Tjalling Halbertsma, Alpita de Jong en Barend ter Haar, *De Predikant en de Boeddha: Beschouwingen bij de heruitgave van Joost Halbertsma's Het buddhisme en zijn stichter uit 1843* [The minister and the Buddha: essays for the reissue of Joost Halbertsma's "Buddhism and its founder" of 1843] (Gorredijk: Uitgeverij Noordboek, 2019), 54–60.

²⁰For descriptions of these collections (and their dispersal) see Jan van Campen, *De haagse jurist*, 174–202, and Jan van Campen, *Collecting China*, 110–14. Also see Tonio Andrade, *The Last Embassy*, 282–90

In the early nineteenth century the Netherlands Missionary Society funded the German Lutheran minister Karl Friedrich August Gützlaff (Charles Gützlaff, 1803–1851) to convert the Chinese of Batavia. Gützlaff arrived there in 1826 but left again in 1828 to pursue missionary activities first in Thailand and later on the China coast. Gützlaff published extensively both in English and in Chinese, and in 1842 would become the second Chinese Secretary of Hong Kong, while he also would continue to train Chinese missionaries. During his fund-raising tour of Europe in 1850 his apostolic contributions would be eulogized at length by pious Dutch poets,²¹ who did not yet know that not all of Gützlaff's Chinese missionaries had lived up to his high hopes. Jessie G. Lutz and R.R. Lutz point out that Gützlaff continued to receive support from the Netherlands throughout his career.²² But it would not be any Christian fervor in the Netherlands that would result in the establishment of a chair for Chinese language and literature at Leiden University, but rather the practical needs of the colonial administration in the Dutch East Indies.

Johan Joseph Hoffmann, Gustaaf Schlegel, Jan Jacob Maria De Groot, and Henri Borel

During the final years of the eighteenth century, the VOC went bankrupt and all its possessions were taken over in 1798 by the Dutch state, then in its incarnation as the Batavian Republic. Over the course of the Napoleonic wars most of the Dutch overseas possessions were taken over by the British empire, but when the Dutch had regained their independence, now as the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the British kept the Cape Colony and Ceylon but returned Java and other islands. Over the course of the nineteenth century the Dutch continued to expand their colonial territories until they had reached the extent of modern-day Indonesia. The steamship and the Suez Canal greatly reduced the distance between the colony and Europe, and by the middle of the nineteenth century the Dutch wanted not only to rule the area, but also to administer its population. This required the training of a specialized corps of colonial administrators. In view of the special position of the Chinese in the Dutch East Indies, it does not really come as a surprise that a growing need was felt for the training of specialized officers for Chinese affairs.

Various attempts to train such specialized officers on Java did not produce the hoped-for results, so eventually the Ministry of Colonial Affairs turned to Johan Joseph Hoffmann (1805–1878).²³ Hoffmann, who eventually would be appointed as

for a description of Van Braam's display of his collection at his China Retreat outside Philadelphia. Andrade notes (p. 398, note 14) that "Art historian Dawn Odell is currently writing a book about Van Braam and his collection, whose working title is 'Chinese art and the Global Eighteenth Century: The "Lost" Collection of Van Braam Houckgeest and Early American Cosmopolitanism.'"

²¹A. Goslinga, *Dr. Karl Gützlaff en het Nederlandse protestantisme in het midden van de vorige eeuw* [Dr. Karl Gützlaff and Dutch Protestantism in the middle of the preceding century] ('s Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1941).

²²"Karl Gützlaff as Propagandist and Fundraiser, 1826–1849: Some Comparisons of Appeals and Sources for Support," in *Karl Gützlaff und das Christentum in Ostasien: Ein Missionar zwischen den Kulturen* [Charles Gützlaff and Christianity in East Asia: a missionary between cultures], ed. Thoralf Klein and Reinhardt Zöllner (Sankt Augustin: Steyler Verlagsbuchhandlung, 2005), 105–39. Jessie G. Lutz is also the author of *Opening China: Karl F.A. Gützlaff and Sino-Western Relations, 1827–1852* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2008).

²³For a brief account of Hoffmann's role in the history of Japanese studies in the Netherlands, see W.J. Boot, "Johann Joseph Hoffmann: Der erste Japanologe?" [Johann Joseph Hoffmann: the first japanologist?], *Hōrin* 16 (2009), 83–104. Also see Frits Vos, "Mihatenu Yume—An Unfinished Dream: Japanese

titular professor of Japanese and Chinese at Leiden, had never visited East Asia but had studied Japanese and Chinese while assisting Philipp Franz Balthasar von Siebold (1796–1866) in compiling his massive description of Japan.²⁴ Von Siebold was, like Hoffmann, German by birth. As a physician he had been stationed in 1823 at the Dutch trading post at Dejima, where he would stay until 1830, when he was banished from Japan. Von Siebold was a remarkable scholar who, once he had settled in the Netherlands at Leiden, set out to publish the results of the research he had conducted while at Nagasaki. In this work he was assisted for a number of years by a Chinese amanuensis, Ko Tsching Dschang / Kok Sin Tjong / Guo Chengzhang 郭成章, who became Hoffmann's teacher of Chinese (to be able to converse with him, Hoffmann first had to learn Malay). When Hoffmann was asked to teach Chinese to some suitable boys, he could answer that he already had trained one such pupil, Gustaaf Schlegel (1840–1903). Schlegel was dispatched to Batavia and continued his studies at Amoy (Xiamen) and Canton (Guangzhou). Following a number of years of activity as an interpreter and advisor for Chinese affairs, Schlegel returned to Leiden where he was appointed in 1877 as Professor of Chinese Language and Literature and entrusted with the training of the future generations of officers for Chinese affairs.

Schlegel's academically most gifted and most productive student was Jan Jacob Maria de Groot (1854–1921). De Groot would join him in Leiden in 1891 when he was appointed as Professor for the Ethnography of the Dutch East Indies, after years as an interpreter and extensive periods of fieldwork in Fujian and elsewhere.²⁵ De Groot succeeded Schlegel upon his death as Professor of Chinese Language and Literature in 1904, only to leave Leiden in December 1911 for Berlin. His departure brought the first period of Dutch academic Sinology to an end, as he had no immediate successor. This was due in part to the strong criticism that had been levelled at the many and often massive publications of Schlegel and De Groot by Henri Jean François Borel (1869–1933). The latter was a headstrong Chinese interpreter who had come into repeated conflict with his superiors in the colonial administration over abuses the Chinese suffered. He accused his former teachers of having lost all contact with contemporary Chinese society, to the extent that they were unaware of the growing self-consciousness and nationalism among the Chinese. Borel, a successful writer, claimed a privileged understanding of the Chinese soul because he was "a poet," a quality which conveniently excused him from the need to pursue in-depth research and made him quite an effective publicist, to the frustration of at least De Groot.

This period in the development of Dutch Sinology was first studied in considerable detail by Leonard Blussé in his "Of Hewers of Wood and Drawers of Water: Leiden University's Early Sinologists (1835–1911)," in *Leiden Oriental Connections 1850–1940*, ed. Willem Otterspeer (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 317–53. This article was reprinted with some minor corrections in 2014 in Wilt L. Idema, *Chinese Studies in the Netherlands: Past, Present and Future*, 27–68. Since then, this period has been described

Studies until 1940," in *Leiden Oriental Connections 1850–1940*, ed. Willem Otterspeer (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 354–77.

²⁴Von Siebold had little Japanese, and Hoffmann acquired his knowledge of the language largely on his own.

²⁵De Groot was actively involved in the training of future *indologen* ("indologues," aspirants for general positions in the colonial administration). See C. Fasseur, *De indologen: Ambtenaren voor de Oost 1825–1950* [The indologues: officials for the Dutch East Indies] (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 1993).

in exhaustive detail by Koos Kuiper, *The Early Dutch Sinologists (1854–1900): Training in Holland and China, Functions in the Netherlands Indies*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2017). The first volume of Kuiper's *magnum opus* is primarily devoted to the content and organization of the teaching of the future interpreters in Leiden and in China, whereas the second volume focuses on the tasks of the interpreters following their training in the Dutch East Indies. The second volume also includes a large number of appendices, starting with "Biographies and Bibliographies of the Sinologists" (pp. 939–1098).²⁶

In the first volume Kuiper starts out by tracing the discussions in Batavia and The Hague that resulted in the invitation to Hoffmann to train a small number of carefully selected students. The second chapter then discusses Hoffmann's instruction of several cohorts of students in Leiden, whereupon the third chapter deals with the adventures of these students in China where they had been sent to complete their studies—it took a while before the colonial administration realized that Hokkien (Emoy/Amoy, Minnanhua) and Hakka were the most widely spoken Chinese dialects in the Dutch East Indies and that Cantonese would be of only limited use. While in China, some of the students collected plant specimens and fauna, an aspect of their life there that is treated in a short fourth chapter.²⁷ The role of one of them, Carolus Franciscus Martinus de Grijis (1832–1902), in the negotiations leading up to the Sino-Dutch Treaty of 1863 is treated in the fifth chapter. The sixth chapter is then devoted to the institution of Chinese teachers/clerks for the interpreters when they took on their duties in the colonial administration. Once a certain number of interpreters were active in the Dutch East Indies, it was again attempted to train interpreters in Batavia, but these attempts were abandoned after a few years, as we learn in Chapter 7.

After Gustaaf Schlegel returned to the Netherlands, he strongly championed the reestablishment of a training program in Leiden. A first group of three students (including De Groot, who greatly disliked his teacher for his propensity for dirty jokes) was admitted in 1873, and a second group of again three students in 1875. Meanwhile Schlegel was first appointed as a titular professor, then following the reform of the Dutch universities around that time, as a regular professor in 1877. When describing these developments in Chapter 8, Kuiper also pays detailed attention to Schlegel's teaching methods and the life of trainees, who were not regular students. But barely had Schlegel pronounced his inaugural lecture than the Ministry of Colonial Affairs decided it had plenty of interpreters and decided not to admit new trainees. While Schlegel had some students who took his courses out of interest, the regular selection of trainees was only resumed in 1888, when five students (including Borel) were admitted, after which a fourth group was selected in 1892. Chapter 9 focuses on Schlegel's teaching in the 1880s and 1890s. Here the many writings of Borel on his student days allow Kuiper to go into much greater detail than in the preceding chapter. The two chapters on Schlegel's students in Leiden, is followed in Chapter 10 by a detailed account of the experiences of his students during their training period in China, where again the many publications of Borel are fruitfully mined. The first volume ends with a long tenth chapter on the compilation of Sino-Dutch and Dutch-Chinese dictionaries, in which most space is taken up by Schlegel's *magnum opus*, his four-volume *Ho Hoa Bun-Gi Lui-Ts'am: Nederlandsch-Chineesch Woordenboek met de transcriptie der*

²⁶Koos Kuiper is also the author of *Catalogue of Chinese and Sino-Western Manuscripts in the Central Library of Leiden University* (Leiden: Legatum Warnerianum in Leiden University Library, 2005).

²⁷Gustaaf Schlegel's father Hermann Schlegel (1804–1884), German by birth like Hoffmann and Von Siebold, was the director of the Museum of Natural History at Leiden.

Chineesche karakters in the Tsiang-tsiu dialect; hoofdzakelijk ten behoeve der tolken voor the Chineesche taal in Nederlansch Indië [Dutch-Chinese dictionary, with a transcription of the Chinese characters according to the Zhangzhou dialect; primarily for the use of interpreters for the Chinese language in the Dutch East Indies] (Leiden: Brill, 1886–1890), which eloquently testified to Schlegel's comprehensive knowledge of Hokkien, including its seamy sides.²⁸

While the first volume of *The Early Dutch Sinologists* is basically devoted to their training at Leiden and in China, the four chapters of the second volume focus on their functions in the colonial administration in the Dutch East Indies. These chapters are a major contribution to the colonial history of Indonesia, especially the history of the relations between the colonial administration and the various Chinese communities within the context of the racially segregated colonial society. Kuiper discusses respectively the activities of the Sinologists as interpreters and translators (Chapter 12), their various advisory functions (Chapter 13), and their studies and missions (Chapter 14). Chapter 15 finally describes the reorganization of the corps of interpreters into a body of officials for Chinese Affairs in 1896.²⁹ The second volume also contains nineteen appendices. The use of this monograph as an encyclopedic survey is facilitated by four indices (of personal names, subjects, titles, and geographical names).

Although Kuiper includes a biographical sketch of De Groot as one of the students of Schlegel, he does not discuss his Sinological work in great detail. That is regrettable because whereas Schlegel's publications nowadays are rarely if ever consulted (his most lasting contribution to Chinese studies is the foundation, with the French scholar Henri Cordier (1849–1925), of *T'oung Pao*³⁰), De Groot's studies of Chinese religion, which combined historical inquiry with extensive fieldwork, are still inspiring. But the relative absence of De Groot in Kuiper's work is largely compensated for by R.J. Zwi Werblowsky's *The Beaten Track of Science: The Life and Work of J.J.M. de Groot*, edited by Hartmut Walravens (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz, 2002).³¹ Werblowsky, who hails De Groot as "as one of the founding fathers (possibly the founding father) of ethnographic Sinology," could make use of De Groot's "Diary," made up of voluminous excerpts from the diaries he kept throughout his life with retrospective comments. His monograph is made up of four chapters, the first of which provides a detailed survey of De Groot's

²⁸On the linguistic contributions of the early Sinologists, also see Rint Sybesma, "A History of Chinese Linguistics in the Netherlands," 129–45, who highlights the contributions of Simon Schaank (1861–1935) in laying the groundwork for the later work of Bernhard Karlgren (1889–1978) in historical linguistics.

²⁹Many interpreters were frustrated because their advice often went unheeded and because they had little or no opportunity to be promoted. One of the rare interpreters who had a stellar career in the colonial administration was Willem Pieter Groeneveldt (1841–1915). Groeneveldt also was a fine scholar, best known for his (repeatedly reprinted) *Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca, Compiled from Chinese Sources* of 1880. For a biographical sketch and bibliography, see Kuiper, *The Early Dutch Sinologists*, 2:993–1000.

³⁰For the important role of *T'oung-Pao* in international Sinology during the first fifty years of its existence, especially during the Interbellum years when it was edited by Paul Pelliot (1878–1945), see David B. Honey, *Incense at the Altar: Pioneering Sinologists and the Development of Classical Chinese Philology* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2001), 76–81.

³¹De Groot's reputation suffered when European academic Sinology followed the lead of French Sinology in taking a philological turn. One of the first scholars to draw attention to the work of De Groot again was the British social anthropologist Maurice Freedman (1920–1975) who envisioned a comparative study of De Groot and Marcel Granet. See his "On the Sociological Study of Chinese Religion," in Maurice Freedman, *The Study of Chinese Society* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1979), 351–69. Unfortunately, Freedman passed away before he could complete this project.

activities in the Netherlands and China, in the Dutch East Indies and, eventually, in Germany. The second chapter deals with De Groot's involvement in the coolie trade on behalf of the Dutch tobacco growers on Sumatra. The last two chapters are devoted to his academic pursuits. Chapter 3, "The De Groot Collections of Chinese Religious Statuary" describes De Groot's efforts to bring together a complete collection of religious statuary from Southern Fujian by ordering newly made images from professional woodcutters. These sets are now at the Musée Guimet in Lyon and the National Museum of Ethnology in Leiden.³² The fourth and final chapter is devoted to an analysis of De Groot's study of Chinese religion, considering both the contradictions in De Groot's attitude toward it and his (apparent) turn-about from praise to condemnation. The volume also includes a detailed bibliography of De Groot's publications.³³

De Groot is listed as one of the homosexual Sinologists of the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century by D.E. Mungello in his *Western Queers in China: Flights to the Land of Oz* (Lanham: Rowman Littlefield, 2012), 75–80.³⁴ The unmarried and puritanical De Groot may very well have been a homosexual, but if he was one, he was a very repressed one. When he left Leiden for Berlin, it was not because his homosexuality had been exposed, but because he had exposed the real and supposed manifestations of homosexuality among Leiden students. De Groot's crusade against homosexuality culminated in the "hazing scandal" of 1911, when De Groot obtained a copy of the text of the freshmen show of the student fraternity. Together with some students De Groot prepared an annotated version that explained all real or supposed references to homosexuality in the text. De Groot had this version printed in 150 copies and mailed one copy to each of the 100 members of the Second Chamber and to each of the 50 members of the First Chamber of the Dutch parliament, requesting them to discuss the document in a combined closed session and to take action against the reported abusers. Parliament could not refuse the request as it came from a former teacher of Her Majesty the Queen, but, made up to a large extent of fathers and elderly relatives of the young men concerned, they decided to deal with the issue in the tried way of shelving problems, that is, by appointing a committee. De Groot then realized that his position at Leiden University had become impossible and decided to accept the long-standing invitation to move to Berlin (together with his best friend). The affair has been studied in great detail by the official historian of Leiden University W. Otterspeer in his *De*

³²On De Groot as a collector, see Oliver Moore, "China's Art and Material Culture," 222–28. For the De Groot collection at Lyon see Deirdre Emmons, R.J. Zwi Werblowski, et al., *Dieux de Chine: le pantheon du Fujian de J.J.M. de Groot* (Lyon: Museum d'histoire naturelle, 2003). The De Groot collection at the National Museum of Ethnology can be viewed on the museum's website. Also see Wang Yuping 王玉冰, "Minsu wenwu de kuaguo liudongshi—yi Gao Yan cangpin weil" 民俗文物的跨国流动史—以高延藏品为例, *Yishu yu minsu* 2020.3, 19–26.

³³Werblowski's monograph on De Groot was extensively reviewed by Barend ter Haar in *T'oung Pao* 92 (2006), 540–60. Ter Haar emphasizes the originality of De Groot's long period of fieldwork in Fujian and the fact that his view of Chinese culture and the role of the state was very much informed by his intensive contacts with ordinary Chinese rather than the literati elite. See also Barend ter Haar, "Een kleine revolutie: het Boeddhisme als een tekst" [A small revolution: Buddhism as text], in Tjalling Halbertsma, Aaltje Pietertje de Jong, and Barend ter Haar, *De Predikant en de Boeddha: Beschouwingen en heruitgave van Joost Halbertsma's 'Het buddhisme en zijn stichter' uit 1843* (Gorredijk: Uitgeverij Noordboek, 2019), 93–98 where he discusses De Groot's fieldwork on Buddhism as a living tradition.

³⁴One would have liked to see a more detailed discussion of how de Groot's sexual proclivity affected his scholarly publications. We are told that he ignored the sexual elements in Chinese religion, but this puritanical attitude is blamed on his strict Roman-Catholic upbringing.

opvoedende kracht van de groentijd: Het Leidse ontgroenschandaal van 1911 [The educational value of hazing: the Leiden hazing scandal of 1911] (Leiden: Burgersdijk and Niermans Publishers, 1995), which includes both the full text of the freshmen show and the letter De Groot addressed to the members of parliament.³⁵

Kuiper not only quotes extensively from the writings of Borel, but also provides a biographical sketch. As Borel was a prolific author who during the last years of his life was a well-known theater critic in The Hague, the bibliography in this case is limited to works “related to his study of Chinese or his work as interpreter or Official for Chinese Affairs” (p. 956). Borel is also the subject of a monograph by Audrey Heijns, *The Role of Henri Borel in Chinese Translation History* (London: Routledge, 2021). In conformity with a major trend in contemporary translation studies, this work is not limited to a discussion of Borel’s (Dutch) renditions of Chinese texts, but also treats his many articles and books that presented his views on Chinese culture to the world at large as well as his role as a cultural intermediary in the colonial society of the Dutch East Indies. As a translator of texts, Borel’s most original venture was his contributions of three volumes in his series “De Chineesche filosofie toegelicht voor niet-sinologen” [Chinese philosophy explained for non-Sinologists] which presented his Dutch translations of extensive selections from the *Lunyu* (coupled with the *Zhongyong* and the *Daxue*), from the *Daodejing*, and from the *Mengzi*. These volumes were explicitly aimed at the general (Dutch) public, and each volume came with a long introduction and detailed notes. While these works were never translated into other Western languages, Borel’s travel writings and his meditations on Daoism were rendered into other European languages, often to be reprinted multiple times. For all Borel’s insistence on the rising nationalism among the Chinese of the early twentieth century, it is curious to note how rarely he moved in his translations of texts beyond the materials he had encountered in his student days.³⁶

Jan Julius Lodewijk Duyvendak, His Students, and Robert Hans van Gulik

De Groot was an international celebrity in his own day, but his scholarship had been severely criticized by the widely read Borel, whose understanding of contemporary

³⁵For a brief evaluation of De Groot’s impact on German Sinology, see David B. Honey, *Incense at the Altar: Pioneering Sinologists and the Development of Classical Chinese Philology* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 2001), 129–30. Honey misleadingly characterizes De Groot as a “diplomat-turned-scholar.” For a reevaluation of the negative comments on the work De Groot by his younger contemporaries such as Otto Franke (1863–1946) and Paul Pelliot (1878–1945), see Ter Haar in *T’oung Pao* 92 (2006), 557–60. For more recent German reactions to the scholarship of De Groot, see for instance Mechtild Leutner, “Zur Genese des Universalismus-Konzeptes. J.J.M. de Groots Ansichten zur Religion in China in Vergleich mit W. Grube” [On the origin of the notion universalism. J.J.M. de Groot’s view of Chinese religion compared with those of W. Grube], in *China, Nähe und Ferne: deutsch-chinesische Beziehungen in Geschichte und Gegenwart: zum 60. Geburtstag von Kuo Heng-yü* [China, closeness and distance: German-Chinese relations in history and the present. For Kuo Heng-yü on his sixtieth birthday], ed. Bettina Granson and Mechtild Leutner (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang 1989), 155–74. For a rebuttal, see Ter Haar in *T’oung Pao* 2006, 550–52. Also see Elena Meilicke, “‘In die Tropen!’ Zur Verschränkung von Sinologie und Kolonialismus im Leben und Werk von J.J.M. de Groot” [‘To the tropics!’ On the intertwining of Sinology and colonialism in the life and work of J.J.M. de Groot], *Berliner China Heft: Beiträge zur Gesellschaft und Geschichte Chinas* 33 (2008), 75–86.

³⁶In his *Het Daghet in het Oosten* (Amsterdam: Veen, 1910), Borel’s account of his stay Peking in 1909, he quotes as proof of the rising nationalism among Chinese an essay of a primary school student from the Dutch East Indies and little else.

Chinese culture would appear to be certified by the Chinese Revolution of 1911. Leiden University hesitated to appoint a successor to De Groot, uncertain whether to seek someone who knew the Chinese community in the Dutch East Indies and spoke its language or someone who was acquainted with the politics and culture in China itself and spoke *guanhua* rather than Hokkien. Eventually the university opted for the latter and hired J.J.L. Duyvendak (1889–1954) as lecturer for Chinese. Duyvendak had studied not only with De Groot but also with Édouard Chavannes (1865–1918) in Paris, after which he had served a six-year stint (1912–1918) as one of the interpreters at the Dutch legation in Peking.³⁷ There he had witnessed the turbulent history of the early years of the Republic, in which the Dutch legation had been caught up when Zhang Xun 張勳/勳 (1854–1923), following the failure of his short-lived restoration of the Qing dynasty in 1916 had sought diplomatic asylum with the Dutch. Duyvendak's appointment greatly frustrated those such as Borel, who felt more qualified and had counted on a professorial appointment for themselves. While choosing Duyvendak, who did not speak Hokkien, the university also stipulated that he would be accompanied by an assistant for teaching that dialect to meet the needs of the future officials for Chinese Affairs in Batavia.

Following his arrival in Leiden, Duyvendak would quickly establish his credentials as an expert on contemporary China by a series of substantial articles in Dutch on the political and cultural developments in China during the 1910s, including his personal interactions with Zhang Xun during the latter's year-long stay at the Dutch legation. He next busied himself with the translation of the *Jingshan Diary* 景山日記, an exposé of the inner-palace machinations preceding the Boxer Rebellion that turned out to be a fraud (as Duyvendak belatedly recognized in 1937), and eventually, following a second visit to Peking in 1926 and a meeting with Gu Jiegang 顧頡剛 (1893–1980), obtained his doctorate in 1928 with a study and translation of the ancient legalist philosopher Shang Yang 商央. Once Duyvendak had obtained his doctoral degree, Leiden University made him a full professor. Most of his own publications from that date on dealt with various aspects of traditional China, and as a former student of Chavannes he became a major representative of the philological tradition in academic Sinology.³⁸ At the same time the majority of his students studied Chinese in order to pursue a career in the administration of the Dutch East Indies, and with that purpose in mind several of them combines their study of Chinese with the study of "Indian Law" (law of the Dutch East Indies).

During the interbellum years some Leiden academics involved in colonial studies became advocates of an "ethical policy" and argued that the colonial administration should first of all serve the needs of the local population of the Dutch East Indies—they envisioned that in a distant future the colony might achieve some form of internal autonomy or even independence. Confronted not only with a nascent independence movement in Indonesia itself but also with this "treason" inside government and academia, big business in the Dutch East Indies raised the money for the establishment of chairs in colonial studies (including a chair of Chinese) at the University of Utrecht in

³⁷On Duyvendak's stay in Peking as legation interpreter and his later visits to China, see Barend ter Haar, "The Frustrations of Learning Chinese: The Case of J.J.L. Duyvendak," in *The China Experience and the Making of Sinology: Western Scholars Sojourning in China*, ed. Guillaume Dutournier and Max Jakob Fölster (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, forthcoming).

³⁸Honey, *Incense at the Altar*, 78–79 devotes one page to Duyvendak as a philologist in his discussion of *T'oung Pao*.

order to ensure the training of future colonial officials that would be committed to the status quo. The first occupant of the chair of Chinese in Utrecht, appointed in 1933, was Th.T.H. Ferguson (1871–1946), who was succeeded in 1940 by the Flemish missionary Jozef Lodewijk Maria Mullie (1886–1976), an excellent linguist who had acquainted himself with the language during the many years he had spent in Inner Mongolia and Northern China.³⁹

Following World War II and the Independence of Indonesia, the “Oil faculty”⁴⁰ at Utrecht faded from history as vacant positions were not filled.⁴¹ At Leiden, Duyvendak, who died in 1954, was succeeded in 1956 by his former student Anthony François Paulus Hulswé (1910–1993) who after Leiden had continued his studies in Peking and Kyoto. He arrived in Batavia to take up his duties in the Office of East-Asian Affairs just a few years before the Japanese invaded and spent the war in Japanese prison-camps. After the war he was appointed at Leiden as lecturer for modern Chinese. Hulswé was the last Professor of Chinese Language and Literature at Leiden University to have direct link with the colonial *raison d’être* of Dutch Sinology.

So far we have had no Koos Kuiper to describe the history of Dutch Sinology during the first half of the twentieth century. In *Chinese Studies in the Netherlands: Past, Present and Future*, the period of the teaching of Duyvendak and Hulswé is covered by Barend ter Haar in his chapter “Between the Dutch East Indies and Philology” (pp. 69–104). Ter Haar stresses the many ways in which Duyvendak’s scholarship was different from that of his predecessors. The teaching program at Leiden became much more rigorous, heavily stressing the ability to read classical texts (with their commentaries), and Duyvendak stimulated his students to pursue a PhD. Among his PhD students one encounters not only Dutch names, but also American scholars such as Arthur W. Hummel Sr. (1884–1975), Derk Bodde (1909–2003), and William R.B. Acker (1907–1974)⁴² (the presence of these Americans may be linked to Duyvendak’s close connections to Columbia University, where he regularly taught summer courses in the 1930s). Duyvendak also was an institution builder who was very much responsible for the development of the Chinese library.⁴³ Ter Haar blames Duyvendak for the poor quality of the teaching of modern Chinese in the 1950s, but Duyvendak will of course have organized his teaching program in Leiden in the assumption that Sinologists would spend some years in China to pursue their studies in preparation for future employment. Ter Haar notices the interest in law of several

³⁹Mullie’s career is covered in a long entry by J. van Hecken in *Nationaal Biographisch Woordenboek* [National Biographical Dictionary] (Brussel: Paleis der Academiën), 8:517–32. For a detailed discussion of Mullie’s grammatical works, see Rint Sybesma, “A History of Chinese Linguistics in the Netherlands,” 145–52.

⁴⁰Royal Dutch Oil had been one of the major sponsors of the Utrecht chairs.

⁴¹Robert van Gulik briefly occupied the chair in the 1960s. William Acker, appointed in 1970, soon left to move to Ghent.

⁴²Acker returned to the Netherlands in 1965 to become the librarian of the Sinological Institute at Leiden University and was later appointed to the chair of Chinese at the University of Ghent.

⁴³Enabled to do so by the “Foundation for the Advancement of the Study of Chinese at Leiden University” (which drew its income from the Boxer Indemnity Fund), Duyvendak in 1930 established the Sinological Institute which combined the offices of the Chinese faculty and the Chinese library at a single location. This arrangement was maintained when the Sinological Institute moved to a new location in 1982, but it was ended when the university, in its unfathomable wisdom (financial considerations) decided to house all Asian collections together in a single section, “The Asian Library,” of the University Library.

of Duyvendak's students. As Chinese family law applied to Chinese in the Dutch East Indies, both Marius Hendrikus van der Valk (1908–1978) and Marinus Johan Meijer (1912–1991) published on family and marriage law. Hulswé had intended to write on Tang law, but his eventual dissertation was *The Remnants of Han Law*, Volume I: *Introductory Studies and an Annotated Translation of Chapters 22 and 23 of the History of the Former Han Dynasty* (Leiden: Brill, 1955). Volume II never appeared, but following the archaeological discovery of many early legal documents Hulswé would return to the field of law with his *Remnants of Ch'in Law: An annotated translation of the Ch'in legal and administrative rules of the 3rd century B.C. discovered in Yün-meng Prefecture, Hupei Province, in 1975* (Leiden: Brill, 1985).⁴⁴ Ter Haar characterizes Hulswé as “The Last of the Philologists,” and while he continues to lament the limited capacities in spoken Chinese of Leiden students during the 1960s, he acknowledges that the Leiden training “did enable people to read Chinese in all genres for themselves” (p. 98)—perhaps a criticism of those China experts of the middle of the twentieth century who had a strong disciplinary training in one of the social sciences but relied on Chinese research assistants to read the texts they needed?

Duyvendak's internationally most famous student probably was Robert Hans van Gulik (1910–1967), but Van Gulik only took his BA in Leiden (in Chinese and in Indian Law). He did not get along very well with Duyvendak as the two men had very different personalities and interests,⁴⁵ and Van Gulik transferred to Utrecht for his MA and PhD. Because the Ministry of Colonial Affairs was economizing at the time, he ended up with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which posted him to Japan for his first appointment. From there he would visit Peking in 1936 and 1940 for contacts with traditional Chinese literati and pursue traditional arts such as calligraphy, painting,⁴⁶ and the seven-string Chinese zither (the *qin* 琴 or *guqin* 古琴, which Van Gulik preferred to call the Chinese lute).⁴⁷ Following the outbreak of World War II and the exchange of diplomats he would later be posted to Chongqing (1943–1946). His career as a diplomat would take him back to Japan in the early fifties, when he started to write his Judge Dee novels.⁴⁸ All the while he would also continue to

⁴⁴Also see Ph. de Heer, “A.F.P. Hulswé, a biography,” in *Thought and Law in Qin and Han China: Studies Presented to Anthony Hulswé on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday*, ed. W.L. Idema and E. Zürcher (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 10–14, and Ph. de Heer, “Bibliography of A.F.P. Hulswé,” *ibid.*, 15–25.

⁴⁵The prim and proper Duyvendak may well have been offended by Van Gulik's lifestyle and interest in Tantrism, while Van Gulik considered Duyvendak a mediocre scholar. When speaking of Duyvendak after World War II, Van Gulik noted Duyvendak's principled opposition to the German occupation of the Netherlands, but stood by his evaluation of his scholarship.

⁴⁶For an evaluation of Van Gulik's publications on Chinese art, see Oliver Moore, “China's Art and Material Culture,” 238–41.

⁴⁷For a critical evaluation of Van Gulik's *The Lore of the Chinese Lute*, of 1941, see Ouyang Xiao, “The Lore of the Chinese Lute revisited,” *Monumenta serica* 65.1 (2017), 147–74.

⁴⁸Van Gulik found the model for his own Judge Dee novels in the first half of an anonymous novel of the Qing dynasty titled *Wu Zetian sida qi'an* 武则天四大奇案 [Four exceptional cases of the reign of Empress Wu Zetian] which he translated as *Dee Goong An: Three Murder Cases Solved by Judge Dee* (1949). On this translation see Wilt L. Idema, “The Mystery of the Halved Judge Dee Novel: The anonymous *Wu Tse-t'ien ssu-ta ch'i-an* and Its Partial Translation by R.H. van Gulik” *Tamkang Review* 8 (1977), 155–70. The second part of this novel has been translated by P.A. Rombouts as *Dee Goong An, Second Part: Governor Dee Defies the Empress* (Zeeland: Boekerij “De Graspeel,” 2016). For comments on Van Gulik's Judge Dee novels, see for instance William P. Alford, “Robert van Gulik and the Judge Dee Stories,” *Orientalism* 12.11 (The Robert van Gulik Issue, 1981), 50–55; Wilt L. Idema, “Robert H. van Gulik (1910–1967),” in *Mystery and Suspense Writers. The Literature of Crime, Detection, and Espionage*, ed. Robin W. Winks and

publish original scholarship,⁴⁹ often related to his own hobbies and on subjects that at the time were ignored in academic Sinology.⁵⁰

Van Gulik is briefly covered by Ter Haar in his “Between the Dutch East Indies and Philology.” In doing so he could rely on the biography of Van Gulik by C.D. Barkman and H. de Vries-van der Hoeven, *Een man van drie levens: Biografie van de diplomaat/schrijver/geleerde Robert van Gulik* [A Man of Three Lives: A biography of diplomat/author/scholar Robert van Gulik] (Amsterdam: Forum, 1993).⁵¹ Both authors of this biography knew Van Gulik personally, Barkman as a fellow Sinologist and diplomat and de Vries as the wife of another diplomat. In writing their biography they in turn

Maureen Corrigan (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1998), 933–41; William Antony S. Sargeant, “Robert van Gulik and the Cases of Judge Dee,” *The Armchair Detective* 15 (1982), 292–304; Hartmut Walravens, “Richter Di bei der Arbeit. Zu Robert van Guliks chinesischen Kriminalromane” [Judge Dee at work: on Robert van Gulik’s Chinese detective stories], *Orient Extremus* 36 (1993), 223–234. Van Gulik illustrated his Judge Dee novels with his own drawings in the style of traditional Chinese woodcuts. On his sources for these drawings, see Piet Rombouts, *Bronnen van illustraties in de rechter Tie-romans/ Judge Dee Illustrations and their Sources* (privately published, 2019).

⁴⁹When Van Gulik published his *Erotic Colour Prints of the Ming Period* in a limited edition in 1951, he unconvincingly claimed that his interest in the subject was the result of his Japanese publisher’s insistence on the need for a female nude on the cover of his Judge Dee novels. The provenance and authenticity of some of the materials reproduced in *Erotic Colour Prints of the Ming Period* has proven to be even more problematical than suggested by Van Gulik’s own introduction. See James Cahill, “Judge Dee and the Vanishing Ming Erotic Colour Prints,” *Orientalisms* 34.11 (2003), 40–46; James Cahill, “Introduction,” in R.H. van Gulik, *Erotic Colour Prints of the Ming Period, with an Essay on Chinese Sex Life from the Han to the Ch’ing Dynasty, B.C. 206–A.D. 1644, with introductions by James Cahill, Wilt L. Idema and Sören Edgren* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), ix–xxvi; Sören Edgren, “A Bibliographical Note on van Gulik’s Albums of Erotic Prints,” *ibid.*, xxvii–xxx. Also see the follow-up essays of Cahill and Edgren written after the Shibui collection (a major source for Van Gulik) became available: James Cahill, “The Sibui Printed Books in Chinese and Japanese Erotic Pictorial Art,” *Orientalisms* 40.3 (2009), 43–48; Sören Edgren, “The Bibliographic Significance of the Colour-Printed Books from the Shibui Collection,” *Orientalisms* 40.3 (2009), 30–36.

⁵⁰For an evaluation of the contribution of Van Gulik to the study of Chinese sexual culture, see the introduction by Paul R. Goldin in the 2003 edition of R.H. van Gulik, *Sexual Life in Ancient China: A Preliminary Survey of Chinese Sex and Society from ca. 1500 B.C. till 1644 A.D.* (Leiden: Brill, 1961), xiii–xxx. Also see Charlotte Furth, “Rethinking Van Gulik: Sexuality and Reproduction in Traditional Chinese Medicine,” in *Engendering China: Women, Culture, and the State*, ed. Christina Gilmartin et al. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 125–46; Charlotte Furth, “Rethinking Van Gulik Again,” *Nan Nü* 7.1 (2005), 71–78; Bret Hinsch, “Van Gulik’s *Sexual Life in Ancient China* and the Matter of Homosexuality,” *Nan Nü* 7.1 (2005), 79–91.

⁵¹Even earlier the diplomat Chen Zhimai 陳之邁 (1908–1978) who first had met Van Gulik in Chongqing had provided a quite detailed biographical sketch as *Helan Gao Luopei* 荷蘭高羅佩 (Taipei: Chuanji wenxue chubanshe, 1969) which focuses on Van Gulik as a Sinologist (Chen’s account of Van Gulik’s early years is at times misleading). While this is a work of friendship it is not uncritical when discussing Van Gulik’s scholarly publications on Chinese art. Chen’s little book also includes two English articles by him commemorating Van Gulik, while Fang Hao 方豪 (1910–1980) contributed a translation of the obituary for Van Gulik by Anthony Hulsewé that originally had appeared in *T’oung-Pao* 54.1 (1968), 116–24. Chen’s biographical sketch and Fang’s shorter note are also included in Yan Xiaoxing 严晓星, comp., *Gao Luopei shiji* 高罗佩事辑 (Hangzhou: Haidun chubanshe, 2011; rev. ed. Hangzhou Xiling yinshu chubanshe, 2019), which collects materials testifying to Van Gulik’s contacts with Chinese literati. Another early biographical sketch of Van Gulik was provided by Thomas Lawson, “Robert Hans van Gulik Ambassador Extraordinaire,” *Orientalisms* 12.11 (The Robert van Gulik Issue, 1981), 12–22. Janwillem van de Wetering, *Robert van Gulik: His Life, His Work* (Miami Beach: Dennis Macmillan, 1987) is very short on information.

could rely on the detailed manuscript account of his life up to 1956 that Van Gulik had prepared for the English publisher of his Judge Dee novels in which he speaks very frankly about his early youth in the Dutch East Indies, his student days, and his adventurous bachelor years. For the decades following World War II the authors mostly limit themselves to a description of his diplomatic career, as they take the international fame of his Judge Dee novels for granted and apparently do not feel qualified to discuss his Sinological publications. *Een man van drie levens* sold very well in the Netherlands and was quickly translated into Chinese⁵² and French,⁵³ but it took more than twenty years before an English translation, by Rosemary Robson, appeared as *Dutch Mandarin: The Life and Work of Robert Hans van Gulik* (Bangkok: Orchid Press, 2018). One aspect of Van Gulik's activities as a diplomat, his reporting on China, is analyzed by Lisanne Boer in *Love is Blind: Political Views Expressed by Robert H. van Gulik* (The Hague: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2004). The true Judge Dee aficionados will of course want to own their personal copy of Marco Huysmans, ed. *Robert van Gulik* (Zeeland: Boekerij "De Graspeel," 2010). This richly illustrated book contains not only drawings and essays by Van Gulik, but also selected memories of the man and discussions of his Judge Dee novels by various authors, both in English and Dutch.

Van Gulik's Judge Dee novels, often based on originally Chinese plots, have been translated and retranslated in Chinese since the 1980s where they have enjoyed an enormous popularity, greatly contributing to the posthumous fame of the Tang official Di Renjie, whose ever more fantastic and complicated adventures have been turned into long multi-episode TV dramas since the beginning of the twenty-first century.⁵⁴ In China, Van Gulik's Sinological studies, especially his work on the Chinese lute and on sexual culture, have also been eagerly translated and studied. One of the most productive Van Gulik scholars has been Shi Ye 施晔, who in her *Helan Hanxuejia Gao Luopei yanjiu* 荷兰汉学家高罗佩研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 2017) devotes separate chapters to Van Gulik's writings on the *qin* 琴,⁵⁵ to his publications on the appreciation and mounting of Chinese paintings, on his studies on the gibbon⁵⁶ and the horse-headed Guanyin, and on his engagement with traditional Chinese sexual culture. Her study further includes an evaluation of Van Gulik's translation of the *Tangyin bishi* 棠陰比事,⁵⁷ a study of the spread of his Judge Dee novels in the PRC, and an introduction to his Chinese library. Zhang Pin 张萍, *Gao Luopei: goutong Zhongxi wenhua de shizhe* 高罗佩: 沟通众犀文化的使者 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2010) also has separate chapters on Van Gulik's studies on the *qin* and on the sexual culture of ancient China but is mostly devoted to a discussion of his Judge Dee Novels.

⁵²Shi Huiye 施晔, trans. *Da hanxuejia Gao Luopei* 大汉学家高罗佩 (Haikou: Hainan chubanshe, 2011).

⁵³C.D. Barkman and H. de Vries-van der Hoeven, *Les trois vies de Robert van Gulik: une biographie*, trans. Raoul Mengarduque (Paris: C. Bourgeois, 1997).

⁵⁴The overwhelming majority of the articles on Van Gulik produced in the PRC deal with his Judge Dee novels in their Chinese translations.

⁵⁵The *qin*, the favorite musical instrument of the traditional Chinese gentleman, is a seven-stringed zither, but Van Gulik used the translation "lute."

⁵⁶Also see Shi Ye and Freerk Heule, "An Evaluation of Robert van Gulik's *The Gibbon in China* and its Place in Modern Sinological Discourse," *Southeast Review of Asian Studies* 35 (2013), 141–60.

⁵⁷R.H. van Gulik, *T'ang-yin-pi-shih "Parallel Cases from under the Pear-Tree": A 13th Century Manual of Jurisprudence and Detection* (Leiden: Brill, 1956).

Two further biographies, both in Dutch and dealing with marginal figures in the history of Dutch Sinology, may be mentioned here to round off this section. Rudi Wester, *Bestaat er een vreemder leven dan het mijne?* [Is there a weirder life than mine?] (Amsterdam: Prometheus, 2021) describes the life of Jef Last (1898–1972). Last is best known in the Netherlands as a social activist, poet, and novelist, but he was also one of the earliest students of Duyvendak at Leiden. Abandoning the study of Chinese after two years, he resumed his studies during World War II, and eventually obtained his BA in 1949. He went on to obtain a doctorate from the University of Hamburg in 1957—his dissertation was published in 1959 as *Lu Hsün—Dichter und Idol. Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte des neuen Chinas* [Lu Xun: author and idol. A contribution to the intellectual history of the New China] (Berlin: Alfred Metzner). In later years he often traveled to East Asia, and he continued to publish on China, but these publications are marred by extreme carelessness. A.H. Huussen Jr., *Johan Schotman 1892–1976: Psychiater, Dichter, Filosoof* [Johan Schotman 1892–1976: psychiatrist, poet, philosopher] (Soesterberg: Aspekt, 2015) describes the life of a physician who spent many years in the interior of China in the 1920s. His own poetical effusions inspired by his stay in China have been rightly forgotten. His most important work may well have been his complete Dutch translation of the Book of Odes as *Sji Tsjing: Het Klassieke Boek der Oden* [Shijing: the Classic Book of Odes] (Deventer: Kluwer, 1969), which was repeatedly reprinted at the time.

New Beginnings

With the retirement of Hulsewé in 1974, the umbilical cord that linked Dutch Sinology to its colonial past was finally cut. That break with the past was in a way already symbolized by the appointment of Erik Zürcher (1928–2008) as full professor in 1961, even though his chair was not yet called “Chinese History” but “The History of East Asia, with an Emphasis on the Encounter of East and West.” Zürcher had come to Leiden in 1947 to study Egyptology, but he was converted to Sinology during his hazing period. In contrast to the earlier professors of Chinese, he had never spent any time in East Asia before his appointment.⁵⁸ And while earlier professors of Chinese were expected to have a universal knowledge of Chinese culture, he was very much an intellectual historian, focusing on the Chinese reception of foreign systems of thought. That did not mean that Zürcher was appointed in the Department of History at Leiden. Throughout his lifetime, that department remained very much focused on Dutch and European history. Even when its members studied the world outside Europe they tended to do so on the basis of the (admittedly extremely rich) Dutch colonial archives, and a scholar like Leonard Blussé (b. 1946), who in his work on early modern Taiwan, the Chinese community in Batavia, and the interregional trade in East and Southeast Asia combined these colonial archives with sources in Chinese, Japanese, and Malay remained an exception.⁵⁹

⁵⁸Zürcher first visited the PRC for an extended period of time in the fall of 1964. The diary he kept during that period and the letters he wrote to his wife have been edited by his son and his daughter-in-law as Erik-Jan Zürcher and Kim van der Zouw, eds. *Het Verre Oosten: Oog in oog met het China van Mao* [The Far East: Face to face with Mao's China] (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2016). An English version appeared as *Three Months in China: Between the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution*, trans. Vivien Collingwood (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017).

⁵⁹Blussé also organized several programs to train young scholars from Asian countries to use the Dutch colonial sources concerning their home countries. For an evaluation of his contribution to scholarship see Nie Dening, “Bao Leshi jiaoshou yu Huaqiao Huaren lishi yanjiu: dang'an wenxian ziliao de souji he

As the relevant chapters in *Chinese Studies in the Netherlands: Past, Present and Future* show, the last quarter of the twentieth century witnessed a rapidly growing disciplinary diversification within Chinese studies, with the expanding staff specializing in linguistics⁶⁰ or literature, premodern or modern history, law, economics, or social developments.

Barend ter Haar called his second chapter in *Chinese Studies in the Netherlands: Past, Present and Future*, “Rediscovering Chinese Religion and Contemporary China” (105–26). It covers Dutch Sinology from the 1960s to the early years of the twenty-first century, with a focus on Chinese history, starting with an evaluation of the contribution of Erik Zürcher to Chinese studies. Zürcher established his reputation with his dissertation on the reception of Buddhism in China, which was published in two volumes as *The Buddhist Conquest of China* (Leiden: Brill, 1959; reprinted in 1972 and 2007). Zürcher would greatly stimulate the study of contemporary China with the foundation of the Documentation Center for Contemporary China in 1969,⁶¹ and would also play a major role in the improvement of modern language teaching at Leiden. In his own research he would continue to focus on the Chinese reception of foreign systems of thought, comparing the reception of Buddhism to the later reception of Christianity and of Marxism. These studies resulted in a continuous stream of articles, on the one hand continuing his study of Buddhism and on the other hand on the activities of Jesuit missionaries in late Ming and early Qing China (Zürcher never published much on Marxism and shied away from public debates on topics such as the Cultural Revolution). When Zürcher retired in 1993, he was succeeded by Kristoffer Schipper (1934–2021), well-known for his original work on Daoism,⁶² and when Schipper retired in 2000, the chair passed to Ter Haar himself, who has worked extensively on Chinese popular religion.⁶³ As Ter Haar notes, I myself (Wilt L. Idema, b. 1944) succeeded Hulsewé in 1976; I left Leiden for Harvard in 1999,⁶⁴ to be succeeded by Maghiel van Crevel, a specialist in contemporary Chinese poetry.⁶⁵

yunyong” 包乐史 教授与华侨华人历史研究：档案文献资料的搜集和运用, *Huaqiao Huaren lishi yanjiu* 2003.3, 71–77, and the section devoted to him in Zhang Xiaolan 张小兰, ed. *Butong xunchang de Zhongguo zhi lu* 不同寻常的中国之旅 (Beijing: Zhongguo duiwai wenhua jiaoliu xiehui, 2018), 121–84.

⁶⁰Rint Sybesma currently holds a chair in Chinese linguistics.

⁶¹The most recent survey of contemporary China studies in the Netherlands, in Leiden and beyond, is still Pieke, “Contemporary China Studies in the Netherlands,” 163–87. On the Documentation Center see also “Reminiscences and Ruminations: Playful Essays to Celebrate the 25th Anniversary of the Documentation and Research Center for Contemporary China, Leiden,” Supplement to *China Information* 9.1 (1994). In later reorganizations of the Faculty of Arts, the Documentation Center lost its independent structure, but the importance of contemporary China studies in the Leiden program was insured by the establishment of a chair in contemporary China studies, first occupied by Anthony Saich. When Saich left Leiden for Harvard in 1999, he was succeeded in 2000 by Axel Schneider who left Leiden for Göttingen in 2009. Schneider was succeeded by Frank N. Pieke.

⁶²In contrast with Zürcher, Schipper had spent many years on Taiwan (1963–1970) where he had studied the living tradition of Daoism in Tainan and even had been initiated as a Daoist priest himself. As Schipper had studied in Paris and taught there for most of his career, his scholarship is best evaluated in the context of French Sinology. It should be pointed out, however, that his return to the Netherlands stimulated Schipper to produce Dutch translations of the *Zhuangzi*, the *Daode jing*, and the *Lunyu*.

⁶³Following Ter Haar’s departure for Oxford, he was succeeded in 2013 by Hilde De Weerd.

⁶⁴For a look back at my early career, see Wilt Lukas Idema, “My Passage to Chinese Literature,” in *My China Story: China in the Eyes of Sinologists*, Ge Jiangxia and Xin Bingfeng (Egelsbach: Flieder-Verlag, 2018), 2–30.

⁶⁵For the study of modern and contemporary Chinese literature, see Mark Leenhouts, “Between Money and Curiosity,” 195–210. For a detailed survey of the translation and reception of Lu Xun, see Yi Bin 易彬,

When Zürcher passed away several obituaries were published. Ter Haar singles out Ad Dudink, “In Memoriam,” *Sino-Western Cultural Relations Journal* 30 (2008), 1–16 as the best. Nicolas Standaert provided a lengthy evaluation of Zürcher’s work on the Jesuit missionaries and their Chinese converts in his “Erik Zürcher’s Study of Christianity in Seventeenth Century China: An Intellectual Portrait,” *China Review International* 15.4 (2008), 476–502. For an evaluation of Zürcher’s contribution to the study of Buddhism one may consult Jonathan A. Silk, “Introduction,” in Jonathan A. Silk, ed., *Buddhism in China: Collected Papers of Erik Zürcher* (Leiden, Brill, 2013), 1–25.

Today the students of Chinese affairs tend to be academics who spend their whole careers within the cushioning walls of academia. If they travel to East Asia they usually do so on scholarships and are based at universities or research centers. Whatever their adventures of the mind, they usually live rather placid lives. One can only wonder how many of them will attract monographic treatment of their lives and works in years to come.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares none.

“Helan wenban Lu Xun zuopin de chuanbo yu jieshou yanjiu” 荷兰文版鲁迅作品的传播与接受研究, *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue yanjiu* 2018.10, 151–71.