UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Santa Barbara

Protestant Missions, Seminaries and the Academic Study of Islam in the United States

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Religious Studies

by

Caleb D. McCarthy

Committee in charge:

Professor Juan E. Campo, Chair

Professor Kathleen M. Moore

Professor Ann Taves

June 2018

The dissertation of Caleb D. McCarthy is approved.

_____
Kathleen M. Moore

_____
Ann Taves

_____
Juan E. Campo, Committee Chair

June 2018

Protestant Missions, Seminaries and the Academic Study of Islam in the United States

Copyright © 2018

by

Caleb D. McCarthy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While the production of a dissertation is commonly idealized as a solitary act of scholarly virtuosity, the reality might be better expressed with slight emendation to the oft-quoted proverb, “it takes a village to write a dissertation.” This particular dissertation at least exists only in light of the significant support I have received over the years. To my dissertation committee Ann Taves, Kathleen Moore and, especially, advisor Juan Campo, I extend my thanks for their productive advice and critique along the way. They are the most prominent among many faculty members who have encouraged my scholarly development. I am also indebted to the Council on Information and Library Research of the Andrew C. Mellon Foundation, which funded the bulk of my archival research – without their support this project would not have been possible. Likewise, I am grateful to the numerous librarians and archivists who guided me through their collections – in particular, UCSB’s retired Middle East librarian Meryle Gaston, and the Near East School of Theology in Beriut’s former librarian Christine Linder. Additionally worthy of mention are the numerous colleagues and friends who offered not only scholarly support, but also commiseration and reminders of joy amidst the doldrums of writing. There are too many to name, but I make special mention of Aaron, Rico, Josh, Peter, Liz, Gwen and Andrew. Finally, I thank my wonderful parents who have encouraged me tirelessly, not only on this project, but in general to live a life full of curiosity and empathy in whatever forms that might take.

الحمد لله

VITA OF CALEB D. MCCARTHY

March 2018

EDUCATION

2018 PhD, Religious Studies, University of California Santa Barbara.

2011 MA, Religious Studies, University of California Santa Barbara.

2007 BA, History; Middle Eastern Studies (Hebrew), University of Utah.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

University of California Santa Barbara

Teaching Associate (Instructor of Record)

Islamic Traditions (Upper Division), Department of Religious Studies, 2015, 2017, 2018.

Introduction to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (Lower Division), Department of Religious Studies, 2013 & 2014.

California Lutheran University

Adjunct Instructor

Muslims in the Modern World (Upper Division), Department of Religion, 2017.

GRANTS, FELLOWSHIPS AND AWARDS

Research Fellowships

2014 Graduate Division Dissertation Fellowship, University of California Santa Barbara.

2013 Andrew Mellon Fellowship for Dissertation Research in Original Sources, CLIR, 2013-14.

2013 Humanities Research Assistantship, University of California Santa Barbara, 2013-14 (accepted in part).

Honors and Awards

2015 The Professor Charles Wendell Memorial Award for Academic Achievement in Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies. Religious Studies, UCSB.

PUBLICATIONS

Peer Reviewed Articles

2016 "'The Islamic State is not Islamic:' Terrorism, Sovereignty, and Declarations of Unbelief," *Critical Research on Religion* 4:2, 2016; pp. 158-170.

ABSTRACT

Protestant Missions, Seminaries and the Academic Study of Islam in the United States

by

Caleb D. McCarthy

“Protestant Missions, Seminaries and the Academic Study of Islam in the United States” presents an institutional history of the influence of Christian missionaries on the development of Islamic Studies as an academic field during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. The dissertation -- based on extensive archival research in the U.S. and Middle East -- argues that missionaries through their interactions with Muslims provided significant direction to both the theoretical and institutional foundations of Islamic studies in U.S. universities and seminaries, connecting American studies of Islam with European Orientalism, while simultaneously framing the study within their confessional and national horizons. This missionary scholarship, unlike most of that which came before it, valued religion as its primary analytical category and in turn emphasized Islam as a contemporary and globally diverse religion. Additionally, the missionary side of Islamic studies was instrumental in facilitating the participation of women and immigrant scholars, while also limiting the range of their involvement to particular dimensions of that study. Understanding the roots of Islamic Studies in the U.S. is essential to mapping its trajectory to the present, and is also instructive as a historical consideration of the relationship between Muslims and the West.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ……...…… iv

List of Abbreviations ……...… viii

Introduction: The Study of Islam in the U.S. ……..…. 1

Chapter 1: The "Research Missionary" and the Study of Islam ...…… 24

Chapter 2: Islamic Studies in U.S. Seminaries and Colleges ……..……..…… 66

Chapter 3: Missionary Scholarship and the Study of Islam as Religion ……... 107

Chapter 4: Missionary Women and the "Moslem Woman" ……... 158

Chapter 5: "Voices from the Near East" and the Diversification of the Field ……200

Conclusion: The Study of Islam in America ……..…. 249

Bibliography …….…….. 258

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABCFM	American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions
AOS	American Oriental Society
CMS	Church Mission Society
IMC	International Missionary Council
PCUSA	Presbyterian Church of the United States of America
RCA	Reformed Church of America
SPG	Society for Propagation of the Gospel
UMC	United Missionary Council
UPCNA	United Presbyterian Church of North America
WBM	Women's Board of Missions
ACFGC	American College for Girls, Constantinople
AUB	American University of Beirut (originally SPC)
AUC	American University at Cairo
CSC	Cairo Study Center (renamed SOS)
NBTS	New Brunswick Theological Seminary
NEST	Near East School of Theology
PTS	Princeton Theological Seminary
SOR	School of Religion (Athens/Constantinople)
SOS	School of Oriental Studies (AUC)
SPC	Syrian Protestant College (renamed AUB)
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
MW	*The Moslem World* (*The Muslim World*)
RMM	*Revue du Monde Musulman*

INTRODUCTION

THE STUDY OF ISLAM IN THE UNITED STATES

On a warm July day in 1911, a middle-aged missionary opened with some trepidation a letter from the renowned Hungarian Islamicist Ignaz Goldziher. The letter extended an invitation for the missionary to join Goldziher in the afternoons and engage in a leisurely course of study – sure to include conversational walks in the nearby woods and mountains – on things Islamic.[1] By 1911, Goldziher was recognized among the top tier of European scholars studying Islam and especially Islamic law and hadith. The missionary, Canon W.H.T. Gairdner, was in Germany having come precisely in search of such specialized knowledge at the encouragement of another prominent scholar, Duncan Black Macdonald, who had by that year established the first dedicated program for the study of Islam in the United States. Macdonald had introduced Gairdner to Dutch colonialist scholar Claude Snouck Hurgronje, who in turn had written an introduction to Goldziher suggesting Gairdner as a suitable pupil. This series of personal introductions highlights not only the network of connections between scholars of Islam in Europe and America, but more substantially its link to missionary training on the topic of Islam.

Thirty years prior to that day in July, Islamic studies in America was virtually non-existent. A handful of schools offered coursework in Arabic that at times would assign the reading of Islamic texts such as the Qur'an and Hadith. Occasional articles appeared in the

[1] Letter from Gairdner to Macdonald (July 17, 1911), Macdonald Collection Box 93: Folder 1918, 49125 [Hartford Seminary].

pages of journals such as the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (*JAOS*) discussing the tradition in some limited facet. In the popular realm, Islam served largely as a point of comparison to use in polemics against political and religious rivals.

Thirty years following the letter, the study of Islam was embedded in an increasing number of academic departments within American colleges. There was an American-led English-language journal dedicated significantly to the topic of Muslims and their religious traditions: *The Moslem World*. And, while Islam was often still maligned in popular mediums, there were the beginnings of a push for interfaith discussion and dialogue within the United States. In what follows I argue that the dramatic changes in the academic landscape of American Islamic Studies were to a large degree directly linked to the history of Protestant missions to Muslims and related implementation of missionary training programs.

Considering the connections between missions and scholarship serves as a reminder for contemporary scholars of how confessional, theological (and non-theological) frameworks shape the definitional contours of what is included in the study of religion. The missionaries examined herein were bound to conceptualizations of "religion" as a category, deeply rooted in Protestant (and especially American) frameworks. So in considering Islam, they drew upon Christian examples to make comparative sense (as well as critique) of this "other" religion. Further, in connection with their missional presence all over the globe, missionaries recognized the geographic and cultural diversity of Muslim communities, in turn emphasizing the study of the contemporary Islam.

These two emphases – religion and the contemporary – separated missionary scholarship from most other scholarship on Islam at the time. On the one hand, in

prioritizing the contemporary and lived experience of Muslims, mission-affiliated scholarship broke with the traditional Orientalist focus on classical and textual study. On the other, in making "religion" its primary analytical category, missionaries delineated a course of study different from colonialist scholarship, which was primarily interested in the political and social dynamics of Muslim societies in regards to colonial maintenance. These missionary categories for scholarship substantially informed the institutional and intellectual frameworks that shaped the English-language, and especially American, study of Islam. What this reevaluation of the emergence of the academic study of Islam in America demonstrates is not so much a critique of the ideas themselves, but rather a history of the epistemological formation of that study and its institutionalization.

In what follows I trace the rise of the missionary scholar, or following the appellation given by Goldizher and Macdonald to Gairdner, the "research missionary," a man or woman dedicated to the evangelical calling while also producing scholarship on Islam. It was not only that individual research missionaries influenced the development of Islamic Studies in their particular scholarly contributions. It was also, and more so, the formalization of missionary training programs, which served as some of the earliest sites for the American Islamic Studies. In short, I contend that in the American context, rather than seeing the study of Islam emerge primarily as a product of philological, Semitic and biblical studies (as was the case in Europe), it instead developed as a product of missionary training. Notably, missionary training was not only present in seminaries, but also in American universities and colleges, and in Protestant mission-stations around the world.

The History of Islamic Studies

Chronologically, the development of U.S. academic Islamicism has antecedents even before the Civil War, but the establishment of scholarly programs and resources related to the study of Islam was largely inaugurated in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, and missionary-connections were especially visible throughout the interwar period. It is impossible to look at the scholarly study of Islam in the U.S. and not observe the imprint of European Orientalist scholarship. At the same time, the United States had a much less complicated relationship with Islam in its imperial and cultural manifestations. European scholarly interest in Islam grew out of centuries of direct interaction with so-called Muslim empires. The study of Islam was thus born for Europe largely out of a great fear of dominating rival powers (e.g. Ottoman, Moravid, etc.). It was in the framework of this military threat that the first European scholars of Islam appeared. Figures such as Petrus Alfonsi, Raymund Lull and Francis of Assisi were among the earliest, considering Islam theologically as a rival tradition (or a Christian heresy) that could be proved false through study. In this approach they challenged the military response of the European powers and Catholic Church as demonstrated in the Crusades.

The work of these twelfth to fifteenth century Europeans tended to focus on depicting Muhammad as a false prophet, often drawing upon Arabic-speaking Christian polemics as they were transmitted into Europe. These accounts often focused on the idea of Muhammad as preacher of a heretical interpretation of Christianity, as well as critiques of his sexuality (which was shocking in regards to the valuation of celibate life endorsed by many of the earlier Catholic priestly/monastic authors of such texts).[2] Interestingly, it

[2] For more on the depictions of medieval and early modern European accounts of Muhammad in European see John Tolan, "European Accounts of Muhammad's Life," *The Cambridge Companion to*

appears the term *Mohammadanism* as the commonly-used designation for the religion of Muslims emerged through the prioritization of the religion's founder in such Christian scholarship as analogue to Christ/Christian. In any case, these early scholars produced polemics and scholarship about Islamic traditions that would have long lasting impacts. It was not that these more priestly/theological scholars viewed Islam as less of a threat than their military-minded compatriots, but that they believed the solution to the threat was solvable through intellectual and spiritual warfare. For Europe the scholarly engagement with Islam was always carried out alongside the real interactions and presence of Muslim empires at their borders; and later the interaction and presence of Muslim subjects within colonial empires.

While Americans inherited this European fear of Islam as a rival religion and empire, they largely lacked the tangible experience with Muslims as a politically dominant power, or the converse case, as political subjects. In the American imagination there was a limited need to care about Islam outside of fancy. Of course there were Muslim slaves taken from Africa, and fanciful tales of Barbary pirates taking hostage white American travelers in the Mediterranean, but these proved poor motivation for scholarly consideration of Islam in the U.S. It would be missionaries who would cultivate a larger interest in Islam and Muslims within the American scholarly setting precisely because they had immediate experience with living Muslims. For American Christian missionaries the conception of Islam as a problem to be solved emerged after more than a half-century of evangelical failure to convert Muslims in the nineteenth century. This missionary concern reiterated the narrative of Islam

---

Muhammad, Jonathan E Brockopp (ed.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Many of the ideas perpetuated in these early accounts persist today, and were certainly visible in the accounts of many of the missionaries we will consider.

as a problem, but as with the theologian-scholars of Europe, the problem was primarily a religious and missional one.

Catholic and Protestant European missions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries informed the scholarship in Europe as well. The efforts of Catholic missions (especially the Jesuits), motivated from similar conversionary desire (and often in competition with Protestants), produced many prominent Orientalists (e.g. Henri Lammens). While a study of the Catholic dimensions would certainly be informative and welcome, I engage with this dimension only as it dovetails with the American study of Islam. For instance, amidst growing ecumenism in the twentieth century there was a greater acceptance and reading of Catholic scholars, such as Louis Massignon, among Protestant scholars of Islam. However, as Americans were a bit late in coming to the Orientalist table, Europe through its colonial machination had developed a vibrant Orientalist industry which expanded far beyond missionary work (and often was highly critical of missionary scholarship). The scholarship in the United States would move in these directions as the twentieth century progressed, but its roots were in Protestant missionary training.

The History of the History of Islamic Studies in the United States

Existing accounts of the emergence of Islamic Studies in the United States tend to focus on the post-WWII period and largely ignore the contributions of missionaries. The discussions that do occur of missionary scholarship are mostly critiques of their work and while such critique is often valid, generally overlook the historical importance of missions as an institution for generating scholarship. Attempting to catalogue the history of Islamic Studies is also complicated by its interdisciplinary nature, which has been imbedded in the

broader discourse of Orientalism, and especially represented in the scholarly fields of philology, comparative religions, and area studies. That is, Islam has been studied as an artifact useful to Semitics via its textual traditions in Arabic; as a religion in relation to other religions; and a unifying marker bound to geographical and social-political communities (e.g. The Muslim World or the Middle East). When one engages in Middle Eastern Studies, part of that study will likely include the study of Islam. When one studies Arabic, texts such as the Qur'an become indispensable. When one studies Christian history, Islam becomes a significant comparative case as a related/rival religion. All of this is to say that the exact realms of the study of Islam have varied. In attempting to recognize this distinction, I will generally use the phrase Islamic Studies to refer to the field as a discrete academic and disciplinary category, whereas the study of Islam refers to the broad considerations of Islam as a component in a range of disciplinary circles and for a variety of aims.[3]

It remains difficult to speak of the history of the study of Islam without saying something of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978). Said's argument that the class of scholars termed Orientalists constructed a mythical Orient as the counterpoint to the Occident in an attempt to affirm distinctive ontological Occidental and Oriental characters, serves as one of the most widely recognized critiques of Orientalists and in turn scholars of Islam. As Said frames this caste, "The scientist, the scholar, the missionary, the trader, or the soldier was in, or thought about, the Orient because he could be there, or could think about it, with very little resistance on the Orient's part."[4] Here Said explicitly recognized the role of missionaries as beneficiaries of and contributors to Orientalism. Yet, in casting missions and

[3] It is problematic to refer to a discrete Islamic Studies in the US prior to 1911. Until then the study of Islam was entirely tied up in other departments. Even the 1911 opening of the Department of "Moslem Lands" in the School of Missions at Hartford Seminary is an exceptional case as we will see.

[4] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Penguin, 2003 [1979]), 7.

missionaries as part of this monolithic Orientalism bound to the colonial project something is lost. While he is correct to note that missionaries were part of the process, by clumping all of these professions together, the nuances of involvement are lost. It is quite obvious that the missionary and the trader, the solider and the scholar had different agendas in studying the so-called Orient. The ways in which missionary scholars debated such categories among themselves is less obvious. By conflating all Orientalists together, the particular influences of missionaries on both the conceptual and institutional formation of related fields are concealed.

Earlier critiques of Orientalism, such as A.L. Tibawi's *English Speaking Orientalists* (1963), highlight some of the trends in Christian scholarship in Islamic and Oriental studies. Tibawi recognizes that there was a large degree of cooperation between missionaries and Orientalist scholars: "the missionary prayed, and the Orientalist speculated, and both wrote and continue to write, with varying degrees of subtlety and insight on the subject."[5] Tibawi in his short critique provides one of the more explicit and fruitful recognitions of the links between Protestant missions and production of scholarship, but his work is more an assessment of the state of the field at the time of his writing, rather than a history of the field. He does offer a brief overview of the long hostility of both Jewish and Christian scholars (from Byzantium and onward) towards Islam. Tibawi also highlights the strong links between Biblical Studies in England and Arabic studies, which ultimately bound both the theological aims of the past with the so-called objective observation of post-Enlightenment scholarship. But after this brief introduction he returns to his critique of living Orientalists. Notably, his critique admits a possibility of valuable contribution from missionary and theological channels, and this tempering of invective may have at least a

[5] A.L. Tibawi, "English-Speaking Orientalistst (part 1)" *The Muslim World*, (53:3, 1963), 188.

little to do with his time spent researching at the American University of Beirut – an institution bearing associations with American missionary efforts in the region.[6]

Tibawi takes aim primarily at the Arabists as they were invested in the study of the Middle East and Islam. His concern emerges from a fear that "'religious' prejudices have more recently been reinforced by new 'national' prejudices…. That the feeling of hatred long reserved for Islam has now been extended to the Arabs."[7] Here, Tibawi does not mean to critique any explicit polemic or missionary aims in the work of his contemporary English-speaking Orientalists/Arabists, who he defends as engaging in purely "academic activity," but is concerned that the suppositions underlying their research are often problematic and linked to the long history of European antipathy towards Islam. Tibawi proceeds to address some of the most prevalent issues, such as the treatment of Muhammad and ideas of foreign influence in the Qur'an and early traditions.[8] Through this he highlights the numerous Christian standards by which Islam is compared and judged.

While Tibawi is careful to soften his critique by maintaining the scholarly aims of the work, more scathing critiques of the Christian endeavor of Orientalism followed. For instance, Asaf Hussain, observes that "Christian missionaries laid the foundation for the development of Orientalism." According to Hussain, missionary influence peaked in first half of nineteenth century, but he also notes the works of twentieth century Christian scholars of Islam, such as "Zwemmer [sic], Lammens, MacDonald [sic], Watt, and Cragg" who "produced studies which created doubts about Islam or relegated it to an inferior status…. In fact the missionary Orientalists had one objective and that was 'to deny and

[6] Letter from Mrs. Edith M. Laird (acting director AUB) to American Mission (August 5, 1957) offered a letter of introduction of Tibawi to the AUB mission, in order that they might approve his use of the missionary records. Syrian Mission Files RG115 Box 3: Folder 14 [Presbyterian Historical Society]

[7] Tibawi, 189.

[8] Tibawi, 188-192.

disprove the Prophet's status as such and the Qur'an as revelation.' In other words, they did not study Islam to understand it, but to discredit it."[9] This of course would be a damning invective were it true. It is perhaps accurate to say that most missionaries personally held the position that Muhammad and his revelation were false, but to reduce all missionary scholarship to the aim of making this claim, demonstrates a simplistic reading of the large canon of works produced by missionaries on a variety of topics and for a variety of purposes. This is not to say that Hussain's argument was not the case in specific instances, but such dismissive readings of missionary scholarship distracts one from observing the significant ways missionaries directed the development of the study of Islam as it persists today.

To further expand on Hussain's claim, consider the remarks by Gordon Pruett. Pruett argues the Orientalist "fails to see the transcendent truth and good in the Muslim tradition and thinks of it as a cultural artifact only."[10] This, Pruett suggests, may on the surface seem a reasonable approach for the Orientalist as "he" is not a Muslim. However, Pruett challenges,

> 1) that unless the Orientalists accepts the truth of the assertion that the history of Islam is indeed the history of attempts to submit to Allah, he will… misunderstand that history…. 2) that the concern for 'objectivity' as the Orientalist defines it is a misguided goal based on prior reification… of Muslim faith – an act which is possible … for one who begins with the unquestioned assumption that Muslim history is *not* a history of attempts to submit to Allah…. 3) That it is indeed possible to adopt a perspective from which to view Muslim history as Muslims view it, by accepting the truth of the transcendent orientation of the tradition.[11]

[9] Asaf Hussain "The Ideology of Orientalism" in *Orientalism, Islam, and the Islamists,* Hussain, Olson, Qureshi (eds.), (Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1984), 7. Many of these figures were also subject of critique for Tibawi. Correct spelling of names in Hussain should read as Zwemer and Macdonald.

[10] Pruett "'Islam' and Orientalism" in *Orientalism, Islam and the Islamists,* Hussain, Olson and Qureshi (eds.), (Brattleboro, VT: Amana Books, 1984), 44.

[11] Pruett, 44.

So how might a missionary respond to such a point? Well, perhaps with the following, as the missionary James Stewart Crawford wrote seventy years earlier,

> Islam remains vital because it is a religion. Before all else it may be socially and politically, Islam is a system that in its own way serves to maintain the religious life of its followers…. this elementary proposition is sometimes called in question. To all who do so we can only say that they have remained strangers to the inward invisible forces of Mohammedanism.[12]

Crawford's statement illustrates the ability of the outsider to recognize that the vivacity of Islam in the lives of Muslim is precisely in its transcendent qualities. The mistake of so many critiques of missionary scholarship seems to be largely in the fact that they are critiquing the stereotype of missionary scholarship, or the worst excesses of such scholarship, rather than considering the actual and complex writings by missionaries, and perhaps more importantly the institutional structures which made such scholarship and influence possible. But what Tibawi and these other critiques do highlight are the links between Christian missionaries and better-established scholars of Islam, and they are right to interrogate how Christian evangelical and theological thought has influenced the study of Islam.

Jacques Waardenburg has offered a compelling comparative case study of some of the formative thinkers of Islamic Studies in his *L'Islam en du Mirriore*, which traces the interpersonal and intellectual connections between Ignaz Goldziher, C.S. Hurgronje, Martin Becker, D.B. Macdonald and Louis Massignon.[13] In the work he likewise recognizes the

[12] Crawford "Fourth Study," in *Vital Forces*, Gairdner, Macdonald and Zwemer (eds.), (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1915), 127.

[13] Waardenburg details nicely the interactions between these figures, and their influence on one another. At the same time, Macdonald's geographical separation from those he clearly viewed as close colleagues is apparent in a letter from Hurgronje to Macdonald (April 4, 1920; Macdonald Collection Box 95, Folder 1952 #50044 [Hartford Seminary]), "With Sachau I have never been in strong personal sympathy; we had frequent connexions in 1886, and I got the impressions of what Germans call a 'streber' and avoided him ever since. So without being on bad terms with him, I rarely get news from or concerning him. My young colleague Wensinck being his pupil, knows little more about him. He seems to feel very old and sad. From

connections of Christian theological frameworks (especially for Macdonald and Massignon) in influencing the study of Islamic theology, mysticism and law. In particular, he notes how these scholars focused especially on the work of ʻAbū al-Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ghazālī (d.1111), the influential Sunni scholar. Waardenburg's biography and analysis of Macdonald is particularly instructive in relation to the missionary roots of Islamic Studies, given Macdonald's work at Hartford Seminary training missionaries.

Waardenburg makes a compelling case that Macdonald's approach to the study of Islam and religion was theocentric and that he was especially intrigued by the mystical dimensions of religion. Macdonald's work introduced the idea of an "invisible world [*monde invisible*]" to Islamic Studies, by which Macdonald allowed for metaphysical and supernatural phenomenon as part of religious experience.[14] Waardenburg also observes his complicated relationship with Christian mission, which Macdonald maintained as necessary, though primarily in response to his fears of materialism/atheism taking hold in place of religions.[15] Macdonald stands in the American context as the primary figure to introduce the study of Islam, bringing together the scholarly concerns of Europe with the evangelical concerns of Christian missionaries. He was in many ways the bridge that allowed missionary scholarship on Islam to take hold in the American context and gain followers beyond.

Waardenburg declares Macdonald a Protestant spiritualist with a "personal [*individuelle*] notion of God."[16] It is not an unfair label and yet at the same time Macdonald

---

Noldeke I get letters now and then…. Notwithstanding his 84 years (reached March 2) he is always working steadily, but he wrote me the last time his bodily condition was very bad and he hoped not to live much longer…. Goldziher has had the most terrible time of his life: all sorts of illness came over him and his family…. If you write him a letter this will have the beneficent effect of medicine. He was so glad to receive kind letters from Massignon. Massignon is lecturer at the College de France on Mohammedanism; his delicate constitution is a great hindrance to his work."

[14] Waardenburg, *L'Islam dans Le Miroir de L'Occident* (Paris: Mouton & Co., 1962), 255-56.

[15] Waardenburg, 274.

[16] Waardenburg, 282.

was a committed Protestant theologian. Macdonald believed in the idea of personal and mystical experience of God in line with Protestant Christian understandings. In a letter to one of his students, Macdonald wrote, "I cannot see that your theology is in any respect different from that of the historic Christian Church; only now you see it from within and not from without; it is a living fact and not a system."[17] The experience of religion was the essential component, and it was this experience he sought to chronicle through comparative parallels in the lives of Muslims.[18]

I have no desire to defend the scholarship of missionaries. In what follows we will see that missionaries were at times complicit in colonial exploitation and their scholarship was often problematic. At the same time, missionaries were aware of this. By indicating the range of missionary perspectives on Islam, I do not mean to free them of the burden of criticism, but rather highlight the often vibrant and competing discussions which took place within missionary and broader scholarly channels. The truism that the scholarship was a product of its time holds, but it also shaped the future of that study. We must take seriously this reality and not simply dismiss it because they – like their Muslim counterparts – believed the truth of the religion they professed.

Moving towards more specific histories of the study of Islam (and the American context), rather than broader Orientalism a number of accounts can be considered.[19] Muhsin

[17]Letter from Macdonald to Calverley (July 3, 1919) Macdonald Collection Box 95, Folder 1948, #49930 [Hartford Seminary].

[18] Likewise it was these ideas that connected him personally and intellectually with Louis Massignon. The personally-held sense of the experiential understanding of Christianity that influenced both of their works, can perhaps be seen also in Massignon's comments to Macdonald (Letter Jan 18, 1919, Macdonald Collection Box 95; Folder 1947, 49868 [Hartford Seminary]), "More than ever, I am burnt by the desire to love God - and he is Purity, and I am a rather wretched sinner, and still I am longing, amid my daily work, after the fair face of my Lord, though there may be on it only, for me, the wrath of an indignant Judge."

[19]Azim Nanji, *Mapping Islamic Studies* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyters,1997) and Edmund Burke III and David Prochaska (eds.), *Genealogies of Orientalism* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008) as edited volumes offer a range of articles discussing developments in Islamic studies. Another paralleling text is

Mahdi locates its inception in America almost *ex-nihilo* in the work of Gustave Grunebaum and H.A.R. Gibb, both of whom were established European scholars who immigrated to America in the 1940s.[20] He makings passing references to a few other figures influential prior to them, such as Duncan Black Macdonald and Philip Hitti, but leaves out any sustained consideration of how the soil had been prepared for the arrival of the two "G's", and makes no mention of missionaries. Of course, war conditions in Europe were responsible to a degree in bringing European scholars to the U.S., but their reception in the United States necessarily relied upon existing programs of study, which we will see were closely bound to missionary efforts.

An example of explicit recognition for missionary contributions to the study of Islam is offered by Charles J. Adams' contribution to Leonard Binder's edited collection of essays *The Study of the Middle East* (1976). Adams, who was director of the Institute of Islamic Studies at McGill University, contends, "Missionaries and colonial officials were among the earliest serious contributors to the growth of the science of Islamics, and until recent times were a basic constituent of the scholarly community… all who now work in the Islamics field owe them a great debt."[21] Adams' brief assessment in this piece gives little indication what precisely this debt was, other than to note shift from apologetic towards irenic tendencies in later (1940s and 50s) scholarship.

Zachary Lockman's *Contending Visions of the Middle East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), which offers a related account of how the Middle East has been studied in American and European scholarship. Others such Richard King, *Orientalism and Religion Post-Colonial Theory* (London: Routledge, 1999) and Bryan Turner, *Orientalism, Postmodernism, and Globalization* (London: Routledge, 1994) add to the discussion. While offering productive treatment of the development of the field, the above works pay little mind to missionary and seminary influences.

[20] Mahdi "The Study of Islam, Orientalism, and America" in *Mapping Islamic Studies*, 158.

[21] Adams in *The Study of the Middle East,* Binder (ed.) (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976), 36.

Adam's remarks at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion in 1973 on "The History of Religions and the Study of Islam," are more instructive.[22] In the address he presents a "gloomy" portrait of the state of Islamic Studies, noting its recognized and yet persistent neglect. His account focuses on the state of the historical and philological studies of Islamics, although he recognizes other dimensions pursued in the phenomenological and "contemporary reality of Islam as a living faith."[23] Notably, in this account he intentionally leaves out the work of missionary and apologetic approaches, as well as those scholars who produce work which indirectly examines Islam (e.g. political and social studies, which touch on Islamic studies only incidentally). I am not debating his assessment of the field as sparse during the mid-century, but I would point to his later recognition of the huge debt to missionary work to highlight that how leaving them out of the equation results in a scarcity of studies. In the American context at least, missionaries and missionary-training were until mid-century the main contributors to Islamic Studies, however biased their approaches might have been. Such history was part of an older American discourse about Islam.

Fuad Sha'ban in *Islam and Arabs in Early American Thought* (1991) examines Puritan influences on the development of thought about Islam in the U.S. up through the missionary career of Henry Jessup (late nineteenth century). Timothy Marr has offered a similar treatment of early American engagement with Muslims and Islam. While both of these accounts offer fruitful insight into American perceptions of Islam, they are not primarily interested in the formation of its scholarly study. Shaban does observe that in the latter half of the nineteenth century American Orientalist scholarship developed significantly

[22] Charles J. Adams, "The History of Religions and the Study of Islam," *ACLS Newsletter* 25/3-4 (1974), pp. 1-10.

[23] Adams, "The History of Religions and the Study of Islam," 2.

in relationship to the missionary enterprise, transcendentalists, free religion, and universalists.[24] However, as his focus is primarily on earlier periods, he does not discuss in much detail the institutionalization of this scholarship during this latter period. Thomas Kidd's *American Christians and Islam* (2009) engages in a similar project to Shaban and Marr, while forging ahead into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. However, Kidd is likewise preeminently concerned with popular conceptions of Islam in the U.S. and has little to say about the scholarly production informing it.

Additionally, there are a couple short papers discussing the development of Islamic Studies along the lines of Religious Studies: Carl Ernst's "The Study of Religion and the Study of Islam,"[25] and Kurzman and Ernst's "Islamic Studies in U.S. Universities."[26] This latter piece allots two paragraphs discussing two centuries worth of American interest in Islam from the early eighteenth to early twentieth century. In this brief summation, Ernst and Kurzman highlight D.B. Macdonald as the first proper professor of Islamic Studies, but declare the true North American beginnings of the discipline of Islamic Studies with the opening of the so-named institute at McGill University in 1952. As for the U.S. they point to Hartford Seminary and its Duncan Black Macdonald Center for the Study of Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations (est. 1973), as the first U.S. location.[27] It is somewhat perplexing given their awareness of both Macdonald's work as a professor in the "Mohammedan department" (actually titled "Department of Moslem Lands") that they do

[24] Fuad Sha'ban, *Islam and Aras in Early American Thought* (Durham: The Acorn Press, 1991), 28.

[25] Carl Ernst, "The Study of Religion and the Study of Islam" Paper given at Workshop on "Integrating Islamic Studies in Liberal Arts Curricula," University of Washington, Seattle WA, March 6-8, 1998. Available online: http://www.unc.edu/~cernst/study.htm (Accessed Feb 2017).

[26] Ernst and Kurzman, "Islamic Studies in U.S. Universities," *Review of Middle East Studies* 46:1 (2012).

[27] Although they observe earlier examples of Islamic Studies scholarship in the 1950s with the work of Grunebaum. However, Grunenbaum's program at UCLA was organized under the banner of Near East Studies.

not consider this the first department of Islamic Studies. Why the authors do not consider that department as the first is unclear, but one might presume that it has something do with the fact that said department was part of the Kennedy School of Missions at Hartford Seminary. Their account excises missions as a contributing factor, instead suggesting more generally that "Christian theology" had a large influence on the development of the field. While this was certainly true, this more general admission obscures the particularities of missionary scholarship, which while grounded in Christian theology, was also produced by individuals living among and interacting with Muslims. In fact, the second half of their statement that "Islamic studies in the U.S. originated in the tradition of Orientalist scholarship and Christian theology, with its strong textual emphasis, *but it has gradually expanded to overlap with Middle East area studies as well as a number of humanistic and social science disciplines, especially religious studies*,"[28] is better understood through the recognition of missionary contributions, which prioritized study of contemporary and geographically diverse communities of Muslims.

Relatedly, there are a number of works dealing with the development of religious studies (comparative religion, world religions, history of religions) that observe how the study of Islam took place under such headings.[29] Of particular note is Tomoko Masuzawa's *Invention of World Religions*, which includes a chapter discussing the way Islam was conceived in world religions' rhetoric as a Semitic religion during the nineteenth century in Europe. The conception of world religions more generally was a project of European scholarship that emerged in connection with philology and comparative linguistics.

[28] Ernst & Kurzman, 24. Emphasis mine.

[29] Sharpe's *Comparative Religion* (1975), Cherry Conrad's *Hurrying Towards Zion* (1995), Braun and McCutcheon's *Guide to the Study of Religion* (2000), and Tomoko Masuzawa's *Invention of World Religions* (2005).

Masuzawa's primary concern is how such rhetoric formed and informed the European consciousness of itself as "harbinger of universal history, as a prototype of unity amid plurality."[30] Her conclusions about the emergence of the study of world religions in Europe, however, offer insight into similar developments in the United States.

Most recently Zachary Lockman's *Field Notes* (2016) examines the related history of the development of Middle Eastern Studies in the U.S. It is an impressive account of the work of scholars and funding agencies in developing area studies generally, and Middle Eastern studies specifically.[31] Yet, like so many of the other studies, it overlooks missionaries – even while discussing them. For instance, in 1938 the American Council for Learned Societies (ACLS) formed a committee to develop Arabic and Islamic Studies, selecting for it five men: George Howland Shaw, Edwin Calverley, Arthur Jeffery, William Thomson and Philip Hitti. Four of the five had some connection to Christian mission. Calverley and Jeffery had each served as missionaries to Muslims before taking professorships at Hartford Seminary and Columbia University respectively. Calverely was also, along with Thomson, a pupil of Duncan Black Macdonald at Hartford Seminary.[32] Hitti was indirectly connected through the history of missions in Lebanon, where he had studied and taught at the Syrian Protestant College (later American University of Beirut). Yet, Lockman hardly makes reference to these significant indirect and direct connections

[30] Tomoko Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), ix.

[31] Lockman's history examines the antecedents of Middle Eastern studies in the United States in the pre-WWII period. This goes against the common narrative for the study, which suggests its emergence after the war. For instance Timothy Mitchell writes, "The founding of the Middle East Institute in Washington D.C. in May 1946 seems a convenient event to mark the arrival of Middle Eastern area studies in the United States." (Mitchell, "The Middle East in the Past and Future of Social Science," *UCIAS Edited Volume 3*, 2003, 1). Mitchell in the article does discuss earlier efforts significant to the study, such as Phillip Hitti's work at Princeton beginning in 1927.

[32] Lockman discusses Macdonald's work in a brief paragraph. He also briefly mentions *The Moslem World*. See *Contending Visions,* 8-10.

throughout the work. While this is somewhat understandable as Lockman is primarily concerned with the post-WWII period in which missionaries became increasingly less significant within scholarly circles, it highlights how missionary connections to scholarship are regularly overlooked.

The negligence related to considerations of missionary dimensions of Islamic studies seems to indicate a blindspot (intentional or otherwise) in these intellectual and institutional cartographies. Why have scholars been so willing to ignore or readily dismiss missionary efforts towards scholarship? One argument is that such scholarship was recognized in its time as problematic or unoriginal and as such had little influence on the field. The first half of this statement might be argued successfully. At a glance, a lot of what missionaries produced was derivative, adding little to existing discussions; or, it was poorly argued and based upon inadequate research. Missionaries and their supporters were aware of such shortcomings, real and perceived. As one ironic exchange between an associate editor for the missionary-supported *The Moslem World* wrote to a colleague, "I am anxious to avoid mistekes [sic] which would bring discredit upon the 'Moslem World,' and thereby on the cause of Missions."[33] Ironic typo aside, we can see that missionaries were concerned with how they were viewed and that critique of their work is hardly new. With such longstanding censure, it is easy to see why scholars are so ready to brush off their hands and be done with any lengthy consideration of missionaries and their work as a noteworthy contributor to the study of Islam. Yet, such accounting fails to adequately consider the vast network of scholars and their connection to missions, who in fact shaped the field.

[33] Letter from Shellabear to Macdonald (Nov 14, 1921) – Macdonald Collection Box 95; Folder 1961, 50307 [Hartford Seminary]. Similarily, D.B. Macdonald once advised a student writing a book review for the *American Historical Review* to "keep missions out of sight and write as quite a 'godless historian'!" (Letter from Macdonald to Titus (Jan 21, 1929) Macdonald Collection Box 98: Folder 99, 51614[Hartford Seminary]).

The connection with missionary scholarship and agendas of proselytization and conversions is not to be dismissed. This was certainly a motivating element for the study. And yet, like most scholarship, much of the dregs of the missionary scholarship were sifted, and a number of important and influential examples remained. Dismissing the entirety of contributions of missionary scholarship simply because some (or even much) of it was "bad," conceals the history of field. Just because one does not agree with missionary aims, does not remove them from the complicated legacy of the development of the field.

The Missionary Study of Islam

In what follows we will trace the missionary contributions to the study of Islam and the foundations of Islamic studies within U.S. institutions, attempting to provide a more detailed picture of the significance of such scholars in shaping its study. This research is grounded upon the assessment of a wide-range of missionary correspondence and university bureaucratic documentation contained in archives and special collections in the United States and Middle East.[34] From these resources a comprehensive picture emerges of the ways missionaries and scholars collaborated to establish programs in Islamic Studies.

In chapter one, we begin by considering the Protestant missionary efforts among Muslim populations and the networks of individual missionaries and their supporters who produced scholarship on Islam. In this, we will focus on those missionaries invested especially in missionary education about Islam, which prompted their founding of programs of study in connection with missionary institutions. This investment in producing better educated missionaries was essential to the production of scholarship and emerged in

[34] A list of the special collections visited can be found in the bibliography.

response to the failures of missionaries to find converts among Muslims. Individuals such as Samuel Zwemer, Duncan Black Macdonald and W.H.T. Gairdner believed that more rigorous education about Islam would provide a stronger basis from which missionaries could engage Muslims. Such aims prompted the founding of missionary-training programs in Islamic Studies in the countries in which they worked, such as the Cairo Study Center in Egypt. These programs advanced the scholarship on Islam and provided teaching opportunities for missionary scholars.

In chapter two, we continue tracing the individual and institutional development of missionary programs, this time in the American context considering the close relationship that was formed between seminaries and colleges and the training of missionaries. Islamic Studies in U.S. academic life, as a subsidiary of Semitic and Oriental studies, was deeply connected with missionary work. This connection included not only the training of missionaries, but also their inclusion within scholarly circles as fellow professors and researchers. With such considerations in mind, this chapter highlights the institutional development of Islamic Studies in America in U.S. Higher Education, especially focusing on Hartford Seminary, New Brunswick Theological Seminary, Princeton Theological Seminary, and the University of Chicago.

Chapter three brings us then to the significance of such individual and institutional legacies, examining the scholarly contributions of missionary-affiliated work. Two dimensions are considered. First, the publication record of missionary-scholars, in terms of its presence and distribution. Second, the original and significant themes this scholarship contributed to the study. Here we arrive at a central thesis of the work: that missionary-scholarship above all else promoted the study of Islam as a religion, and one with a diversity

of contemporary expressions. This focus emerged precisely from missionary encounters with Muslim communities around the world.

With these conclusions in mind, chapters four and five turn to the ancillary and indirect influences of missions on the study of Islam. Chapter four examines the ways in which Protestant missions provided scholarly spaces to women writing about Islam. Women by the mid-nineteenth century comprised the majority of missionaries. On top of this, women's education became increasingly encouraged, also facilitating women to participate more thoroughly in the production of scholarship on Islam. At the same time, this scholarship was often limited to discussion of women and family in Islam. As such this chapter considers how women became the primary source of information about Muslim womanhood – scholarship which often reflected the concerns of American protestant sensibilities.

Chapter five, similarly, considers how missions opened spaces for "non-Western" scholars to participate in the scholarly realm. In particular, we focus on the American educational facilities in the Middle East (e.g. the American Universities in Beirut and Cairo), which emerged in connection with missions there. These institutions produced a number of scholars – many who emigrated to the U.S. and became major contributors to the field. We consider how such scholars reflected their Americanized education, and at the same time pushed beyond it.

As it stands, histories of Islamic Studies as a discipline and the academic study of Islam in the U.S. more generally have been confined to either analysis of the early American Republic or, more commonly, the post-WWII period. While most scholars give a nod to Macdonald's work at Hartford, virtually none have considered it important enough to

warrant further investigation. Given this almost willful avoidance of any serious consideration of Islamic Studies between the Civil War and World War II, this account of missions and missionary training as part of the genealogy of the Study of Islam provides a fuller context necessary for its understanding its development and institutionalization.

I

THE "RESEARCH MISSIONARY" AND THE STUDY OF ISLAM

At the annual general conference of the Egypt Inter-Missionary Council in 1926, a missionary Charles C. Adams spoke on the training of missionary workers among Muslims. In his speech he argued that a thorough knowledge of the Christian religion was necessary for the Christian worker. In addition to this, he indicated that the missionary worker required "an equally thorough knowledge of Islam." He specified that the content of that knowledge,

> Should include familiarity with its origin and historical development, including the life of Muhammad; The Koran, its interpretation and its principal teachings; the fundamentals of the Moslem faith; the mystical teachings with their practical ramifications and developments; the practical duties required of the Moslem and something of the legal and moral ideas which mold his thought and life…. The aim should be to acquire at least a sufficient acquaintance with Islam to create a certain respect for the system into which have been built so much intellectual acumen and moral devotion.[35]

Such an endorsement for careful and moderately serious and sympathetic study of the tradition had not always been a part of missionary training. When the first American Protestant missionaries set out to convert Muslims in the Middle East at the beginning of the nineteenth century, they did so with limited understandings of the people to whom they were bearing their gospel. Yet in the encounter with Muslim communities around the world, missionaries began to recognize that a more thorough knowledge of Islam would be required. This chapter examines the formation of a network of missionaries responsible for

[35] C.C. Adams, "Methods of Training Egyptian workers (professional) for Moslem Evangelistic work," Paper delivered at Annual General Conference of Egypt Inter-Mission Council (1926), 41 [NEST].

promoting the study of Islam for evangelical purposes. The efforts of these missionaries during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were among the earliest efforts in such directions, and in turn were significant in the foundations of the academic study of Islam by Americans.

Protestant Missions to Muslims

Calvinist theology somewhat hamstrung missionary efforts in first centuries following the Reformation, and those early Protestant missions that formed typically followed European colonial enterprises in India and the Middle East during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.[36] The main thrust and organization of Protestant missions developed in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, with Henry Martyn (1781-1812) often regarded as the first modern missionary to Muslims.[37] Martyn was a missionary of the Church of England and worked significantly with Muslim populations during his time in India and Persia. He was a dedicated linguist and produced works on and in Urdu and Persian, especially famous for his translations of the New Testament.[38] Martyn built upon the missiological approach of fellow missionary, William Carey (1761-1834). An English Baptist missionary in India, Carey was not explicitly connected with the mission to

[36] Tejirian and Simon, *Conflict, Conquest, and Conversion* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012). In particular, note, "When Protestant evangelism began to develop in the seventeenth century, it, like that of Spanish and Portuguese Catholics in the Age of Exploration, tended to follow the flag…" (68), but in the eighteenth century due to various theological and missionary influences, reorganized so that in "In Protestant countries, evangelism was primarily the sphere of private individuals organized for the purpose, although frequently with at least quasi-governmental support…. Catholic missions were state sponsored, whereas Protestant missions were organized by nonstate entities and individual initiative" (73-74).

[37] This was the estimation of the Church of England in their 1926 report writing: "Modern missions to Moslems may be said to date from the beginning of the nineteenth century, when Henry Martyn sailed in 1805 for India" (*The Call from the Moslem World*, (1926), 28). Kenneth Cracknell, in a more scholarly approach, locates the birth of modern missions in general in the thought and work of Brainerd, Mathers and Carey (Kenneth Cracknell, *Justice, Courtesy, and Love* (London: Epworth Press, 1995), 3).

[38] Stephen Neill, *A History of Christian Missions* (New York: Penguin, 1990), 225-26. It is worth noting as well, that Martyn was Cambridge educated, setting him somewhat apart from the self-educated Carey.

Muslims, but was a major figure in giving both impetus and shape to Protestant missions especially in relation to the promotion of philological and linguistic scholarship by missionaries.[39] It would be on the evangelical calls of missionaries such as these that many organizations formed and later missionaries would harken back to their scholarly careers as examples.[40]

The first American missionaries to engage in evangelism to Muslims were sent to the Middle East in 1819 by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM). Tejirian and Simon observe that the mission to the Middle East was, unlike most other missions, motivated by "millenarian conviction that the conversion of the Jews and the defeat of the Antichrist were essential for the second coming."[41] In this millenarian schema, Muslims came to be regarded as part of the apocalyptic millennial conditions. But even as apocalyptic emphasis declined, Protestant missionaries continued to view Islam as a challenge or problem.[42] Still, the encounter with Muslims changed the missionaries and their approaches. While the imperative to go work among Muslims played a role in the founding of missions in the Middle East, North Africa and India, these aims were quickly redirected after the missionaries confronted the difficulties of proselytization in Muslim population centers. Instead, missionaries largely turned their efforts towards "rejuvenating" existing

[39] In addition to his commitment to evangelical aims, Carey also taught for many years at the College of Fort William in Calcutta, where he gained a reputation as a respectable linguist and scholar. It is noteworthy that Carey, a cobbler by trade, was self-educated (Tejirian and Simon, 74), yet his philological research offers an early example of missionary scholarship and an imperative for its continuance. H.H. Wilson, the Boden Professor of Sanskrit at Oxford beginning in 1832, commemorated Carey writing, "I must acknowledge, here, that whatever has been done towards the revival of the Bengali language… must be attributed to that excellent man, Dr. Carey, and his colleagues…" in Eustace Carey, *Memoir of William Carey* (Boston: Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln, 1836), 400.

[40] For instance see W.H.T. Gairdner, *The Reproach of Islam* (London: CMS, 1909), 240. Carey and Martyn were both made significant contributions to the study of the languages and cultures in which they worked.

[41] Tejirian and Simon, 81.

[42] Timothy Marr, *The Cultural Roots of American Islamicism* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 114.

Christian populations, setting the Muslim populations aside as part of a long game strategy. It would not be until the last years of the nineteenth century that missions returned to a direct interest in Islam, and with it attempts at a scholarly study of the religion.

While direct missions to Muslims were mostly set aside during the nineteenth century by Protestant missionaries, the framework for the later scholarly-missionary approach to Islam developed during the period. There were those who remained committed to working among Muslims (whether or not they actually carried out such work). They can somewhat simplistically be divided into two camps: Controversialists and Educationalists.[43] It was the controversialists who would motivate an engagement with the tradition in its particulars, seeking sparring points, which could be won in favor of Christianity. It was the educationalists who through their efforts at educating local populations would come to value the need for a more subtle approach to evangelizing through relationships. Further, within such educational settings a higher valuation for respectable scholarship developed. Together with a growing ecumenical spirit among missions at the end of the nineteenth century, these approaches would form the ground on which missionary-scholarship on Islam would ultimately stand.

This scholarship would in turn develop alongside and shape Islamic Studies in the United States, especially as concerned missionary training. Missionaries advanced strategies and programs for the study of Islam. These programs were built on existing understandings

[43] In titling the two camps as such I draw upon the labeling of Matthew Ebenezer, *American Prebyterians and Islam in India* (1885-1923) [Dissertation at Westminster Theological Seminary], as well as the definitions of missionaries themselves in discussing controversy. I use educationalists loosely, remembering neither of these categories is entirely discrete, with various missionaries and educators overlapping approaches, but such delineations serve as a basis for tracing the development of a scholarly approach to Islam as a religion. Tejirian and Simon refer to the work of individuals like Hamlin as a civilizational mission, but I prefer to group these figures under the title educational, for while their aim was a civilizing one, they emphasized education as the means to this end, and it was in their educational efforts that they connect to the development of the academic study of Islam.

of Islamic Studies, but were adapted to the missionaries' particular settings and needs. Additionally, such programs required advanced training for their teachers, encouraging a greater inclusion of scholarship within missionary circles. As a result these dedicated missionary scholars contributed to the Western production of knowledge on Islam, and in the U.S., they especially played a large role in shaping that study in colleges and universities. The missionary approach to the study of Islam in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, served as one of the primary supports for the study as it was institutionalized in the twentieth century.

Controversialist Polemic and Apologetic

While nineteenth century America displayed a limited popular interest in Islam – parading it as a sort of bogeyman in political and social rhetoric, or as part of an eschatological chronology – there was very little scholarly interest in the tradition until the end of the century. Even then, that interest was usually more in line with philology and Semitic language studies than with religion. Timothy Marr has written on the state of American understandings of Islam in the early nineteenth century, observing that Americans had a tendency to view the tradition in eschatological terms and as a Christian heresy, without taking it seriously in its own right. However, Marr notes a couple exceptions, which provide early examples at attempts of scholarship. Of particular note here is the work of James Merrick.

Merrick was commissioned by the ABCFM to investigate the probability of success among Muslims in Persia and Central Asia in 1834. He conducted what was in part an ethnographic survey of the region interacting with Muslims and debating the merits of Islam

in light of Christianity. Marr observes that Merrick began his work convinced, through the influence of fellow missionary William Schauffler, that some grounding in Muslim traditions was necessary for effectively evangelizing Muslims. After Merrick's investigations he wrote to the ABCFM his conclusions. From his experiences, he cautioned, "few have understood Mohammedanism, who have not bestowed laborious research on the subject."[44] In this Merrick provides an early imperative for scholarship. However, the ABCFM rejected his call, convinced from his report that a mission to Muslims in Persia was unfeasible and instead directed Merrick to focus his work on the Assyrian Church of the East (Nestorians).[45] Here an early example of a semi-scholarly approach to Islam was endorsed by Merrick, but ultimately ruled out of line within the missionary currents of his day. Merrick's approach was grounded, via the influence of Schauffler, within a spirit of controversy – the need to know more about Islam in order to better argue against it. But as Marr observes, within such an approach Merrick "displayed an appreciation of Islam as a religious system that other Americans of his era were incapable of perceiving."[46] Still, Merrick had limited influence on the missionary and academic interest in Islam, perhaps precisely because of his more open-minded attitude.

It would be Merrick's more aggressive contemporary Karl Gottlieb Pfander who would be remembered as a pioneer of apologetic approaches to Islam the nineteenth century. Pfander began his missionary career with the Basel Mission in Persia,[47] and in 1838 due to

[44] Quoted in Marr, 124.

[45] Turning attention away from Muslims towards native Christian communities would be the general protocol for most missionary work in the region.

[46] Marr, 124

[47] See Mrinalini Sebastian, "Scholars Missionaries of the Basel Mission in South West India" in Heather Sharkey (ed.), *Cultural Conversions* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2013). Sebastian discusses the early work of Basel missionaries in forming Indology, through their ethnographic and linguistic accounts. She writes, "They produced substantial works of linguistic and ethnographic research" that influenced German Indology (177). This is a notable corollary to my discussion of Islamic Studies, and worth noting that the Basel

the closing of that mission transferred to work with the Church Missionary Society (CMS). A later missionary regarded Pfander as taking up the mantle of Henry Martyn, maintaining the latter's intellectual and apologetic aims.[48] Pfander is most famous for his 1829 Persian volume, *Mīzān-al-Haqq* (*The Balance of Truth).* In it he weighed various components of Islam against Christianity, finding the former lacking. The influence of Pfander on later missions and Islamic studies is readily apparent. For instance, over a half century later, the Scottish Orientalist and colonial administrator William Muir described *Mīzān-al-Haqq* as possessing "extraordinary value."[49] Muir, an early English scholar on Islam noted for his *The Life of Mahomet* (1858) among other works, was deeply sympathetic with Christian aims, even if he was not himself a missionary. In Muir's reflection on Pfander, he called him a "champion of Christianity against the Mohammedans."[50] Pfander's *Mīzān al-Haqq* was reproduced in later years by a fellow CMS missionary St. Clair Tisdall who edited it to adjust for updated conditions. The book and its approach encouraged many missionaries to engage more directly with Islam, yet always with Christian superiority in mind.

The influence of both Merrick and Pfander can be seen in E.M. Wherry, who represents developments in the controversialist school of thought within missions in the late nineteenth century. Wherry, a Pennsylvania-born Presbyterian, signed on with the Presbyterian Board of Missions (PCUSA) after graduating from Princeton Seminary in 1867. He was sent to India where he helped found Saharanpur Theological Seminary, and he taught there until 1888 when he resigned to return to the U.S. in order to see to his children's education. In the U.S. he continued his engagement with missionary work as a

---

Mission had long promoted scholarship as a principle. It is an example of missionary investment in in general.

[48] Gairdner, *Reproach,* 240.

[49] William Muir, *The Mohammedan Controversy* (Edinburgh: T.T. & Clarke, 1897), 20

[50] Ibid., 36.

secretary for the American Tract Society, as well as working as an organizer for the World Congress of Missions, which met in conjunction with the 1893 Parliament of Religion in Chicago. He returned to India in 1898 and remained for another twenty-five years until his death in 1927.[51]

As a good controversialist, Wherry was not interested in Islam for Islam's sake, but in writing apologetic to undermine the rival religion. In his work on Wherry, Matthew Ebenezer notes a cautious approach to controversy, avoiding things that could "rebound" and serve as critiques of Christianity as well. Thus, "Wherry is willing to give Muhammad the 'praise honestly due him as a man, a reformer, a statesman, a general, or a hero.' However, he insisted that the prophet was deceived in his belief in Quranic revelation."[52] In this pragmatic approach to controversy, missionaries such as Wherry began to take seriously, if not appreciate, aspects of the tradition. In this we can see the influence of Merrick's willingness to admire certain points of Islam, while still participating within Pfander's method of critique. Yet, in the early twentieth century authors such as Wherry quickly found themselves on the outside, even while works of controversy remained on missionary reading lists.

Educationalists and Missionary Colleges

On the other side of the spectrum were the educationalists: those missionaries who became invested in the idea that the gospel message could be spread only after inculcating "Western" values and knowledge among the missionized populations. This was in accordance with ideas of a civilizing mission, while maintaining evangelizing aims. The

[51] For a fuller biography and analysis of Wherry's life see chapter five in Matthew Ebenezer, *American Presbyterians and Islam in India* [Dissertation at Westminster Theological Seminary, 1998].

[52] Ebenezer, 249

educationalists were convinced – based on their reflection on the failures of mission hitherto – that through instilling so-called Western Christian principles, Christianity as a religion would naturally take root. Thomas Valpy French (1825-1891) was among the first missionaries to promote such educational aims, though notably he claimed Pfander as his mentor thus highlighting the broad influence of Pfander.[53] French, who later became the first Anglican Bishop of Lahore, India, founded St. Johns College at Agra in 1850, with aims at engaging Muslim students.[54] In his efforts at education he shied away from apologetic, despite his claimed heritage in Pfander.

Following Thomas Valpy French by a decade, American missionaries Cyrus Hamlin and Daniel Bliss founded respectively Robert College in Constantinople/Istanbul (1863) and the Syrian Protestant College in Beirut (1866, SPC). A half century later, the founding spirit of these schools was recalled in promotional materials stating, "Early American missionaries were amazed at the ignorance of both Moslems and Christians in Syria."[55] The patronizing Western attitude along with the racializing tendency, which guided much of the colonial enterprise, can be seen in these endeavors alongside the missionary commitment to the spread of the gospel. In the same way colonial officials wrote of the residents of the region from attitude of political dominance, so too the American missionaries often displayed a religious and cultural smugness.[56] Recalling these founders as part of American evangelical exceptionalism intent on spreading American Christian values, the brochure continued,

[53] According to a quote of French in Gairdner, *Reproach*, 250.

[54] And notably as with many other missionary-founded colleges, it is still functioning. http://stjohnscollegeagra.in/ (2014).

[55] Folder 641, Joint Brochure Robert and SPC (1920), 5 [NEST].

[56] Lord Cromer's (Evelyn Baring) *Modern Egypt* (1908) is a good example of the benefactor's condescension of colonial perspective. Cromwell wrote at the outset of his work of his "deep sympathy with the Egyptian people" born out of years in Egypt (8). It is this sympathy which motivated his desire to see reform in Egyptian society, which the British were particularly able to promote "due to their superior talents," (6). While there were also colonialists actively racist and despising of the populations they colonized,

> Dr. Bliss, the founder of the Syrian Protestant College, and Dr. Hamlin, the builder of Robert College, in common with all others of that noble band of missionary workers who served and sacrificed there, realized that the only way to the permanent upbuilding of the civilization of the Near East was by the road to universal education. And America, acting through such institutions… offers the only gateway to that road.[57]

The SPC and Robert College were early models among a wave of missionary colleges that would be founded in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries with such principles in mind.

As far as the study of Islam was concerned these missionary colleges had two main impacts. First, they brought American missionary educators into sustained personal contact with Muslim students. While in the early years the majority of students came from Christian backgrounds, as the nineteenth century progressed more and more non-Christian students entered the schools. By the early 1900s Muslim students constituted a significant minority at these schools.[58] This meant that Protestant educators had to take a serious look at the

---

Cromwell's benevolent colonial attitude more closely resembles missionary relations with those they missionized. Relatedly, this book was included on the reading list within a number of missionary Islamics courses.

[57] Ibid., 13 [NEST]. I return to these themes in depth in chapter 5.

[58] Exact annual statistics are limited, but a few periods are clearer. At the time a student controversy relating to religion in 1908, the non-Christian population of the school was about 1/6 of the total. Bliss Annual Report SPC (1908-1909), 6-7; see also Betty Anderson, *The American University of Beirut* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), 19-20. The exact make up of this non-Christian population is vague, 128 "Moslems" attended, but the background of those students is ambiguous in the reporting. Later, the diversity of students at the SPC would be emphasized. In 1866 all students came from Ottoman Syria, mostly from what would become called Lebanon – and these regional stats remained post-1920s. There were some Egyptians and Syrians (though the latter not distinguished from Lebanese until after 1920), but their enrollment declined over time. Anderson (193 fn. 13) also notes Christian presence in school during the nineteenth-century consisted of about 1/3 Protestant and 60% other Christians (e.g. roughly 90% Christian; Greek Orthodox, Armenian Orthodox, Catholic, Maronite, etc.). Following the name change of the SPC to AUB in 1920 the school was largely equalized between Christians and non-Christian. This trend towards including more non-Christians continued and by 1957-8 the school was about 21% Christian (12% protestant). It is also worth noting the Bliss opened the school aiming for a Christian student majority population (which eventually lessened – See: Two Missionary Educators: Daniel Bliss. Howard Bliss (N.D. and N.A.; Howard Bliss Collection, Box 1: File 15, [AUB]).

President Dodge in 1920 emphasized to an American audience the variety of students across society, which have included a Shi'i "princeling", sons of ruler in Basrah "who could muster the forces of Islam… at a word," an Armenian orphan, Egyptian sons of literary figure, along with Coptic Christian boys. (Bayard Dodge, "The Syrian Protestant College," *Presbyterian Banner*, June 10, 1920; Bayard Dodge Collection, Box 3: File 3 [AUB]). While not particularly comprehensive, it does suggest the dynamics of the student

beliefs and customs of their Muslim students in order to accommodate them. The schools maintained clear Christian policies, but tried to provide some support for non-Christian students largely in order to avoid antagonizing local populations.

The second impact was in the requirement for teachers. By emphasizing education as a missionary tool abroad, better education was required of missionaries. Expectations for missionaries coming to teach increased over the second half of the nineteenth century across disciplines, with specialization increasingly expected. These American schools founded in the Middle East wanted to compete with American and European institutions. In 1901, the Syrian Protestant College annual report noted that it needed to adjust its structures in order to "approach the standard of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton."[59] As such, missionary educational projects provided an impetus for missionary training in Islamic studies as it developed more formally in the early twentieth century. Further, missionary schools often provided a home for such training programs.

In reality, the difference between the controversialist and the educationalist in terms of Muslim evangelization was not that significant, more of degree than substance. Both continued to hope for conversion and change. Both saw greater knowledge of Islam as important to the missionary project. The main divide was method – whether that project should be direct (via preaching and argument) or subtle (through education and social work). The shift towards studying Islam was reflected in both approaches. On the one hand, direct engagement with Muslims promoted knowing one's own position *vis à vis* Muslim understandings. Here, the argumentative element remained in the call for scholarly research

---

population, and the diversity which the university intentionally cultivated in the twentieth century. This impact of the students trained in these mission-connected schools on the development of Islamic studies in the U.S. will be taken up in Chapter 5, and more details on these institutions can be found there.

[59]1901 Annual Report of the Syrian Protestant College, Vol. 2 on Reel 551 (16.8.2.5) [Lamont Library, Harvard]. This was said with context of the need for endowments.

into Islam. On the other hand, it encouraged a more cautious approach to interacting with Muslim themselves, aiming to understand before attacking – a position which would lead to a genuine sympathy among many missionaries, even when in disagreement. Emphasis on scholarship developed alongside growing ecumenism among Christian mission agencies (and Christians globally for that matter), which sought to provide a well-informed unified Christian front in the engagement with the so-called Muslim world.

Samuel Zwemer and the Mission to Muslims

It is with these two methodological approaches as background that we arrive at last at the formation of an Islamic Studies missionary curriculum in the twentieth century, which owes much of its initial establish to Samuel Zwemer. Zwemer is perhaps the most famous missionary to promote the study of Islam for missionaries. He is remembered in many missionary and Christian circles as the "Apostle to Islam," yet his path to this title was largely by circumstance. Zwemer in his promotion of direct mission to Islam was an inheritor of the controversialist school of thought. He recommended the works of Pfander, Wherry and other controversialists of the nineteenth century as beneficial to missionaries well into the twentieth century. At the same time, as the value of controversy was being questioned by many missionaries, Zwemer helped facilitate these discussions within the missionary educational scene.

Born in Michigan in 1867, Zwemer was raised in the Reformed Church and educated in its seminaries. Upon graduating from New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1890, Zwemer along with a classmate James Cantine and their seminary professor John G. Lansing founded a mission to Muslims in the Arabian Peninsula. It was in fact more

coincidence than anything that led Zwemer to the Arabian Peninsula and his commitment to evangelizing among Muslims. While he quickly took to the idea of missions at New Brunswick, the location was open in his mind. Recalling the founding of the mission, Zwemer later observed, "Finally the choice of field was decided by Dr. Lansing…. None of us were *first* in thinking of Arabia"[60] For his part, Lansing, professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis had some attachment to the region.

Lansing was born in Egypt, the son of American missionaries. In a tribute, upon his death in 1906, a colleague wrote,

> Baffled and disappointed by insuperable barriers in his intense longing to go himself with the Gospel to the millions under the spell of the false prophet, he yearned increasingly to do something in way for their evangelization, and at last out of the profound yearning was conceived the idea of sending some of his own students to engage in the difficult task.[61]

As an Arabic and Semitic language professor who possessed a zeal for proving Islam false, Lansing reflects the overlapping nature of education and polemic among missions. Zwemer would prove to be a powerful force for the cause dear to Lansing's heart and a central figure in organizing the study of Islam.

The mission began with practical necessities in mind. First, Cantine and Zwemer worked to gain a hold on the language. They had studied the basics of Arabic grammar under Lansing, but continued after graduation, Cantine in France and Zwemer with fellow missionaries in Beirut. Through this Zwemer developed a closer connection with other missionaries working in the broader region. These connections would prove essential as Zwemer shifted from individual missionary to missions organizer. Once they had improved

[60] Letter from SM Zwemer to Dr. Gillespie (June 19, 1912), SM & Amy Zwemer Correspondence 755.2 [NBTS], his emphasis.

[61] JP Searle, "Rev. John G Lansing, D.D." *The Arabian Mission Field Reports and Quarterly* (No. 59; 1906 [NBTS])

their language ability, they turned to the question of where to establish a presence. Not desiring to compete with existing missions the pair turned to what they dubbed "neglected Arabia." They spent several months touring the peninsula's coastline cities and making occasional forays into the interior. Eventually they decided to found their primary mission station in Basra (Iraq) in 1892. Not long after Zwemer moved to Bahrain to found an additional station.

These stations saw few results in terms of conversion. It is clear that these early failures had an impact on Zwemer. Having come across the globe to evangelize people of a religion he knew little about proved challenging. As had been the case in the other Protestant missions working among Muslims, converts were few and far between. The Muslim populations were largely uninterested in the message of these foreigners, Zwemer included. Where many missionaries instead turned to other population groups (primarily Christians), Zwemer doubled down.[62] He began to study Islam, hoping to find avenues of attack through investigation of its traditions and doctrines. In the years that followed this approach would become his *modus operandi* as he organized conferences, a quarterly journal, and schools for training missionaries in the study of Islam. His approach to scholarship was never the high-minded intellectual type, but a practical scholarship bound intimately with evangelical aims. In this Zwemer characterized the missionary scholar, though some of his contemporaries and successors would lean away from this towards more secular research. While Zwemer may have stumbled rather by chance into missions to Muslims, he embraced

[62] Chandra Mallampalli, "Missionaries and Ethnography in the Service of Litigation" in Sharkey, *Cultural Conversions* notes a similar phenomenon in the India case of Indology, noting the "large, diverse and at time contradictory body of 'knowledge' that Protestant and Catholic missionaries had produced…. In the absence of (and not for the sake of) conversion." (70). Nicholas Dirks' *Castes of Mind* (2001) also discusses the production of knowledge on India and missionary involvement in creating Indology.

it whole-heartedly and the religion of Islam would consume the majority of his attention for the remainder of his life.

Zwemer became the most famous of the missionary-scholars of Islam and was highly influential in encouraging its study among his missionary-colleagues, but he was neither the first nor the only one writing about the religion and its adherents. He built his study upon the writings of the continental orientalists, colonial explorers, and earlier missionaries. Zwemer modeled the balance between controversialist and educationalist when it came to missionary training. He drew upon the work of controversialists, such as Gottleib Pfander and E.W. Wherry. Yet, he also worked closely with educationalists (especially in Egypt) in promoting education for missionized and missionaries alike. Zwemer's work as an organizer of Christian missions to Muslims through educational efforts among missionaries reflects a balance between these two schools of missionary thought.

Missionary Training and the Networks of Orientalism

Zwemer served as a main agent bringing together the controversialist and educationalist camps to promote the study of Islam. While he was not appreciated by all, his zeal in promoting both missions and missionary training was instrumental in putting plans in motion. Likewise, he benefited from the growing ecumenism among missions that valued collaborative projects and education. The nineteenth century may have been dominated by denominational and national competition, but the twentieth century saw a breaking down of rigid lines. Of course certain national sentiments flared, particularly during WWI among British and German missionaries, but as a rule missionaries became committed to the principle of comity, working alongside one another if not precisely together. This was

especially true for English-speaking missionaries, and it was within this group that Zwemer would find a cohort of like-minded individuals interested in promoting evangelization among Muslims, and in better training missionaries for such tasks.

As the focus returned to direct evangelization of Muslims it was clear that the missionary needed a better understanding of Islamic traditions. The groundwork for formalized missionary training in this regard was laid out in the first decade of the 1900s. In 1906, Zwemer organized a conference in Cairo for missionaries to Muslims. At the conference sixty-two missionaries from twenty-nine European and American missionary societies gathered for five days to discuss the current conditions of Christian missionary effort among Muslims.[63] The aim of the conference was to describe the missionary situation among Muslim populations, with talks given by missionaries working in the North Africa, the Middle East, India, China and South East Asia. Both veteran and younger missionaries participated, and the new approaches were offered in challenge to the old. One of the major conclusions to come out of the conference was a move away from controversialist approaches. Missionaries such as W.H.T Gairdner and St. Clair Tisdall of the Church Missionary Society (CMS), W.A. Shedd of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America (PCUSA) argued against antagonistic approaches to Muslims.[64] They highlighted a more nuanced approach focusing on relationship. In addition, the conference resolved to prepare a class of missionaries specifically prepared to work with Muslims "by giving them a specialized training."[65] Knowledge of Islam was seen as essential to the missionary

[63] H.V. Weitbrecht, "The Cairo Conference" *CMS Intelligencer* (No.58; April-Sept 1906).

[64] Ebenezer, 283. Ebenezer discusses how interesting it is that Tisdall as a proponent of controversial literature backs away at this point.

[65] Weitbrecht, "The Cairo Conference," 4.

project, though that knowledge was not to be deployed in so blatant apologetic schemes as it had previously been.

As more missionaries became attached to the idea of the study of Islam, some began to realize a lack of ability and leadership for teaching such specialized course work. In particular, W.H.T. Gairdner (1873-1928), a CMS missionary in Egypt, became committed to improving his scholarly understanding of Islam. This would lead Gairdner, as we saw in the Introduction, to travel and study with more established scholars of Islam. Prior to this study, Gairdner had written *The Reproach of Islam* (1909), which had two major aims.[66] First, he attempted to give an overview of what Islam is and how it developed. Second, he presented a history of and suggestions for the missionary approach to Muslims. Jane I. Smith summarizes Gairdner's view of Islam as a simple religion, intellectually unsound, and arguing that most Muslims are in fact dissatisfied with it.[67] But while Gairdner did express such views, he also attempted to understand how the religion had maintained such a strong hold on the minds of so many, and concluded that in studying Islam there are lessons for Christians as well. Additionally, even Gairdner was dissatisfied with the quality of the work upon later reflection, and decided he required a stronger intellectual basis on which to discuss Islam. The book and his decision to pursue additional education reveal Gairdner's scholarly commitments as a missionary, particularly evident during his furlough in 1910.

[66] Later on Gairdner reflected sourly on the title, noting that he had intended by it a meaning that Islam served as a reproach to Christianity, and a need to reconsidered Christian principles and aims. However, most Christian circles understood the title as a criticism of Islam. At last in 1920 he was able to amend the title to better suit his aims renaming its second edition the *Rebuke of Islam* and clarifying, "It was with pain that the author found, when too late, that an undersigned double entente lurked in the original title. Nothing more was meant than that Islam was a perpetual reminder to Christendom of the latter's failure to truly represent her Lord." (London: United Council for Missionary Education, 1920), iii.

[67] Jane I. Smith, "Christian Missionary Views of Islam in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations* (9:3, 1998), 361.

Gairdner spent his furlough year pursuing two programs of study. He initially went to Germany to take classes with Orientalists such as Eduard Sachau, but he found himself dissatisfied with the simplicity of the course work and decided instead to study in the United States at Hartford Seminary in its affiliated School of Missions under the instruction of Duncan Black Macdonald, whom he had previously contacted. Macdonald as the foremost American Islamicist of his day, had long supported increased training for missionaries working with Muslims, and in his professorial capacity at Hartford had done much in building the school's program.[68] In this the two shared a vision for increased study of Islam by missionaries. Gairdner spent about half of his furlough at Hartford in independent study with Macdonald, during which the two became close.

Macdonald suggested Gairdner return to Germany for the second half of the year, where he might receive more specialized training under prominent Orientalists. Macdonald introduced him to Dutch Islamicist Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje (1857-1936), who in turn introduced him to the prominent Hungarian Orientalist Ignaz Goldziher (1850-1921). Gairdner spent the remainder of his furlough in private study with Goldziher. It is instructive to note here the scholarly connections which brought together this meeting. For his part, Goldziher had risen to prominence as an Islamicist with his significant efforts in the study on Hadith. Hurgronje and Goldziher begin corresponding in 1880 and met in person for the first time at the International Congress of Orientalists in 1883. Goldziher dedicated his *Muhammedanische Studien* (1889) to Hurgronje, demonstrating the former's esteem for the latter. Hurgronje was well connected with both Macdonald and Goldziher.

[68] We will return to Macdonald's work at Hartford in significant detail in the next chapter. As an additional note now, in some publications his named has been spelled with a capital "D" (MacDonald), however he did not write it this way in his own hand, nor did his close colleagues. Macdonald with a lowercase "d" is the correct spelling.

After becoming a pastor in the Reformed Church, Hurgronje completed a doctorate in Semitic Theology and a few years later, at the encouragement of Goldziher, took up the study of *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence). However, Hurgronje would become famous more for his work as a colonial advisor for the Dutch government in Indonesia. Jean-Jacques Waardenburg observes the close relationship between these figures (and some others), which was born out of and maintained a scholarly and methodological cohesion.[69] Edward Said offers a further observation that these scholars also shared a political bond, each being involved to greater or lesser degrees in colonial consulting.[70] I present a third observation that these scholars were also bound through this network to the missionary enterprise.

Gairdner greatly valued his time with Goldziher, and was struck by the man's willingness to work with him and his supportive demeanor. Gairdner wrote to Macdonald of his wonder "that the greatest Islamicist in the world should be *daily* making a gift of his knowledge and experience to a perfect stranger, who came to him self-invited."[71] The impact of Goldziher on Gairdner seems to have gone beyond scholarly contribution, causing Gairdner to rethink his personal understandings of religion. While early in their relationship Gairdner had commented on Goldziher's Jewishness in somewhat unflattering ways, he later came to regard his professor as a co-religionist. "I feel towards him as towards a fellow-religionist. He has a deep and sincere personal religion – a trustful attitude to a real God –

[69] For a fuller biography of Goldziher and Hurgronje see Jacques Waardenburg, "Chapter 1", *L'islam dans le Miroir de l'Occident* (Paris: Mouton and Co, 1962). Waardenburg also details their intellectual contributions to the study of Islam.

[70] Said, *Orientalism*, 210. In a recent article, George Awad responds to Said's comments on Macdonald as follows: "I doubt that Edward Said read many of Duncan Macdonald's writings and examined carefully his views on missionary work in the Muslim Near East before deeming him a colonially-driven orientalist. Not only did Duncan Macdonald train his students for missionary work, he also left for us writings that state his own understanding of mission—literature that the scholar must not miss if pursuing an objective, scientific study ("D.B. Macdonald on Relating to Islam," *The Muslim World* 106: July 2016, 523). Awad concludes that Macdonald does not fit Said's definition of a "colonial orientalist," nor was he a proper missionary, but instead he was a "passionate Arabist and Islamicist…and critical missiologist (537)."

[71] Letter from Gairdner to Macdonald (June 30, 1912), Macdonald Collection, Box 93: Folder 1923, 49263 [Hartford Seminary], his emphasis.

and of this he often and quite simply talks. I can but respond in the same spirit – looking to it, indeed, that my attitude to God be indeed trustful and indeed real."[72] While still revealing certain Protestant sensibilities concerning religion as personal relationship to God, Gairdner's open-mindedness remains notable for a missionary and would be reflected in his subsequent approaches to Muslims.

Beyond this, Goldziher together with Macdonald encouraged Gairdner not to get lost in the simple life of the missionary, but to continue his scholarly pursuits within that context. Goldziher for his part envisioned Gairdner as a "research missionary."[73] That Goldziher would be invested in Christian missions is a testament to the scholarly and political bonds of between the Orientalists. Macdonald reiterated the idea commending Gairdner, "You are a research missionary. Keep on being a missionary... but remember that you are called to other things than the ordinary circle of missionary life."[74] Returning from his furlough studies Gairdner acknowledge this scholarly benediction: "The student and the missionary - the two must be more one henceforward than they have been in the past."[75] The research missionary was born, perhaps with a more serious scholarly aims than other missionary scholars such as Zwemer ever anticipated.

The World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910, and a follow up to the Cairo conference for missions to Muslims in Lucknow in 1911 further validated the efforts of missionaries like Zwemer and Gairdner in promoting missionary training on Islam. Many of the participants from the 1905 conference in Cairo served at these latter conferences as

[72] Letter from WHT Gairdner to Macdonald (Aug 7, 1911), Macdonald Letters, Box 93: Folder 1919, 49142 [Hartford Seminary). As for why someone like Goldziher would take up a student like Gairdner is an interesting question, though he seems to have relished the opportunity to speak in Arabic with Gairdner, and found him a promising student in Islamics.

[73] Quoted in C.E. Padwick, *Temple Gairdner of Cairo* (London: SPCK, 1929), 216.

[74] Letter from Macdonald to Gairdner (Aug 21, 1911) Macdonald Collection Box 93: Folder 1919, 49142 [Hartford Seminary].

[75] Quoted in Padwick, 216.

key speakers. At Edinburgh, Zwemer, Gairdner, Jessup, Shedd and Tisdall were key representatives at the sessions on Islam; all encouraged a more moderate approach, as well as commending further study of the religion.[76] Edinburgh stressed the need for better training of missionaries, and this call was formalized at Lucknow. At Lucknow a resolution for missionary training was passed, noting specifically "the scheme consists in the organizing of facilities for the study of Arabic and Islam."[77]

A final, smaller conference that would prove integral to the finalization of Islamic Studies education among missionaries was the Conference on Language Study in Cairo, 1911. Following up on the themes of the preceding Cairo and Lucknow conferences, and mindful of the general shifts and emphases of Edinburgh, this conference put all the gears in motion. The conference focused on the logistics of standardization and centralization of missionary preparation, and in particular identified the most ideal location for such a training center. The committee determined that if "emphasis was on Islamic Study, Cairo would be the best centre, while for general Arabic study, Beirut possessed equal advantage."[78] On the surface the debate boiled down to a distinction over what was most important to the practicing missionary: purely linguistic competency or a fuller engagement with religious and cultural issues arising in Muslim contexts. Out of this conference the final plans would be laid to form a missionary training center in Cairo, indicating the decision among the various mission agencies represented, to see both Arabic and Islam as important for study. Yet, it is also important to recognize the colonial structures in place that

[76] Ebenezer, 283. Ebenezer notes the omission of Wherry from the list, perhaps suggesting the turn away from controversy by missionaries. He notes further that Wherry was included in the conference as a delegate on Hinduism.

[77] Quoted in Prospectus of Courses and Examinations (1930-32) The School of Oriental Studies, Cairo Box 2 SOS: Folder 4 [AUC].

[78] Resolution passed by the Conference on Language Study, Held in Cairo in December, 1911, Box 1 SOS: Folder 1 [AUC].

facilitated missionary work. The rule of the British in Egypt (1882-1922) offered benefits for the missionary training program to settle there.

Colonial Entanglements

Much of missionary work was made possible only in relation with colonial administration. The production of knowledge by missionaries was often connected to colonial agendas, as is the case of T.P. Hughes' famous early dictionary on Islam, produced based on his missionary experiences in India, and adopted by the colonial administration as a reference source.[79] American missionaries were in a more ambiguous position *vis à vis* colonial administration, yet they still benefited from its structures. As Heather Sharkey summarizes, in Egypt "missionaries were expected to provide the empire with a veneer of ethics, respectability, and moral purpose; to praise British governance among churchgoing audiences at home; and to act in ways that would tacitly support and not compromise British rule on the ground."[80] In return, missionaries expected support from their governments, which they understood as at the very least hypothetically representing Christian interests. Thus American missionaries often appealed for support to British and American political envoys in countries in which they were evangelizing.

Such relations were not exclusive to Egypt. In fact some of the clearest examples of American missionary and colonial links can be found in the records of the American educational efforts in Beirut. The faculty response to a student controversy at the Syrian Protestant College (SPC) in 1908-09, highlights the relationship between the administration

[79] Thomas P. Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam* (1885). A discussion of this dictionary can be found in the next chapter.

[80] Heather Sharkey, *American Evangelicals in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 64.

and British and U.S. diplomatic envoys. The trouble began when Muslim and Jewish students at the school protested the required Bible courses at the SPC. The controversy was significant enough to be of concern to the British and U.S. administrators working with the Ottoman government. In a letter to the British Consul-General Cumberbatch, SPC president Howard Bliss explained the situation as a misunderstanding and appealed for British support. Bliss defended the compulsory Christian courses,

> We do not believe in cramming religion down a man's throat; that while we ask all students to be present we do not compel them to bow their heads or kneel or take part in the singing. What we ask of them is to observe the same kind of quiet and respect that we should feel called upon observe in case the conditions were reversed and we were attending services in a mosque.[81]

Bliss's defense highlights his desire for what he called religious liberty, the ability for all religions to be taught to all students – which, for the Protestant educators really meant the desire to teach Christianity to non-Christians. For the present discussion, the relevant point is how Bliss relied on colonial authority to press this agenda.

The U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire J.G.A. Leishman requested that the school discontinue its mandatory policy for Christian courses. However, he was transferred around the same time to Rome and the school sent Bayard Dodge to meet the new Ambassador Oscar Straus. Dodge described Straus as a sympathetic figure, "He wants to introduce and strengthen American conceptions of civil and religious liberty, to encourage development along commercial, agricultural and other lines and also to always protect and perhaps enlarge the educational and missionary work in the Empire."[82] In such statements the tangled relationship between missions and colonialism and likewise between Christian and American values is clear. His efforts would help secure the school's compulsory

[81] Letter From Howard Bliss to H.B.M. Consulate-General Cumberbatch (confidential; Feb 26, 1909), Howard Bliss Collection Box 14 [AUB].

[82] Quoted in Letter from H bliss to Ravndal (June 4, 1909), Howard Bliss Collection Box 14 [AUB].

religious programs and following the mostly favorable (for the school) conclusion of the controversy the faculty thanked the British and American officials involved in the process.[83] Such relations between American and missionary interests would grow in the years to come, notably with the Woodrow Wilson administration following WWI.[84]

Still at other times the missionary relationship with colonial authorities was tense. The missionaries benefited from the structures and influence of colonial governance, yet often found themselves as critics of the colonial policies and undertakings themselves. In a report on the state of missions to Muslims issued following World War I, a number of missionary authors criticized the European colonial powers for alienating Muslims from Christianity during their misrule. For instance, Zwemer in his portion of the report argued, "We shall not understand the disappointment and collapse of Moslem hopes unless we realize that long before the war in Europe the Near East suffered gross injustice from the European powers." He follows this statement by detailing the colonial exploitations of Muslim populations and its connection to Muslim perceptions of "Christian nations."[85] The critique of colonial failings would grow among missionary circles in the first decades of the twentieth century. In particular, the colonialists were critiqued by missionaries for their materialism. The evangelist John Mott wrote in 1925 that "Western materialism and the corrupt influences of modern civilization" has been deeply connected to "the diplomacy, the

[83] H. Bliss to James S. Dennis (representing Trustees) (May 13, 1909), Howard Bliss Collection Box 14 [AUB]. It should be noted the threat of military action was perhaps part of the success as the US Warship Montana was also sailed into the area around the same time.

[84] The two prominent families (Bliss and Dodge) involved in higher education in the Middle East at SPC/AUB and Robert College were closely tied through marriage to one another. This notably facilitated a good relationship between both schools and U.S. President Woodrow Wilson who attended Princeton with Cleveland Dodge. As Tejirian and Simon note many of Wilson's statements that became part of his Fourteen Points were thought to reflect his association with Dodge. Such connections reveal how Christian mission, education and politics were clearly connected even at the highest levels of American government. Tejirian and Simon, *Conflict, Conquest and Conversion* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 178-180.

[85] Samuel Zwemer, "Arabia" in the Missionary Outlook in Light of the War (New York; Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook/Association Press, 1920), 158. [NEST].

territorial designs, the administrative policy, and the commercial activities of Christian Powers."[86] While missionaries relied upon the structures and protections of Colonialism, they also critiqued it, seeing its exploitative forces as undermining Christianity in the eyes of Muslims and others.

The Cairo Study Center and American University at Cairo

Much as in Beirut, missionaries in Cairo benefited from the British Protectorate, which provided at the least indirect support for their educational efforts. The discussions of the aforementioned conferences coalesced into the formation of a missionary training center in the Cairo. At the international level complex political and colonial structures and entanglements were at play in the establishment of a training program for missionaries in Cairo. Yet, at the local level, these structures were not so obvious and time was consumed in the immediate realities necessary for creating the institution. Zwemer and Gairdner took up the logistical planning, with additional advice from Duncan Black Macdonald in America. Macdonald, in these early years of their acquaintance held little respect for Zwemer and his scholarly ability. Noting Gairdner's formal training, Macdonald dismissed other so-called scholarly-missionaries including Zwemer, stating, "You know now what to think of Zwemer's knowledge and reading. With St. Clair Tisdall it is not much better. Canon Sell made a good beginning in his day, but had not books or guidance and he never really got into the light."[87] Gairdner attempted to assuage Macdonald's concerns. He noted that "as far back as 1906 when Z[wemer] called, and presided at the first Moslem-mission conference…" and again at the Lucknow conference it was clear that Zwemer would have a

[86] John R. Mott (Ed.), Moslem World of To-Day (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1925), x.

[87] Letter from Macdonald to Gairdner (Aug 21, 1911) Macdonald Collection Box 93: Folder 1919, 49142 [Hartford Seminary].

hand in shaping any development of a training program.[88] In another letter Gairdner endorsed Zwemer's participation, writing, "If my part has been to try and guide this scheme with sound sober and scholarly channels, I expect to learn much on my part from his directness and real zeal for Christ."[89] Gairdner concluded that Zwemer would be part of the project whether or not he was ideally suited, and while his scholarly credentials might be lacking (in Macdonald's estimation), he offered an important missionary perspective. Here Gairdner affirmed the missionary character of any training center to be established, while also validating scholarship as a legitimate activity for missionaries.

The Cairo Study Center (CSC) for Arabic, Islam, and Mohammedan Evangelisation opened its doors to its first class in 1912. During this initial year Zwemer and Gairdner taught a handful of missionary recruits and veterans through lectures and short courses. This first year was seen as laying the groundwork for continuing development of the program. In the annual report they related their pleasure that,

> Much interest was displayed, and it is quite certain that if the first year of the study-centre has born no other fruit, it has at least acquainted many with the elements of the problem before Christendom, impressed them with the magnitude of Islam as a subject for study, and created a keen desire to know more, together with a salutory [sic] sense of how little was known before.[90]

The following year they formalized the program into two main departments: Arabic Studies headed by Gairdner and Islamic Studies lead by Zwemer. Several missionary societies also loaned new teachers to the school. The American Mission (a mission of the United Presbyterian Church of North America, UPCNA) delegated R.F. McNeile, R.S.

---

[88] Letter from Gairdner to Macdonald (Aug 13, 1912) Macdonald Collection Box 93: Folder 1924, 49285a [Hartford].

[89] Letter from Gairdner to Macdonald (June 30, 1912) Macdonald Collection Box 93: Folder 1923, 49263 [Hartford Seminary].

[90] Cairo Study Centre for Arabic, Islam, and Mohammedan Evangelisation (Report of First Session, 1912-1913) SOS Box 1: Folder 3 [AUC], 2.

McClenahan, Anna Thompson,[91] and George Swan of Egypt General Mission also joined the staff. As such, in these early years the school emphasized itself as a study center as opposed to a college "for its superintendents are not professors: they are on the contrary exceedingly busy missionaries with serious responsibilities towards the duties entrusted to them by their Churches or Societies."[92] They were first missionaries, and then educators providing fellow missionaries with training in Islam as well as the necessary linguistic and cultural tools for their evangelistic work.

The course offering in these early years included, "Islam, Its Doctrine and Practice," "The Moslem Doctrine of God," and "Koran, Hadith and Sira in the light of Modern Criticism." Such classes show the broad engagement with Islam as a religious tradition, characterized by doctrines, practices and texts, but primarily insofar as they related to modern conditions. And it was by these modern conditions that the missionaries could judge it. Over the years, more missionary-faculty joined further adding to the curriculum, but what unified all courses was a pragmatic interest in Islam as a contemporary religion for the purpose of evangelism. Knowledge of classical Islamic traditions and texts was considered relevant only as far as it applied to preparing missionaries for service to living Muslims. As Zwemer described a reader for one of his courses, "for those who desire to make a thorough study of Islam and the Moslem problem from a missionary standpoint."[93] The study of Islam was meaningful only as it answered the "problem" of Islam.

[91] Anna Thompson's inclusion as a woman is particularly notable. A topic we return to detail in Chapter Four.

[92] Cairo Study Centre For Arabic, Islam, and Mohammedan Evangelisation (Report of First Session, 1912-1913) SOS Box 1: Folder 3 [AUC].

[93] Zwemer, "A working Library on Islam with a Syllabus for Progressive reading courses" (CSC reader, 1912), SOS Box 1: Folder 3[AUC], 3.

While the CSC never boasted large enrollment numbers, especially during WWI, it endured and was restructured. In 1921, the CSC was incorporated into the American University of Cairo (AUC; founded in 1920), and renamed the School of Oriental Studies (SOS). Most of the staff remained the same, although a number of Egyptian Arabic instructors were added to bolster its language instruction. An increased emphasis on scholarly quality was encouraged, as evidenced by the renaming of the school – an intentional nod to the School of Oriental Studies at the University of London which had been started just a few years earlier in 1916. By incorporating within the University, the SOS developed a collegiate rigor. It would be in this period that several prominent missionary scholars would gain a scholarly reputation during their tenure in the SOS. Subsequently, several of these professors would find their way from Cairo to the United States to teach in seminaries and universities there.

The merger was not always smooth, and tensions between the scholarly and missionary aims of the SOS arose over the years. AUC as a Christian-founded institution was glad to be involved in the training of missionaries within the SOS, but at the same time was also concerned with its profile as a university within local Egyptian society and broader American and European research spheres. As founder and president of the University, Charles Watson (1873-1948) was committed to maintaining quality in both of these dimensions.[94] In a letter he highlighted his desire for balance in the SOS, stating,

> On the one hand it was to be a place where missionaries could be trained, not merely in language study, but in Islamics. On the other hand, it was to

[94] Watson was the son of American missionaries in Cairo (UPCNA). Born and raised in Egypt, at eighteen, he left for the U.S. to study at Princeton. He remained working for various Christian organizations and churches in the U.S. into the twentieth century, and as a secretary for UPCNA embarked on his plans for a Christian University for the education of Egyptians, as well as such corollary aims that components such as the SOS provided. For more on Watson's involvement in founding the American University of Cairo, see Heather Sharkey, *American Evangelicals in Egypt* (2008).

> be as center for keeping in touch with the trends of Moslem thought and a place where the sources of Islam could be thoroughly investigated and from which would issue in lectures and book form, the most useful forms of Christian apologetic in relation to work among Moslems.[95]

So the study of Islam remained linked with Christian evangelistic aims, but was formalized and carried out with more rigor. With such concerns in mind, Watson worked to find the right staff for the job. Watson saw the SOS as a sort of graduate level program for missionaries, with an emphasis on small lectures and discussions lead by missionary experts. The CSC/SOS set the precedent for many future missionary training programs regarding Islam. The inclusion of missionaries in teaching curriculum combined with the expectation that missionaries engage at some broader level with the scholarship, as well as the balance of language learning with the study of Islam would serve as guides to many future schools.

So while the school maintained the majority of the staff from its years as the CSC it also began adding new members. Zwemer continued to lecture at the school on Islam, though somewhat intermittently until he was brought on at Princeton Seminary in 1929 as Professor of Missions and History of Religions, especially focusing on Islam. Even after departing Zwemer stayed in contact with many of the missionaries and professors affiliated with the school, continuing to promote Islamic studies for missionaries. While many found him overbearing and others considered him a mediocre scholar at best, there were few missionaries interested in Islam who did not come to appreciate his efforts at promoting the study in general.

W.H.T. Gairdner served on the staff until his death in 1928, though he became almost entirely focused on the Arabic training side of the program. It was work he saw

[95] Letter from Watson to Mr. [E.W.] Thompson (July 23, 1926) Charles Watson Collection Box 9: Folder SOS-Jeffery [AUC].

essential for missionary preparation, but he largely failed as a "research missionary" in Islamics. Macdonald, after Gairdner's death noted that Gairdner felt, "His life as a scholar… had been frittered away. That was not true, but a sense of the unaccomplished gnawed at him."[96] Gairdner died feeling the only contribution he had made to the scholarship on Islam (and for missionaries) was a translation of al-Ghazālī's *Mishkāt al-Anwār* (*The Niche for Lights*).[97] While Gairdner may have felt he failed individually, he certainly set an example of missionary scholarship, which would be filled by some of his younger colleagues hired at the School of Oriental Studies of the AUC. In a promotional bulletin for the AUC in the early 1930s, the School of Oriental Studies was commended as research center in which Islam could be studied "by such thorough methods as would draw both orientalists from the West and Moslem students from the East," and two staff members in particular were fulfilling that aim: C.C. Adams and Arthur Jeffery.[98] It was these two who best represent the ideal of the "research missionary." They also highlight the limits of its scholarly possibility.

Arthur Jeffery arrived on the faculty in 1921 and remained until 1938 when he took a post as professor of Semitic Languages at Columbia University. Jeffery was an Australian missionary with the Wesleyan Methodist Church, having begun his missionary career as a professor at a Christian College in Madras, India. Watson heard that Jeffery was a man of sound intellect and scholarship, and seeking to improve the scholarly quality of the institution, extended him an offer to join the SOS staff at the AUC. Jeffery agreed, and

[96] Letter from Macdonald to Padwick (Oct 11, 1928) Macdonald Collection Box 98: Folder 1996, 51570 [Hartford Seminary].

[97] Considering Waardenburg's assessment of the focus on al-Ghazālī among many of the scholars Gairdner study under, Gairdner's translation of the work serves as another example of the enshrinement of al-Ghazālī as perhaps the most important Muslim scholar in the work of Orientalists.

[98] A Promotional Brochure (N/D; Ca. 1930?) - "special presentation of the work of the School of Oriental Studies" -- prepared for Mr. John Doe (prep template copy), SOS Box 2: Folder 14 [AUC].

served as their most proficient and respected scholar within classical Islamic Studies. In this he was the more traditional scholar within European categories of Orientalism and Islamics – emphasis on textual traditions and especially Arabic, in addition to the classical period within the history of Islam. Jeffery focused his research in Quranic studies, and was especially drawn to Quranic exegesis using a historical-critical method.[99]

Jeffery arrived on a five year loan from the Wesleyan synod and at the end of the period was conflicted as to whether to stay and what his role ought to be. The synod requested him to return to India to do more practical missionary work, fearing he had become too much of a "bookworm."[100] His commitment to scholarship prickled against his responsibility as missionary. In defending Jeffery's value as a scholar within missionary circles, Watson contrasted the more evangelistic work against work which is "distinctly that of research, teaching, lecturing and literary production in the sphere of Islamics. It is for such work that we had felt Mr. Jeffery was distinctly qualified and my conference leads me to believe that he also feels that the call of God to him lies within this sphere."[101] Here Watson recognized scholarly work as a legitimate calling of the Christian missionary. In such declaration, the "research missionary," which Macdonald and Goldziher had anticipated in Gairdner was realized and validated. It is also notable that Watson -- as Macdonald before him -- discussed the position within the Protestant notion of "a

[99] Letter from Jeffery to Watson (n.d. [although in pencil is written "spring of 1926" which seems dubious -- more likely post Aug 1926 reply to Watson's suggestions above]), Watson Collection Box 9: Folder SOS-Jeffery 1921-29; Special Collection [AUC].

[100] Letter from Watson to Jeffery (Aug 30, 1926), Watson Collection Box 9: Folder SOS-Jeffery 1921-29 [AUC].

[101] Letter from Watson to Mr. [E.W.] Thompson (July 23, 1926), Watson Collection Box 9: Folder SOS-Jeffery 1921-29 [AUC].

calling."[102] The research missionary was sanctified as divine appointment in the language of the missionaries.

At the same time, Watson cautioned Jeffery from losing sight of the Christian responsibility for such work. He encouraged Jeffery to stay connected to contemporary life in Egypt, suggesting that Jeffery might develop contacts among the Muslim scholarly and intellectual circles of Cairo. Watson argued that by acquainting himself with contemporary movements and thinkers and through "sympathetic intercourse with them as would enable one to sound out their deepest thinking, – all of this would help to humanize one's life and to give practical value to one's investigations."[103] Notably, again, the purpose of studying Islam was with contemporary and practical implications in mind. Jeffery replied to Watson agreeing on the value of such projects, but feared a lack of time to do so in addition to his university responsibilities. In the end, Jeffery determined to stay on at the college and continue his work. His mission granted him leave to do so.

It should not be inferred from the above that Jeffery was not committed to a Christian missionary project. During a small controversy over the nature and future of the AUC in relation to the missionary boards affiliated with it, Jeffery wrote: "As to the question of the type of institution we are building, I had always assumed that is was a Missionary Institution, and not a secular university such as State University at home. If the latter is our ideal, I have no further interest in the place**.** As I understood our purpose it was to reveal to the Moslem world… spiritual life and power that are to be found in Christ."[104]

[102] In such renderings, Max Weber's discussion of the Reformation's influence on the view of professions within such sacralized language seems relevant.

[103] Letter from Watson to Jeffery (Aug 30, 1926) Watson Collection Box 9: Folder SOS-Jeffery 1921-29 [AUC]. Watson further suggested that Jeffery might stay grounded by taking on a greater role working with local Egyptian Christian churches through preaching and instruction.

[104] Letter from Jeffery to Watson (handwritten) (Aug 5, 1930; From Fez). Watson replied to Jeffery consoling him on these points and insisting that the university did in fact remain committed to evangelical

That Jeffery felt so strongly as to leave should the school lean in secular directions is telling. He saw his individual commitment to serious research as fitting perfectly well with the larger aims of the school for facilitating missionary efforts. It was not that Jeffery's scholarship was overtly missionary, since it was heavily focused on textual analysis of the Qur'an, but that this study fit within a larger framework of Christian educational aims. This belief that Qur'an deserved serious study reflected in many ways the changing world of missions of the twentieth century. It highlights that missionaries were becoming concerned with seriously engaging Islam and its adherents, traditions and beliefs. Yet, it also demonstrates an open-mindedness towards traditions outside of Christianity, and a recognition of Islam as a semi-legitimate (though competing) religious system – an idea that had not always been the case.

Still, remaining at the AUC ultimately proved unsustainable for Jeffery. While he appreciated the missionary character of the university, he found the scholarly atmosphere lacking. It was clear early on that the tension between missionary and scholar would lead Jeffery to eventually leave. Near the end of his five year initial term in Cairo he wrote, "Also, I must say, it strongly appeals to me to be working again in real University, where scholarship comes first of all things. But … I do not want to be even in the slightest degree unfair to the work at Cairo, or to be in any way a deserter from the plans to which we are committed there."[105] He remained for more than a decade after penning those words, but when offered a position at Columbia University in 1938, Jeffery decided he had reached the limits of his work in Egypt, and chose to go to the United States to become part of an

---

aims, though through a more subtle and open-minded approach than perhaps some missionaries were with. Letter from Watson to Jeffery (Aug. 1930), Watson Collection Box 9: Folder SOS-Jeffery 1930-40 [AUC].

[105] Letter from Jeffery to Watson (July 23, 1925; from London) (handwritten) [Watson Collection Box 9: Folder SOS-Jeffery 1921-29; Special Collection AUC].

increasingly robust scholarly community. Ultimately, Jeffery felt the mostly missionary staff of the AUC was not intellectually-motivated enough to support his ambitions. Still, he remained a proponent of the AUC and its work in Egypt. Likewise he stayed in contact with many missionaries and continued to promote the work of missionary scholarship through various publications and partnerships.[106] For its part, the School of Oriental Studies at the AUC remained committed to scholarship as well. During the job search after Jeffery left, Watson cited him as the ideal archetype of a candidate, "We want a man who is or may quickly become an authority on the general field of Islamics, first of all as a religion, then as a historical development, and finally as a stream of literary production. Dr. Jeffery was recently in this position. He was complete and satisfying authority in this field."[107] Thus we can see the AUC viewed Islam foremost as religion, which in turn would lead to consideration of its historical and cultural influence.

If Jeffery best represents the "research missionary" within classical understandings of European Islamic studies and Orientalism, C.C. Adams reflects the turn to the study of contemporary Islam. Adams joined the faculty of the SOS the same year as Jeffery in 1921 and served various roles within it until his death in 1947. Adams as we saw in the quote from the beginning of this chapter was a strong proponent of missionary training in Islamic studies. He was a member of the American Mission in Egypt (UPCNA), and split his time between his mission and university commitments, until he was given a permanent position with the university in 1928, replacing Gairdner. During a furlough from 1926-1928 he returned to the United States and completed a Ph.D. under Martin Sprengling at the

[106] See letter Letter from Jeffery to Watson (from NY; July 27, 1940), Watson Collection Box 9: Folder SOS-Jeffery 1930-40 [AUC].

[107] Letter from C.R. Watson to Dr. F.M. Potter (Feb. 19, 1946), Arabia Mission/AUC Correspondence 78.16 [NBTS].

University of Chicago, which began as a translation of the controversial work of Egyptian Muslim Reformist thinker ‘Ali ‘Abd al-Rāziq (1888-1966).[108] By the time it was published as *Islam and Modernism in Egypt* in 1933, it had been expanded into a thorough treatment of earlier nineteenth-century Muslim reformers Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī (1838/9-1897) and Muhammad ‘Abduh (1849-1905) and their influence upon modernist movements within Egypt during the nineteenth and twentieth century.[109]

It is in this turn towards the contemporary that Adams demonstrates a missionary influence upon scholarship. Where traditional European style Orientalism and Islamics tended towards a fascination with the classical and textual, Adam’s work as a missionary living in Egypt led him towards scholarly consideration of the contemporary. Likewise, while many colonial officials also produced work on the contemporary, the scholarly rigor in Adam’s focus on Abduh as a religious reformer (rather than a political or social one) was astounding. So much so that *Islam and Modernism in Islam* received the endorsements of Orientalists such as H.A.R. Gibb and in fact is still regarded in a recent biography of ‘Abduh as one of the “two most useful sources for Muhammad Abduh’s life.”[110] Sprengling at one point endorsed Adams to Macdonald, saying “Adams is a sound scholar and a fine man, whose scholarship and sympathetic knowledge of the Mohammedan world, Mediaeval and

[108] Abd al-Raziq’s *Islam and the Foundations of Governance* (*al-Islām wa ‘usūl al-hukm*, 1925) caused a stir in Egypt for its argument that the Qur’an and other Islamic jurisprudential and hadithic texts should be kept out of political and civic structures. He likewise argued that Muhammad was not a political leader, but a religious one.

[109] Charles C. Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1966 [1933]).

[110] Sedgwick, *Muhammad Abduh* (Oxford, One World, 2010), 133. Likewise, Gibb commends Adams alongside Wiflred Cantwell Smith in his *Modern Trends in Islam* (1947), ix. We will return to the content and significance of this work in Chapter 3.

Modern, broadened out visibly in his two years with us."[111] In the statement a connection between missionary and American scholarship on Islam is evident.

Adams remained at the AUC as both an administrator and professor, and continued to promote the education of missionaries on Islam. In a eulogy within the minutes of the SOS Adams was remembered, "Coming to the University as Dean of the School of Oriental Studies after long years of service with the American Mission in Egypt, Dr. Adams brought qualities of mature scholarship and familiarity with the Arabic language and Egyptian and Islamic institutions that are not easily found among Americans."[112] Jeffery and Adams present a model of the ideal research missionary. Yet, both also showed the limits. Whereas Jeffery eventually left Cairo to pursue more rigorous scholarship, Adams stayed, but was largely buried in administrative work. The promise of his work coming out of Chicago was not developed, and it remained his sole significant scholarly contribution to Islamic Studies. As with Gairdner before him, he was lost in the life of the missionary and the administrator at the expense of scholarship. The problem for the research missionary had little to do with aptitude and more to do with time and commitments. Yet, missions of the twenties and thirties remained dedicated to this idea of scholarly missionaries.

Missionary Training as the Norm

Along with these programs of study, the discussion of missionary training continued to be highlighted in missionary conferences. In 1924, a series of conferences were held throughout North Africa and the Middle East under direction of John Mott, commissioner of

[111] Letter from William Randall (U. Chicago) to Macdonald (May 20, 1932), Macdonald Collection Box 100: Folder 2020, 52514 [Hartford Seminary].

[112] Minutes of Special Meeting of Trustees (March 18, 1948) Arabia Mission/AUC Correspondence 78.16 [NBTS].

the International Missionary Council (IMC). This series of conferences shows a clear fruition of the early themes of ecumenism, missionary education, and rejection of controversy established at the 1906 Cairo Conference. The conference series organized under the banner of the IMC, illustrated the growing formalization of the ecumenical impulse of missions in the twentieth century missionaries. The conference featured prominent missionaries working in Muslim contexts from a number of mission societies.

As for educational aims, the participants (which included notables like Zwemer, Watson, and Gairdner) at a conference in Helwan, Egypt argued the need for specialists on Islam. The proceedings summarize the desire as, "That certain picked men, Oriental or Western, should be called to specialize on Islamics with a view to serving as expert advisers to the great mass of workers who have not the leisure or the opportunity for such specialization."[113] The clear endorsement for committed scholars of Islam had a lot to do with the increase of programs and a lack of skilled teachers to work in them. Such endorsement also served to validate the work of already active missionary scholars such as Jeffery and Adams, and further pointed to the opening of the field to include non-Western scholars as well.

At the Jerusalem meeting of this conference series the dynamics of missionary scholarship in relation to evangelism were further developed. The proceedings of the conference emphasized training in Islamics as offering "real understanding of the mind and heart of the Moslem of to-day in his native environment. Such training includes not only the study of historical Islam but of contemporary movements within Islam, especially in the

[113] *Conference of Christian Workers Among Moslems* (New York: IMC, 1924), 93. Likewise here we see a commitment to diversification of the study among missions. See chapter 5 for more on this.

particular area concerned."[114] No doubt, this sentiment remained somewhat patronizing, but whereas at the Cairo Conference there was still debate over the value of scholarship in controversy and apologetic, now such uses were almost fully forgotten, replaced by a discourse of "understanding." The ultimate aim of evangelism remained, but understanding represented a much more relational approach to Muslims and positive regard for Islam. In some ways it represented the failure of missions thus far, not unlike the turn of earlier missionaries towards existing Christian churches. At the same time, it showed changing theological perspectives on missions – especially the dominance of liberal Protestant perspectives on religion and interreligious relations during the interwar period.[115] In this sense it represented further the success of the educationalist school of thought in missiology, as it developed alongside ideas of Christianity as culture.

After participating at the Jerusalem Conference, Murray T. Titus, a Methodist Episcopal missionary in India, became instrumental in continuing the promotion of missionary training. Titus was a disciple of Zwemer, having met him in 1911, during which Zwemer convinced him of the need for evangelistic work among Muslims. He was also a student of Macdonald in Hartford and through that became a more cautious and rigorous scholar. He first became indirectly involved in the founding of the Newman School of Missions in Jerusalem in 1928, and more formally was involved in founding a training program for Islamic studies in India, eventually named the Henry Martyn School of Islamics.

In Jerusalem, the Newman School was opened in the late 1920s as another missionary training center in the Middle East. Its first director Eric F.F. Bishop regarded

[114] *Conference of Christian Workers Among Moslems*, 29-30.

[115] See Hutchison, Chapter 5, *Errand to the World* (1988) for more on the growth of liberal Protestant attitudes among missionaries during the Interwar period.

Titus as "the originator of this place so far as the idea is concerned."[116] The school itself was a project of the Methodist Episcopal Mission in affiliation with the United Missionary Council (UMC) and aimed to be a source of missionary training in Palestine for Christian workers among both Muslims and Jews. The school opened in 1928, consciously modeled on the pattern of the Cairo Study Center, focusing on language preparation (Arabic and Hebrew primarily), while also offering lectures and short courses on Islam and Judaism.[117] Like the CSC in its early years, the staff consisted primarily of missionaries training fellow missionaries on practical understandings of these religions. In addition, during the 1940s a number of notable figures came as guest lecturers reflecting the links between missions and scholarship, as well as the growing prestige of the school. Lecturers included Montgomery Watt (1909-2006) in 1944, a prominent Orientalist scholar who was at that time aide to the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem;[118] Alfred Guillaume (1888-1965) in 1944, an Arabist and Islamicist, who came from Beirut, where he was a visiting professor at the American University;[119] and, Arthur Jeffery in 1948 on a break from Columbia.[120]

As mentioned, Murray T. Titus had more direct involvement with the formation of the Henry Martyn School of Islamics. This school also demonstrates the missionary recognition of the broader geographical range needed in the study of Islam, beyond primarily Arabic-speaking regions. Despite its namesake, the school considered Zwemer as the contemporary agent "whom the Henry Martyn School owes the inspiration which led to

[116] Letter from Eric FF Bishop (Newman School) to Macdonald (Feb 7, 1928), Macdonald Collection Box 98: Folder 1993, 51432 [Hartford Seminary].

[117] NSM Historical Foreword1931, NSM Folder 686 [NEST].

[118] NSM Occasional #17 (1944) Watt "gave a course of lectures during Summer School on 'Free Will in Islam,'" NSM Folder 693[NEST], 3.

[119] Ibid, 3. NSM Folder 693; [NEST].

[120] Letter from Greenslade to Bishop (Aug 3, 1946), Syrian Mission Files RG115, Box 14: Folder 8[Presbyterian Historical Society].

its establishment."[121] Again it should be noted that it was not Zwemer's scholarship itself that made him important to missionary training and scholarly work in Islam, but his high estimation and promotion of such work. The naming of the school further evoked the early missionary work of Henry Martyn, affirming both his evangelical and scholarly ambitions. While the inspiration may have come from Martyn and Zwemer, L. Bevan Jones, a Baptist missionary, and L.E. Browne of the Society for Propagation of the Gospel, alongside Titus with the Methodist Episcopal Mission, attended the practical details of its formation. These missionaries first started a short correspondence course in Islamics for missionaries in India in 1928. The success and popularity of the course, in addition to a visit and report from Zwemer, led the committee to expand and formalize the program as a missionary training school in 1930.[122] The Henry Martyn School continued to expand in the subsequent years. Numerous missionary scholars of Islam studied and taught there, such as Dwight Donaldson[123] and Wilfred Cantwell Smith.[124] It continues its work today, although it has shifted its aims to focus on interfaith dialogue and relations – which, as we shall see in the next chapter was the case with many of these once missionary institutions.[125]

All of these training centers featured similar approaches and understandings of the relationship between scholarship on Islam and missionary work. Likewise, the individuals involved in the founding and maintenance of these various schools were often connected in the same circles and in contact with one another. They traced their legacy to the

[121] *Henry Martyn Bulletin* (xxxiv, 2; July-Sept 1952)

[122] The school moved rather frequently in following years from Lahore to Landour to Aligarh to Jabalpur to Lucknow and finally to Hyderabad where it continues to function today under the name "Henry Martyn Institute: International Center for Research, Interfaith Relations and Reconciliation."

[123] Donaldson was prior to this a missionary in Persia, and wrote influentially on the twelver-shi'a. Letter to from E.E. Calverley to Dwight M Donaldson (Oct 5, 1940) – Calverley Collection Box 125: Folder 2298, 60907 [Hartford Seminary]

[124] W.C. Smith, *Modern Islam in India* (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1963 [1943]), x.

[125] http://www.hmiindia.org/ (Accessed May 2017).

organizational skills of Samuel Zwemer, the scholarly approaches of W.H.T. Gairdner and the labors for missionary education endorsed by Duncan Black Macdonald. These three figures had especially been essential to the promotion of Islamic studies for missionaries, and in turn they influenced the development of that field in the United States and beyond.

Conclusion

What the foregoing discussion demonstrates is a growing interest in scholarship among missionaries, as well as the growing quality of that scholarship during the first half of the twentieth century. Missionary engagement in scholarship had roots to the early work of individuals such as William Carey and Henry Martyn, and while such engagement began largely as philological and linguistic study, it developed in the case of the Protestant mission to Muslims into a treatment of Islam as a religion. Whereas missionaries of the nineteenth century were concerned to know about Islam only so far as it concerned Christian missions, twentieth century missionaries began to seek to describe Islam comprehensively as a religion. Such developments in the mission fields in Muslim-majority regions would precipitate significant changes for the academic study of Islam in the United States. In Europe a reasonable cohort of scholars of Islam had formed during the nineteenth century, but in America there was a dearth. While Timothy Marr's observation that Americans did think about Islam within popular society is important, this did not particularly translate into American academic life. The introduction of Islamic studies into the American academy developed largely because of the growing missionary interest, which arose especially at the end of the nineteenth century and continued well into the first several decades of the

twentieth. With missionary involvement in scholarship on Islam in mind, we can now turn the development of Islamic Studies in the U.S. colleges and seminaries.

II

ISLAMIC STUDIES IN U.S. SEMINARIES AND COLLEGES

> "The prominence which Hartford Seminary is taking with reference to the study of Mohammedanism is a matter of gratification with all of us who have studied there. That the English, Mr. Gairdner, should leave Germany to go to Hartford for study – if the facts are so – is very significant and must influence others who work in similar lines."[126]

This chapter traces the paths on which study of Islam was institutionalized within the changing American educational landscape and shifting Protestant sensibilities of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In American seminaries and colleges, the study of Islam was typically connected with Christian missions and their supporters. Further, as the opening passage suggests, this American development was a point of educational pride in competition with European academics. The academic study of Islam in America emerged in force during the first decades of the twentieth century alongside both American missionary and imperial expansion. Even as the missionary component of such education declined in the late 1930s, it was in such theologically/religiously motivated schools that Islam was studied as a religious phenomenon. Thus while Islamic Studies is typically traced back to political/area studies of the 1950s and 60s, as intersecting cold war theorizing and American Imperial meddling, the study of Islam as religion actually developed much earlier as a component of missionary fervor. Of course today, both of these dimensions are constitutive, but as I argue, the implications of this missionary/seminary side on the study have been largely ignored.

[126] Letter from John E. Merrill to Macdonald (July 5, 1911) Macdonald Letters Box 93: Folder 1918, 49112 [Hartford Seminary].

Major changes occurred in U.S. higher education during the latter half of the nineteenth century, which were essential in facilitating the study of Islam. American colleges and seminaries increasingly emulated the model of the German research universities that had emerged a half-century earlier. Many schools reduced their focus on chaplaincy training and instead invested in research. Likewise, developments in European Semitic and Biblical Studies (such as Higher Criticism) lead to restructurings in the relationship between universities and seminaries in the United States.[127] The associations varied in form. Schools such as the Harvard and Chicago officially incorporated their Divinity Schools into the campus. Other institutions attempted incorporative partnerships, as the case with Andover-Newton Seminary. Finally, some schools maintained informal relationships like Princeton and Princeton Theological Seminary, and Rutgers and New Brunswick Theological Seminary. These changing institutional norms facilitated shifts in the understanding of teaching religion in America, and in turn the missionary participation in teaching comparative religion and Islamics.

It was a period of major reevaluation and competition over the relationship between Protestantism and scientific principles; resulting in a growing divide between what William Hutchison termed liberals and fundamentalists during the first third of the twentieth century.[128] In this changing setting, there is one man and one school in particular that stands tall within American Islamic Studies: Duncan Black Macdonald at Hartford Theological Seminary (and its Kennedy School of Missions). It is little overstatement to say that Macdonald was the most substantial figure in shaping Islamic Studies in the United States at

[127] Glen Miller, *Piety and Profession* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), xxii.

[128] For further discussion of the divide between liberals and fundamentalists in America see especially, William Hutchison, "Chapter Six: Tradition Under Fire," in *Errand to the World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987),146-175 .

the turn of the twentieth century. Yet, he was not alone in his efforts and relied upon existing academic structures.

European Orientalism and Higher Education in the U.S.

The study of Islam in the United States, as in Europe, was closely connected with the project of Orientalism. The emergence of all forms of Orientalism in the U.S. was predicated on the development of such scholarship in Europe. Orientalism, as Edward Said indicated in his now classic and thoroughly critiqued work, was a field of discourses (Islamics, Indology, Sanskrit, Semitics, etc.) that all took for granted a monolithic Orient, which served as a counter-world to the West.[129] Of course, Europe had a much earlier start to study of Islam, which for much of its history had hovered along its literal and imaginary borders as a military and religious threat. A few late medieval European Christian theologians and missionaries such as Francis of Assisi (d. 1226), Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), Roger Bacon (d. 1294) and Raymund Lull (d. 1315) initiated preliminary (though polemical) scholarship on Islam – endorsing missions as a counter-crusade.[130] However, it was not until European countries emerged as dominant colonial forces in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the religion and its associated political benefactors (namely the Ottoman and Mughal Empires) became sustained objects of European scholarly fascination.

It was from such earlier endeavors that a regularized disciplinary formation flourished in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, combined with increased academic

[129] There is some difference between Orientalism as academic discipline(s) and the discourses these disciplines produced. While the terms are moderately interchangeable in that Orientalism/Oriental studies constituted the source of these discourse, the latter sense refers to the more general (and not necessarily academic) view.

[130] These figures were also heroes of later Protestant missionaries. See for example Gairdner's discussion of past attempts to "save Islam" in chapter six of his *Rebuke of Islam* (1920). For more recent accounts of the medieval encounters see Albrecht Classen (ed.), *East Meets West in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Times* (2013).

specialization in continental universities. For good reason Said places the French Arabist Sylvestre de Sacy (1758-1838) as the progenitor of modern Orientalism, having taught nearly all the major Orientalists of the early nineteenth century.[131] The scholarly production of knowledge endorsed by figures like de Sacy provided the ideological structures on which the whole colonialist undertaking was justified and was in turn necessitated by that same colonial dominance of eastern lands. In short, "Orientalism assumed an unchanging Orient," incapable of self-reformation, and "absolutely different (the reasons change from epoch to epoch) from the West."[132] The scholarship on Islam produced by most European Orientalist was largely bound to classical era studies and represented largely with within comparative Semitics and philology. So, many influential Islamicists of the latter half of the nineteenth century – such as Ignaz Goldziher and William Robertson Smith – also produced works dealing with early Judaism and other Semitic language and religious topics. In the next chapter we will compare the views of missionary scholars with that of their European Orientalist counterparts, but for now we limit the topic to the structural contributions of European Orientalism in the America setting and with specific attention to Islamics.

The early American republic did not entirely lack interest in Islam/Orient, having early encounters with Barbary pirates in the Mediterranean, African Muslim slaves, as well as the adventures of missionaries such as Pliny Fisk and Levi Parsons in the Levant.[133] Yet, for Americans, Islam did not demand quite the same attention as it did to countries like France and England, who were invested colonially in Muslim-majority regions at the

[131] Said, *Orientalism,* 83.
[132] Said, *Orientalism,* 96
[133] See Thomas Kidd, *American Christians and Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); Marr, *The Cultural Roots of American Islamicism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Sha'ban, *American Orientalism* (Durham: Acorn Press, 1991). All three document the presence of discourse about Islam in the U.S. However, it was almost exclusively used in a public capacity as a rhetorical polemic drawing on European tropes about Islam and Muhammad. The early uses were hardly academic, and none of these authors discuss the study in the early American higher education scene.

time.[134] Likewise, educationally Germany led the way in the development of research universities in which such studies could flourish. U.S. schools were largely unequipped for rigorous academic study until after the American Civil War.[135] What little study of Islam took place was conducted by isolated individuals and typically after completing advanced study in Germany.

After the Civil War higher education in the U.S. developed dramatically. This was especially due to the Morrill Act of 1862, which provided Federal land grants for colleges across the county. As historian Rogers Smith has described the period following the act, "The colleges it fostered, along with private founding of denominational colleges, teacher training institutes, women's colleges, and various institutions of higher learning for blacks, transformed the U.S. into a 'land of colleges' by 1875."[136] With such changes the U.S. began to thrive as an educational center. A product of the proliferation of colleges was greater opportunity for select institutions to adopt research models. A number of American professors who had studied in Germany early in their careers were positioned to encourage more rigorous research methodologies in American universities. European approaches to comparative philology and biblical studies were brought increasingly into American institutions and played an important role in how Islam came to be studied in the U.S. Along

[134] Tejirian and Simon, *Conflict, Conquest and Conversion* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 55-62. They discuss both Catholic and Protestant missionary connections to colonial interests.

[135] Yale was slightly ahead of the curve, granting the first American University PhD in 1861. Shepard, *God's People in the Ivory Tower* (Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing, 1991), 1.

[136] Smith, *Civic Ideals* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 322. The Morrill Act was explicitly designed for the founding of Agricultural colleges, though with the provision that they also teach general subjects.

with these came changing understandings of Protestantism that allowed for the study of other religions to enter both universities and seminaries.[137]

The early U.S. study of Islam followed the course of its European counterparts, developing in connection to Semitic philology, comparative religion and history of religion(s), as well as in anthropology and ethnography. Yet, divergences emerged soon after, as American higher education in the nineteenth century was particularly committed to the production of good moral citizens.[138] The study of Islam was not essential to that goal in the mind of most American Orientalists and so, even as the related fields of Semitics and comparative religion increasingly appeared in the U.S., Islam received meager attention. It was not until missionary scholarship on Islam gained adherents at the end of the nineteenth century that Islamics would find any real purchase in U.S. institutions. Still, the adoption of European research methodologies on religion and language set certain precedents in the United States and served as the grounds upon which the missionary study would develop.

Comparative Religion and Religions of the World

The history of the study of religion(s) as an academic field in the U.S. has been a regular topic of inquiry for disciplinary historians within Religious Studies.[139] Initially in most schools the study was reflected through required "religion" courses, which primarily meant courses detailing Protestant ethics via discussion of the Bible. As D.G. Hart summarizes, the value of studying religion was in the idea that "religion was a socially

[137] D.G. Hart, *The University Gets Religion* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 14. Hart goes on further to note that such changes were instrumental in the creation of the modernist-fundamentalist divide of the early twentieth century.

[138] Both Hart and Shepard discuss the production of moral citizenship within American higher education. Even as institutions pushed away from denominationalism they maintained a desire to promote (broadly Christian religiosity. Hart gives the example of Eliott at Harvard, 25-30.

[139] Its development has elicited decadal evaluation: e.g. Sharpe (1975), Kitagawa (1987), Shepard (1991), Hart (2002), Masuzawa (2009).

cohesive, intellectually integrative, and morally reassuring entity that gave the small liberal college its unique character and that gave the state university what it needed to provide a proper education not just for Protestant students, but for all Americans."[140] However, as several scholars have noted, there was some attempt towards the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century to formalize the study of religion more broadly and scientifically. This manifested in departments of the history of religion(s) and comparative religion at institutions such as Harvard Divinity (1867), Boston University (1873), the University of Chicago (1893).[141] While some have argued these trends reflected a growing secularization in the schools – a product of the Darwinian scientific revolution – the more accurate assessment is that of Hart, who recognizes that it was more a move away from denominationalism than Christianity as a whole.[142] Thus religious education was maintained at most colleges and universities even as they introduced scientific approaches to the topic in other classes. Administrators stripped away denominational oversight while maintaining the general moral value of religious education to students. The comparative study of religion was established with Christianity as the ideal against which all other religions were judged. As such it was often within such departments that Islam received occasional early attention.[143]

[140] Hart, 79.

[141] Shepard, 10-16; 77-106.

[142] Hart, 36.

[143] The growing interest in comparative religion was also connected with the popularity of World Fairs, and events like the Parliament of Religions. For instance, the emphasis on comparative religion at the University of Chicago was explicitly connected with such events by its founder: "At the beginning of our work the mind of Chicago was engrossed with the thought of the Columbian Exposition." (Harper, "Quinquennial Address," *University Register*, Institute Docs Box 7, [University of Chicago], 254). Masuzawa has discussed how the Chicago Parliament of Religions of 1893 has often been discussed as a first attempt, though flawed, towards religious pluralism. She is more staid in her assessment of the significance of the event. Similarly Sharpe has offered a negative critique of the importance of the Chicago parliament. That notwithstanding, for those involved at Chicago it was seen as a significant event in their promotion of comparative religion, even as the field in the U.S. was still deeply bound to Protestant categories and at least some emphasis on missions.

The push away from denominationalism was important in how Islam came to be studied as part of a larger reformation in Protestant Christianity, including in mission circles, at the turn of the twentieth century. There was a pronounced trend (via interdenominational mission conferences and organizations) to encourage a Christianity which was universalized, especially as part of missionary efforts. It is not coincidental that at the same time these sorts of changes were occurring among missions, comparative religion appeared in many schools, emphasizing precisely the universal and highest quality of Christianity as religion. A universal Christianity was increasingly seen as valuable to the missionary front, as it faced increasing criticism from its audiences around the world over its factionalism and denominationalism. So while denominationalism never disappeared entirely, the turn of the century was characterized by efforts at Christian unity (at least among mainline churches), seen both in missions and in colleges and seminaries. These attempts meant paring down heavy sectarian confessions, and stressing a core message of Christianity – usually Christ himself – as the heart, often paired along with social and educational work. And the efficacy of that message would become a crucial debate in the decades to come.[144]

Comparative religion as articulated in the conception of world religions in the United States reflected much of this changing sensibility. While the number of world religions varied somewhat, the basic list included Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism and Christianity. As Tomoko Masuzawa in her discussion the study of world religions observes, "It may be credibly suggested that the popularity of world religions was more a legacy of the religious-evangelical enterprise of comparative theology than of the arcane technical and

[144] It is worth noting how Christian organizations in the latter nineteenth century began to use the language of non-denominational, non-sectarian, interdenominational and similar phrases. An exploration of the exact parameters of those terms would likely offer an insightful portrait of the shifting understandings of Protestantism in connection to missions.

scholarly tradition of the nineteenth-century science of religion."[145] While some American scholars attempted to differentiate in this period between so-called academic comparative religion and confessional comparative theology, the differences were often minute. In both, Islam was typically denied universal status, and instead depicted as a national Arab/Semitic religion, and compared unfavorably to Christianity. In these depictions, another constitutive component of the study of religion is revealed: comparative Semitics/philology.[146]

Philology and Semitics and the rise of American Orientalism

The corollary and perhaps even more constitutive side in the development of Islamic studies came from philology and comparative Semitics. Benjamin Foster in his history of Semitics in the U.S. observes the influence of European Orientalist professionalization in the early nineteenth century, observing that most of the first American Orientalists and Semiticists studied in Germany, or at least drew upon German scholarship. For instance, Moses Stuart who taught Hebrew at Andover Seminary relied heavily upon the work of German philologist Wilhelm Gesenius.[147] It is worth noting the close connection between such Semitic studies at Andover and the first American missions in the Middle East. Foster comments, "Nearly all the leading American missionaries in the Near East had been among Stuart's students."[148]

[145] Masuzawa, *Invention of World Religions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 23.

[146] Masuzawa, 173. Masuzawa makes this connection readily apparent by noting that Buddhism was often presented as a world religion, because of its Aryan heritage, thus connected it to Europe; See 179-206.

[147] Benjamin Foster "Semitics in the U.S." in Amanat and Bernhardsson (eds.) *US-Middle East Encounters* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press), 16.

[148] Foster "Semitics," 17. This is an observation that reads surprisingly similar to what Said remarked about de Sacy in Europe. The fact being, that in the early years of academic Hebrew/Arabic/Semitic studies there were few qualified or interested, and so early figures had enormous influential power on the emergence of the field.

Arabic arrived in the U.S. primarily as a handmaiden to Hebrew study and was important to the development of both Islamic studies and Oriental studies more generally. Foster locates the beginnings of American academic Oriental Studies in the work of Edward Salisbury (1814-1901). Salisbury, a Yale graduate, traveled to Europe to study Arabic (with Georg Freytag and Sylvestre de Sacy) as well as Sanskrit. He returned to teach at Yale in 1841 and introduced Arabic and Sanskrit graduate courses in 1847. Foster suggests, "[Salisbury's] early essays on Arabic and Islam, not to mention Buddhism… were the first professional scholarship of their kind published in America."[149] Foster emphasizes the significance of this work as specialized academic research did not exist in U.S. colleges at the time. Yet, Salisbury's impact on students was limited. Only two students in thirteen years enrolled in his Arabic or Sanskrit courses. Thus at mid-century there existed only a small cohort of male scholars who contributed to development of American Orientalism.[150]

This small coterie formed the American Oriental Society (AOS) in 1842, as the earliest American scholarly society explicitly interested in Oriental and Semitic studies. It mimicked earlier-established colonial research societies such as the French Societé Asiatique (1822) and British Royal Asiatic Society (1823). Those involved were primarily interested in Semitic philology and biblical archaeology. At the inauguration of the society, its president, John Pickering, described its interest in a broadly construed Orient (China, Pacific Islands, etc.), but especially in ancient Egypt and India – hieroglyphics, biblical studies and ancient languages. Notable to our present study is that the little attention paid to the contemporary period was framed explicitly in connection with missionary work. Pickering states:

[149] Foster "Semitics," 21.
[150] Foster "Semitics," 22.

> We cannot but take pride in … American missionaries in the East and other parts of the globe, we have reason to believe there is a greater number of individuals, who are masters of the languages and literature of their pagan and other converts, than are to be found among the missionaries of any one nation of Europe. While these indefatigable men, – aided by the resolute American women, who with characteristic devotedness fearlessly accompany them even to martyrdom, – have been impelled, by a sense of religious duty, to the task of peacefully disseminating the benign principles of Christianity, *they have also been making lasting additions to our knowledge of the moral and social condition of those distant nations;* and – what more immediately concerns our own Association – *they have greatly extended our acquaintance with the languages and literature of the oriental nations, and have furnished the most valuable additional materials towards the history of the human race and the completion of the science of ethnography*.[151]

A clearer statement of the convergences between missionary work and scholarly development in the U.S. is hardly possible. Missionaries – and it is noteworthy that in 1842 Pickering includes men and women – were doing an important religious duty in spreading the Christian principles, yet they were also producing ethnographic knowledge on contemporary conditions. Additionally, Pickering establishes the focus of the AOS in connection with missions as language and literature. He places these missionaries in competition with their European counterparts, thus setting the stage for American scholarly competition with Europe. As the AOS expanded during the latter half of the nineteenth century missionaries continued to comprise part of its base.

Yet, the majority of the scholarship published within the society's journal, the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (*JAOS*) did not discuss Islam. Up until the turn of the century, the *JAOS* published only around two dozen articles pertaining to Islam or Islamicate subjects. The most notable early articles discussing the Islamic subjects were Salisbury's translation of selected Ismaili doctrinal writings (1851) and article on

[151]Pickering, "Inaugural Address" *JAOS* (1:1, 1843), 2. My emphasis.

predestination in Islam (1866); and John P. Brown's article on Sufism (1866). Near the end of the century, D.B. Macdonald and Charles Torrey Smith added a few more pertinent articles on famous Muslim figures.[152] Meanwhile the journal published primarily articles on ancient history and languages. So, even as the AOS began to increase American scholarly interest in Oriental studies, this did not particularly translate into the study of Islam.

Despite attempts to establish Oriental language studies as an independent field, for most of the nineteenth century these remained subordinated to Hebrew, biblical exegesis and history. Still, the study of Arabic and cognates meant the introduction of its literature. As the best examples of Arabic were firmly grounded in the Islamic textual tradition, the study of Islam was somewhat inadvertently and haphazardly introduced into Semitic language programs. It is important to recognize that this was not a study of Islam as such, but of Islamic texts, as a way of dealing with comparative philology. Yet, many of the ideas that came out of this philology in Europe (e.g. racialized hierarchies) carried over to the U.S. and comment was made on Muslims historically as well. This broadening of Semitic studies to consistently include cognates was not widespread until the mid-1870 and -80s within programs developing mainly in east coast colleges and seminaries.[153]

Arabic and Missions at New Brunswick Theological Seminary

One of these programs to offer the study of Arabic significantly was New Brunswick Theological Seminary (NBTS), which in turn had implications for the study of Islam. When the school decided to hire John G. Lansing (1851-1906) as professor of Semitics, it did so convinced of Lansing's skills as an Arabist. A look at the curriculum of this school is

[152] This was Macdonald's sole contribution to the journal.
[153] Foster , "Semitics," 19-25.

instructive in seeing how missions and Semitic language education were connected to the early study of Islam in the United States. We have already seen Lansing introduced through his connection to Zwemer and the Arabian Mission in chapter one. Lansing was the son of missionaries in Egypt affiliated with the United Presbyterian Church of North America (UPCNA) mission there. He was born in Cairo, and his love of the city and the Arabic language carried into his professional career. In 1884, NBTS hired Lansing as the Gardner A. Sage Professor of Old Testament Languages and Exegesis. In his inaugural speech Lansing stated clearly his vision for the program, "The Languages of the Old Testament are commonly classified as Hebrew and Aramaic… in this classification there is one serious omission… Arabic."[154] Here we can see Lansing, while endorsing the study of Arabic seriously, confirmed its role in the seminary as of primarily comparative biblical linguistic interest. Still, the seminary was excited by Lansing's work and success in bringing new students to the language. Whereas forty years prior Salisbury had only managed to secure two students for Arabic, Lansing in just 1887 had a class of nine.[155] This is still a humble number, but is indicative of substantial growth in Arabic studies and of Lansing's belief in the importance of the language.

Lansing was first and foremost an Arabist. In his *Arabic Manual* (1886) he writes, "That the prominent position due it [Arabic] has not always been universally felt and conceded as equally relevant…. Arabic occupies the first place as to importance in the study of the Hebrew and Aramaic of the Bible." Despite the fact that Arabic does not occur directly in the biblical texts, Lansing insisted its value because of its overlap with other Semitic languages, lexical richness, logical structure, literary importance, and finally "living

[154] Inauguration of John G. Lansing (1884) [Presbyterian Historical Society]. Although it's not really clear what he meant by "omission," as the Hebrew Scriptures do not contain Arabic within them.

[155] NBTS Faculty Minutes (May 17, 1887), Minutes of the Board of Superintendents (Vol 3) [NBTS].

character," since "about seventy millions of persons speak the Arabic as their vernacular, while it is read, more or less, by about two hundred million."[156] This consideration of the living quality of the language has two significant implications. First, it reveals the notion endorsed by many European Semitists that the living Arabic-speaking populations – and in particular Bedouin – were a resource for understanding the lifestyles of the ancient Israelites. Here the Orientalist vision of the Arab world as backward was connected with timelessness, allowing for ethnography of Israelites through ethnography of Bedouin. That is to say, the Arabs and their language revealed the prototypical Semite.[157]

Secondly, though not necessarily unrelated, was the imperative of the language for contemporary missionary work. Arabic as a language for the Semitic scholar also had implications for the missionary and it was in this latter connection that the study of Islam came to be valued.[158] Here the twin aspects of the study of Islam in comparative religion and comparative Semitics become clear. The further missionary connection is highlighted by the fact the same year Lansing arrived and added Arabic to the school's curriculum (under the course heading "Hebrew and Cognate Languages"), comparative religion was also introduced under the grouping of "Apologetics." Five years later the Graves' Lectures on Missions were inaugurated at the seminary with the speakers Cyrus Hamlin and E.M. Wherry.[159] We can see here links between Semitic studies and comparative religion at the

[156] Lansing, *An Arabic Manual (*Chicago: American Publication Society of Hebrew, 1886), J.G. Lansing Works [NBTS], v.

[157] This was an idea argued by Ernest Renan and his racialized understanding of language (where Semitics was inferior to European languages and thus culture/race), especially outlined in *Histoire generale et systeme compare des langues semitiques* (1855). And in relation to comparative religion/theology: Semitic religion was likewise demeaned (mostly meaning Islam; though also referring to antique Judaism – as there was little attention paid during this time to existing Arabic speaking Christians outside of the missionaries working with and/or polemicizing them).

[158] Foster states that missionaries made up the majority of those studying "oriental languages," "Semitics," 23.

[159] NBTS Course Catalog, 1888-89 [NBTS].

seminary, which in turn would be associated with mission promotion. And in the particular case of NBTS these components facilitated the study of Islam. It is significant that Hamlin (the founder of Robert College, Turkey) and Wherry (the influential missionary apologist) spoke at NBTS, reflecting not only the increasing interdenominational spirit of that Reformed seminary (Hamlin was a Congregationalist and Wherry a Presbyterian), but also a bridging of the gap between educationalist and controversialist positions in relation to the discussion of Islam. It is no wonder then that young Samuel Zwemer as we saw in the previous chapter, encouraged by Lansing and his connection to Egypt, would take up the torch and promote both missions and Islamic studies. While the study of Islam never featured prominently within the curriculum of NBTS outside of its literary contributions in Semitics, the seminary in these years instituted it within the promotion of missions.

This, however, was a short lived period at New Brunswick. Lansing in the 1890s was only intermittently present at the seminary due to numerous health and personal issues. This culminated in his resignation in December of 1898. After that time he largely disappeared from any participation in scholarly work. He ended up in Denver where he died in 1906. In Denver he sold his collection of books, manuscripts and "oddities" from his life in the Middle East to the librarian at the Denver Public Library, thus starting a museum collection. The collection was largely uncurated for another forty years, until its discovery by the scholar Charles Matthews.[160] Matthews' remarks on the collection highlight an enduring connection between missions and the study of Islam,

> Soon I had the thrill of handling about fifty books, several manuscripts, a beautiful Mameluke inscription, and a few antiquities, which had belonged to the inspirer of the Arabian mission, the author of *An Arabic Manual* in the

[160] Matthews was a research fellow at the University of Chicago, and found the collection while conducting a survey of "Oriental" collections at libraries in the Western U.S.

> series edited by President Harper of Chicago, the teacher of Zwemer and Cantine - the Rev. Dr. John G. Lansing![161]

We see here the explicit link between Lansing at New Brunswick Theological Seminary, William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago, and the Arabian Mission of Zwemer.[162] The reference to Harper is notable. Lansing's work had not been limited to NBTS, he had likewise worked with Harper in the latter's vigorous efforts to develop biblical linguistic prior to founding the University of Chicago.

Sacred Literature, Chicago and W.R. Harper

W.R. Harper, was a major shaper of higher education in the United States through his work as first president of the University of Chicago. He was also dedicated to biblical studies and Semitics, fields he remained involved in even while president – heading the Semitics program at Chicago. Harper completed a PhD at Yale in 1875, and in the following years taught at various schools and developed a network of Semitic scholars. Harper also founded (while he was at Union Theological Seminary) the American Institute of Hebrew in 1880 in collaboration with George E. Day (Yale), Charles A. Briggs (Union Theological Seminary), and John P. Peters (Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church). The Institute of Hebrew was comprised of correspondence courses, a summer intensive program, as well as the publication of the Hebrew Student Journal, which sought to promote the "undenominational" study of Hebrew and its cognates. Regarding the instruction in cognates, it included among its initial officers J.G. Lansing, who undertook most of the

[161] Matthews, "The Reliques of John G. Lansing" *Moslem World* (30: 3, 1940), 269.

[162] There is a final connection with missions as Matthews published his catalogued description of this collection in the *Moslem World* journal – a journal which was initially founded as a place for missionary scholarship by Samuel Zwemer, and at the time of publication affiliated (until today) with Hartford Seminary, under the editorship of Edwin Calverley, a student of D.B. Macdonald. A complete list of the collection can be found in Matthews, "Reliques of John G. Lansing" *Moslem World* (30: 3, 1940).

responsibility for organizing Arabic components of the Institute's programs.[163] The inclusion of Arabic became an important element when the program was restructured and reorganized in 1889 as the American Institute of Sacred Literature (AISL).[164] While it remained primarily invested in study of Christian scripture, the expanded society also considered "the contributions of other religious literatures… that through the study of these literatures the teachings of the Scriptures may be more clearly understood."[165] This included Arabic courses that aimed to produce "mastery of the Quran."[166] Here we see again the blending of Comparative Religion with comparative philology/Semitics, which stressed direct engagement with Islamic texts, even if only for illuminating Christian scriptures. After the founding of the University of Chicago, AISL was incorporated into its Extension Division, and fit in nicely with that University's developing Semitics and comparative religion programs.

The University of Chicago and its divinity school became a major site for Oriental studies in the early twentieth century. The University opened its doors in 1892, grounded in the vision of Harper, the money of Rockefeller and the support of the American Baptist Educational Board.[167] Despite its Baptist heritage, it was explicitly designed to be free of

[163] Constitution and By-laws for the Institute of Hebrew (n.d.) [American Institute of Sacred Literature Box 2, Folder 1; Special Collections, University of Chicago]

[164] A History of the American Institute of Sacred Literature (N.D.) [U Chicago Special Collections: https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/scrc/findingaids/view.php?eadid=ICU.SPCL.AISL&q=Hebraica]. They do note some confusion over the founding of the Institute, where some material dates it to 1878.

[165] Creed [of Council of the AISL] (n.d.; c.a. post 1895), WR Harper Collection subseries 2 misc. correspondence, notebook ii; [University of Chicago].

[166] The American Institute of sacred Literature (June, 1893), WR Harper Collection subseries 2 misc. correspondence, notebook ii [University of Chicago].

[167] In his Quinquennial address, Harper thanks Rockefeller using religious language: "To the God who is over all and in all we make acknowledgement of our gratitude, because he it was who prompted the founder's [Rockefeller] heart to undertake this gigantic work, because it was his spirit that inspired the hearty cooperation with which the donors entered into a participation of the work; because it was his overruling providence that created so widespread a sympathy and appreciations in the hearts of men who have everywhere become its friends." (Harper, "Quinquennial Address" University Record (1:16; 1896) American Institute of Sacred Literature Box 7 [University of Chicago], 254)

ecclesiastical control, although it maintained a general commitment to the value of a broadly-defined Protestant Christianity for its students. These Christian principles were for Harper completely compatible with scientific research, and he saw no serious conflict between religion and science. Chicago was to be a research university.[168] It was in this spirit that Harper devoted much of his energy to the promotion of competitive Oriental studies within the new university. He was to a degree fulfilling the request of Oxford Assyriologist A.H. Sayce, who wrote Harper in 1890 requesting, "That you in America would help us.... The whole English-speaking world ought to be united in the attempt to advance Oriental studies."[169] Sayce desired increased attention among the European Oriental Congress on Old Testament scholarship, which was Harper's particular field of interest. Of course we have already seen Harper calling for this in the AISL, but institutionalized at Chicago, Harper's vision for a liberally-minded atmosphere of research also opened up space for discussion of religion beyond biblical studies.

Chicago opened a department of Comparative Religion, which D.G. Hart describes in his history of religious studies: "Of all the emerging universities dedicated to the newer ideals in higher education… Chicago was the only one to have what today would resemble a department of religious studies."[170] If all of this seems to suggest that Chicago was isolated from Christian missionary efforts, it is necessary to mention the endorsement of missions within the pages of a 1894 issue of *The Biblical World*, which commended the Comparative Religion department of the University as "useful to those who are intending to enter the work of foreign missions and to those missionaries who may desire to investigate more

[168] Shepard ,43-45.
[169] Letter for A.H. Sayce to Harper (May 16, 1890) WR Harper Collection Box 1, Folder 12; [University of Chicago].
[170] Hart, 52.

deeply the special religions with which they come in contact, or the subject of religion in general."[171]

The study of Islam at Chicago developed against this backdrop of missionary education and in an interdisciplinary fashion. While much has been made of the novelty of the Department of Comparative Religion at University of Chicago, it was within the Semitic Language and Literature department that Islam would be given the widest treatment.[172] Likewise, the History department offered courses that intersected with consideration of Islam as a civilizational force. In its opening year of 1892-93, the university had an unusually large selection of courses intersecting with Islamic Studies. George S. Goodspeed (chair and sole professor of the Comparative Religion department) taught a course titled "Islam" during the summer session of 1893, which examined "The life and Teachings of Mohammed and the religious movement proceeding from him."[173] This class was cross-listed with the Semitic Language and Literature department, which further offered a pair of courses looking at "Earlier Suras of the Kuran" and "Later Suras of the Kuran," (taught by Harper).[174] The History department additionally offered a course entitled "History of Mohammedanism to the End of the Crusades." By the end of the century the coursework on Islam was shifting out of Comparative Religion – Goodspeed's Islam was subsumed within a course entitled "Religions of the Semites." The History department expanded its courses

[171] "Comparative-Religion Notes," *Biblical World* (3:2, 1894), 128-129. This journal was published by Chicago, and was edited by Harper. While this was blatant self-promotion, it makes all the more relevant the explicit desire for missionary education.

[172] As Shepard notes, Comparative Religion at Chicago struggled to find a foothold in the first several decades, attracting few students. Further neither of its first two major professors was especially interested in Islam (G.S. Goodspeed being mostly concerned with antique religions and G.B. Foster a philosophical scholar) (Shepard 95;101). Still while perhaps not directly influential in Islamic Studies, the cross-listing with other departments increased attention to a degree on the topic of Islam as religion (rather than as a civilizational and literary antecedent). For instance the invitation for Macdonald to participate in the Haskell lectures came from Goodspeed, as part of the Comparative Religion department.

[173] Register of the University of Chicago (1892-93) [University of Chicago], 51.

[174] Register of the University of Chicago (1892-93) [University of Chicago].

on Islamic civilization to include both a survey course on the early expansion as well as keeping the course on the crusade period. The two Qur'an survey classes remained. Additionally, James Henry Breasted who had joined the faculty of the Semitics department in 1894 after completing a PhD in Egyptology, offered a course on Ibn Hishām's biography of the Prophet in comparison with "leading European lives of the prophet."[175]

The shifts continued in the new century. James R. Jewett was hired in 1902 to teach Arabic. Jewett had graduated with a BA from Harvard, and went to Europe to obtain a PhD at the University of Strasburg in 1890, and had likewise traveled around the Middle East (including a brief scholarly residence at the Syrian Protestant College).[176] In addition to Arabic, Jewett took over most of the Islamic text courses within the Semitics department. He added a class on Muslim eschatology and another on the spread of Islam, significantly billed as "a study of the progress of Mohammedanism, with special reference to the Islam of today."[177] This was the first course at Chicago directed explicitly towards contemporary Islam. It is notable that the Divinity school had also added a Professor of Modern Missions around this time, who would in the years that followed teach regularly a course on Missionary work among Muslims. Jewett's courses remained cross-listed in Comparative Religion, but the reality was that Islamics was entrenched now within Semitic studies. At the same time, Jewett's hiring freed Breasted to devote himself almost entirely to his passion for Egyptology, which would become a defining feature of the Chicago's Semitics program. In 1911, due to department infighting, Jewett resigned from the University and took a position of Arabic language at Harvard.

[175] Register of the University of Chicago (1899-00) [University of Chicago], 209.
[176] Register of University of Chicago (1907-08) [University of Chicago]; SPC catalogue 1902-03 [NEST].
[177] Register of the University of Chicago (1905-06 Register) [University of Chicago],191.

Courses were spread around again, until Martin Sprengling was invited in 1915 as formal replacement for Jewett and largely maintained his coursework. Following the war, significant changes came, which included the renaming of the Semitics department as Oriental Languages and Literature, as well as delineation of various sub-programs of study within the department. These included a program aimed "For Service in the Near Orient," which was designed "For missionaries, commercial or professional men, diplomatic or other government service."[178] Again, we see the continued connection between missionary training and the University of Chicago, though now extended to the expansion of U.S. imperial interests in the twentieth century. In 1918 comparative religion was turned over, upon the death of its controversial professor George Burman Foster, to a Chicago Divinity graduate Eustace Haydon, who displayed no interest in Islam.

For all its assorted classes on Islam within various departments, Chicago in the early years did not have a scholar explicitly devoted to the study of Islam in their own research. As such, we may see the most significant event in the early decades of Islamic studies at Chicago in the Haskell Lectures in Comparative Religion[179] delivered in 1906 by D.B. Macdonald, on the "Religious Attitude and Religious Life as it developed in Islam." While the lectures themselves were notable (and we may see Jewett's addition of contemporary Islam course as a preparatory for Macdonald's visit), they more significantly point us to the

[178] Register of the University of Chicago (1921-1922) [University of Chicago], 186-87.

[179] Caroline Haskell was a major donor to the University's Oriental and religious studies. To get a sense of the liberal Christian motivations in Caroline Haskell's endowment of the Haskell (as well as Barrows) lectures, Harper's statement on her in regards to her endowment of the Oriental Museum are instructive: "Her heart is full of love to God who has so providentially guided her life. Her mind is so occupied with the thought that men and women everywhere should know more about the revelation vouchsafed by this God to humanity; her whole soul is so aglow with the contents of divine truth itself, that she makes this contribution to further the interests of a true understanding of the true religion. She realizes, moreover, that this thought of relationship to God is universal; that in the minds of men everywhere there has been effort to find the God whom we, the disciples of Jesus Christ, have learned to know from our Master." (Harper, "Notes on the Dedication of the Haskell Oriental Museum," The University Record (Vol 1:15; 1896), American Institute of Sacred Literature Box 7 [University of Chicago], 244).

heart of the study of Islam in the United States in the person of D.B. Macdonald and a small seminary some 850 plus miles to the East in Hartford, CT.

Hartford and the Kennedy School of Missions and a department of Islamic Studies

In 1885, the Theological Institute of Connecticut (est. 1834) changed its name to Hartford Theological Seminary. Seven years later the Seminary hired a young Scottish scholar to serve as a professor in its Oriental Language department. The new professor, Duncan Black Macdonald, remains among the most famous individuals associated with that school for his considerable contributions within the field of Islamic Studies. Macdonald was a graduate of Glasgow University and a licentiate of the Church of Scotland. After he completed his M.A., he traveled to Berlin where he spent fifteen months studying under the Orientalist Eduard Sachau.[180] His studies in Berlin were focused on Semitic languages, and in particular Arabic, which Macdonald, not unlike Lansing, believed was "the only pure foundation for Semitic study."[181] Arabic as we have seen was becoming more common in seminaries and Macdonald was brought on as an Arabic-specializing Semiticist, but unlike most of his counterparts at other seminaries and colleges, Macdonald would drastically re-envision his role at the school, creating the first dedicated program of Islamic Studies in the United States with missionary-training in mind. Reflecting to a colleague in 1932, Macdonald boldly stated, "I have had here in Hartford the first real School of Arabic this side of the Atlantic; I have had the first and only School of Muslim Science."[182]

[180] Eduard Sachau is perhaps most noted for his translation of Abu Rayhan al-Biruni's (d. 1048) *Tarīkh al-Hind* [History of India]. Al-Biruni in this and other works has been regarded as providing an early model of comparative religion.

[181] Letter Macdonald to Hartranft (April 21, 1892), Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1875, 47738 [Hartford Seminary].

[182] Letter from Macdonald to Capen (Nov 18, 1932), Macdonald Collection Box 100: Folder 2021, 52526 [Hartford Seminary].

Yet, after his first year in the seminary, his future with the school was undecided. The administration had received a number of complaints from students regarding Macdonald's teaching style (he was too difficult), and seminary President Chester David Hartranft in discussing bringing Macdonald back for another term noted, "In your case we feel that the experiment of the past year has issued ambiguously."[183] Macdonald defended his position, emphasizing the need to adjust course scheduling for language work. He also commented, "Frankly, if the Seminary requires a man who will be a social success, I shall not suit. I am a student, a bookworm," but that he would teach by example what it means to conduct scholarship. "By scholarship, I do not mean grammatical finesse but that devotion to truth and clear accuracy which makes up the character of the scholar and which cannot be produced in any didactic way but only by the influence of character upon character."[184] From this early exchange, we can see that Macdonald already had something very particular in mind for his work at Hartford. He was a scholar first, not an instructor, and he sought to train seminarians as scholars by example. If character-formation was a major aim of American higher education, Macdonald was dedicated to scholarly-character formation. As the administration's hesitation reveals, this stress on scholarship was out of place for the seminary at the time.

For his part, Macdonald probably did not intend to spend his whole career in Hartford, and many were perhaps surprised that it became his only position. A friend commented to Macdonald in 1892, "[Hartford] Seminary is small, but it is a good place to

[183] Letter from Letter from Registrar at Hartford Sem to Macdonald (July 11, 1893) Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1975, 47751a [Hartford Seminary].

[184] Letter to Hartranft from Macdonald (July 30, 1893; Berlin) Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1875, 47753 [Hartford Seminary].

go from,"[185] highlighting the expected trajectory of Macdonald. Over the years he would consider various positions in Arabic and Islamic Studies in the U.S. (e.g. University of Chicago) and in Europe (e.g. Cambridge), but he never received another post.[186] While Macdonald's scholarly persona might have been out of the norm at the time of his hiring, it actually reflected a serious restructuring of the Seminary occurring around the turn of the century.

President C.D. Hartranft (from 1888 to 1902) was the driving force attempting to build a different type of seminary, especially focused on missionary preparation. The first major change Hartranft implemented was opening the doors to women in 1888, becoming the first co-educational theological seminary in the United States. Women were included in the school specifically to receive missionary training, and thus the decision was part of the larger plan for the seminary to train missionaries more thoroughly for their work.[187] Following this, the school inaugurated in 1890 the A.C. Thompson sponsored Lectures on Foreign Missions, which promoted missions as a career among students. In 1899, the school began to partner with other regional colleges (initially Trinity College) to offer a more

[185] Letter from Elizabeth Kelsey to Macdonald (May 11, 1892) Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1875, 47741 [Hartford Seminary].

[186] William Harper president of the University of Chicago suggested the possibility of establishing a chair of Arabic Studies for Macdonald. Though the seriousness of this offer is somewhat questionable as R.M. Venley (University of Michigan) explained to Macdonald, "The plain truth is, [Harper] is a promoter, and like the breed, not too careful about keeping roseate promises." (Letter from Venley to Macdonald, (Feb 5, 1905), Macdonald Letters Box 91: Folder 1887, 48130 [Hartford Seminary]. As for the Cambridge position, Macdonald had applied to the Sir Thomas Professor of Arabic post, but lost after review to E.G. Browne – a British Orientalist perhaps most famously known for his work on Persian Literature. Additionally HTS president Mackenzie notes in the *Macdonald Presentation Volume* (1933) that Macdonald declined several prestigious American posts while at Hartford (though he does not clarify which schools), 5.

[187] Elwood Street, *A Living Vision : A Brief Story of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1833-1958* (Hartford: Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1958), 26.

diverse liberal education to students. Within this effort the school hoped to give "Comparative Religion a more distinctive place in the curriculum than hitherto."[188]

Hiring Macdonald was a part of Hartranft's project in reforming the seminary. As quoted, Macdonald's appointment was an "experiment," and while it was initially unclear if an Arabic scholar was what the school needed, it did reflect changing values of the school. Of course, as we have seen in other schools, the hiring of an Arabic professor for a Semitic language program was hardly new. But Macdonald's dedication to research in Arabic was somewhat different than the more typically pedagogically focused programs, which used Arabic merely as comparative tool for biblical study. Hartranft saw in Macdonald the potential for something more than just textual analysis – missionary training. Macdonald supported this aim, remarking later that language instruction was "partly to aid missionaries to Arabic-speaking and Aramaic-speaking peoples, e.g. in Urmia." That such work was a new project to seminaries is reflected by Macdonald's additional comment, "This opened a long period of conflict with the Mission Boards who were hostile to all special training for separate fields and who said specifically that they wanted the Seminary to turn out men trained exactly as those for the home ministry," with the idea that they could thus be sent anywhere.[189] The training of missionaries for specific projects was a key aim of the Hartranft-era Hartford Seminary, but it was competitive endeavor.

[188] 1903-04 Course Catalog Hartford Theological Seminary [Hartford Seminary], 34. During the early years the relationship between Trinity and Hartford Seminary was not entirely smooth. Trinity opposed coeducation, so when Macdonald sent two students, a man and a woman, to study Sanskrit with W.R. Martin there, there was some commotion. Martin remarked to Macdonald on the early starts that this co-education issue along with a series "special unfortunate circumstances prevented from being a successful beginning of your plan as to a Mission Course in that language." (Letter Jan 23, 1902), Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1881, 47914 [Hartford Seminary].

[189] Statement regarding Macdonald's work in the Preparation of Missionaries (May 11, 1926), Macdonald Letters Box 97: Folder 1984 [Hartford Seminary], 3.

Macdonald did become firmly established in the school, and was an active promoter of this missionary training emphasis. The professor who had been hired on as Semiticist was by 1900 teaching in addition to the predictable Arabic, Coptic, Syriac and Hebrew, courses on the theology of Islam, missionary activities and methods for work with Muslims, attitudes of Muslim towards Christian and Jewish scriptures, missions in Egypt and Arabia, and Muslim educational methods.[190] Such an assortment of courses on Islam was not present anywhere else in the United States at the time. While we saw at Chicago a handful of courses examining Islamic texts and Islamic history, the courses at Hartford presented Islam as a thorough object of study both contemporarily and historically. Macdonald had begun to incorporate provisionally such courses into his repertoire as early as 1894, but their standardization did not take place until the Mackenzie administration (1904-1929). The inclusion of these courses was specifically with missionary preparation in mind. Yet, notably, a number of them were focused on Muslim thought and practice, rather than expounding Christian missionary methodologies for evangelism. For Macdonald the key was scholarly engagement, not merely apologetic tactics. He based his program of missionary preparations in Islamic studies on the model of his mentor Sachau's *Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen* in Berlin, which was involved in the training of consuls. Such a structure hints at the connections between production of knowledge, consular training and missionary training – and it is not a stretch in the American context to see these missionaries as the counterparts to the scholarly colonialists.[191] Macdonald first proposed his ambitious plan in 1898-99, but it was scuttled, and resurrected in 1900 in a more modest form, when

[190] 1903-04 Course Catalog Hartford Theological Seminary [Hartford Seminary].

[191] Here it is worth noting a slight distinction from Najib Awad's categorical denial of Macdonald as a Colonial Orientalist ("Understanding the other from within," *The Muslim World* (106: July 2016), 537). Macdonald's brand of Orientalism was connected to mission, which was in turn connected to colonialism (even if only indirectly).

the aforementioned coursework on Islam began to take a more significant portion of his time.[192]

This program despite a few bumps at the start was deemed successful by the end of the decade. It came about in the era of missionary zeal and reevaluation that culminated in the 1910 World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh, and the Hartford program was one of the examples instrumental in shaping missionary training (as we saw in the case of the Cairo Study Center). The controversy over training missionaries for specific fields was no longer an issue, and the mainline mission boards increasingly valued rigorous missionary training. By 1906, Hartford had gained a reputation across the Atlantic. In a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG) review of missions, one author discussed the state of "missionary professorships," in which he highlighted Hartford's efforts to provide instruction in "theory and practice of missions on a scale unequalled in any other institution." The author additionally commended the curriculum of that program, which included "the study of various languages of the Mission-field… Comparative Religion and Sociology in its bearing on Missions…", and noted in particular the work of Macdonald in Arabic and W.R. Martin in Sanskrit.[193] Such remarks reflected the significant shift occurring at Hartford, which corresponded to broad liberal arts education as the basis for specialization, as well as the increasingly inter/non-denominational spirit among mainline missions. It was within this framework that Macdonald would have success in creating a program of Islamic Studies, and in turn set a model for emulation at both missionary training schools and colleges and seminaries. It also indicates the growing global position of

[192] Statement regarding Macdonald's work in the Preparation of Missionaries (May 11, 1926) [Hartford Seminary].

[193] Weitbrecht, "Missionary Professorships" *East and West* (1906), 167.

America education at least within Christian educational settings, which in turn led to greater general academic appreciation.

Although in the early twentieth-century Macdonald was gaining a name for missionary preparation *vis à vis* Islamics, he was not personally connected to missionaries until after 1907. In that year Macdonald took a sabbatical and traveled for the first time to the Middle East. This would be a crucial moment in his formulation of missionary education at Hartford Seminary. In a 1928 letter of reminiscence to the missionary tour-de-force, Constance Padwick, Macdonald recalled how disconnected from actual mission work he was prior to 1907, and how his sabbatical journey deeply influenced him. He confessed, "[When] I came to Egypt in 1907 I knew next to nothing about the work started by Gairdner and Thornton. Further, I was much more a wandering Arabist trying to get under the surface of Muslim society than a theological professor interested in missionaries and their work and training." It is a notable admission given what we have seen of Macdonald's work and claims to missionary training at Hartford prior to the sabbatical. We perhaps get a semblance of an answer when Macdonald explained his opinion of the missionaries in Cairo, stating, "They did not understand the Muslims because they were not properly trained for their work and were, in fact, as far as Islam was concerned, horribly ignorant." Macdonald found the missionaries to be rather unhelpful there and he spent much more time talking with Egyptians.[194]

Even in his dismissal of the missionaries, we see a valuation of missionary training. When he arrived in Egypt he was a professor on sabbatical, mostly concerned with his own research. Yet, while in Egypt he met Andrew Watson and became thoroughly committed to

[194] Macdonald to Padwick (Oct 11, 1928), Macdonald Correspondence Box 98: Folder 1996, 51570 [Hartford Seminary]. The Letter was his response to Padwick's request for details on his relationship with W.H.T. Gairdner to be used in the memorial for Gairdner, which Padwick was preparing.

missionary education. "Old Dr. Watson was really the only missionary with whom I got on understanding terms…. The result for me was that I made up my mind if I ever could do anything to train missionaries to Muslims to know Islam I would put my back into it."[195] His disapproval of the state of missionary training would translate into his promotion of the idea that missionaries could also be competitive scholars and researchers. The remainder of his letter to Padwick reflects this vision, as he recounts his relationship with Gairdner and his call for him to become a research missionary.

When Macdonald returned to Hartford, he emphasized in his teaching the need for students to "understand Islam." Macdonald recalls a quote of Gairdner during the latter's study at Hartford, "'I came here thinking that I would get from you [Macdonald] knock-down arguments' – this phrase I am certain of – 'to the Muslims and you are teaching me only to understand them.'"[196] Macdonald boasts in the end Gairdner came around to his view of the importance of understanding. Macdonald also recognized that he had only a limited time with students and it was up to them how they put this to use in their work for Muslims. While we might question the authenticity of the understanding Macdonald taught, it remains a clear shift in direction, and one that through Macdonald's years in Hartford would influence many future programs of Islamic studies.[197]

---

[195] Ibid., Macdonald to Padwick (Oct 11, 1928), [Hartford Seminary]. Andrew Watson was Charles Watson's father. As an additional note, it is ambiguous which Watson Macdonald was actually referring to. While Charles was at this time Secretary of the Board of Missions (UPCNA) and based in the U.S., he often traveled back to Egypt. Both had completed doctorates of divinity by this point. Andrew Watson died in Egypt 1916. However "Old Dr. Watson" seems to suggest the father rather than son (who was younger than Macdonald).

[196] Ibid., Macdonald to Padwick (Oct 11, 1928), [Hartford Seminary].

[197] Macdonald's success as a scholar has been challenged by later generations. In his 1982 assessment of Macdonald, Gordon Pruett concludes that Macdonald "in a very important sense is not 'right' in his view of Islam. He fails to understand and to participate. He judges, and finally, condemns."("Duncan Black Macdonald" in Hussain (ed.), *Orientalism, Islam and Islamists*, 167). More recently, Najib G. Awad has responded to the critique, arguing that Pruett in turn misunderstands Macdonald ("'Understanding the other from within,'" *The Muslim World* 106: July 2016). It is significant to the current discussion that a century later

The missionary training at Hartford Theological Seminary was formalized as the School of Missions in 1910 and endowed in 1913 as the Kennedy School of Missions (KSM).[198] Within the KSM the first official American department of "Mohammedan Studies" was established under the supervision of Macdonald as "Professor of Semitic Languages and Muhammadanism."[199] By 1915, the department had added William Worell to teach classical and modern Arabic language and Madiros Ananikian to teach other Middle-Eastern languages and literatures (e.g. Turkish, Armenian, Syriac), as well as E.K. Mitchell teaching Russian.[200] This range of languages taught reveals the missionaries' recognition of the linguistically diverse range of Muslim (and Christian) communities around the globe.

With the language work passed onto other instructors, Macdonald focused on teaching courses on Islam. The program of the department was based on the following principles: "The Moslem field is one and yet diverse…. Two things, therefore, have to be kept in view; the normal Islam of the textbooks of theology and law and the belief of the masses showing itself in the details of life, in customs and in popular literature."[201] In this we see the how missionary approaches to Islamic study took seriously the historical and textual traditions in light of contemporary lives of Muslims. At Hartford the focus on the

---

Macdonald remains a figure of (polarizing) consideration. It is a testament to his contributions in forming Islamic studies in the United States.

[198] The missionary training program was technically independent of the seminary, though in 1913 the Theological Seminary, KSM and a Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy incorporated under the banner of the Hartford Seminary Foundation. While each of these components remained distinct in its efforts, there was significant overlap in faculty and administration. Thus Macdonald taught Semitics and Old Testament courses in the Seminary alongside his Islamic Studies courses in the KSM.

[199] Hartford Seminary Foundation Catalogue (1915-1920) [Hartford Seminary], 13.

[200] Worrell later briefly directed the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem in 1919, before returning to America to take several teaching posts, eventually settling in at the University of Michigan's Semitics department. Ananikian was an Armenian immigrant, who began at Hartford as a librarian, and was eventually picked up to teach Armenian Church History and continued on from there at the seminary. Mitchell's invitation to the department to teach Russian suggests a broader view of the range of Islam to include central Asia and Russia.

[201] Hartford Seminary Foundation Catalogue (1915-1920) [Hartford Seminary], 151.

contemporary state of the Muslim world paralleled the colonialists' interest in the living Muslim populations. But whereas colonialists were interested primarily in researching contemporary Islam and Muslim population in regards to political and social conditions, the missionary dimension prioritized the study of religious beliefs and practices among Muslims. Still both presented a partial break with the classically-minded Orientalistic view of Islam as a monolithic entity, recognizing instead the necessity to examine the diversity of Muslim populations around the world.

Macdonald and the KSM trained a number of students who went on to become contributors in the field of Islamic Studies. We have already seen the case of W.H.T. Gairdner and his work with the CSC/SOS in Cairo and Murray T. Titus with the Henry Martyn Institute in India. Macdonald was also a mentor to missionaries Edwin E. Calverley (in Iraq) and William G. Shellabear (in Malaysia), each of whom would contribute to the American study of Islam in connection with their missionary activities and later became professors at Hartford.[202] One of the things that commended the program to missionary training was its flexible schedule, accommodating missionary limited furloughs, which allowed students to complete work through correspondence and *in abstentia*. Thus missionaries like Calverely, Titus and Shellabear were able to finish their PhDs while still serving as missionaries. Macdonald saw this form as well suited for research, and encouraged students to take up topics related to their mission fields. Titus wrote his dissertation on Islam in India, which Macdonald encouraged him to revise into a book believing it "would go far to remove the stigma of unscholarliness which marks so much

[202] Though it should be noted Shellabear never really did much as a missionary, seemingly prone to severe anxiety issues, which prevented him from travelling on several occasions. Consult the Macdonald and Shellabear correspondence at Hartford Seminary for more details.

missionary work."[203] At the same time, Macdonald, evidencing the strong Arabic bias in Islamic Studies, always expected his students to keep up with Arabic. In Titus' case he stated on numerous occasions the sentiment, "that you can make no real advance in a study of Islam without thorough Arabic," which he saw as the particular failing of so many scholars of Islam in India.[204]

In such sentiments the pedigree of European Orientalism was apparent. While Macdonald was open to his student's interests, he also directed them to topics he saw as valuable, which often reflected his connections with other Orientalists. Calverley, a missionary of the Reformed Church of America's Arabian Mission, studied at Hartford with Macdonald in 1915-16, eventually completing his dissertation on one of the most important works of the 11/12th century Sunni scholar Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyā' 'ulūm al-dīn* (*Revival of the Religious Sciences*). It is a notable dissertation topic because it addressed a topic that other Islamicists had earlier encouraged Macdonald himself to consider. Ignaz Goldziher had met Macdonald in 1904 at the Universal Exposition in St. Louis, France, shortly after the Macdonald's publication of *The Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory* (1903). In that meeting Goldziher was excited by the project and encouraged Macdonald to continue to specialize in Islamic Theology, citing a dearth of scholarship on the topic.[205] Additionally, British scholar E.J. Gibb noted that Macdonald's article on al-Ghazālī in the *JAOS* offered "the best account of the philosopher that I have ever read" and in turn called for Macdonald to take up Islamic

[203] Letter from Macdonald to Titus (Dec 28, 1920), Macdonald Collection Box 95: Folder 1955, 50166 [Hartford Seminary]. In this letter he also made reference to J.N. Faraquhar, a missionary who had carved a name for himself as scholar on Hinduism, illustrating the comparative examples of missionary scholarship in other fields of Orientalism.

[204] Letter from Macdonald to Titus (July 26, 1919), Macdonald Collection Box 95: Folder 1948, 49933 [Hartford Seminary]

[205] Waardenburg, *L'Islam Dans Le Miroir De L'Occident* (Paris: Mouton and Co, 1962), 133.

philosophy, noting, "A history of Muhammedan philosophy is very badly wanted; and I know of no one so well-qualified to undertake such a work as yourself. I hope you will entertain the idea."[206]

Yet Macdonald did not exactly oblige either, publishing his next book *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam* in 1909, as an attempt to examine the life and thought of Muslims, "as opposed to the systematic theology of Islam."[207] And Macdonald's later work only continued a move away from work on Islamic theology and philosophy towards an engagement with Muslim-Christian relations and missionary work. It is with such shifts in mind that Jacques Waardenburg concludes Macdonald did not quite achieve what Goldziher had hoped for him in becoming a specialist of Muslim theology.[208] Yet, in a sense it was through his students that Macdonald continued to pursue inquiries into Muslim Theology. Calverely's completed dissertation, "A translation, with commentary and introduction, of the Book of Ihya of al-Ghazzali bearing on Muslim Worship"[209] echoes Macdonald's own work on the topic, while focusing specifically on al-Ghazālī explication of '*ibadāt*.[210] Yet, despite the work's focus on a classical text, in his introduction Calverley makes it clear he is interested in how such a text is helpful in understanding contemporary Muslim "worship." Even in analyzing classical works and histories, the relevance of such scholarship for missionaries remained the contemporary.

---

[206] Letter from EJ Gibb to Macdonald (Jan 4, 1900), Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1880, 47879 [Hartford Seminary]. Given al-Ghazālī's critiques of Islamic philosophers, he likely would have bristled at being dubbed as such. As for E.J. Gibb, his work was primarily dedicated to exploration in Turkish materials, of which he noted in the same letter that "In Turkish I have the field practically to myself." The Macdonald article Gibb refers to was Macdonald, "The Life of Al-Ghazzālī, with Especial Reference to His Religious Experiences and Opinions." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (20, 1899): 71-132.

[207] D.B. Macdonald, *Religious Attitude and Life in Islam* (Beirut: Khayat, 1962 [1909]), vii.

[208] Waardenburg, 135

[209] HSF Catalogue (1915-20) [Hartford Seminary], 40.

[210] '*ibadāt* is term within the context of Islamic law meaning the "acts of worship." It is related semantically to the Hebrew *avodah*, with its similar conceptual usage in Judaism.

Macdonald retired formally from the KSM in 1925, though he remained at the seminary teaching Semitic languages, and continued to consult on Islamics as necessary.[211] His former pupil, Shellabear replaced him in the Kennedy School of Missions in 1926. Calverley would also join the department in 1930, and was instrumental in continuing to encourage scholarly perspectives both through his writing and teaching. Here we see two missionaries becoming professors of Islamics at the seminary, which has maintained a dedication to Islamic Studies to this day (and in doing so has undergone seismic changes in its reconstitution as an interfaith seminary). In 1932, his former (official and informal) pupils put together an honorary volume to commemorate his seventieth birthday. Among the nearly thirty contributors are the names of many prominent American Orientalists and Islamicists, missionary and non-missionary, who continued to shape the field in the succeeding decades (e.g. George Sarton, William Thomson, C.C. Adams, E.E. Calverley, D.M. Donaldson, L. Hodous, W.M. Randall, W.G. Shellabear, M.T. Titus).

Macdonald and the Larger Field (1900-1930)

Macdonald's reputation within the Orientalism in the U.S. and abroad was significant. He maintained correspondence with a good deal of the major European Orientalists, collaborated with numerous American Arabists and Semiticists, and at the same time encouraged scholarship among a cohort of missionaries.[212] Virtually all the American individuals of the early twentieth century to become seriously involved in the study of Islam

[211] As he stated later in letter "You know that I have always held that my students were my students for life; that any knowledgeable experience, possible help I might have for them, were fully at their service wherever they were." Letter from Macdonald to Capen (Nov 18, 1932), Macdonald Collection Box 100: Folder 2025, 52715 [Hartford Seminary].

[212] A short list of corresponding Orientalists (whom Macdonald did not teach himself) would include Goldziher, Noldeke, Hurgonje, Massignon, Arberry, Gibb among the Europeans; Torrey, Jewett, Lane-Poole for Americans.

were in contact with him. Likewise, missionaries from a range of organizations sought his council. Macdonald, and in turn Hartford Seminary, was to a large extent at the center of the network of America Islamic studies. While Samuel Zwemer may have been the famous "Apostle to Islam" of missions, Macdonald was the apostle of Islamic Studies for missionary preparation in America. Yet, in stating this, we must also recognize that much like Zwemer, he rallied only a few converts to his cause within the broader American academic framework.

The state of American Islamic studies at the start of his career was only marginally improved over his decades at Hartford in terms of institutionalized programs and scholars. For instance in a series of correspondences with Macdonald in the first half of the year 1900, the Scottish Orientalist E.J. Gibb bemoaned the state of Islamics and commended Macdonald as a vanguard in the U.S. "I can easily believe that in America you are quite alone in your studies; even here the students of Muslim civilisation are few and far between."[213] Although we have seen there were occasional instances at schools such as Chicago of courses on Islam, such assessment was largely correct. Similarly, Charles C. Torrey at Yale, teaching a course on the Qu'ran in 1902 informed Macdonald that he had only one student who was specializing in Arabic.[214] American students were largely disinterested in Orientalism and Islamics.

There was, in fact, very little going on outside of mission-connected scholarship, pertaining to Islam. Torrey complained to Macdonald during the first two decades of the twentieth century of the dearth of both Arabic and Islamic studies among more general scholarly societies like the AOS. Macdonald for his part did little to remedy this, publishing

[213] Letter from EJ Gibb to Macdonald (Jan 4, 1900) [Special Collections Hartford Seminary].

[214] Letter from Charles C. Torrey to Macdonald (Oct 3, 1902) Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1882, 47940 [Hartford Seminary].

one article in 1899 in the *JAOS* and then largely divested from any participation in the AOS. Torrey complained again in 1927, "I wish, Macdonald, that you would attend the meetings of the AOS and contribute to its Journal. It would be a great encouragement and help especially for the few of us who are engaged in Arabic and Islamic studies."[215] Torrey recognized Macdonald as the central figure in Islamic studies in the U.S., stating in another letter to Macdonald, "You have done more for Arabic and Islamic Studies than anyone else in the U.S.A. I see no prospects of a successor when your place is vacated – which may it be many years hence!"[216] This high praise of Macdonald shows both his prominent place in the creation of Islamic Studies, as well as the limits of his work.

Unlike in Europe, Islamic Studies in the United States was not well connected with formal departments and societies of Oriental studies. And this was to a large degree the influence of the missionary nature of these studies. The most prominent figures studying Islam, such as Macdonald, in the United States, simply did not participate largely within formal Orientalist organs, instead limiting involvement to missionary and seminary education. This is not to say that their work was not a part of Orientalism as that broadly construed discursive space. Rather, it is a point about the formalization of the study of Islam in America, and how it came, not so much as Oriental studies, but as missionary training. Even in cases where it emerged in direct connection with its traditional European disciplinary roots, the study of Islam was still usually publicized as of value to missionaries. With this institutional development in mind, we can turn to the implications of this study. Despite Macdonald dedicating the majority of his career to the study of Islam (both academically and within missionary training), research on the religion struggled to find a

[215] Letter from CC Torrey to Macdonald (June 19, 1927) Macdonald Collection Box 97: Folder 1989 [Hartford Seminary].

[216] Letter from CC Torrey to Macdonald (July 9, 1927) [Hartford Seminary].

foothold outside of a handful of seminaries and colleges. It remained largely as a component of missionary training. While many programs of Semitic and Oriental studies began to thrive during the first third of the twentieth century, Islam was typically ignored or simply a limited corollary subject within them.

Missionary Professors and Princeton Theological Seminary

The broader state of Islamic studies might have been gray in the early decades of the twentieth century, but among missionary/seminary networks it was much more vibrant. At Hartford, Shellabear and Calverley maintained Macdonald's dedication to the study. Beyond Hartford other seminaries also began engaging in scholarship on Islam to lesser degrees and especially in connection to missionary training. A final case remains instructive in this regard: Princeton Theological Seminary, as it highlights most clearly the twentieth-century changes in Protestant sensibilities and their impact in upon Islamic studies.

Islamic studies as was often the case first appeared provisionally within Arabic studies at Princeton Theological Seminary (PTS). Arabic had been at the school intermittently since the 1860s. In Arabic classes the Qur'an, *sīra* literature, and assorted jurisprudential sources saw occasional use, but remained tools of Arabic pedagogy rather than being studied for their content. Changes began to come as early as the 1890s with the addition of missionary James Dennis to teach Arabic (or as he called himself in Beirut, James Ennis) upon his retirement in the 1890s from the Syrian mission.[217] In addition to his Arabic courses Dennis endowed a lecture series on missions in 1893, which would provide early structure to explorations of Islam, within missionary questioning. Over the next thirty

[217] Upon arriving in Lebanon Dennis found that his name was off-putting to Arabic speakers because in Arabic the root DNS (د\ ن \س)has a meaning of sullying or defiling, thus he dropped the D for an 'alif, and the connected him with the Arabic root ANS (س \ان\ ا) with meanings of amiability and friendliness.

years the Students' Lecture series included talks by prominent missionaries working in Muslim contexts: W.A. Shedd of the Persian mission in 1902 spoke on the relationship between Islam and Oriental Churches; E.M Wherry on evangelization of Muslim in India in 1906; C.R. Watson spoke in 1907 on mission work in Egypt; George Washburn spoke on missions in Turkey in 1911. Notably the invited speakers tended to fall on the more modernist/liberal side of the Protestant spectrum. Such missionary lectures on Islam eventually found counterparts in the course curriculum in 1912 with the introduction of "Mohammedan theology" within the Systematic Theology department. It is likely that Hartford Seminary's formalization of the School of Missions and its "Mohammedan Studies" department, also factored into the incorporation of the new course.

In 1914, J. Ross Stevenson assumed presidency of PTS. Stevenson initiated a relationship with Princeton University that allowed students from both institutions to take courses from the other. That same year, the seminary renamed its department of missions as "History of Religion and Christian Mission," in which "courses of instruction are given in the genesis and growth of religion, comparative religion, and the opportunity and urgency of carrying the gospel to non-Christian peoples."[218] This reflected larger debate taking place in the school and in American Christianity generally, which would lead to a liberal-fundamentalist schism in Presbyterianism (and in the school as such) at the conclusion of the following decade.

One large component of the divide was over the unique efficacy of Christ/Christianity in salvation. It was a question for those engaging in the study of other religions, for it fashioned the limits of the value of such studies. If Christianity was the solely efficacious final religion, then at best other religions might be studied merely for

[218] PTS Catalogue 1914-15 [Princeton Theological Seminary].

establishing facts of inferiority. But among more liberal Christians there was increasingly a view that other religions, even if inferior, might offer something to Christianity, or that at the very least missionaries should make a more concerted effort to "understand" the traditions of those they were evangelizing.[219] We saw Macdonald endorsing this sort of view, and his influence on promoting Islamic studies of "understanding" was echoed throughout many mission circles. The decision at Princeton to rebrand their missions department within the frame of History of Religion was indicative of the changes occurring in American Protestantism at the time. Things came to a head at the school in 1929, when fundamentalist theologian Gresham Machen and many of his like-minded colleagues withdrew from the seminary leading to its domination by (moderate) modernist theologians.[220]

As far as Islamics were concerned, the department of History of Religions and Missions regularly invited Samuel Zwemer as a lecturer beginning in 1919. During that first year, the most classes on Islamic topics were offered at Princeton Seminary up to that point. He returned several more times as temporary lecturer during the next several years and following the exodus of Machen and his supporters Zwemer was extended an offer to become a full professor. This also ended Zwemer's tenure as a missionary-at-large. The hiring of Zwemer surprised many of the more academically minded missionaries who had worked with him over the years. Arthur Jeffery wrote to Macdonald, upon learning the news, "We had never dreamed of him taking up an academic position for he is the least

[219] Hutchison, 127-130; 139-43; 150-52. Hutchison also discusses other critiques leveled by fundamentalists against modernists/liberals, such as inerrancy of scripture, social activism vs. evangelical work, and doctrinal soundness.

[220] Hutchison, 170-73. Machen several years later in 1936 would severe his connection completely with the PCUSA and form a new denomination: The Presbyterian Church of America.

academic of persons."[221] Yet, Zwemer fit the bill for the reconstituted Seminary. He was a relatively middle-ground thinker between the hardline fundamentalists such as Machen and the more liberally-minded scholars producing the Laymen's Report on Missions in years after.[222] Thus he provided a gradual transition for the seminary: a proponent of missions to Muslims, yet softened through his years of correspondence with Macdonald, Calverely and other scholarly missionaries. As a professor Zwemer taught courses mostly pertaining to Islam, though he offered occasionally more general courses on history of religions and missionary methods as well. On Islam his courses varied between missionary emphasis and more general surveys, reflecting the same sort of courses he taught for the CSC/SOS in Cairo. For instance his course on Islamic Mysticism treated "Its origin and history; and a study of the life of Al Ghazali and of other mystics."[223]

The relationship between Princeton and Princeton Seminary which had been formalized in the early years of the Stevenson administration to allow students from either institution to take classes at the other, developed in relationship to Philip Hitti's work at the University. Hitti had arrived just prior to Zwemer in 1927 as professor of Oriental Languages at Princeton University, and the partnership between Princeton's Near Eastern Studies, and the Seminary's History of Religions and Missions would have a long tenure. Hitti and Zwemer also both drew a number of Middle Eastern students to Princeton for their studies. Botros Abd al-Malik from Egypt, who later became a fixture of the School of Oriental Studies at AUC completed his Masters of Theology in 1933. Also Yahya Armajani

[221] Letter from Jeffrey to Macdonald (Aug 15, 1929), Macdonald Collection Box 98: Folder 2002, 51748 [Hartford Seminary]. Zing!

[222] Hutchison discusses at some length the debate surrounding *Re-Thinking Missions* (aka the Laymen's Report) as it related to these debates between liberals-fundamentalists, see Hutchison, *Errand to the World*, 158-171.

[223] PTS Catalogue 1932-33[Princeton Theological Seminary]

finished his Bachelor of Theology the same year and likewise became a prominent commentator on the Middle Eastern affairs. The connection between missions, teaching and students were readily encouraged in this period at Princeton. Zwemer retired from the position in 1937, and was replaced by Edward Jurji, a graduate of AUB and Princeton University. Thus the position of Islamic studies was secured within both Princeton seminary and university for the future.[224]

Conclusion

The study of Islam in the U.S. was most certainly connected to approaches in Europe. Yet its differences are notable as well, for they reflect the importance of Christianity in American education of the turn of the century, as well as the relatively valued position of missionaries. That so much of the early academic study of Islam in the U.S. was connected to missionary training and often conducted by former missionaries is important to note, because it shaped the questions being asked in American Islamics. These mission-connected programs were largely situated within seminaries – especially as denominationalism declined, and the beginnings of American ecumenical missions took shape – but many programs of comparative religion and related fields in universities also advertised themselves as centers of missionary training. In either case, these programs increasingly encouraged scholarly approaches, even if such scholarship was framed around (often critical) questions over the relationship between Islam and Christianity, with practical dimensions at stake. With these institutionalized formations in mind, we can now turn to consider the theoretical contributions of such scholars within the Islamic studies.

[224] We will return to Hitti, Jurji and others in chapter five.

III

MISSIONARY SCHOLARSHIP AND THE STUDY OF ISLAM AS RELIGION

> "We should be producers. We have unique opportunities, and qualifications that are not general. It has been Prof. Macdonald's idea that the missionaries could be trained to produce work that would rank in scholarship with that produced by the students of Islam in Europe."[225]

We have established in the previous two chapters an overview of the missionaries themselves and their connection to scholarly work in U.S. colleges and seminaries. With these frameworks in mind, this chapter now turns to the central question remaining: what was the intellectual contribution of missionary-affiliated scholars. An answer is found by engaging this question from two different angles. The first is to consider the publication record itself. As the prior chapters demonstrated, missionaries were thoroughly engaged in teaching about Islam. Yet, publication is perhaps a more central marker of scholarly output. So first we will take up that question, examining the locations in which missionary-scholarship found publication and dissemination as an indicator of its relevance.

The second dimension of this investigation considers the details of this publication. What were the missionaries saying, and how did their perspectives relate to the broader fields of Orientalism and Islamics? Together these two approaches map out a picture of missionary-scholarship on Islam that was a significant contributor in expanding the discussion in terms of chronological emphasis – focusing on contemporary over the classical; and geographical expansion – considering Muslim communities far beyond the Middle East and normative centers of Islamic Studies. Most of all, this scholarship

[225] Calverley to Naish (June 29, 1929; from Amarah, Iraq), Syrian Mission Files RG115 Box 10: Folder 9 [Presbyterian Historical Society].

bolstered the study of Islam as a religion. As the opening quote indicates, this scholarship did not come about by chance, but through intentional work by missionaries and their supporters to contribute thorough and rigorous studies of Islam, broadly defined.

Contemporary Islam – a Missionary Endeavor

In 1945 the prominent Orientalist H.A.R. Gibb delivered a series of talks on the subject of "modern trends in Islam" as a part of the University of Chicago's Haskell Lectures. These lectures were soon after collated and published as a book under the same name.[226] In the preface to the book Gibb bemoans the lack of study of contemporary Islam, and locates the limited lineage of the study primarily among missionaries and their supporters. Most of all, Gibb praises his predecessor at the 1906 Haskell Lectures, D.B. Macdonald and the subsequent book evolving out of his lectures, *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam* (1908). Gibb summarizes that work as outlining three suggested directions for future Islamic studies: The psychology of Muhammad; the pantheistic development in later Sufism (via Buddhist and Vedantic influence); and quoting Macdonald, "The present religious attitudes and movements of the Muslim people."[227] It is on the final point that Gibb sticks, criticizing the field for allowing four decades to pass since Macdonald's Haskell

[226] Gibb, *Modern Trends in Islam* (New York: Octagon Books 1972 [1948]). H.A.R. Gibb (1895-1971) was a prominent Scottish Orientalist. He began his career at the School of Oriental Studies in London where he taught Arabic beginning in 1921 and in 1937 became the Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford in following D.S. Margoliouth's retirement. In 1955 Gibb immigrated to the United States to assume the James Richard Jewett Professorship of Arabic at Harvard University. He was influential in the field of Islamic Studies writing a number of works on Islam and serving as an editor for the Brill *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. For additional biographical details see Albert Hourani, "Gibb, Sir Hamilton Alexander Rosskeen (1895–1971)," Robert Brown in Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, ed. H. Matthew and B. Harrison (Oxford: OUP, 2004); online ed., ed. D. Cannadine, 2004, www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31143 (accessed April 13, 2017).

Edward Said in *Orientalism* presents a critique of Gibb's work. After recognizing Gibb as "the greatest name in modern Anglo-American Islamic studies," Said critiques Gibb for his role in promoting the idea of a discrete "Orient," which Gibb, who identified primarily as an Orientalist (despite his training as an Arabist) linked with area studies. Gibb strongly promoted an idea of an "Arab mind," which was largely interchangeable with the "Muslim mind" and "Oriental mind." Said, 53; 105-107.

[227] Qtd in Gibb, vii

lectures with little engagement in that large and relevant topic. Gibb was aware, of course, that there were increasingly more books issued each year dealing with political and social factors in the contemporary Muslim world within the purview of colonial and imperialistic scholarship, but these socio-political studies were not of interest to Gibb. He was taking up Macdonald's call for the "religious aspects of modern Islamic culture." Gibb advocated, as with Macdonald before him, the study of contemporary Islamic religious thought and practices. Given the link to Macdonald, it should come as no surprise that what few examples of meaningful work Gibb does recognize as having been produced on that subject were almost wholly written by missionaries.

Gibb's summary of the field – one of the last to take seriously the contribution of missionaries – provides us an outline of where to look for significant missionary publication. For English language scholarship he points to one journal as taking up examination of Islam as a contemporary religion: *The Moslem World* – a missionary journal founded by Zwemer in 1911.[228] Gibb admits that not all of its articles reach sufficient academic standards, but that many do, and it remains the best English-language journal related to the topic of Islam in the modern world. He likewise recognizes three edited series on Islam: *The Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam* (1915); *The Moslem World of Today* (1925) and *Whither Islam?* (1932). The first two of these were studies commissioned in relation to Christian missions. The third was Gibb's edited volume, which was not explicitly connected.[229] Finally, Gibb lists two books of value by individual authors on contemporary

[228]Gibb also recognizes the contributions of the French *Revue du Monde Musulman* (1906-26; and then retitled *Revue des études Islamique)*, which had was edited first by Alfred Le Chatelier, and later by Louis Massignon. We will return shortly to the parallels between *The Moslem World* and its French counterpart.

[229]Gibb was himself a committed (liberal) Protestant. In a moment of introspective, he opens the book with self-reflection into how his own views on Christianity inherently shape how he considers Islam as a religion. "The practical conclusion from all this is that there is no possibility of avoiding the introduction of a very large subjective element into the discussion. But we can be on our guard against two frequent causes of

Muslim thought: C.C. Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt* (1933) and Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Modern Islam in India* (1946). Once again, both of these authors were Protestant missionaries. What Gibb's survey reveals is that missionary scholars set the bar for what a contemporary study of Islam should look like, and in a real sense they were the founders of that study. As such, missionaries delimited the questions and understandings of religion as an analytic category, and applied their confessional horizons to the study of Islam *vis à vis* Christianity.

Reference Works and a Broad Readership

Before turning to Gibb's genealogy of the field, we ought to take stock of the broader contributions missionaries made regarding Islamics. The earliest work was mostly along the lines of apologetic and polemic targeted at Muslim audiences – the controversialist side of the publishing realm. While this was not disconnected from the scholarly ambitions of the missionaries, we will set it aside here to focus on the more immediately relevant publications: studies of Islam for the education of missionaries and others. One of the early significant publications in this latter category was Thomas Patrick Hughes' *Dictionary of Islam* (1885). Over the next several decades Hughes' dictionary would be valued as a good

misunderstanding… we ought at least be aware that we are exteriorizing and to that extent we are doing violence to the intimate personal element which constitutes the mainspring of the religious life…. In the same way the element of criticism inseparable from honest discussion makes it difficult to avoid the appearance of surveying the religious life of Muslims from some superior height," (xii). Further, "In these days, when we are enveloped in an atmosphere charged with propaganda, it is the duty of every investigator to define precisely to himself and to his audience the principles which determine his point of view. Speaking in the first person, therefore, I make bold to say that the metaphors in which Christian doctrine is traditionally enshrined satisfy me intellectually as expressing symbolically the highest range of spiritual truth which I can conceive, provided that they are interpreted not in terms of anthropomorphic dogma but as general concepts, related to our changing views of the nature of the universe. I see the church and the congregation of Christian people as each dependent on the other for continued vitality, the church serving as the accumulated history and instrument of the Christian conscience, the permanent element which is constantly renewed by the stream of Christian experience and which gives both direction and effective power to the experience," (x-xi) thus he admits, "My view of Islam will necessarily be the counterpart of this," (xi).

reference source for the non-specialist.[230] Samuel Zwemer in passing the dictionary along to his son-in-law remarked that it was "the most precious book in my library."[231] And it is no wonder it was taken as such. The dictionary predated the first edition of the famous *Encyclopaedia of Islam* by thirty years.[232] Hughes' dictionary was for the period the only available English language reference work on Islam of any repute. And it was notably deeply connected to the missionary cause, even as it was picked up more broadly by British colonial authorities ruling over Muslim populations.[233]

The missionary connection is clear from the start, as Hughes dedicated the work to the aforementioned Rev. Thomas Valpy French, the CMS missionary and first bishop of Lahore for the Anglican Church, and a prominent figure among late nineteenth century missionaries working among Muslims in India.[234] Hughes was himself an Anglican missionary at work in India, and prefaces the work highlighting his position, while also noting his aims, "Although compiled by a clergyman who has had the privilege of being engaged in missionary work at Peshawar for a period of twenty years, this 'Dictionary of Islam' is not intended to be a controversial attack on the religious system of Muhammad, but rather an exposition of its principles and teachings." He clarifies his intended audience as "the Governmental official… the Christian missionary… the Oriental traveler… [and] the

[230] For instance it was recommended by Henri Lammens in *Islam: Beliefs and Institutions*, E.D. Ross (trans.) (London: Methuen, 1929) and included in bibliographies, for example E.M. Wherry *The Muslim Controversy* (London: Christian Literature Society, 1905); and it remained in many missionary reading lists such as *The Call from the Moslem World* (1926), see the Preface by Rev. St. Clair Donaldson (Bishop of Salisbury); part of the World Call to the Church Series.

[231] Letter from Zwemer to Pickens (Nov 14, 1933) attached to Zwemer's copy of the dictionary, Picken's Collection [Havard-Yenching Library, Harvard University].

[232] *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, First Edition (1913-1936), Edited by M. Th. Houtsma, T.W. Arnold, R. Basset, R. Hartmann.

[233] Notably, Hughes also produced a Pashto-language textbook adopted by the British government. For more biographical information consult Gerard Anders, *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions* (New York: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing, 1999), 308. Hughes upon retirement moved to the U.S.

[234] David A. Kerr, "French, Thomas Valspy," in *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*, Gerald H. Anderson (ed.) (New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 1998), 227.

student of comparative religion anxious to learn the true teachings of Islam."[235] So we see here the developing range of those westerners interested in Islam and in it the links between colonialism, missions and the academy. While the dictionary took up discussion of classical topics, its purpose in doing so was related to navigating interactions with living Muslims.

In terms of content, the dictionary focused primarily on Sunni Islam – drawing on its classical terminology and doctrines, though Hughes does have some articles related to Shi'i traditions. He sets aside the latter, citing statistics that the Shi'a represent a minority (around 10%) of the Muslim population and are thus of secondary concern – a trend that has long remained in Islamic Studies scholarship. Likewise, Hughes separates Wahhabism as distinct from Sunnism, and also includes Sikhism as a sect of Islam, citing the work of F. Pincott on that subject. The dictionary is notable that despite having spent his missionary career in India, Hughes bases it on Arabic terminology (while giving the terms in in English translation). Here the biases of the study of Islam in its core as an Arab(ic) religion are clear.

Hughes' definitions are problematic at times. For instance, his prioritizing of Sunni materials leads him to largely critique Shii traditions. In describing his personal experience with Husayn's commemoration during Muharram, Hughes describes the participants as "fanatical" and disturbing and summarizes the self-flagellation he witnessed in a biblical comparison, stating, "Such must have been the cuttings of which we read in Holy Write, which were forbidden to the Israelites by Moses… and these extravagances, I conjecture must resemble the practices of the priests of Baal, who cried aloud and cut themselves after this manner with knives and lancets."[236] Notably, Samuel Zwemer would repeat this

[235] Hughes, v-vii.
[236] Hughes, 407.

comparison in his own work.[237] Similarly, in his entry on Muhammad, despite admitting respect for the elements of his life, Hughes cannot help but critique the prophet. Again, Hughes critique arises in comparison to Christian sources, in which he contrasts Jesus with Muhammad, claiming that "the divine and holy character of Jesus rises to our view, and the inquiring mind sickens at the thought of the beloved, the pure, the lowly Jesus giving place to that of the ambitious, the sensual, the time-serving hero of Arabia"[238] While Hughes maintained a tempered tone in many of his articles, examples such as these highlight his grounding as a Christian minister. The fact that he compiled the entire volume alone (though quoting lengthily from earlier Orientalists) is a testament to his dedication to the project, but its polemic qualities underscore its failings as fair treatment of Islam.

Despite its continued citation over the next several decades, scholars were increasingly aware of its shortcomings and attempts to replace it with a better encyclopedia/dictionary were undertaken. Macdonald in his work as an editor of Islamic subjects for James Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (1908-28) used Hughes as the basis for critique of one of their (missionary) contributors, writing, "[Canon] Sell has not taken his work seriously enough… there are better articles even in Hughes' Dictionary. That of course, we can't possibly allow."[239] And even Hughes would reflect on the work with some embarrassment, stating later in his life, "My views of Islam have vastly changed since I retired from the mission field and as I am now in my seventy fourth year I sadly want to publish a small edition of my Dictionary, eliminating all anti-Islamic remarks."[240] Yet,

[237] See Zwemer, *Arabia* (New York: F.H. Revell Company, 1900), 140.
[238] Hughes, 398.
[239] Letter from Macdonald to Hastings (June 26, 1905), Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1888, 48194 [Hartford Seminary].
[240] Letter from TP Hughes to Macdonald (May 11, 1911) Macdonald Collection Box 93: Folder 1917, 49095 [Hartford Seminary].

what is significant is that Hughes, as with many of the subsequent works we will consider, was interested in presenting an accessible account of Islam as a religion still flourishing in the world. Its historical past, as defined in various entries of the dictionary, was meant to provide context to its present practice and theology.

Missionaries were involved in producing and contributing to many of the early reference works on Islam. As mentioned, Macdonald was brought in for a number of years as an editor for Hastings' attempt to create an encyclopedia of religion. Notably, in Macdonald's acceptance of the position he emphasized the readership of such a work would include missionaries and comparative religionists, and should thus contain general information for public consumption as well as specialized topics. To make his case Macdonald penned in a letter to Hastings, "Take it that a missionary comes across a queer name somewhere. We should be able to help him out, and I understand that that is a part of our legitimate duty."[241] Macdonald's desire was that the encyclopedia should be broad and deep, and of relevance to those working among living Muslims. In Macdonald's view, their contributors were of significant clout to produce such work (including Browne, Hartmann, Juynboll, Margoliouth, Goldziher and Noldeke among others).[242] Missionaries were also included among the names, though Macdonald seemed less impressed by of many of them since they were drawn largely from the past generation of controversialists. Around 1910 Hastings and Macdonald had a falling out and Macdonald left the project, but his interest in

[241] Letter from Macdonald to Hastings (April 24, 1905) Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1888, 48167 [Hartford Seminary].

[242] Hastings enticed Macdonald to the project by pointing out those who had volunteered to contribute articles. (Letter from Hastings to Macdonald, (Nov 21, 1904) Macdonald Collection Box 91: Folder 1887, 48151 [Hartford Seminary]).

producing such a work confirms both his aims at general education for the public, as well as more specialized works for missionaries and scholars.[243]

Macdonald would continue such work, writing over eighty entries at M. Th. Houtsma's request for the *Encyclopaedia of Islam.* These included broad topics such as "Allah" (which rang in over 10,000 words), biographical notices such as "al-Ghazālī", as well as more specific uncommon words such as "Firdaws" (a term for garden or paradise). That Macdonald was such a major contributor is an indicator of his prominence among Islamicists. While his articles span a range of subjects, some hint at his association with Christian missions. Macdonald wrote entries on "'Īsā" (Jesus) and "Dhimma" (minority religious communities). In these articles he relies on a range of sources from European scholars, to Muslim commentators, and even missionary scholars. For example on *dhimma*, Hughes' *Dictionary* is referenced along with Māwardī's *Aḥkām al-sulṭānīya*.[244] On 'Īsā, Macdonald highlights European scholarly discussions and also points to the classical commentaries by al-Bayḍāwī and al-Zamakhsharī. He spends a significant portion of the article discussing the development of epithets for Jesus, starting with the Qur'an and moving onward. As for the understandings of 'Īsā as a figure, Macdonald remarks that the Qur'an is often inscrutable and contradictory regarding his life. In this discussion Macdonald reveals his position as a Christian scholar, concluding, "It is evident that Muḥammad had learned a definite story of Jesus from some heretical Christian teacher…. He knows more, of sorts,

[243] Their disagreement stemmed from a question of editorial review, which Hastings felt Macdonald had fallen behind on during his sabbatical. "Now you know quite well that after you left America you did not continue to do the work which you had undertaken, and which up to that date you did most satisfactory," (Letter from Hastings to Macdonald (March 19, 1910), Macdonald Collection Box 93: Folder 1912, 48886 [Hartford Seminary]). The dispute led to Macdonald stepping down, writing to Hastings "In order that we may part upon decent terms I will take for granted that you did not mean to insult me in your last letter," (Letter from Macdonald to Hastings (April 5, 1910) , Macdonald Collection Box 93: Folder 1913, 48922 [Hartford Seminary]).

[244] D.B. Macdonald, "Dhimma," Encyclopaedia of Islam, First Edition (1913-1936). Edited by M. Th. Houtsma, T.W. Arnold, R. Basset, R. Hartmann. Brill Online, 2016.

about him than about any other of the religious figures of the past. But it is evident, too, that he omits something."[245] In such description, he thereby assumes his Christian understanding of Jesus as the base from which to judge other depictions. Therefore, it should not come as a surprise that his bibliographical references include Samuel Zwemer's *the Moslem Christ* (1911).

His entry on "Dīn," further reveals the thinking on the part of Christian scholars on Islam as religion. After discussing the scholarly (classical and contemporary) debates over the somewhat ambiguous term, Macdonald defines dīn theologically as a "divine institution which guides rational beings… It thus means 'religion' in the broadest sense and is so vague that it was felt necessary to define its difference from milla [q. v.] 'religious community', madhhab [q. v.] 'school of canon law' and sharīʿa [q. v.] 'system of divine law.'"[246] Given his Haskell lecture topic, it is not coincidental that Macdonald wrote the entry on "Dīn," illustrating the role he played in generating interest in the study of religion. Yet, he nuanced the meaning carefully, understanding the complicated sense of the term and its relation to a number of Islamic concepts. Dīn, he argued, could be understood as any religion, and yet was typically paired in the phrase "dīn Allah" to mean the Muslim religion, which included *Islām* (here meaning the five pillars: *Shahāda* (bearing witness), *Sawm* (fasting), *Salāt* (prayer), *Zakāt* (charity) and *Hajj*(Meccan Pilgrimage)), *Imān* (faith) and Ihsān (ethics/right-doing). This understanding of the religion of Islam came from within the tradition itself, best outlined in the Hadith of Gabriel (reported by Muslim) in which Muhammad answers the questions of the disguised angel as to the nature of his religion within those categories.

[245] D.B. Macdonald, " 'Īsā," Encyclopaedia of Islam, First Edition (1913-1936). Edited by M. Th. Houtsma, T.W. Arnold, R. Basset, R. Hartmann. Brill Online, 2016.

[246] Macdonald, D. B.. "Dīn." Encyclopaedia of Islam, First Edition (1913-1936). Edited by M. Th. Houtsma, T.W. Arnold, R. Basset, R. Hartmann. Brill Online, 2016.

Macdonald's work on this topic and others is an example of his investment in the study of Islam as religion, as well as an indicator of his repute as a scholar.

While Macdonald was a major contributor to the work, few actual missionaries appeared to such an extent. Still, missionaries were involved in the completion of the first edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, such as Calverley, who wrote the article on "Nafs" (soul). More common than authorship was the citation of missionary-penned sources within the articles. W.H.T. Gairdner received a number of citations in various entries. C.C. Adams' *Islam and Modernism in Egypt* was cited in the article on Arabia. Hartmann relied heavily on missionary Marshall Broomhall's volume *Islam in China* (1910) in his article on the subject. In addition to his citation in Macdonald's article on 'Īsā, Zwemer was also cited in the article on *Zār,* although only to critique his etymology of the term. While citation is not as significant as authorship, missionaries still comprised a portion of the scholarly tradition. Even in cases such as Zwemer, in which their work is critiqued, it highlights that such work had gained enough of readership that such critique was deemed necessary. As *The Encylcopaedia of Islam*, became a staple of the scholarly study of Islam, the involvement of missionary scholars in it is important.[247]

So we have seen in the first decades of the twentieth century an already fruitful participation of missionaries in scholarship – both public and specialist, as demonstrated in the production of reference materials. With this in mind, we can turn to the particular directions that missionary scholarship took in the field.

[247] Gairdner's work was cited in entries by Macdonald on *Ḥaqīqa*, *al-Ḥamadala*, *Darwīsh*, *Malā'ika*, al-Ghazālī, *Kalām*, *al-Qiyāma*, as well as in Massignon's article on *Taṣawwuf*, de Boer and Hartner's entry on *Nūr*, and H.G. Farmer's discussion of the science of music. See *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (1st ed.).

The Vital Forces of Islam & the Moslem World of To-Day

The study of Islam as conducted by missionaries was particularly concerned with Islam as a religion. By that I mean, drawing upon the classifications of Hodgson, a focus on Islam, the religion, rather than Islamicate, the cultural and artistic productions within Muslim societies or Islamdom, the political empires of Muslims. This is not to say that they did not consider the social, cultural and political – they very much did – , but that they begin with religion as the source of analysis. What the study of religion meant for these missionary scholars was a questioning of beliefs and practices and their vital/transformative quality. That is, did religion (Islam) change the lives of its followers, for a loosely defined better? To answer this question the relationship between religion and society was explored, but always with a focus on what Islam as religion might mean in shaping it (e.g. the ethical/moral influence of religion). In particular the societal effects of religion were seen as demonstrable in education and the treatment of women. We will return to these themes in the last two chapters, but for now these may be seen as examples of a broader understanding of western "modernity" and the missionary attempt to valorize a place for religion (Christianity) within it.

Of course missionary discourses were shaped by broader discussion taking place in European and American scholarship. As Tomoko Masuzawa has explored, study of religion(s) in nineteenth century European scholarship took place within the framework world religions and comparative religion. This framework privileged Christianity as universal religion and as the soil from which European modernity emerged. In it most basic configurations the religions of the world were Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and the rest of

"pagan" traditions. Although over time this definition of world religion was expanded to include Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism and so forth.[248]

Masuzawa observes how disciplines such as philology served as a primary basis for the study of religions, and inasmuch privileged textual traditions. As it regards Islam, philologists classified Semitic languages as a distinct group, and in turn discussed Islam as a Semitic religion. For European scholars it became the ethnic religion par excellence, which was contrasted against the universal Christianity. "Islam, an old menace and invincible foe to European Christendom for centuries, had been recast as a prototypical Arab - hence Semitic- religion."[249] Much of this framework was transplanted to the U.S., especially in the early generation of scholars such Edward Salisbury at Columbia University, who studied under philologists of Europe.[250]

Perhaps most important to the current investigation is Masuzawa's recognition of the role comparative theology played in shaping discussions of world religions. "It may be credibly suggested that the popularity of world religions was more a legacy of the religious-evangelical enterprise of comparative theology than of the arcane technical and scholarly tradition of the nineteenth-century science of religion"[251] As far as this is true within European scholarly settings, it may be said to be only more so in the American context, whereas I am arguing Christian seminaries played a substantial role in the promotion of the

[248] Masuzawa, ix-xi.

[249] Masuzawa, 179. Masuzawa notes that similarily Judaism was typically considered as a Semitic religion, but unlike Islam, it was seen by scholars such as Ernest Renan and Abraham Kuenen to hold the seed of universal religion that would be realized in Christianity. This understanding appears in the work of Samuel Zwemer *The Moslem Doctrine of God*, in which he quotes Hegel's account of Islam as "In the Mohammedan religion God is conceived only as the Lord," in contrast to Christianity. Yet notably, Zwemer mis-quotes Hegel, who also includes Judaism in his description. For more on Zwemer's use of Hegel see: McCarthy, "Samuel Zwemer and the American Study of Islam" (M.A. Thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2011), 22-24.

[250] See chapter 2 for additional details on Salisbury. Also consult Foster, Benjamin. "Edward E. Salisbury: America's First Arabist." *al-'Usur al-Wusta* 9, no. 1 (1997): 15-17.

[251] Masuzawa, 23.

study of religion, and especially Islam. Missionary training was the site of much of this study, and in turned produced much of the early American scholarly accounts of Islam as a religion.

One of the major shifts produced in this scholarship was the understanding that despite much argument to the contrary by earlier scholars (including many missionaries) Islam was capable of adaptation to modern conditions. Missionary exploration of this relationship between Islam and modernity was not isolated from their concerns about the relationship of Christianity and modernity. This scholarship of Islam was situated within a broader discussion of religion as a universal concept, while simultaneously allowing for an increasingly diverse understanding of religion in its particular expressions. Thus, Islam could be a world-religion, with general tendencies of belief and practice, while also demonstrating a range of expressions among its practitioners – shaped within particular social, historical and political contexts. This is not to say missionaries were positive in their assessment, but many at least took seriously a critical study of Islam, based in the structures of western objective sciences. While often expecting their research to prove the insolvency of Islam for modern living, missionaries were genuinely dedicated to its comprehensive study. In part they were forced to take the tradition seriously in light of the reality that Muslims had largely succeeded in resisting Christian evangelism.

Where so much of the Orientalist discussion of Islam might be better described as the study of Islamicate (the art, literature, and sciences produced within Muslim-majority lands, mostly classically) or Islamdom (the political empires ruling over such production), the missionary study was focused on Islam as religion. As Gibb argued three books made the most significant contributions to the study of Islam as a religion in the first half of the

twentieth century. Setting aside Gibb's *Whither Islam* (1932), its predecessors *The Vital Forces of Islam* (1915) and *The Moslem World of Today* (1925) were the products of Christian missions. The latter two, both featured the writings of prominent missionaries working in Muslim contexts as well as scholars sympathetic to such missionary causes. Together these books effectively illustrate the directions missionaries pushed the study of Islam. At the same time both books were deeply embedded in the promotion of continued evangelical work among Muslims, and the various authors, while they disagreed on specifics, were generally in agreement that Islam was a "problem" to be solved.

The earlier of the two, *Vital Forces of Islam*, was edited by Samuel Zwemer and was the collation of a half dozen previously-published articles on Islam in the *International Review of Missions*. Given this heritage coming out of the Continuation Committee of the World Missionary Conference of 1910 it is not surprising that this is the more overtly missionary minded of the two works. Yet, in case its appeal might be deemed limited to merely missionary circles, the volume was published by Oxford University Press. It effectively showcases the growing recognition of the diversity of Islam along regional lines. Each of its six primary articles is written by a missionary who had worked in a different location and each author stresses the regional peculiarities of Islamic expression. This scholarly division of the Muslim world into regions was directly connected to the missionary idea of separate mission fields. While the authors agree that Islam possessed some common features across boundary lines (and still all under the broader rubric of East or Oriental culture), they also saw differences of application, belief and practice specific in the contexts in which they worked. It is instructive to consider how the missionary division of the world into various mission fields and stations, thus constructed regional categories of Islam, which

at the same time reflected legitimate diversity within Islamic thought and practice. The book features articles by W.H.T. Gairdner on Islam in Egypt (Cairo), W.A. Shedd on Islam in Persia (Urumia), Gottfiried Simon on Indonesia (Sumatra), Stewart Crawford on Syria (Beirut), Siraju'd din on colonial India (Lahore), and Canon Godfrey on East Africa/Zanzibar (Tanzania). Likewise it opened with an introductory chapter by Samuel Zwemer and a closing chapter by D.B. Macdonald, highlighting its aims at providing a scholarly account of the situation.

The missionary nature of the volume is laid out from the start by Zwemer. Each author composed his article with the same set of questions in mind. For our purposes the first two questions are most relevant: 1) What are the vital forces of the religion of Muslims and 2) with what aspects of Islam do Muslim express dissatisfaction. The remaining four questions inquire about the Muslim understandings of Christianity, and what aspects of Christianity most alienate and resonate with Muslims.[252] Notable in this line of questioning is its argument for considering Islam as a religion. We'll return shortly to examine what was meant by religion for these authors, but for the present, these studies, unlike much of the colonial or classical studies of Islam, demonstrate a commitment to the study of Islam as a contemporary, lived religion that impacted believers' lives in significant ways. And in the case of this work, it also marked a departure from earlier missionary rejections that Islam offered nothing of value spiritually. Zwemer in his introduction still admitted hesitancy in considering "vital forces in Islam" as it is "In Christ alone" that there can be life. He backs away from the concept by defining vital forces as those which have caused the religion to persist, and yet he concludes that "to study Islam with sympathy… we must seek to know

[252] Zwemer "Introduction" in *Vital Forces*, Gairdner, Macdonald, Zwemer (eds.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1915), 3-4.

where its real strength lies and what there is in its teaching that captivates the minds and hearts of Moslems."[253] The authors in the work take up the sympathetic study of Islam with varying degrees of success, and in their attempts a picture of missionary understandings of "religion" emerges.

As mentioned, the authors attempt for the most part to constrain their assessment to the discussion of Islam in the region where they have worked/lived. For instance, W.A. Shedd notes that his "impressions" are derived primarily from the limited view of working among "Shi'a Mohammedans of the province of Azerbaijan in Persia." The attention to non-Arabic speaking Shi'i Muslims is significant given the dearth of scholarship on Shi'a in the early twentieth-century. Yet, despite this recognition of specificity, and caution that scholars "must beware of universal statements," Shedd only partly escapes Orientalizing his subjects, often referring to a distinctly eastern character over against the western, and discussing "Asiatics" as a type.[254] That the other authors follow a similar course is somewhat a product of the questions they were answering.

In taking up the question of the value of Islam, a thematic of the civilizing force of religion becomes apparent. So Gottfried Simon writes a dismissive account of the value of Islam in Sumatra, noting it only in relation to its successes among "heathen tribes," and while he, as earlier authors before him (e.g. E.W. Blyden in Liberia), admits Islam as a civilizing force, he does so primarily to suggest the Bataks who convert do so mostly out of a desire for social-economic gain, rather than truly spiritual reasons.[255] Similarly, Crawford in his discussion Muslims in Syria admits the civilizing quality of Islam, yet does so in more positive terms. As a professor at the Syrian Protestant College/American University of

[253] Zwemer, *Vital Forces*, 9.
[254] W.A. Shedd, "Second Study," in *Vital Forces*, 47-49
[255] Gottfried Simon, "Third Study," in *Vital Forces*, 79.

Beirut he takes great pride in the educated and intellectual discussions taking place in Syria, suggesting a great value to "this intermingling of earnest and intelligent" Christians and Muslims. Crawford's is a more positive assessment of the situation, and yet it is still embedded in racializing discourses, where (Syrian) Muslims are depicted, however "genial and kind" as they may be, as a distinct "race" somehow different from Westerners in their way of thinking/acting.[256] And again this mode of thought is linked to universal principles in Islam.

Their discussion of the generative or "vital" forces of Islam reveal their opinions of what religion was, and how Islam reflected religion as a concept. Rooted in Protestant conceptions of revival and social ethics, religion was demonstrable by the impact of its theological conceptions in producing activity. The missionaries thus examined the Islamic concept of God, the prophetic role of Muhammad, the mystical dimensions of Sufism, and the sacred scripture of the Qur'an in light of such concerns. W.H.T. Gairdner largely sets aside the formal elements (law, theology and rituals) of Islam in his discussion stating that while discussed at length in Muslim scholarly circles it has very little bearing on the majority of Muslim lives.[257] He notes further, specifically regarding ritual, that "it is often that which is unofficial rather than that which is officially recognized that is found religiously to matter."[258] For Gairdner, "the heart of every religion is its doctrine of God," and it is there he begins his analysis of Islam as a religion. By stripping away the so-called irrelevant theoretical baggage, the key point of interest to Muslims "is their conviction that Allah is, that He is more than a principle… that He is a personal force, and that He has a

[256] Stewart Crawford, "Fourth Study," in *Vital Forces*, 125-126.

[257] Of the writings included, Gairdner tends the most towards generalization of Islam paying the least attention to the particularities of Islam geographically constituted. In this, Gairdner's pedigree through Macdonald and Goldziher as more traditional Orientalists is apparent.

[258] W.H.T. Gairdner, "First Study," in *Vital Forces*, 17.

definite relation to the world – which includes a real, though quite inscrutable and also passionless favour towards themselves."[259] He further suggests that Muhammad and his revelation become the point at which Muslims understand God's relationship to humans, so much so that Gairdner argues the Sunna and Hadith have more bearing on Muslim life than the Quran itself. In this a Christian valuation of mediation, or a mediator, are apparent. By stripping aside the highly developed theological and jurisprudential qualities of Islam, he is able to locate the vital forces in its mystical understandings. Contrasting the daily prayers as a rote duty against the spiritual energy of the *dhikr*,[260] Gairdner concludes, "the hold which mysticism has upon Moslems… and the reality of the part it plays in their religious lives, cannot be exaggerated."[261]

This focus on the mystical was repeatedly cited by Christian scholars as the most meaningful part of Islam. While the authors debated the importance of the major practices and beliefs shared among Muslims, all of the authors in this work agree that the mystical dimension was among the most important dimension, suggesting it in a way that privileged the mystical as the most authentic expression of Islam. This is in part because these evangelical missionaries prioritized feeling and experience over practice and even belief. Crawford states it most clearly, "Islam remains vital because it is a religion. Before all else it may be socially and politically, Islam is a system that in its own way serves to maintain the religious life of its followers."[262] What they disputed then was the genuine evocation of feeling through various practices and beliefs. Whereas Gairdner rejects many practices as

[259] W.H.T. Gairdner, "First Study," in *Vital Forces,* 17.

[260] *Dhikr* translate as "remembrance," and is used in religious contexts to mean "remembrance of God," grounded in numerous quranic verses. In the context of Sufism it developed into a specific practice of cultivating remembrance. The exact contours of that practice vary among Sufi orders, but typically include repeated chanting (usually "allah" (god) or "hu" (he *is*), often accompanied by swaying.

[261] Gairdner, in *Vital Forces,* 21.

[262] Crawford in *Vital Forces,* 127.

rote feeling-less ritual, Crawford argues that for many Muslims these activities generate "genuine activity." Still for Crawford, the *dhikr* remains a particularly powerful example, stating, "It is difficult for the Westerner to realize what a channel for religious energy is provided in the *dhikr*, and how eagerly it is employed in every time of deep religious need or feeling."[263]

If *Vital Forces* pushed for a look at the particular regional variations of Islam in light of universal and mystical principles maintaining Islam, then *the Moslem World of To-Day* (1925) emphasized the contemporary products of that religion. Although the title reflects the idea of a unity among Muslim populations independent of linguistic, ethnic and political borders, the volume explores the relation between national division and Muslim unity. [264] In particular, the dissolution of the caliphate by the Turkish republic in 1924 served as a primary case motivating the study. The book features twenty-three essays attempting to present a view of the current state of Islam in relation to modernity (by which adoption of "Western values" was generally taken to be the chief indicator). In addition to many of the missionary-scholars of Islam we have seen in the prior chapters (e.g. Gairdner, Zwemer, Titus, Jeffery), prominent missionary administrators contributed essays to the volume, including James L. Barton (Foreign Sec., ABCFM), Robert E. Speer (Sec. of Board of Foreign Missions, PCUSA). Likewise, a number of establish scholars added their voices. These included scholars of missions such as Julius Richter (Prof. of Missions, University of Berlin), as well as Islamicists/Orientalists D.S. Margoliouth (Laudian Prof. of Arabic, Oxford University) and C.S. Hurgronje (Professor, Leiden University and Counsellor to the

[263] Crawford in *Vital Forces*, 132.

[264] The use of the concept of the Muslim World remains strong today. It is a phrase used uncritically to mean many things from the category of Muslim-majority countries, to a more nefarious Orientalist construct of "others" threatening the Western way of life.

Dutch Ministry of Colonies). This highlights again how missionaries and more established scholars partnered to develop the study of contemporary Islam.

The volume focused on the contemporary status of religion, and questions of how Islam fit into and adapted itself to modern life. Its theorizing of Islam ran counter to the prevailing discourse, as Barton explicitly noted, "Islam, in its doctrine, traditions, and its practices has been declared to be stereotyped beyond the possibility of change…" and cited Orientalist authors like Fairbairn, Muir, Cromer, Palgrave, Houghton, and Lane-Poole who claimed that Islam is "inflexible, unprogressive, incapable of adapting itself to new conditions, stationary."[265] But Barton argued that while "theoretically Islam may not change in form or practice, the fact remains that marked modifications have taken place especially within this generation."[266]

The authors discussed the evolution of the religion in the contemporary period largely in terms of its relationship to nationalism and Western science. They generally agreed that pan-Islamism had given way to national movements in Muslim-majority colonies. While Islam still retained importance to those Muslims agitating for independence, it was increasingly within limited geographical communities rather than as a general whole. The collapse of the caliphate, and lack of a clear successor or even desire for one, demonstrated this. Margoliouth presents an overview of the historical precedent of caliphate from the beginnings of the Muslim community to the present, noting particularly that caliphal authority was typically valued in relation to maintenance of the pilgrimage sites in Mecca and Medina. With this is mind, he suggests that the most likely candidate for a new caliph, following the Ottoman collapse, rests with the Wahhabis who had taken control of

[265] J.L. Barton "Impact and Influence of Western Civilization on the Islamic World," in *The Moslem World of To-Day*, John R. Mott (ed.) (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1925), 3.
[266] Barton in *The Moslem World of To-Day*, 3.

those cities. On this however, Margoliouth scoffs, "the Sanctuary of Islam ought not be in the hands of a sect which, in proportion to others, is exceedingly small and notoriously fanatical in its attitude towards others."[267] Further, he suggests that the absence of the caliph has been inconsequential to most Muslims – and additionally, that even historically the function of the caliph as a religious figure was largely superseded by the judges and jurists who advised him.

Other authors in the work agreed, with one anonymously-penned essay arguing "the caliph has been a political functionary rather than a religious one. He possessed no spiritual functions which are not possessed by all Moslems."[268] The loss of the position, then, had little effect on the religious unity of Muslims, as opposed to its effect on the political solidarity expressed between Muslim communities. At the same time, the absence of the position, while it may have had little tangible consequence, did create an anxiety among many Muslims. Murray Titus discusses Indian Muslim responses to the Ottoman collapse, noting that Indian Muslims of all stripes were concerned by the Turkish decision.[269] He points to the entreaties of the Shi'i scholar Ameer Ali and the Ismaili Aga Khan who both submitted letters of protest against the abolition of the Caliphate by Turkey – an institution which was largely embraced by Sunni Muslims.[270] Titus' piece argues for a sense of Muslim

[267] D.S. Margoliouth, "The Caliphate Yesterday, To-Day and To-Morrow" in *The Moslem World of To-Day*, 40.

[268] Anonymous, "Institution of the Caliphate" in *The Moslem World of To-Day*, 48.

[269] The Indian interest in the Caliph was in particular represented by the Khilifat Movement 1919-1924. The Movement was founded by the brothers Muhammad and Shaukat Ali, Abul Kalam Azad, and Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari, and briefly succeeded in mobilizing large segments of the Indian Muslim population to pan-Islamic support of the preservation of the institution, which they saw as part of resistance to European colonial authority over Muslim lands. Notably, for its first three years the Indian National Congress (and Gandhi) supported the movement as part of its nationalist/anti-colonial efforts. The Turkish abolishment of the institution effectively ended the movement in India as well.

[270] Murray Titus, "Reaction of Moslem India to Western Islam," in *The Moslem World of To-Day*, 96.

unity remaining among Indian Muslims, and yet he largely dismisses its religious quality, suggesting instead that it was primarily a product of political expediency.

John E Merrill (Principal, Boy's High School, Aleppo), following these articles which in many ways take up political concerns, turns back to the focus on religion. Regarding the relationship between the political and the religious he concludes that political reactions among Muslim populations, have more to do with the "imperialistic diplomacy of Christendom" than it does with the religion of Islam.[271] He argues that so much of Christian literature on Muslims has lacked a "fundamental understanding of Islam as a religion," and thus failed largely to accurately account for it. For Merrill, as with many of the other authors in this volume and the earlier *Vital Forces*, "the essence of Islam is religiousness." Beyond this, Merrill cautions against monolithic views, in which "a single event is generalized, and all Moslems are imagined to be like those described."[272] It is perhaps notable, that one of the most forward thinking essays in the work regarding Islam as a religion does not come from the more established scholars of Islam, missionary or otherwise, but from a missionary educator who had worked years among Muslim and Christian youth in Northern Syria.

The missionary scholarship of *Vital Forces* and *The Moslem World of To-Day* took seriously the discussions and ideas presented in local press, and with it the apologetics produced contemporarily, in order to understand immediately pressing issues among Muslims.[273] At the same time, its reason for doing so was bound to evangelical interest. The

[271] John E. Merrill, "Attitude of Christendom to Peoples of the Moslem World," in *The Moslem World of To-Day*, 111.

[272] Merrill in *The Moslem World of To-Day*, 118.

[273] The so-called "Muslim press" was often considered an important source for missionary education. Mission stations often dedicated some of their time to the translation and distribution of local news to other missionaries For instance, the missionary-connected scholar of Islam at the Near East School of Theology in Beirut, Lutfi Levonian, received a regularly distributed collection of translated press clippings from the Mission in Urumia, Persia. He in turned used these for both his research as well as teaching, along with other news sources in language he already knew. The grouping of these disparate news sources from a variety of

study of Islam by missionaries was then largely a biased comparative religion, where the reason for study was a concern for either the success of Islamic *da'wa*, or the failures of Christian evangelization among Muslims. While such biases by no means invalidate conclusions, they shaped the questions missionaries were asking. So as a study of religion missionaries took up questions of theological critiques and challenges of Christianity, as well as mystical and ritualized expressions of Islam, which maintained communities. Both of these volumes, added significantly to the knowledge of such dimensions through (often problematic) ethnographic depictions, and yet, returned over and over again to a concern for something called religion, even if they left the term ambiguously defined. The shaping of the field by missionaries through their scholarship was thus connected to the study of religion primarily, rather than a political or colonial agenda (although at times it might also serve such needs). These two books give an example of what missionaries produced; yet, the more ambitious project came in the form of a periodical: *The Moslem World*.

The Moslem World: Concept and Journal

A number of editors of *The Moslem World* throughout its publication have pointed out Gibb's endorsement of the journal, where he wrote,

> The fullest documentation [on contemporary Islam] is to be found in the quarterly issues of the *Moslem World* since 1910 [sic]. Though its standpoint and outlook are uncompromisingly missionary, it is part of the modern missionary's technique to acquire a much deeper understanding of

countries and in a variety of languages as "Muslim press", was not solely the creation of missionaries. In the French scholarly journal, *The Revue du Monde Musulman*, a regular feature was a summary of "La Presse Musulmane." The meaning of this Muslim Press was described as "*Une des manifestations les plus remarquables du mouvement d'évolution qui s'accentue si rapidement dans les pays musulmans, est le développement de la presse: arabe, turque, tartare et persane, au moins*" (*RMM* 1:1, November 1906, 122). Missionaries had a similar idea of the phrase in mind, by which the range of Muslim thought transcended merely Arabic association, and yet was at the same time conflated to imply an essential unity of Muslim, and likewise make Islam as the primary marker of such press. We will discuss the *RMM* further in the following section.

> other religions than his predecessors displayed. Not all its contributions reach the high standard set by D.B. Macdonald, but a large proportion of its articles at least reflects current phases of Muslim religious thought.[274]

The history of the journal reveals the debates over the position of academic research within missionary work, as well as the general lack of English-language scholarship on contemporary Islam outside missionary circles.

The journal emerged out of the conversations at the Edinburgh conference in 1910, with Samuel Zwemer taking the lead in its establishment. It functioned alongside Zwemer's work in the foundation of the Cairo Study Center, aiming to provide "a review of current events, literature, and thought among Mohammedans as they affect the Church of Christ and its missionary program."[275] That is to say, the journal was seen as a component within missionary training. However, as with the Cairo Study Center, it developed into a functional scholarly apparatus – not abandoning its missionary character, but using that as a basis from which serious scholarship could be generated.

Zwemer served as editor for the journal from 1911 until 1948, during which time the periodical was published in the U.S. and Cairo (1911-28; during Zwemer's tenure in the city) and Princeton (1928-38; while Zwemer was a professor there). In 1938, Edwin Calverely (Macdonald's student and a missionary in Zwemer's Arabian Mission) joined as co-editor, and the journal became connected officially with Hartford Seminary.[276] When stated so succinctly, the history of the journal seems solid, whereas in reality its continuation

[274] Gibb, viii.
[275] Zwemer, "Editorial" *The Moslem World*, 1, 1911, 2.
[276] Minlib Dalh, "The Muslim World: A Historical Biography" *The Moslem World* (100: 4, 2010), offers a general overview of the entire history of the journal beyond the period I am detailing here. In it Dalh, locates some of the major points of shifting at both Hartford Seminary and in the Journal, which saw it change from a missionary-character periodical to the interfaith journal it is today.

was often tenuous, and this tenuousness was a product of the ambiguous space it held, between missionary-magazine and academic periodical.

Its inaugural issue reflects well the aims and scope of the new journal. The first issue featured articles by prominent missionaries and scholars, and further included an article by a woman – a dimension of missionary publication that we return to in the next chapter. Topically, the initial issue nicely demonstrates its aim to consider contemporary Islam around the world, featuring an article on Islam in Russia (especially focusing on the work of Muslim reformist thinker Ismail Gasprinski) and one on Muslims in China. Likewise, there was a general survey on Muslim movements around the world (the first of a multi-issue series). These initial articles tended towards overviews of their subject matter, perhaps less because the authors were incapable of depth, but more because these topics were so largely understudied at the time that breadth was the surest place to begin. Following its Christian/missionary impetus, there was an article on Christ in Islamic tradition, emphasizing classical Muslim discussions of Christ that could be beneficial as bridges for explaining Christian understandings of Christ. Finally, the issue included summaries of a couple missionary and colonial conferences. Keeping in mind the intended readership of the journal as Christian missionaries and their supporters, such articles offered an introduction to the state of the field (in both scholarly and missional terms).

During its first three decades of publication under Zwemer's eye, it maintained this commitment to a broad geographic treatment of Islam. Around three hundred articles during this period might be categorized as explicitly geographically oriented in their analysis of some aspect of Islam (e.g. Muslim thought, life, practice, belief or writing as opposed to missionary efforts towards Muslims). A little over a third this material falls within the

typical regional focus on the Middle East and North Africa (especially Egypt, Turkey, Persia/Iran, Syria/Palestine). The next largest regional focus was on China and Central Asia (19%), then the Indian Subcontinent (18%), Sub-Saharan Africa (10%), Southeast Asia (primarily Indonesia and Malaysia) (6%), Russia and the Caucuses (6%), with the remainder including articles on Islam in Europe, North America, Latin America, Australia and the Pacific.[277] That the Americas and the like received any attention in terms of the study of Islam was remarkable, even if it was motivated in part by a fear of Muslim evangelizing at "home." When compared with other major organs of Islamic Studies scholarship, *the Moslem World* clearly stands out for casting a wide geographic net. The only other journal with such a range was the French language *Revue du Monde Musulman (RMM).*

The differences between *MW* (and *RMM)* and journals such as *Der Islam, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (JRAS), and* the *Journal of the American Orientalist Society* (*JAOS*) might best be described with Hodgson's distinction between Islam and Islamicate. The latter journals considered the religious dimensions of Islam largely as ancillary, instead focusing historically on cultural, political and social production of Muslim authors, thinkers and rulers.

In many ways, the *Moslem World* was the English counterpart of the *RMM*. For one, a number of the articles in the *MW* dealing with Islam in understudied regions were actually derivatives of similar articles in the French. Both journals also represented a break with the focus on classical Islam and Islamicate societies. Instead, contemporary Muslim

[277] These estimates are based upon the review of titles within the *MW* during this period. For the most part the journal maintained a policy of clearly named titles, specifying the particular region or theoretical focus of the articles to a degree where the title is sufficient in determining the geographic focus of the content (e.g. Zwemer, "Islam in South America," (1916); Weibrecht, "Muslim Missions to England," (1917); Aijian, "Mohammedans in the U.S." (1919)). Of course, some uncertainty remains between the title and content, and it is possible that given a closer review of all of the articles published in this time, these statistics might shift slightly.

communities were the focus of the periodicals. Yet, *RMM*, unlike *MW*, was primarily attached to French colonial interests, and prioritized the study of Islam in light of social-political, rather than religious analysis.

RMM begin publishing in November of 1906 under the direction of the French colonial scholar Alfred Le Chatelier.[278] Le Chatelier had served as a bureau chief for the French colonial authority in Algeria in the early 1880s, and then resigned his post to pursue a number of studies throughout Egypt, Morocco and West Africa, in turn becoming the first chair of Muslim Sociology at the Collège de France and director of the Mission scientifique du Maroc. As Edmund Burke III has discussed, Le Chatelier's work with *RMM* highlights the crisis occurring in French sociology of Islam in the period leading up to WWI and, at the same time, the failure to break paradigms in the field, instead reaffirming colonial discourses.[279]As an inspiration for the *Moslem World*, the *Revue du Monde Musulman* turned its attention to the contemporary and considered Muslim communities all over the world. Burke III notes that in the pages of *RMM* "Muslims were for the first time the subjects as well as the objects of inquiry, and their societies were presented in all of their manifold differences and vitality."[280] At the same time, it maintained colonial fears of pan-Islamic spread and was still invested in guiding French colonial policy, albeit "grounded in empirical observation and not colonialist fantasy."[281]

The scope of *RMM* was ambitious and it discussed a vast range of topics and figures. A prominent focus of the first decade was on education among Muslim populations, aligning

[278] It continued publishing until 1926 when it was superseded by *Revue des études islamiques*, which was overseen by Louis Massignon.

[279] Edmund Burke III, *Genealogies of Orientalism*, 165.

[280] Burke III, 166. Timothy Mitchell also briefly mentions the *RMM* as an example of the turn of the twentieth century emergence of interest in contemporary studies of Islamic societies. Notably, Mitchell does not include the *The Moslem World* in his discussion ("The Middle East in the Past and Future of Social Science," *UCIAS* 3, 2003, 4.)

[281] Burke III, 166.

with French civilizational aims. Such themes can be seen in articles such as "L'Enseignment Primaire des Indigenes Musulmans de l'Algerie,"[282] "L'École Française d'Extreme Orient,"[283] "Unversite Egyptienne"[284] and notably in the special issue "La Conquête du Monde Musulman," which includes a discussion of the Protestant missionary-founded American School for Girls in Constantinople and its work in promoting women's education.[285] This special issue is of particular note as it is focused on the history of Christian missions and, as the title suggests, their role in promoting Western colonial systems in Muslim-majority contexts. That the issue came out in the same year *MW* began publishing is likely coincidental, yet highlights the way missions were implicated in colonial enterprises, even as *MW* directed its attention on the spiritual and religious dimensions of the study of Islam.

Many missionaries pushed back against the perpetuation of so-called Western civilization as the primary aim. Take for instance a letter segment published in the *RMM* special issue, in which Samuel Zwemer writes,

> *Les résultats de l'oeuvre des Missions en pays musulmans ont un double caractère : ils sont constructifs et destructifs, ou, si vous voulez, dissolvants et reconstituants. Il n'y a pas le moindre doute qu'on doit beaucoup plusaux missions qu'à la civilisation occidentale.*[286]

The notion of a need for a reformation in Muslim societies was not disputed by Le Chatelier in the article. But where Le Chatelier emphasized Western civilizational structures as the solution, Zwemer pointed to Christianity as the solution. Zwemer suggests that there are many Muslims who have already converted to Christianity in their hearts in secret, and

[282] *RMM* 1:1 (Nov 1906).
[283] *RMM* 5:6 (June 1908).
[284] *RMM* 13:1 (Jan 1911).
[285] *RMM* 16:1 (Nov 1911) 111.
[286] Zwemer, *RMM* 16:1 (1911), 7.

many more waiting. Le Chatelier ultimately disagrees with Zwemer's sentiment, yet the implication remains that there is a need for outside influence in so-called Muslim lands – either that of the evangelical mission or that of colonial one. Ultimately, both were co-implicated, and the scholarship of journals like *RMM* and *MW* overlapped in their aims, if not their methods. In dedicating an issue to the viewpoints and work of Christian missionaries, *RMM* also recognized such work as a contributor to scholarship. *The Moslem World* thus emerged as an English-language paralogue to the *Revue*, promoting research on the diversity of Muslim communities around the world, while maintaining a notion of Islam as a problem in need of reform in the latter's case, or dissolution in the former.

The quality of scholarship varied immensely in the pages of *MW* during the Zwemer editorial period. An undated advertisement brochure (CA. 1920s) from the Zwemer era highlights the intentionality of the journal in providing space for a broad range of topics pertaining to Islam. It begins by noting a handful of recent articles by authors including, S.A. Morrison, Olive M. Botham ("Muslim women of China"), Daisy Griggs Philips ("Feminist Movement of Egypt"); Mabel Emerson ("Outlook of women in Turkey"), D.S. Margoliouth, and D.B. MacDonald. In such a list, several observations stand out. First we see the intentional blending of both established scholars (e.g. Margoliouth, Macdonald) alongside missionary authors (e.g. Morrison, Botham). As such, there was an understanding that the readership of the journal would be potentially interested in both sides of spectrum. The inclusion of women authors (notably all writing on the topic of Muslim/"Eastern" women) is also significant.

Following the authorial notes, the advertisement continued with endorsements from a similar spectrum. A quote from Robert Speer, the prominent missionary administrator,

reads, "*The Moslem World* is the best source of information in the English language with regard to religious movements among the Mohammedan peoples and with regard to Christian Missions to Moslems." Such an endorsement was echoed similarly in Gibb's endorsement, and in it the split is apparent between two directions of the journal. The word "and" stands out between the stated scholarly ambitions in examining the Muslim religious movements, and the additional missionary dimension. Following Speer, an endorsement from Macdonald continues this dual trajectory, "The Moslem World has always been a suggestive and vitalizing magazine for missionaries to Moslems. But of late it has been more than that. It has become also the most valuable survey of the world of Islam published in English."[287] There are likewise endorsements from Julius Richter and Basil Matthews (YMCA), which indicates readership in Europe, as well as in a range of more liberally-minded Christian missions such as the YMCA.

Finally the brochure reveals the editorial board, which gives one more set of insights into the where the journal was located. Zwemer as editor was supported by a growing cohort of associate editors: Macdonald, Gairdner, Weitbrecht, Shellabear, Titus, Broomhall, Wherry, Jeffery, Harlow and Elder. This editorial board was overwhelmingly missionary (with Macdonald as the sole non-missionary), yet it also shows a set of missionaries deeply committed to scholarship. Gairdner, Jeffery and Elder were, as we have seen, connected with the School of Oriental Studies in Cairo. Wherry, as a more conservative thinker had gained a reputation for his controversialist work. Broomhall, whom we saw cited in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, was a missionary in China, and committed to expanding knowledge on the subject of Islam there. Titus and Shellabear, both students of Macdonald, served as

[287] Undated Brochure for *Moslem World*, Pickens' Collection Box 1 [Harvard-Yenching Library].

missionaries in India and Malaysia respectively, and were examples of Macdonald's training of research missionaries. This board of editors illustrates the clearly Christian, missionary basis for the journal, while also indicating the scholarly ambition. None of these editors saw academic research on Islam as incompatible with missionary work. Understanding this helps us make sense of the debates that went on intermittently among the editorial and trustee boards during the Zwemer era of *The Moslem World*.

A decade after its founding, the journal was struggling. In the early 1920s, it was unclear whether the quarterly could be continued. The American Committee of *The Moslem World*, which featured an assortment of prominent missionary board administrators and trustees and their wives (e.g. James L. Barton, Mrs. Wm. Bancroft Hill, and Mrs. William Borden), met in January of 1922 to discuss the future of the publication. They expressed disappointment at the subscription level of the periodical, noting that there were approximately 1300 subscribers in the U.S., but renewal was rare "showing that the quarterly is not adapted to the home constituency. The magazine is most valued by missionaries and specialists."[288] In such a statement, the scholarly quality of the journal was made clear – it was different from its numerous missionary-published newsletter and promotional counterparts, which were addressed to an uninitiated crowd. As such, the committee found it financially unsustainable, and recommended discontinuing its distribution in the United States. If this is not a description of an academic journal, then what is? Zwemer was unhappy with this course of action, calling it a "great disappointment," and hoped to find a way to forestall the discontinuation.[289]

[288] Minutes of the Meeting of the American Committee of the Moslem World (Jan 10, 1922), Charles Watson Collection Box 11: Folder Zwemer, Samuel [AUC].

[289] Letter from Zwemer to Gairdner (feb 10, 1922), Charles Watson Collection Box 11: Folder Zwemer, Samuel [AUC].

In April of 1922, he gathered together a group of missionaries working among Muslims to discuss the publication's future. They drafted a series of resolutions. The first read,

> That in view of the present critical condition, political, intellectual and religious in the Moslem world… it is unthinkable that the only English journal devoted exclusively to the thought and life of Moslem lands, and the only means of exchange of views and news for workers among Moslems, should be allowed to cease publication while the French and German magazines continue as vigorous as ever.[290]

Yet again we are reminded of the commitment to both the missionary character and scholarly character, as two mutually-constitutive parts of the magazine. We likewise, see a bit of the American/English-language competition, in the note that the journal is especially needed for the English-speaking world. The committee resolved to modify some of the aims of the quarterly, by reducing the number, "and at the same time strengthening in character of the scientific articles in the magazine," thereby demonstrating their continued commitment to balance scholarly articles with more generally accessible popular articles, or as they phrased it, "racy descriptive articles on modern conditions… with the object of sustaining a popular interest."[291] They were trying to find a way to produce a missionary magazine for American public consumption and also something of use to missionaries and scholars. They hoped that by including a handful of strong scholarly pieces, alongside reviews of the Muslim press and European scholarship they might appeal to the latter category, and with the light, descriptive articles they might win over the former into maintaining subscriptions. However, they were also aware that such a balance may not be possible and thus resolved, "If this fails, an effort be made to turn the magazine into a purely scientific journal after the

[290] Memo on Meeting of Dr. Zwemer with group of Missionaries interested in Moslem problem (April 12, 1922), Charles Watson Collection Box 11: Folder Zwemer, Samuel [AUC].

[291] Memo on Meeting of Dr. Zwemer with group of Missionaries interested in Moslem problem (April 12, 1922), Charles Watson Collection Box 11: Folder Zwemer, Samuel [AUC].

nature of *Der Islam* and have it published with a definitely limited circulation by such an institution as the Hartford Seminary."[292] Ultimately, the primary aim of these missionaries was shifting to the production of scholarly, rather than evangelical, content for the journal.

This series of resolutions was enough to maintain the quarterly's publication for the 1920s. While Zwemer was not as dedicated to academic research as Macdonald and others involved with the publication of the journal, he still desired to have it both ways – academic and missional. Upon the close of its eighteenth volume, Zwemer wrote of his frustrations to Macdonald regarding the deficits of the late twenties, stating, "You who are one of our Associate Editors know better than most outsiders what difficulties we have had to meet during these long years maintaining the Quarterly and raising its standards."[293] Things did not improve over the next decade, amidst the depressed economy of the 1930s, and the question of viability continued to plague the journal. In 1934, Zwemer sought advice from a colleague, as to whether continued publication was warranted given the economic circumstances. His colleague replied affirming its need, particularly given its two decades of reputation.[294] Yet, the journal's future remained tenuous, so that in 1937 a confidential memorandum entitled "The Future of '*The Moslem World*'" was circulated among a group of its advisors, which included missionaries and professors of missions, and was itself mostly the collation of a number of earlier letters and memorandums on the topic.

This memorandum begin by stating that subscription was nearly at record highs, maintaining around 1200 to 1400 accounts, and yet this was still not sufficient to avoid

[292] Memo on Meeting of Dr. Zwemer with group of Missionaries interested in Moslem problem (April 12, 1922), Charles Watson Collection Box 11: Folder Zwemer, Samuel [AUC].

[293] Letter from Zwemer to Macdonald (Oct 16, 1928), Box 98: Folder 1997, 51574 [Hartford Seminary].

[294] Letter to Chamberlain from Zwemer (Jan 11, 1934) and Response to Zwemer (Jan 16, 1934), SM & Amy Zwemer Correspondence [NBTS]

deficits in publishing it. It also revealed the beginning of the end for Zwemer's editorial commitment to the journal. Zwemer noted his plans to retire from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1937 and, questioning his ability to keep up with the responsibility, considered who might take over its publication.[295] Several potential organizational homes were suggested. The Near East Council of Churches was discussed, but they deferred instead offering that the Henry Martyn School of Islamics in Lahore might be interested. They also suggested that the Newman School of Missions in Jerusalem would be more suitable because of its location "so close to the heart of the Muslim world and so close to Western Islamic scholarship."[296] After some discussion, the committee resolved that the Newman school was the most favorable option.

A few general concerns for the scope and production of the journal were reiterated regarding the international, interdenominational character of the *Moslem World*. The Newman School seemed fitting as it was "international and interdenominational," and also maintained a working relationship and access to the libraries at The American School of Oriental Studies and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem as well.[297] Still some concerns remained about ensuring that the denominational character of its oversight included a broader constituency than that represented at the Newman school (Methodist Episcopal Church, Church Mission Society, and Danish Mission to the Orient). In his comments, Murray Titus emphasized, "The quarterly must be managed and edited in the interests and through the co-operation of the whole orientalist-missionary body or fail of its purpose."[298] Again we see the recognition that the journal possessed a dual audience of missionary and

[295] Memorandum on Future of the Moslem World 1937, 1. Charles Watson Collection Box 10, Folder Church Mission Society – Padwick, Constance; 1930 [AUC].
[296] Memorandum on Future of the Moslem World 1937 [AUC], 1.
[297] Memorandum on Future of the Moslem World 1937 [AUC], 3.
[298] Memorandum on Future of the Moslem World 1937 [AUC], 3.

scholar. Likewise, concerns about the printing situation in Jerusalem were raised, and it was suggested that it should be printed outside of the Middle East (rejecting the Jerusalem, Beirut, and Cairo mission-associated printing presses), in order that it might "hold its own with the scientific quarterlies of Europe and America" in terms of production quality.[299] Following this discussion of organizational affiliation and location for the journal, the memorandum took up suggestions for new editors and especially a replacement for Zwemer when he stepped down. The first suggestion was L.E. Browne, a Cambridge graduate, who was on the staff at the Henry Martyn School, having previously resided in a number of locations, including Istanbul, Cairo, Lahore, as well as parts of Malaysia.[300]

For all the suggestions and discussions in the Memoranda, none of this came to pass. The Methodist Board, which supported the Newman School determined they lacked the funds to take on the *Moslem World*.[301] And yet, despite the ever present existential threats to the journal over its first several decades of its publication, it continued uninterrupted. At the end of the 1930s *MW* found itself relocated to Hartford Seminary, and Edwin Calverley joined as the co-editor, and eventual successor to Zwemer.[302] The link between seminary's long established program of Islamic Studies, and publication on the subject matter was now

[299] Memorandum on Future of the Moslem World 1937 [AUC], 3.

[300] An additional line in the Memorandum notes that the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem was also seeking a Islamics Specialist and that Browne would be a good fit for that in addition to journal editorial-ship at the Newman School. Notably, it was not Browne who would go to Jerusalem to take the Bishop's consulting post, but the prominent orientalist Montgomery Watt.

[301] Letter from Zwemer to Watson (Dec 3, 1936) Charles Watson Collection Box 11: Folder Zwemer, Samuel [AUC].

[302] Zwemer had in fact predicted this arrangement some years earlier. In 1925 he wrote a letter to Macdonald at Hartford (on the occasion of Macdonald's semi-retirement from his work there). After praising Macdonald for his "leadership in the study of Islam," he suggests, "You sure need not be downcast over the results of your toil when you think of the men and women who have gone out of Hartford. May God bless and strengthen you, especially in your new relationship with Dr. Shellabear! I look forward to his help on *The Moslem World* and with two of you at *Hartford I think the day will yet come when the magazine will be transferred there and we shall satisfy scholars, as well as missionaries, by its character*." Letter from Zwemer to Macdonald (Feb 4, 1925) Macdonald Collection Box 97: Folder 1997, 50902 [Hartford Seminary], my emphasis.

entrenched. Hartford and Macdonald's student Calverley had more immediate control over invigorating the profession of the research-missionary through the journal. And yet, this came at the same time that Christian missions were being significantly rethought. While William Hocking's Rockefeller-funded *Rethinking Missions* (1932), or its colloquial and dismissive rendering as the Laymen's Report, had been controversial among Protestants of the 1930s, it signaled the broader reevaluation of the strategies and aims of missionary work taking place among various missionary societies.[303]

By the late 1930s the editors of *MW* were increasingly aware of the challenge raised by its dual nature as a missionary and scholarly journal. In 1938, with Calverley joining as co-editor and its base of publication solidified at Hartford Seminary, notable shifts in aim began to occur. These came at the same time that Christian mission societies were reevaluating their approaches significantly. Calverley was in many ways a product of and contributor to re-envisioning of missionary scholarship – certainly related to his rigorous scholarly training under Macdonald. He began to reshape *MW* in small, yet significant ways. In the American Protestant spirit of the early twentieth century, he embarked on the creation of a committee to oversee the journal's development, the New Muslim World Fellowship. A new constitution was drafted for guiding the journal, and several revisions were made to its frame. In these changes Calverley reassured Zwemer that no significant evolution was occurring. "There is no desire whatever… to change the nature and purpose…. I do hope that… it will always reveal to Muslims and others our sincere and honest desire to win them as friends of Jesus Christ and influence them to think of Him as we do."[304] And yet, in its framing of friendship, he pointed to shifts in the understanding of evangelism within

[303] See Hutchison, *Errand to the World*, 158-171.

[304] "A tentative list of officers" as part of the New Muslim World Fellowship (n.d.; attached to a Dec 16, 1940 letter) Calverley Collection Box 126: Folder 2298, 60967 [Hartford Seminary].

mainline Protestantism, which connected with ideas of internationalism and religious tolerance.

What this would tangibly look like, predicted the future of the magazine, as Calverely noted, "Muslims might conceivably become members of the Fellowship, as a gesture of good-will, and to promote the purpose of the Fellowship…. It would give us a good opportunity to display fairness and willingness to let the best win."[305] While the idea of Christianity's superiority to Islam remained, as it had in so much of the comparative religion rhetoric of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there was an increasingly open spirit of collaboration. The idea that Muslims might be involved in the production of a Christian missionary periodical illustrated in addition to a certain Christian exceptionalism, a willingness to listen to other voices as they presented themselves. This reflected Macdonald's vision for understanding. And it would be such openings that would precipitate the journal eventually bringing on Muslim editors several decades later and eschewing its missionary character entirely.[306] It started with technical, but meaningful changes, such as the shift in spelling Calverley introduced in 1948, which swapped the vowels "o" and "e" for the "u" and "i" in the spelling of Muslim – a more conventionally accepted transliteration by that time. As the journal opened up to Muslim contributions, so too did Hartford Seminary. The concept of "friendship" and interfaith dialogue created new avenues for the study of Islam in the United States. By the 1960s Muslim were beginning to find Islamic Studies related professorships in the U.S. These openings were not, of course,

[305] Letter from Calverley to Zwemer (Jan 23, 1941), Calverley Collection Box 126: Folder 2298, 61011 [Hartford Seminary].

[306] Zwemer to Calverley (March 21, 1941) Calverley Collection Box 126: Folder 2304, 61151 [Hartford Seminary].

necessarily connected to the missionary-roots, but the ways in which missionaries participated in facilitating that study were part of the story.

So, in retrospect, perhaps Zwemer was right to be concerned that the small changes he saw taking place were in fact not so minor as Calverley and others claimed. Zwemer was not silent about his concerns. He expressed apprehensions about some of the articles being published and perspectives of those involved in the publish process. His concerns, however, were not merely theological in nature. In a letter to Calverley, he highlighted some of the shifts in the character as potentially devastating to its financial support among its more "conservative and evangelical" readers.[307] What exactly were these shifts that Zwemer feared? He pointed to the journal's publication of one article in particular, H.H. Riggs "Shall We Try Unbeaten Paths in Working for Moslems?"[308] In the piece, Riggs noting the generally accepted failure of missionary efforts among Muslims, argued for a reconsideration of methods. In particular, he suggested three main potential adjustments. First, missionaries should avoid discussing controversial doctrines, namely, the divine nature of Christ as "son of God" and his resurrection. Instead, the focus should be placed on "Christ's way of living, and the power of Christ himself to enable us to live such lives."[309] The second point was a rejection of the emphasis that converts declare themselves "Christian." Here Riggs notes the "racial, political and social group connections" affiliated with that identification was problematic for some converts. His third point, takes up the issue of baptism, on which he argues that for Muslim converts, the practice be

[307] Zwemer to Calverley (March 21, 1941) Calverley Collection Box 126: Folder 2304, 61151 [Hartford Seminary].

[308] H.H. Riggs, "Shall We Try Unbeaten Paths in Working For Moslems?" *MW* (31:2, 1941), 116-126. Riggs was the son of ABCFM missionaries in Turkey, who returned to serve as missionary for the same board, in turn becoming president of Euphrates College 1903-10. He is also known for his chronicling of the Armenian massacres.

[309] H.H. Riggs, 122.

discontinued.[310] Zwemer remarked to Calverley on Riggs' positions, "I have no use for that approach whatever, and believe with many missionaries that it is a betrayal of Christ. It is 'Rethinking Missions' resurrected – and that theory was repudiated by all the boards (except the A.B.C.F.M.) years ago."[311] Yet, his protest largely went for naught, and the journal over the next decade would become increasingly Calverley's.

In addition to the confessional open-mindedness Calverley allowed, he consulted with other professors of Islamics and related fields seeking to improve further the scholarly character of the journal. Arthur Jeffery, who began teaching at Columbia in 1938, was one of the main collaborators in that dimension. And yet, despite such work and ideas about the journal, Calverley and Jeffery remained both deeply Christian and sympathetic to Christian mission. Both of them had made careers as longtime missionaries before entering into more academic capacities teaching at both mission-affiliated schools and unaffiliated colleges in the U.S. And both were dedicated to improving the state of Islamic Studies as an academic field. It might be said that Gibb's endorsement of the journal as the premiere English-language periodical for Islamic studies, had much to do with these changes. In the decades to come, the journal would continue to adapt, becoming increasingly interested in Muslim-Christian dialogue.[312]

[310] H.H. Riggs, 122.

[311] Zwemer to Calverley (March 21, 1941) Calverley Collection Box 126: Folder 2304, 61151 [Hartford Seminary].

[312] A couple decades later, Edward Jurji, who replaced Zwemer as professor of comparative religion and Islam at Princeton Theological Seminary had become an associate editor for the journal. In a series of letters between him and the primary editor at the time, Willem Bijlefeld, Jurji noted both the need for continuity of the journal, "in thinking of the parts played by such mighty figures as Zwemer and Macdonald we do well to emulate their examples as scholars" as well as the need to adjust. "As for hermeneutics, that is a difficult task. We ought to engage in dialogue not only with Muslims but with followers of all the great religions. This will create for Christianity a background of understanding especially as far as Islam is concerned. Such a living relation will be one of inclusive, rather than exclusive polarity…. But the integrity of our purpose must be made clear both to our Muslim friends and Christian co-religionists of all traditions." (Juri to Bijlefeld (nov 11, 1966) Jurji Collection Box 3 [Princeton Theological Seminary].

Islam & Modernity: Charles C. Adams & Wilfred Cantwell Smith

The final two works cited by Gibb as exemplary studies of contemporary Islam were Charles C. Adams' *Islam and Modernism in Egypt* (1933) and Wilfred Cantwell Smith's *Modern Islam in India* (1943). We encountered Adams previously: a missionary professor teaching at and later directing the School of Oriental Studies at the American University at Cairo. Smith, however, is the more famous of the two figures, a renowned Canadian-born mid-century scholar who taught for many years at McGill University, and later directed the Harvard Center for the Study of Religion. That Smith began his career as a missionary educator working in India at the Foreman Christian College and Henry Martyn Institute of Islamic Studies – both projects of Christian missions in India – is less well known. Thus, the two figures Gibb indicates as offering the best example of modern Islamic studies were missionaries.

At the same time, there was nothing explicitly missionary about these two works. Adam's study, which is functionally a biography of late-nineteenth century Muslim theologian and reformer Muhammad Abduh, was completed first as a dissertation for his Ph.D. under supervision of Martin Sprengling at the University of Chicago. W.C. Smith's volume came a decade later, and offers an analysis of the various Muslim movements and thinkers which had emerged during the nineteenth and early twentieth century in India. Both works were concerned with the question of modernity and the ways in which Muslims articulated their religion in relation to it. Both take for granted the earlier work we have seen allowing for them to see Islam as distinctly constituted within their respective contexts of India and Egypt, and as a religion still vibrant in the contemporary period, despite facing numerous challenges.

Adams' work, somewhat ironically, was submitted to meet the requirements for completion of a doctorate of Philosophy in Old Testament Studies at the University of Chicago, reminding us again of the strange location of Islamic Studies in many American universities. Adams had originally envisioned his work as a study of so-called modernist movements in Egypt, which were active in the nationalist era of the early twentieth-century, and particularly those influenced by the thought of Rashīd Riḍa and ʻAlī ʻAbd al-Rāziq. As he embarked upon that project he determined that to understand those currents of thought, he needed to go back to their source in the work of Muhammad ʻAbduh (d. 1905). Thus a large portion of the dissertation was dedicated to a biography and analysis of that figure. And it was this material that was published in 1933 by AUC press. As far as a biography of Muhammad ʻAbduh, the book was well received at its time, and has continued to be widely used, in part because until 2011 there was no other full biography in English on ʻAbduh.[313] The work relies heavily on Riḍa's *Tarikh*, and thus displayed Riḍa's biases on the legacy of ʻAbduh. Yet, Adams residency at AUC had also afforded him the opportunity to become familiar with other movements active in Egypt. Apart from some factual errors that have been cleared up by later studies (such as some of Adam's biographical sketch of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī)[314], it remains a useful English-language account of ʻAbduh's life and thought.

[313] In 2011 Mark Sedgwick published a new biography of ʻAbduh. In it he notes Adam's work as admirable, despite some shortcomings in its view of ʻAbduh as a progressive figure bridging the gap between liberal and conservative positions in late 19th-century Egypt. Sedgwick suggests this view "underestimated conservative resistance and overestimated Muhammad ʻAbduh's success" (Sedgwick, *Muhammad Abduh*, 2011, 125).

[314] For instance Adams largely takes al-Afghānī's geographical surname for granted. Adams does include a footnote suggesting some evidence that he may have been from Persia (fn. 1, page 4), which more recent scholarship has confirmed. For a more accurate biography of al-Afghani, see Nikki Keddie, "Sayyid Jamal al-Din 'al-Afghani'" in Ali Rahnema (ed.), *Pioneers of Islamic Revival* (London: Zed Books, 2005) 11-29.

Adams argues that ‘Abduh should be seen in light of his Sufi leanings, as primarily a theological and religious reformer, rather than as a political or social activist. This reveals again that distinguishing trait among missionary scholarship to prioritize religion, and further to identify mysticism as the heart of religion. In particular, Adams argues that the political activism which is most prominent in the co-edited newspaper of al-Afghānī and ‘Abduh, *Al-‘Urwa al-Wuthqa,* was representative of the former’s influence rather than ‘Abduh’s. He spends time reviewing ‘Abduh’s *Risālat al-Tawḥīd* (*Theology of Unity,* 1897) and *Tafsīr* (Quranic commentary), highlighting what he sees as an overriding anti-sectarian message which is grounded upon the Qur’an as the primary source of Muslim identity for modern life, in which religion “supplements and aids reason.”[315] Adams suggests that some of ‘Abduh’s earlier work presents a pantheistic idea of God, but that by the 1897 publication of the *Risāla* such ideas are gone. Further, Adams argues that ‘Abduh’s work inspired two different approaches of modernist reform. One direction was promoted most visibly by Rashīd Riḍa, who articulated a vision of state and society based on Quranic principles as interpreted rationally. The other approach was that endorsed by ‘Abd al-Rāziq and others who increasingly understood Islam as a private affair which should be separate from political formation.

W.C. Smith embarked upon a similar, although slightly more ambitious project in *Modern Islam in India*. Rather than restrict his topic to one figure’s biography, Smith attempts to survey the development of Islam in India from the 1870s until the early 1940s. To do so he relies upon the writings of prominent Indian Muslim figures, interspersed with a handful of British, American and European secondary sources. In particular he relies upon the work of Ahmed Khan, Ameer Ali, and Muhammad Iqbal, from which he derives

[315] C.C. Adams, *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*, 127.

respectively three major movements in the development of the tradition in India. The first movement emerged from the liberal, British-sympathizing Islam generated by Sayyid Ahmad Khan and his school at Aligarh. According to Smith, Khan's approach to Islam valued rationality, and relied upon capitalistic notions of individualism. After discussing a later interlocutor of the Aligarh school, Khuda Baksh, Smith remarks, "The new Islam that he envisages is indeed simple. He readily says that it is indistinguishable from all true religions, and especially Christianity, which he readily praises."[316] Such general and universalist conceptions of Islam served for Aligarh as a moral foundation for maintaining good society, which was ultimately of a conservative bent: a desire to maintain the societal status quo of the late nineteenth century middle class, which had emerged under British rule, and mimicked to some extent British sensibilities.[317]

The second broad movement Smith details emerged from among the India bourgeoisie, partly in reaction to Aligarh. Rather than looking to British/European civilization, it looked to the Islamic past, especially the Abbasid era. That era had witnessed the flourishing of Arab-Islamic science and culture, and thus "from this cultrue [sic] modern science and civilization were now said to be derived."[318] Smith suggests Ameer Ali as the best representative of this movement, which was challenging the perceived insubstantiality of Aligarh Islam. Where Khan argued that Islam was not inimical to progress, Ali argues that Islam was progress. Smith more readily critiques this movement, in particular honing in on Ameer Ali's popular book (in the West) *The Spirit of Islam* (1891). He writes,

[316] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 27.

[317] Khan founded a boy's school in the city of Aligarh in 1871, which was incorporated as the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College in 1878, and renamed Aligarh College in 1920. Fitting Khan's vision as described by Smith, the college curriculum incorporated both Islamic sciences and European sciences, and attempted to educate (primarily) Indian Muslims in order to help them thrive within the British Raj.

[318] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 3.

> Naturally, the accurate historian, the careful orientalist, even the logician, could pick errors from the work and from the religious position it embodies; but that is not our purpose. The religious charge that one can lay against it, and against all this movement, is its ethical poverty: it makes no demands upon the Muslim. It is beautiful but inspires no activity.[319]

Such a critique brings us back to what is important to note of Smith's work: its framework as a study of religion. Further, it reveals the tenacity of the idea that religion should generate ethical-action within society, as we have seen in earlier missionary work. While it deals with the political and social outworking of religious thought, Smith's primary concern remains religion itself. And such a concern, and the way he frames it, is underpinned by his missionary vision. Religion for the American missionary was necessarily an ethically generative force. While Smith retains a largely objective posture throughout the work, hints of his missionary presuppositions play throughout it.

In contrast, the third movement Smith suggests might be understood as both progressive and reactionary. He highlights the work of Muhammad Iqbal as providing its progressive nature, while many of those who have followed Iqbal (especially in the 1930s) have embodied a reactionary tendency. Smith notes that Iqbal repeatedly emphasized action, "it did not matter so much what a man said, as what he did."[320] Yet, Smith is critical of Iqbal's follow through on this concept, arguing that he in practice focused primarily on creed rather than deed. Thus, Iqbal's written ideals largely failed when he engaged in actual social and political life in India. Smith maintains his criticism, focusing on Iqbal's understanding of religion, especially in its idealism and distance from science. Smith summarizes Iqbal's definition of religion as "'a higher form of experience,' than science…. [Iqbal] is correct in saying: 'Science does not care whether its electron is a real entity or

[319] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 53.
[320] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 147.

not.' But he goes on: 'the religious and scientific processes… are in fact identical in their final aim. Both aim at reaching the most real.'"[321] Smith instead suggests both science and religion are more pragmatic in their aims. Science's "object is action. Its object is the control of nature."[322] And likewise religion is to prescribe a "dynamic morality," to guide science.[323] Again, Smith emphasizes the active component of religion.

Smith returns to the question of the meaning of religion in the appendix, in which he sets out pertinent, though rather different, definitions for the work. "Religion: that aspect of a person's life, or his society's life, which that person regards as religion."[324] While nearly tautological, such an open-ended definition of terms was intended as a solution to the long history of failed attempts at defining "religion." In the sense that his non-definition prioritized insider identifications of religion, it escaped theological presuppositions. As such Smith presaged his move away from the term "religion" in his later work, instead preferring the concepts of "traditions," and "faith."[325]

He duplicates this strategy in defining Islam and Muslims as well: "Muslim: any person who calls himself a Muslim. Islam: the religion of Muslims." Again, self-definition becomes the basis for identity, and in setting it out as such Smith complicates any sense of a monolithic Islam, instead prioritizing Muslim voices precisely in their diversity and that a coherent sense of Islam as a tradition is only found in exploring how such (often) competing

[321] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 152. The quotes Smith gives are from Iqbal's "the Secret of the Self" [Asrar-i-khudi].

[322] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 152.

[323] Smith notes that in Iqbal's earlier work he often recognized this practical, active dimension of both science and religion, but that as he moved towards his later work abandoned it for omphaloskepsis, navel gazing. Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 152.

[324] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 346.

[325] See *The Meaning and End of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1962) where he largely sets aside the term "religion," and talks about "traditions" (e.g. Islamic Traditions, Christian Traditions) and "faith," where faith referred to the inner life that was ultimately unknowable/observable for scholars, and traditions referred to those beliefs and practices, which shaped the observable and study-able limits.

examples point back towards something grouped under the term Islam. He suggests that his definition of Islam "is more revolutionary than it sounds,"[326] in allowing the range of competing "orthodoxies" to share the common identification "Islamic."

Smith, however, retains the terms orthodoxy and orthopraxy. "As 'orthodoxy' means the officially recognized and established beliefs of a religion; so *orthopraxy* has been used here to denote its officially recognized and established practices."[327] Given his definitions of religion and Islam more broadly, this return to standard definitions of orthodoxy/praxy seems problematic. It privileges an "official" view, without questioning how such a view is deemed official. While in theory this undermines much of what Smith set out, in practice he uses these terms primarily to refer to the ways Muslim internally constituted such ideas of right belief and practice and was likely aware of the positionality of those making such claims. For instance, in his discussion of of Ameer Ali's support of the Khilifat Movement he remarks it "was rather awkward as [Ali] was a member of the Shī'ah minority in Islām whose chief distinction is that they do not recognize the official *khalīfah* of *orthodox* Muslim."[328] Here Smith seems to substitute *orthodoxy* for the grouping of Sunni traditions. At the same time, the example itself illustrates breakdowns of simple differences between sunni/shia, highlighting how so-called orthodox/orthoprax positions were hardly binding, and Muslim thinkers aligned across supposed boundaries.

While there are some questions as to the theoretical and definitional success of Smith in this early work, his attempt to provide an objective, scientific structure for studying

[326] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 347. In Zwemer's copy of this work (Picken's Collection [Harvard-Yenching Library, Harvard]), he penned in the margin his dissatisfaction with Smith's definitions for their "lack of clarity."

[327] Smith, *Modern Islam in Islam*, 347. His emphasis.

[328] Smith, *Modern Islam in India*, 51. It is also notable how Smith echoes Murray Titus in attributing Ali's support of the primarily to political motivation based in his "enthusiasm for Turkish imperialism."

religion is important. Smith's later work would continue this scholarly trajectory, as he became increasingly a spokesman for the study of religion and world religion. Smith's work *The Meaning and End of Religion* explored in much more detail the problem of the term religion as a definitional category, while simultaneously noting Islam as an exceptional case given that from the beginning Muslims understood their tradition as one religion (*dīn)* amidst other religions (*adyān),* in a way that was uncommon among other world "religions."[329] For our present discussion, the success or failure of Smith in theorizing religion is less important than the fact he attempted to, and deeply influenced the study, highlighting the connection between Christian missional approaches and the academic study of Islam and religion.

As we have seen throughout this chapter, missionaries (especially English-speaking) were deeply invested in studying Islam as a contemporary living religion. In both Adams and Smith the focus was not upon Muslim figures and movements as social or political interlocutors, but as harbingers of the new Islam, religion for modern life. That each limited his scope to a further degree of regional specificity, was also indicative of a more nuanced scholarship of Islam which understood it as a variegated and diverse tradition. Finally, they were well received and considered as fine scholarly examples, as Gibb's and later endorsements show. These two cases serve as illustrations of the fulfillment of the research missionary, which had been emerging over the early decades of the twentieth century in the pages of (missionary) edited volumes, (missionary) scholarly journals, and (missionary) texts such as these.

[329] Smith, *The Meaning and End of Religion*, 84-85. There is also a similar point made here to Macdonald's discussion of the term "dīn" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam (1st ed.).*

Conclusion

Given the role of missionaries in the exploration of Islam as a religion, there remains a question of how that designation "missionary" influenced their understanding. Despite Smith's general definition of religion, the sorts of questions he asked in practice often reveals expectations that were generated within American Christian contexts in connection with mission. As mentioned an idea that religion was meaningful in its ability to produce action, certainly appears throughout the pages of such work. This is especially visible in regard to education and women's rights – two topics which were of deep concern to missionaries. In the next two chapters, we will see more on how those concerns enabled the diversification of field, expanding to include more women and non-European/American scholars of Islam.

Missionaries contributed numerous works that informed the study of Islam, some of which still receive attention. This can be seen in the recent praise of *The Shi'ite Religion* (1933), which was written by a student of D.B. Macdonald and missionary in Persia, Dwight Donaldson. The contemporary scholar of Shi'i Islam Farhad Daftary includes Donaldson alongside Goldziher, Wellhausen, Massignon, and Corbin as important early contributors to the development of Shi'i studies, in particular noting Donaldson's discussion of Twelver-Shia.[330] Similarly, Andrew Newman considers Donaldson, Browne and Brockelmann as the few notable scholars of Shi'ism prior to the Iranian Revolution.[331] Not all missionary-scholars produced work of lasting quality and there are many critiques to be leveled at missionary scholarship. Yet, as we have seen, examples of prominent missionary-scholarship were not uncommon in the first half of the twentieth century, including authors

[330] Farhad Daftary, *A History of Shi'a Islam* (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2013), 17-18.
[331] Andrew Newman, *The Formative Period of Twelver-Shi'ism* (London: Routledge, 2000).

such C.C. Adams, Arthur Jeffery, and even W.C. Smith. In both its content and the modes by which it was transmitted shaped, missionary-affiliated work has had a significant influence.

It is important to take note of the ways that missionaries engaged in what might be called "religious studies" even if it had a particularly Christian bent. While it is worthwhile to consider how one's biases influence scholarship, taking a position – theological or otherwise – hardly invalidates conclusions outright. [332]

The emphasis on Islam as a contemporary religion, as Gibb indicates, was rather novel. It was a consideration that moved the study in direction away from the more classical European orientalists who had focused on Islamic antiquity: its jurisprudential treatises, doctrinal manuscripts, *belles lettres*, art and architecture – all of which might be classified as relics of the past. Instead, these missionaries – often for immediate purposes – questioned in what ways these relics continued to generate Islamic thought among the Muslims they interacted with in their daily lives. While not always thorough, the proximity of missionaries to the actual holders of the tradition, allowed for considerations of Islam as a living religion. Likewise, as missionaries lived in specific places, they soon recognized regional differences in how Islam was practiced and understood, shaped by language, culture and interreligious interactions, not to mention encounters with different modes of colonial occupation. So it was largely through missionary-penned works that the study of Islam as a religion came about in subsequent decades. And simultaneously, it was many of these same works that

[332] By noting the Christian bent of such scholarship, I do not mean a simple critique as if it offered nothing of value. Quite the contrary, and in fact, the question of bias is worth considering in all scholarship. Concern over such prejudices is perhaps is best considered in light of Gadamer's idea of the "fusion of horizons," and Nietzsche's recognition of the value (and inescapability) of perspective.

further outlined the grounds for area studies as it developed,[333] though such studies would take a decidedly political turn.[334]

Having examined the missionary contribution as such, it is worth pointing out that such studies were not the limit of missionary scholarship, only their most influential direction. A number of the scholars we have considered thus far, expressed less interest in the contemporary, and fit more snugly among the Islamicists of Europe. Most of Macdonald's work was focused on Arabic classical literature, Arthur Jeffery's most significant work was *Foreign Vocabulary in the Koran* (1938), and it was on the merits of such work that these scholars established their reputations generally within the broader field. It was also their reputation as scholars that allowed some of their less classically-minded missionary colleagues to produce work on contemporary Islam as religion.

[333] For more on the development of Middle Eastern and area studies see Zachary Lockman, *Field Notes* (2016). Lockman uncovers the pre-WWII roots of these fields. At the same time, as I have mentioned, he does not note the clear links between missionaries and these fields.

[334] A profitable study might be done exploring the connection between missions and the diplomatic work, particularly focused on the numerous children of missionaries who would later take governmental posts in the regions they were born.

IV

WOMEN MISSIONARIES AND THE "MOSLEM WOMAN"

In 1911 a missionary conference on the topic of Women in Islam was held in Lucknow, India. Many prominent Protestant missionary women presented on the subject, with most relating their perceptions of the dismal state of life for Muslim women. However, One voice among the presenters – that of Mary Mills Patrick – caused a stir with a positive assessment of Islamic law in the lives of Muslim women. In the edited volume resulting from the proceedings her position was challenged in comments from the editors. Yet, such debate among these missionaries shows the way the scholarly field among missionaries had changed. It was clear women had become a staple of Protestant mission, higher education and the study of Islam. It had not always been this way, of course, – and women still could not vote in the United States – but Patrick and others were firmly entrenched in certain facets of scholarly life. Women's educational mission work was a major contributor to this development. This work had encouraged women's education both for the missionaries and for the women whom they evangelized. This chapter examines the development of women's participation in higher education in relation to the study of Islam, arguing that such participation in this scholarship was formulated around the missionary method of women's work for women, a theoretical framework representing simultaneously the expansion of participation in scholarly life and its limit.

In what follows, I situate first the ways missions and higher education were connected in promoting women's scholarship on Islam, before turning to the primary themes of that scholarship. Calling for liberation of the so-called veiled, oppressed, and secluded women of the East, missionaries used Muslim women as a mirror in which they could to promote their own ideals, which were often still frustrated within the U.S.[335] Through the promotion of women's rights and education abroad, women missionaries carved out a space for themselves within their host countries. Women worked for better educational opportunities for themselves and for the subjects of their missionary work. Likewise, these missionary women had much greater access to Muslim women, thus enabling the production of ethnographic accounts. Anecdotal evidence from these encounters was a common tool in garnering support for further missions and motivating new female missionaries to enter the field. It also remains a source for detailed, though often biased, accounts of the lives of Muslim women.[336] These writings shaped a different perspective on ideas of gender and sexuality in Islam from that of male dominated scholarship. Missionary authors traced several themes that remain in circulation: a focus on women's clothing and veiling; a contrast of a perceived Muslim "sensuality" over against Christian "love;" and a valuation of the need for education and especially women's education. Such focuses of writing lingered (and continue to linger in less Christian terms) harkening back to these norms set by women missionaries. In this, women's proper academic place was often limited to writing about women's issues.

[335] This idea has been especially developed by Lisa Pruitt, who has made a compelling case for how Orientalism was gendered, and created a mirror in which Western women fashioned their own ideals. See Lisa Pruitt, *A Looking-Glass for Ladies: American Protestant Women and the Orient in the Nineteenth Century* (Macon*:* Mercer University Press, 2005).

[336] Eleanor Doumato in *Getting God's Ear* (2000) has made a case for the value of nineteenth and twentieth century missionary ethnographies as sources of information on Muslim Women's lives, which are otherwise historically almost inaccessible.

Women's Higher Education and Missions

Women's entrance into missions was virtually concomitant with their American inception at the beginning of the nineteenth century. In the past several decades numerous scholars have traced the theoretical and practical development of women's missions.[337] The first women to enter the mission field did so as wives. Beginning in force in antebellum New England, women's earliest participation was marked by the concept that they could model the "Christian home," wherein a busy missionary wife was to demonstrate proper child-rearing, housekeeping, and Christian modesty to the "uncultured" people of the world being missionized. The wives of American missionary men were presented as role models to the cultures they were engaging, and were considered as a subordinate "helpmeet" to their husbands who were responsible for the evangelistic and pastoral tasks of the mission. However, this quickly gave way to multiple roles for involvement by women, as single women missionaries came to be commonplace by mid-century. Missionary women argued that they had access to the private space of Muslim women, which men could not enter.[338] This made female missionaries essential to the aims of evangelization. Single missionary women with this broad commission in mind worked in various aspects of mission life, although particularly in educational work and in medicine and hygiene related fields. And much of their involvement was made possible by educational opportunities for women in the U.S.

In the early nineteenth century American and English women were increasingly seeking education in both intellectual and domestic skills, which led to the formation of

[337] The most important and thorough treatment given by Dana Robert, *American Women in Mission* (1996), which systematically outlines the major phases and thought of women's missionary work. But earlier works include MacHaffie, *Her Story* (1986) and R. Pierce Beaver, *American Protestant Women in World Mission: History of the Feminist Movement in North America (1968).*

[338] Pruitt, *A Looking Glass for Ladies*, 48.

women's colleges and seminaries.[339] By the 1830s America was ahead of the curve on higher female education. While nineteenth-century continental colleges developed higher education with emphasis on research, in the U.S. and England there remained a strong commitment to training teachers and providing models for good citizenship. In Europe, research-focus paired with stereotypes on women's intellectual ability and led to white male exclusivity among these schools, under the notion that they alone were capable of completing such rigorous academic work. Since primary and secondary teaching was considered a proper job for women in America and England, higher education for pedagogical development was more readily accepted.[340] While American and English colleges began to emulate the continental schools research focus later in the century, the participation of women in education was already well established.[341]

The differences between continental Europe and England and America are highlighted in a study produced in the late 1880s, in which American women led the world in female education with nearly thirty percent of women pursuing higher education; this compared to eleven percent in England, eight percent in Switzerland, two percent in France and zero in Germany.[342] Germany may have produced the research university, but it was decidedly a male institution. The exact reasons for the higher acceptance of women's education in the U.S. have been debated. In early discussion the civil war was given primary

[339] Dana Robert, *American Women in Mission* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1996), 88

[340] Patricia Mazon, *Gender and the Modern Research University* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 8

[341] This chapter, while focused on the American dimension of women's participation, will attend also to examples in England and Europe. Notably, because of the lack of graduate education in America, most women who obtained graduate degrees attended European universities during the nineteenth century.

[342] Helene Lange, *Higher Education of Women in Europe* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1890), xxx.

cause,[343] but later scholars noted other events such as the industrial revolution and Great Awakening.[344] Likewise, the connection between women's mission and women's education served as a mutually reinforcing structure for involvement in both.

The early model for women's education was primarily that of separate girls' seminaries. The most famous school was Mount Holyoke Female Seminary established in 1837 through much effort by Mary Lyons. It became a central institution in the training of women missionaries and at the time of its half-centennial in 1887, trained twenty percent of women missionaries associated with the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM).[345] Amanda Porterfield in her study of Mount Holyoke observes two defining characteristics of the school: a basis in New Divinity Calvinistic theology emerging from the second Great Awakening, and a commitment to republican motherhood.[346] These ideas were passed down to the missionaries coming out of that school, and influenced the form women's missions took abroad. Mary Lyon maintained control of the administration of the school by relying on a broad base of smaller contributions from women throughout New England, thus preventing a small group of wealthy donors from commandeering its agenda.[347] Mount Holyoke became the model for women's higher education, and many other schools followed course. It prepared the way for other women's colleges such as Vassar, Wellesley, and Smith as the century progressed. One goal of schools like Mount

[343] Thomas Woody. *A History of Women's Education in the United States*, (New York: The Science Press, 1929).

[344] Elizabeth Eschbach, *The Higher Education of Women in England and America* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1993), 43.

[345] Robert, 93.

[346] Porterfield, 12-18. New Divinity was the product of Jonathan Edwards and his successors (especially Samuel Hopkins), who encouraged a disinterested benevolence central to the promotion of missionary work, toning down the more deterministic theologies of hardline-Calvinism. These were combined with a conception of the mother as an educator of civic values to her children, which required education for the mother.

[347] Porterfield, 11.

Holyoke was to make women "useful" to mission. This meant a broad curriculum, which included domestic education alongside religious and pedagogical education. It facilitated teaching as a proper activity for women, instituting it as a parallel profession to male-dominated preaching in missions.[348]

In addition, already established colleges began to open their doors to co-education during this period, particularly following the 1862 Morrill Act. While there was some resistance initially, by the early twentieth century co-education was the predominant model in the United States. Coeducation, however, did not open up all equally to men and women, as Elizabeth Eschbach has noted, "While it was not impossible for bright, serious women to pursue the 'masculine' subjects of history, mathematics, classics, chemistry, and philosophy, social ideas and professional realities induced the majority of women to follow feminine courses that would prepare them for their seemingly preordained roles as intelligent homemakers and teachers," and education did not translate to greater inclusion behind "Pulpit, Senate or Bench."[349] Women's place outside of the home remained largely limited to social work, charity, and teaching.

Increased educational opportunities paved the way for single missionary women. By the mid-nineteenth it was no longer the missionary wife as the norm, but the single missionary woman. For American women, societal changes and the civil war had opened up many opportunities for single women in missions.[350] A quick review of the ABCFM's commission records reveals that by the 1860s about half of the missionaries being sent out

[348] Robert, 83-92.
[349] Eschbach, *The Higher Education of Women*, 184-85.
[350] As with the growth of women's higher education in the U.S. there has been debate over the growth of single women's involvement in missions. The Civil War has often been cited for the incorporation of more women into missions. However, Lisa Pruitt has argued that such a case is overstated. She points out that women were already entering the mission field in greater numbers prior to the war, and the war merely continued to facilitate their inclusion (Pruitt, *A Looking Glass*, 1-4).

were women, the large majority these were single. Most of these commissioned women had also received college education, although advanced theological education was almost unheard of (whereas among men it was practically a prerequisite for mission work by this point).[351] The changes in missionary demographics produced a shift in the aims of many missions. The inclusion of more single women meant a need for women to have roles beyond modeling family life. These women, thinking of their circumstances and privileges, began working under the slogan of "woman's work for women." This idea was made clear in the founding in 1861 of the Women's Union Missionary Society (WUMS) as a women's board for commissioning women to missions, which challenged the traditional male-dominated boards.[352] While the WUMS as an ecumenical board for women missionaries was not particularly successful, it did pressure the ABCFM and other denominational boards to take a more serious look at women's involvement.[353]

In 1868 the Women's Board of Missions (WBM) was established as the autocephalous corollary to the ABCFM for the appointment of single women missionaries, with several other denominational mission boards following suit. Elizabeth Clark, the wife of ABCFM corresponding secretary Nathaniel Clark, defended the need for separate board stating, "It is a blessed thing for our missionary sisters – these young ladies who certainly make a much greater sacrifice than those who go with their husbands – to feel that we at

[351] American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, "College and Seminary Attendance Lists (1812-1922)," ABC 77.2 [Houghton Library, Harvard University]. Of course the lack of seminary education mostly had to do with the lack of seminaries open to women (as we have seen Hartford was the first to open co-education in 1888).

[352] Robert, *American Women in Mission*, 115.

[353] For a more detailed examination of WUMS, see Robert, 115ff. WUMS work was focused first in Ceylon, and its missionaries were not connected with work for Muslims, thus of less interest to the present study.

home are remembering and praying for them."[354] In other words, a women's board was to provide support for the challenges of single women missionaries in a way that the male dominated boards were unable to address.

The WBM concentrated its work among women and children, as well as on missionary training in the United States.[355] As such, the Board sent missionaries all over the world, while also maintaining a presence in the U.S. interior. In the case of its Middle East branch (centered in Anatolia) it regarded its primary agenda towards the stereotypically conceived women there, who have been "so long down-trodden and degraded that their minds are much less easily reached, and men have so long looked upon woman as a mere drudge – that they require some years of enlighten."[356] In this sentiment, one of the primary aims of women's mission was made clear: enlightenment, as expressed through an educational formulation that led to numerous schools being established throughout the region and in Muslim-majority mission fields more generally. The WBM provided workers to help these women, seeing a connection between changes for women at home with the call to go abroad. "It seems a wonderful providence that at the same time with this awakening abroad, the women at home have felt their hearts so strongly stirred within them to do something for their sisters sitting in darkness."[357] These women, typically having completed some amount of undergraduate education in the United States, became the teachers first at primary and secondary mission schools and later the professors at several of the first female colleges.

---

[354] *Reasons for the Formation of the Women's Board of Mission* (Mrs. N.G. Clark) (ND) ABC 9.5.1, box 7 [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

[355] Robert, *American Women in Mission*,128

[356] *Reasons for the Formation of the Women's Board of Mission* (Mrs. N.G. Clark) (ND) ABC 9.5.1, box 7 [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

[357] *Reasons for the Formation of the Women's Board of Mission* (Mrs. N.G. Clark) (ND) ABC 9.5.1, box 7 [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

As higher education as a form of mission became more established, it prompted missionary women to seek advanced education. For most of the nineteenth century graduate degrees were not necessary for American men or women interested in teaching at colleges. However, by the end of the century, the German model of a research university had taken hold in American schools, and advanced degrees were becoming increasingly important and desirable, if not required.[358] As we have seen, while the United States proved most open to the higher education of women in colleges, it lacked the advanced degree programs that were present in the established European institutions.[359] Because of this many American women went to other countries to continue their education (in particular Germany, Switzerland and France), which were more open to admitting foreign women than their own.[360]

Despite the increasing numbers of women obtaining advanced degrees, women found few openings in American colleges for teaching, where they were typically limited to teaching positions at women's colleges like Mt. Holyoke, shuttled into Home Economics departments within co-ed colleges, or given administrative positions.[361] As it happened, Christian missions' connection with education efforts meant that many women having obtained the PhD found opportunities developing and teaching more extensive subject matter in mission (mostly girls') schools and colleges in other countries. Mission schools provided a place for women to put their education to work. Education (and especially

[358] Mazon, *Gender and the Modern Research University*, 8.

[359] The U.S. was definitely slow in developing doctoral programs compared with Europe, with most of the premiere American institutions (Harvard, Yale, Columbia, etc.) not creating doctoral programs until the latter half of the century. It took even more time for women to be considered candidates for these programs (and often these schools segregated women away, such as the case of Radcliffe College as the female counterpart to Harvard).

[360] Eschbach, *The Higher Education of Women*, 189.

[361] Eschbach, *The Higher Education of Women*, 195-199. Eschbach also observes how the growing preference for co-education in the early twentieth century further undermined women's ability to find academic jobs, as women's schools (with their predominately female faculty) closed down.

literacy) in turn was considered as the "handmaiden to the gospel."[362] This is not to say that earlier ideas of a modeling a "Christian home" or "republican motherhood" were abandoned, but these ideas were incorporated as part of proper education. As one missionary promotional document endorsing the foundation of a female Seminary in Turkey explained, "Pastors and preachers must not be hindered and spoiled by ignorant uncultured wives, but aided by real help-meets, so we soon had an embryo Female Seminary… having, at first, as a large part of its pupils, the wives of the theological students."[363] Education, family and mission were all connected in the minds of this cadre of educated women missionaries. They linked the values of past mission theory with education, arguing medical knowledge, literacy and domestic skills were all essential tools for mothers.[364]

The American College for Girls and Mary Mills Patrick

There were many tensions raised by the connection of women's missions and higher education. To understand how these various mission theories were practiced and challenged, the case of the American College for Girls in Constantinople (ACFGC) is instructive.[365] The College began as the Constantinople Home School in 1871 under the ABCFM, as a counterpart to the existing missionary school for boys and men, Robert College, under the missionary idea that the "ignorance and superstition of the woman of Turkey was the chief obstacle in the way of a pure Christianity."[366] One of the early proponents of the Home School was the missionary George Washburn (1833-1915) who wanted the school be

[362] Pruitt, *A Looking Glass*, 95

[363] "The Harpoot News (Vol III; Bangor, Maine, 1878; Number 1)

[364] Pruitt, *A Looking Glass*, 118.

[365] Barbara Reeves-Ellington, *Domestic Frontiers*, has also looked at the history of the Home School, with emphasis on the cultivation of domesticity through education in the region. As part of it she looks at how the ACFGC highlights the eventual failure of the WBM as a system.

[366] Caroline Borden, "History of the Constantinople Home," (n.d.), ABC 16.7.1 [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

staffed, supervised and funded solely by women, promoting "Christian work of women for women."[367] With this philosophy in mind, the ABCFM transferred the school's administration, fundraising, and staffing to the WBM in 1875.[368] It continued focusing on primary and secondary education throughout the remainder of that decade, but planning began under the encouragement of missionary Mary Mills Patrick (1850-1940) to develop a college curriculum. Patrick and supporters of the school were convinced that it could be an equal with American female colleges such as Smith and Wellesley.

This optimism was questioned by some of the ABCFM missionaries in the region. The prominent missionary and a trustee of the Home School, Henry Dwight (1843-1917) wrote to the WBM Home Secretary Abbie Child questioning the seriousness of their intention to found a college. Noting the colloquial meaning of "college" in the Levant derived from the French as a somewhat lower institution than the word held in the United States, Dwight insisted upon the need for a well-qualified faculty to convince locals of its superior character. He wondered about the feasibility of finding the qualified staff and capable students necessary to attain the status of a "real" American college.[369] The women missionaries seeking to establish the college defended themselves. In personal correspondence Patrick responded to Dwight's critiques arguing that Dwight and the other male ABCFM missionaries were uninformed on the matter: "The truth is that they know

[367] Borden, "History of the Constantinople Home."

[368] The staff of the school was reformed in 1876 with Clara (Kate) Williams, Ellen Parsons, Patrick, Annie Bliss, and Clara Hamlin, a group of women with many established familial connections to major educational and missionary thought. In her account, Barbara Reeves-Ellington captures the group nicely with a quote from Patrick naming them, "A group of unusual women," (quoted in *Domestic Frontiers*, 150).

[369] Henry Dwight letter to Abbie Child (Sept 13, 1889). ABC 16.7.1, [Houghton Library, Harvard University]. To be fair to Dwight, many of the collegiate missionary institutions did not match up well with their American counterparts. As the Girls' Department of Euphrates college admitted of itself, "Our college is higher in grade than a high school, but not up to an American college." General Letter from Girl's Department of Euphrates College (March 20, 1901). ABC 16.9.9[Houghton Library, Harvard University].

very little of the work we are doing in school….When I told [Dwight] that our Greek course is as fine as that at Harvard College, he was greatly astonished."[370]

The debate was resolved in 1890, and the board agreed to support the endeavor. On March 17, 1890, the ACFGC was incorporated under the state of Massachusetts, to be managed by the Women's Board of Missions (the WBM would turn over the management and property of the school to its own independent board in 1908). The college was founded as a Christian collegiate institute seeking to train girls to be "women of Christian influence in the home and the society."[371] Such aims demonstrate the persistence of American Protestant valuation of motherly and wifely duties in connection with education. The school at the same time guaranteed the right of admittance to any interested women regardless of confessional affiliation.[372] This pair of standards, seemingly contradictory, fit with the approach of American colleges in the region. With the college successfully established, the curriculum was drafted, encouraging a broad liberal arts education, with classes ranging from English Classical Authors, to Modern History, to Ethics, Rhetoric, Algebra, Chemistry, Psychology and Art. Likewise there was a consistent component of biblical and Christian theological coursework required.[373] They drew a student body from the ethnically and religiously diverse population of the Ottoman Empire, which included Armenians, Bulgarians, and Turks, both Christians and Muslims.[374]

---

[370] M.M. Patrick letter to Caroline Borden (Oct 4, 1889). ABC 16.7.1 [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

[371] Constitution of the American College for Girls at Constantinople, 1890. ABC 16.7.1, [Houghton Library, Harvard University]

[372] Constitution of the American College for Girls at Constantinople, 1890. ABC 16.7.1, [Houghton Library, Harvard University]

[373] "Synopsis of the Course of Study suggested for the American College." ABC 16.7.1, [Houghton Library, Harvard University]

[374] Reeves-Ellignton, 141-144. The actual number of Muslim students was rather few, due to restrictions imposed by the Sultan on religious education.

With the college established another controversy soon followed. The teachers at the college were all appointed by the WBM as missionaries to Turkey. As such they were paid salaries commensurate with the standard rates the board determined for missionaries in the region. However, the teachers became dissatisfied with these low salaries. They argued for a pay increase based on several principles. First, Constantinople [Istanbul], they contended, was an expensive city when compared with other mission stations. Secondly, they felt they ought to be paid in accordance with their advanced educational qualifications on par with other collegiate teachers. And thirdly, the income was simply not enough to cover the further educational requirements of the professors for taking sabbaticals and continuing to develop their own intellectual knowledge of the subjects they were expected to teach. They suggested a near doubling of salary from the established three-hundred dollars a year to five to six hundred depending on position. Patrick wrote, "The work required of us is of a different kind intellectually from that of other missionaries, and requires different preparation," and that "if the college was in fact to be a significant institution of higher education, then such increases were necessary."[375] In such statements the seriousness of the women as educators is made clear. Patrick recognizes Dwight's earlier appraisal of whether such missionaries would be qualified to teach collegiate level course – and answers that challenge by insisting on continuing educational opportunities for teachers. In order to maintain scholarly quality, Patrick insisted that the teachers required additional support from the board. Recognizing the tensions such demands would cause in relation to their contracts, the faculty also admitted that the board might elect instead to dissolve the faculty and start over. Concerned with this possibility, Patrick argued that to find a replacement dean willing

[375] M.M. Patrick letter to Abbie Child (March 12, 1892). ABC 16.7.1, [Houghton Library, Harvard University]

to take such low pay seemed unlikely, "Unless she had private means at her disposal, and it hardly seems just that that should become a necessary qualification for occupying a position in this college."[376] The missionaries desired parity with other academic institutions.

To provide some context for their demands, it is worth looking at salary figures for other missionary-affiliated educators. The American University of Beirut, upon its opening in 1865, had secured for its president Daniel Bliss a salary of fifteen-hundred dollars, and its other American professors around one thousand dollars.[377] Compare that to the ACFGC salaries nearly three decades later, and it should not be surprising Patrick and her colleagues were dissatisfied. It must be noted, however, that AUB, though in cooperation, was established independently of the American Mission in Syria. Thus, the school was able to pay its faculty at a higher rate than common for proper missionaries. It is certain Patrick had in mind independent missionary-aligned colleges such as AUB and her own neighbor Robert College, as being comparable to ACFGC and thus a fair model for commensurate pay. Still, a better figure for comparison comes from roughly contemporary figures for other missionaries, since the issue arose around standardization of missionary pay scales.

Around the same time the dispute was taking place in the ACFGC, salary policies were being changed regarding women teachers within the Presbyterian Church USA mission in Syria. The originally ABCFM-run Syria Mission had been acquired by the PCUSA in 1870. In 1890, their Board of Foreign Missions (which did not have a separate Women's Board) amended the rules regarding the position of women missionaries. Up until this time, the women missionaries lacked voting rights within the Syrian Mission. The rule update gave partial enfranchisement, allowing women to vote on topics viewed as "Woman's

[376] M.M. Patrick letter to Abbie Child (Dec. 31, 1891). ABC 16.7.1, [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

[377] Penrose, *That they May of Life*, 17

Work."[378] This change opened up further discussion of a woman's place in these missions. In 1895-96, the Board updated single woman's salary to be set to half that of a married man's salary.[379] An exception was granted to those "unmarried women residing in Beirut Female Seminary," which set their salary at $466.67, slightly above the roughly $450 salary for most female missionaries, due to increased cost of living.[380] Comparatively, at this time, unmarried male missionaries' salary was set to two-thirds that of a married man's, although this rule was updated in 1901 to bring unmarried men and women to equal salary at the rate of half that of a married man.[381] What is notable is that all of these salaries were higher than what the teachers in Constantinople were paid (though less than what they requested). Further, changes came rather easier for the women of the PCUSA than the WBM, calling into question the effectiveness of a separate women's board in providing for the women it employed.[382]

The challenge raised by Patrick was about larger issues than pay. Rather, it revolved around questions concerning the core aims of the school and the position of its faculty. Dwight was again the first to question the women missionaries, asking if the missionary purpose of the school or the position of the women missionaries had somehow changed. They responded with affirmations of their commitment to missions and evangelization. However, they continued to emphasize that the quality of the college's degrees was essential

[378] Letter from Gillespie to Syrian mission (Dec 10, 1890), Board Letters PCUSA, File 102 [NEST], 111.

[379] Letter from Gillespie to Syrian mission (April 19, 1895), Board Letters PCUSA, File 102 [NEST], 275-277.

[380] Letter from Arthur Brown to Syrian Mission (March 24, 1896), Board Letters PCUSA, File 102 [NEST], 318-330.

[381] Letter from Courtenay H. F[illegible] to Missions (Oct 5, 1901), Board Letters PCUSA, File 103 [NEST], 68.

[382] Reeves-Ellington discusses the failures of the WBM in relation to the ACFGC, observing how it eventually led to the transfer of the school's administration to an independent board of trustees. As she words it, the transfer of boards traded a "missionary patriarchy for capitalist patriarchy" (163).

to its missionary function. In order to do their jobs adequately (a challenge which Dwight raised in the first place in regards to the school), they needed to pursue further intellectual and scholarly opportunities. Patrick wrote as much to Abbie Child, stating,

> I have always embraced all the opportunities for study that were possible, it was a fact well-known to the Trustees, that I have spent the greater part of my life in Turkey, and comparatively few years in the regular study that is needed to fit one for a position like this. I have tried to supply this need to some extent, during the last two years, by studying in Germany and Zurich, in the vacations, and without these advantages should not have felt equal to the position.[383]

Patrick's concern was personal – she wanted to maintain high educational standards at the ACFGC. And with such aims at stake the controversy grew somewhat bitter over the following years. The two sides were at an impasse as the missionary teachers felt their request justified, and the Board felt it a breach of the agreement for the founding of the college (which was expected to remain under the standard missionary model).[384]

The tensions resulted in Dwight and one of his fellow critics of the College tendering their resignations as trustees, and the faculty of the college advocating they be accepted. The remainder of the trustees however continued to support the broader aims of the college, even while they denied pay increases. The controversy was resolved in 1893 by the faculty rescinding their request for increased salary, citing that they had no intention to cause such a problem with the request (they also had little legal grounds in expecting changes, based on the charter). It was disheartening for the faculty, yet Patrick maintained her vision for the college, "The aim of this college is the development of cultured Christian womanhood. And as it is the only institution of its class in the East, it is most important to keep its …

[383] M.M. Patrick letter to Abbie Child (Dec. 31, 1891). ABC 16.7.1, [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

[384] The reality is that things were perhaps never so tense, as the difficulty of long distance communication at the time made it seem. Lost letters, slow responses, and hearsay created false impressions of bitterness that each side tried to alleviate in later letters.

scholarship high, and its Christian teaching strong."[385] The teachers worked hard for less pay than they thought fair, and the Board responded by providing scholarships to fund sabbatical instruction and research as it was able, while remaining unwilling to dramatically increase pay.

One of the significant results produced by the fostering of collegiate teaching among missions to Muslims and Christian women in the region was the further involvement of women in academic life generally. As is clear from the above, women missionary-educators, such as Patrick, were not only interested in teaching, but in being part of the higher education sphere. Patrick and many of the teachers at the ACFGC, still affected by the questioning of their competency, took whatever opportunities they had to advance their studies. For instance, Patrick, who taught Psychology and Ethics at the college, completed a PhD in Psychology at the University of Berne, Switzerland, in 1897 during missionary furlough. Patrick published and spoke on educational missionary work in Turkey (and the larger Middle East), and on how to engage with the religious and cultural values encountered there.[386] Missionaries like Patrick, felt confident in their ability to pursue higher studies, and their right to participate in the male-dominated scholarly world. While missionary women in general found space to write about Muslim women and Islam, these mission-school educators in particular carved space for thorough scholarship.

[385] M.M. Patrick, "Higher Education of Women in the Orient," (n.d.). ABC 16.7.1, [Houghton Library, Harvard University]. The college continued for over three decades under Patrick's leadership when she finally retired in 1924 and returned to the U.S. In 1919 it changed its name again to Constantinople College. The shifts into twentieth century thinking about "sisterhood" can be seen in writings about the college later on: "Constantinople College is ready and passionately eager to take a large share of the responsibility in the Near East for building up broken lives, for bringing together Jew and Gentile, Christian and Moslem into a great sisterhood of service for all humanity." (E. Thomson, "Constantinople College and the Future of the Near East," *The Moslem World* 9:2 (1919), 158).

[386] She published several books including an autobiography *Under Five Sultans(1929)* and *A Bosphorus Adventure*(1934), which told the story of the College.

Missionary Women Producing Scholarship on Islam

The scope and bounds of the involvement of missionary women in scholarship on Islam was largely set by the end of the first decades of the twentieth century. In the early twentieth century Christian ecumenism and social gospel merged with the efforts of women's work for women, culminating in the idea of a (especially post-WWI) "global sisterhood." Within this framework, missionaries emphasized women's rights as a needed component of spiritual, political and social reform. While these women were often still limited within patriarchal systems, their sheer numerical advantage allowed them a stronger voice.[387] It is therefore not surprising that around this time, missionary conferences were held specifically discussing themes of gender, women and Islam, and that the majority of the speakers at these conferences were women. Missionary women among Muslims populations had found a place to contribute to scholarship, even if it remained mostly limited to discussing the "woman question."

Women's work in the twentieth century was widely recognized in broader mission theory, and alongside this came a growing support from male missionaries for their scholarship. A missions conference held in Cairo in 1911, unofficially representing six missionary societies in Egypt and Syria, passed a resolution (based on discussions coming out of the Edinburgh conference and the Lucknow Conference) for the improvement of scholarship on Islam. It included among other things the need for "more specialized literature on women's life [in Islamic contexts] than is to be found."[388] Likewise, Women missionaries were organizing educational opportunities to discuss Muslim women back in their home countries, hoping to find new missionaries and raise support for existing ones.

[387] Robert, *American Women in Mission,* 255-257.
[388] Resolution passed by the Conference on Language Study, Held in Cairo in December, 1911. 4.

That is, the desire to study and discuss Islam remained largely pragmatic, both as a means of maintaining missions and as a way of carrying out evangelization. Yet, the fact that scholarship was being promoted on women and by women should not go without note, even though it often maintained and promoted Orientalist stereotypes. At the 1910 ABCFM centennial celebration, WBM President Mrs. Charles H. Daniels noted the work already done, and encouraged further, "treating of all missions lands, historically and sociologically, and of the work of all denominations in those lands…" which was meeting the needs of "secluded womanhood in harem, zenan and kraal."[389] It was agenda scholarship, no doubt, but it was a place for women to be involved.

In the United States, the WBM promoted various books about Islam and the "Question of Women" in Muslim communities to young women in churches to help spur interest in missions to Muslims. These readings included the work of many male missionaries, such as Dwight's *A Muslim Sir Galahad*; and Samuel Zwemer's scholarly missionary journal, *The Moslem World*. Additionally, they promoted Helen B. Montgomery's popular work, *Western Women in Eastern Lands.*[390] They also organized conferences with notable missionary-scholars. For instance, the Interdenominational Institute for Women's Foreign Missionary Societies arranged for Zwemer at their 1907 meeting in which Zwemer gave a talk entitled, "Now or Never in Moslem Lands."[391] These talks, while clearly positioned on the missionary side of the study of Islam brought a popular attention to the subject among women. Alongside this they also hoped for more women to

[389] Mrs. Charles H. Daniels, "Presentation of Woman's Foreign Missionary Work from the Home Base" (1910). ABC 9.5.1, box 7, [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

[390] Pruitt notes that this book generated eagerness to help women, but was full of inaccuracies. Global (east) study of woes of women, and specifically in the case of Islam on the roots of this woes in the Quran and via Muhammad (Pruitt, *A Looking Glass*, 180). Montgomery's harshest criticisms are on Hinduism.

[391] Committee for the Interdenominational Institute for Women's Foreign Missionary Societies, Minutes from Meeting (Nov. 26 and Sept. 11, 1907). ABC 9.5.1, box 7 [Houghton Library, Harvard University].

write, publish and speak on such themes for both scholarly and publicity reasons. By the early twentieth century, the average American was much better educated and missionaries were expected to reflect this. Missionary writing, however biased it might have been, combined with the promotion of social and charity work as a compelling reason for women to join and support missions. While male and female missionaries had been writing for some time prior, it was in the early twentieth century that the writings about women (and by women) peaked. By the time of the Edinburgh missionary conference in 1910, women were thoroughly involved in publication of scholarship, and in particular ethnographies.[392]

Of course, missionary women were not the only women writing about Islam and Muslims. Other women found success by traveling outside England/US and writing about their travels. Called "Victorian lady explorers" by Eschbach, the prominent travel memoirs of wealthy nineteenth-century English travelers such as Anne Blunt and twentieth-century colonialist Gertrude Bell proved important to the study of Islam and the Middle East.[393] Blunt, for her part, wrote in the popular tradition of travelogue, and was not particularly academic. Bell produced rigorous, intellectually-grounded scholarship on the Middle East: its history, people and culture.[394] While Bell wrote about Islam in some of her works, it was almost always within the specific context of Middle Eastern countries, and with colonial implications in mind. Further, Bell, like Blunt, came from the upper tier of society. Here M.M. Patrick's comment about the need for increased salaries for herself and fellow teachers stands out – "unless she had private means" it was hard for one to run a college, and

[392] Robert, *American Women in Mission*, 263. Although the quality of many of these ethnographies are rather poor.

[393] Eschbach, *The Higher Education of Women*, 189.

[394] Bell was born in 1868, and graduated from Oxford University. She travelled widely in the Middle East, writing and consulting on the region (include collaborating with T.E. Lawrence).

the same could be said for the traveling explorer scholarship of Bell and Blunt. Wealth and privilege played a large part in making their scholarship possible.

This was one of the major points of divergence between missionary women and their colonialist counterparts. Protestant missions allowed a democratization of those going abroad. While these women were still typically recruited from at least middle class backgrounds, they did not travel with the same ease or esteem as that of their non-missionary colleagues. They were the blue-collar workers in the study of Islam, spending decades working for low wages and living among Muslims. This is not to say that their work was somehow more astute, or that all missionary women authors were like-minded; they were part of a missionary network which provided a space to work and write about subjects related to Islam, through the lens of Christian values on women's roles. Women like Gertrude Bell had more freedom in selecting their subject matter, whereas missionary women often found themselves limited to writing about women's work for women, female education, and family life of Muslim women, all in connection with methods for promoting Christianity.

Samuel Zwemer played a large role in facilitating women's involvement in writing on the subject. Under Zwemer's editorship, *the Moslem World* (*MW)* published numerous articles on the status and life of Muslim women and other topics, authored by women. For instance, the first article printed in the *MW* was authored by Sophy Bobrovnikoff on the topic of Muslims in the Russian Empire (Central Asia).[395] By leading with this article, *MW* subverted both the patriarchal and Arabistic biases of typical Orientalist discussions of Islam. Compared with other journals engaging with Islam, *the Moslem World* provided more space for women authors than any other academic publication addressing the topic of Islam

[395] Sophy Bobrovnikoff, "Moslems in Russia," *The Muslim World* 1:1 (1911), 5-31.

at the time. Between its founding in 1910 and 1940, *MW* published over eighty-five articles by more than fifty women authors, covering a range of topics from situational overviews of various mission areas, Islamic theology, Sufism, "superstitious"[396] practices and traditions, although typically with special attention to Muslim womanhood.[397] While such numbers may not seem astounding given the some thousand articles published in *MW* during this period, when contrasted with other organs of scholarship on Islam, these figures take on significance. For instance, the British *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* published between its inception in 1834 and 1940 less than twenty articles by fewer than five women authors on topics pertaining to Islam. Its American counterpart the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (est. 1843) had published fewer than ten articles by five different women by 1940.[398] Perhaps unsurprisingly, things were worse on the continent with the German *Der Islam* not publishing a single article by a woman between its 1910 establishment and 1940. While the scholarly rigor of these latter journals is undisputed compared to *MW*, it came alongside a gendered exclusivity. Missionary scholarship was more open to inclusion of women and this was precisely because women had such a substantial involvement in missions.

The scholarly quality of these missionary writings varied dramatically as can be seen in a brief selection of articles from *MW*. In her article on the life of Muslim women in

[396] By superstitious practices these women meant the popular and often controversial practices found among the Muslim communities in which they worked. Examples include discussion of exorcism rituals (Zar), warding talismans, and "folk" medicine. See for example Stuart, "Ministry of Healing" in *Daylight in the Harem* (1912).

[397] All of these figures and those that follow are rough estimates based on a provisional survey of the contents of these various journals. Since authors first names are often abbreviated in these articles it is possible that some female authors have been overlooked. Still, these general figures present a good basis for comparison.

[398] Regarding the *JRAS* and the *JAOS* it should be noted that these figures are specific to articles pertaining to Islam as a topic (broadly interpreted). There were other authors published in these journals on other subject matter, showing that the limits on women's involvement was not indicative of the journals as a whole, but of the field of Islamics.

Algeria, the missionary C.L. Watling describes the women solely from a distance, without making an effort to actually meet those she writes about. She recounts looking down from her roof patio, and witnessing a funeral ceremony being held by her neighbors. Watling describes one of the mourning women as follows: "It called itself woman, but the wild eyes and mad smile above the half-naked body belied the name."[399] The woman in mourning is dehumanized ("it"), mad and sexualized. This is a clear example of everything missionary writers (and Orientalists more generally) have been critiqued for: an etic account from a position of height (literally in this case), laden with heavy disdain and misrepresentation. It is a reminder that ethnographic accounts are highly embedded in the viewer's own expectations, which at their worst conceal, rather than reveal.

There are counter examples of women missionaries producing more nuanced scholarship. In a *MW* article issued one year prior, the co-authors Elizabet Franke and Anna Thompson discuss the practice of the "Zar in Egypt" with considerably more precision. Thompson presents her first-hand account attending a Zar ritual, and Franke contextualizes the experience within existing scholarship on the Zar. While the focus remains on the popular practices among Muslim women, which missionaries often targeted, the quality of the work indicates an attempt to understand and analyze the ritual.[400] The conclusion the pair reach reflects the balance of missions with scholarship: "Women missionaries especially should constantly strive to understand our Moslem sisters better, and to ask of God that He may show us the way to their hearts and grant us sympathetic love and Divine strength in our effort 'to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison.'"[401] A blend of

[399] Watling, "Desert Rose," *The Moslem World* 4:4 (1914), 390.

[400] In this emphasis on the popular and lived practices of Muslim, missionaries were actually subverting the norms of much of Orientalist scholarship that emphasized "book" Islam.

[401] Elisabet Franke and Anna Thompson, "The Zar in Egypt," *The Moslem World* 3:3 (1913), 289.

paternalism and conversionary desire is expressed here, wrapped within empathetic understanding.

In addition to journal articles, women also began writing books on Islam. Again Zwemer was involved in this production. Zwemer co-edited with fellow missionary Annie van Sommers two volumes featuring conference proceedings on the topic of Muslim womanhood, *Our Moslem Sisters* (1907) and *Daylight in the Harem* (1912). He also co-authored with his wife, Amy Zwemer, *Moslem Women* (1926), which sought to describe the position of Muslim women all around the world. Zwemer's name, as a major spokesman of missions to Muslims, leant weight to these publications, although the work itself was that of women.

Daylight in the Harem and the Limits of Missionary Scholarship

We opened the chapter with the controversy stirred by Patrick at the Lucknow Conference of 1911. Those proceedings published under the title *Daylight in the Harem* best reflect the diversity of the missionary views of Islam. The conference – held in India, which missionaries viewed as an important region of the Muslim world – hosted more than three hundred women missionaries from a variety of mission agencies to discuss the topic of women's place in Islam, ranging from harsh critiques to Patrick's open minded and positive assessment of Islam as it related to women in Turkey.

In her article, Patrick argued that the overemphasis on veiling and seclusion norms in the scholarship on Muslim women had resulted in a biased and inaccurate picture of their experiences. It is even fair to suggest that such a critique might still be warranted today, given the often inordinate amount of public and scholarly attention towards Muslim

women's dress habits. Patrick instead pointed to property rights as one example of advantages provided Muslim women (compared to Western women); in particular highlighting that a woman could own and manage property as an individual from the age of fifteen upward. While much of what she said was based in an interpretive lens relying upon hadithic tradition favorable to women, such a perspective was almost unheard of among missionary scholars.

Patrick also suggested, contra many missionary writers, that Muhammad endorsed respect for women, restricting plural marriages from what was culturally the norm in Arabia at his time. Looking at contemporary Turkey she made an argument that Muslim marriage was purely a civil arrangement and thus women retain a greater degree of individuality and legal right within the system. She concluded by citing examples of Muslim women involved in the literary, philosophical and social scenes of Turkey. One cannot help but think that Patrick's somewhat unpleasant experiences with the WBM and male ABCFM missionaries in Turkey had fostered in her significant doubts over the so-claimed superiority of Western values of womanhood. Patrick's evaluation reflects in part a critique of the status of women's rights in the West, or at least a critique of the narrative of superiority. She echoes what her fellow missionary in Turkey, George Washburn, had said regarding the Young Turk Revolt of 1908,

> It is not true that Islam degrades woman by teaching that she has no soul and no hope of eternal life, nor is it true that she has no influence and no rights before the law. *It is only within a few years that Christian states have guarded the property rights of women as the Mohammedan law* does and women have often been the most important factors in the Turkish government. There have been Turkish women known and honored as writers both of prose and poetry - some have been successful merchants.[402]

[402] George Washburn, "The Significance of the Turkish Revolution" (undated) Western Turkey Mission & Anatolia College [Microfilm, Lamont Library, Harvard University] Emphasis mine. Reeves-Ellington has noted on Washburn's involvement with the founding of the ACFGC that he held a particularly

With that said, Washburn continued in his following sentence, "Still it is in fact recognized by the Young Turks, that the greatest obstacle to the regeneration of Turkey is to be found in the general ignorance and social degradation of the Moslem women." In this we can also understand what was at stake for Patrick. Patrick and Washburn were not necessarily trying to defend the treatment of women in Islam. They maintained skepticism – in fact, Patrick's entire career was founded around an idea that women in Turkey (of all religions) were in need of education. In another paper she described women teachers going into the harems with the "Sophists of Socrates days," doing a pioneering work, and contended that the "nations of the east" were at last beginning to value education.[403] So, it was not that she was trying to praise Islam. Rather, what Patrick and Washburn were challenging was the uncritical reflection on the stereotypes surrounding women in Islam.

Zwemer and van Sommers, as editors, responded to Patrick's contribution to *Daylight in the Harem* with hostility.[404] Following her article, an editor's note appears, which grants that some of these privileges may exist in theory, but in reality, men (through divorce, polygamy, etc.) have found ways to avoid observing many of the laws. Likewise they contended that the Qur'an itself provides no guarantee of property rights for women. So while the editors did not censor Patrick's perspective from the volume, allowing for some scholarly debate on the topic, they ultimately got the last word, and pointed to a limit of what missionary authors could write acceptably. Considering this was the sole article they felt the need to comment upon within the volume, it stands out as significant. When

---

negative view of the state of Muslim women's position in Turkey, but his a statement here, reflects at the very least some nuanced reflection on the topic over time. C.f. *Domestic Frontiers*, 144.

[403] MM Patrick, "Higher Education of Women in the Orient" (not dated), American College For Girls, Constantinople [Microfilm Lamont Library, Harvard University].

[404] See Annie van Sommer Annie and Samuel Zwemer, (eds.), *Daylight in the Harem* (Edinburgh: Oliphan, Anderson & Ferrier, 1911), 90, for full editorial critique.

information challenged the norms endorsed in the scholarship, they were often rebuked or brought into the narrative in some other manner.

Still, there was flexibility in the missionary narrative about Islam so long as it ultimately supported the need for Christianity. In another presentation within *Daylight in the Harem*, Anna Thompson, like Patrick, discusses the risk of stereotyping and universalizing. In her discussion of the state of Muslim womanhood in Egypt and North Africa, she observes that many Muslims have an uninformed view of Christians, assuming that all Christians drink alcohol and all Christian women are immoral to highlight the silliness of generalizations – though this homogenizing tendency was evidenced by the editors themselves. Thompson attempted to avoid such simplistic visions of Islam by noting various exceptions, such as the lack of veiling and more freedom to marry among the Kabyle women in North Africa.[405] Such counter descriptions remained centered on assessment of women's experiences as primarily defined by their clothing choice and marital expectations. Thompson's aim is to show the need for Christianity, and she does so largely in relation to cultural values. In this, she is able to note divergences from the narrative, while maintaining the missionary imperative. While many missionaries gave a simplistic picture of the place of women in Muslim societies, there remained some room for alternative assessments.

The Missionary Narrative: Veiling, Seclusion and the "Oriental Woman"

With that said, the majority of missionary women publishing on the subject were less nuanced. We will now trace the common themes of missionary women's scholarship on Islam. Shirley Foster has argued that since European women travelers could enter private

[405] Thompson, Reforms in Egypt in *Daylight*, 113. For this reference Thompson is actually quoting fellow missionary in Algeria, Lilias Trotter.

women's spaces, they were able to provide a counter-hegemonic, challenging the male-Orientalists writings of the harem as a forbidden site of debauchery. Instead, they saw the harem not as sexual imprisonment, but as the site of a "bored womanhood."[406] These European women criticized the harem life and other tropes of Muslim womanhood, but also sought to liberate women from such structures. While still part of the colonial project, these women also represented "difference that was both alien and a skewed image of their own society's cultural patterns… in empathy and receptivity as well as criticism."[407]

Missionary women also contributed to this project. The idea of woman's work for woman as a major motivator for woman missionaries, confirms an understanding similar to that of the European woman authors (e.g. Bell, Blunt, etc.). These women were often critical of women's modes of dress and adornment – though they also expressed disappointment when they saw Eastern women wearing European clothing, which fails to express the "Eastern effect and look of the Harem"[408] Here perhaps a difference can be seen between missionary women and the travelers.

The ideas that motivated women's missions (the proper housewife, women's education and the work for other women) also influenced their scholarly writing on the position of Muslim women. While there were exceptions, it was easier for the purpose of missions for these missionary authors to write of all Muslims as virtually the same in their treatment of women. There might be some variation in details, but the general portrait of the Muslim woman was that of an oppressed, secluded and superstitious wife who was to bear her husband's children, and who was the mere object of male desire. The missionaries

[406] Shirley Foster, "Colonialism and Gender in the East: Representations of the Harem in the Writings of Women Travellers," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 34 (2004), 7-9

[407] Foster, "Colonialism and Gender," 17

[408] Quoted in Foster, "Colonialism and Gender," 12.

contrasted this Muslim woman caricature against their Western Protestant ideals of womanhood and wifehood. While the writers focused on Islam as a religion (unlike the writings of Bell or Blunt), it was a comparative missiological approach that tended to contrast Islam negatively against proper Christian virtue.

The sexuality of Muslim women was expressed and summed up within missionary discussions of dress, and in particular, veiling. In the view of missionaries the veil reflected everything wrong with the Islamic position of women: the seclusion mandated by *purdah* and the status of women as sexual objects. To further confirm their position, missionaries marshaled examples of contemporary Muslim critics of sexuality in Islam. One of the most prominent figures missionaries cited was the controversial Egyptian jurist Qāsim Amīn (1863-1908), author of *Taḥrīr al-Mar'a* (*The Liberation of Women*, 1899) and *al-Mar'a al-Jadīda* (*The New Woman*, 1900).[409] Missionaries picked quotes from his book to confirm their points: "Man is the absolute master and woman the slave. She is the object of his sensual pleasures, a toy, as it were, with which he plays, whenever and however he pleases."[410] Amīn was himself, regurgitating in part existing missionary critiques,[411] and in turn he served to validate these critiques for the missionaries. From this status of women as unrestricted objects of male desire, all the other "evils" of Islamic society grew: child marriage, polygamy, concubinage, divorce laws, lack of motherliness, and superstitious practices. For the missionary the answer to the perceived low status of women in Islam was through education and Christianity. The missionaries saw their ideals of marriage and the

[409] Leila Ahmed has critiqued much of Amīn's thought, which was grounded in aristocratic interactions of women and colonial discourses. See Ahmed, *Gender and Islam* (1992).

[410] Quoted in Annie van Sommer and Samuel Zwemer (eds.), *Our Moslem Sisters*. (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1907), 7.

[411] Though it should also be noted that Muhammad 'Abduh had previously made similar arguments regarding the position of women in Islam years prior, and without stirring nearly so much controversy as Amīn. Albert Hourani has discussed some of the ways in which Amīn expands upon, and eventually challenges 'Abduh. See Hourani *Arabic Thought in a Liberal Age* (1982).

like as reflecting proper sexuality of women – a sexuality they articulated as based in love rather than sensuality. Muslim commentators who criticized the treatment of women in Islam provided the missionaries much fodder, without them recognizing the reform element such authors intended in their critiques. Authors such as Amīn were intent on defending and preserving Islam as a part of modern life, not doing away with it.

The missionaries argued that Muslim marriages lacked love. In their co-authored volume Samuel and Amy Zwemer pointed out the jurisprudential Arabic term for marriage, *nikāḥ,* is "a crude expression no longer used in polite society," because it references only the physical aspect of marriage, i.e. coitus.[412] For the missionaries this idea of sex (in marriage) as merely physical was troubling. A missionary to the central Sudan wrote about the general mobility of women there, but still bemoaned the lack of love in marriage, where woman was just a "necessary convenience."[413] Even in cases where the missionaries perceived love present in Muslim marriages, they wrote them off as exceptions, or as a temporary sentiment that would eventually be overcome by man's sexual desires.

The lack of love in marriage was particularly evident to the missionaries in the practice of child marriage. Most missionaries viewed child marriage as the worst result of Muslim sensuality. A missionary recounting an anecdote about a Muslim mother defending her decision to arrange a marriage for her fourteen year old son writes that the mother's excuse was "I do it to keep him from learning the bad habit of visiting prostitutes."[414] Such anecdotes proved to the missionary that there was no love in Muslim marriages, but it was

[412] Amy and Samuel Zwemer, *Moslem Women* (West Medford: The Central Committee on the United Study of Foreign Missions, 1926), 40. Though Edward Lane in his lexicon, suggest that it does not necessarily mean only coitus, and that there are instances of it referring to marriage without coitus even (See N K H in Lane). However, it is true that it is no longer used in common speech to refer to marriage in modern Arabic – the term zawāj being preferred (from Z W J – with a meaning of coupling/to make a pair, which perhaps indicates some of the missionary emphasis on marriage as partnership).

[413] Sommers and Zwemer, *Moslem Sisters,* 124.

[414] Van Sommers and Zwemer, *Our Moslem Sisters,* 27.

purely a sexual arrangement for male pleasure and procreation. This view of sexuality, they inferred, provided the rationale for easy divorce laws, acceptance of polygamy and concubinage, which allowed men to continue to sate their lusts, while women suffered. This confirmed for the missionaries the bankruptcy of Islamic sexual ethics and the need for Christianity in order to change the system. On this theme one missionary writes,

> Let her take the place ordained for her by the Great Creator as the "helpmeet" to man, let her fulfil her mission in the world, laid down in the teaching of the New Testament, to love and influence…. then will the daughters of Hagar put on the robe of chastity and the "adornment of a meek and quiet spirit."[415]

Woman was to be the educated helper and partner of man, rather than sexual object. Further the quote establishes a God-ordained role for women in the world, tied up with marriage, partnership and love. Here the missionary contrasted what she saw as the false chastity of external veiling against the true chastity of inner austere Christian spirit. Marriage required mutual love, which elevated the morality of both women and men.

While there was consensus that the removal of the veil would lead to an elevation of women's status beyond sexual object, unveiling in and of itself was insufficient for fostering proper womanhood. Annie Stocking, a prominent missionary in Persia, explicitly links clothing choice with change in views of womanhood. Discussing what she calls the "New woman in Persia" Stocking writes that "being still a woman she straightaway thought of her appearance and made some significant changes in dress." However, she then notes the fashion faux pas made by these women, "European fashions in dress are much sought after, and the results are sometimes painful - cotton lace on woolen dresses, and all the colors

[415] Van Sommers and Zwemer, *Our Moslem Sisters*, 70-71.

of the rainbow displayed on one gown."[416] In adopting new clothing, and eschewing the veil, women seemed to be asserting themselves. Yet, to Stocking they still had a ways to go. More seriously than bad fashion, at play in such sentiment was the low regard the missionaries held for non-Christian sexual morality. Another missionary in Persia comments, "As to discarding the veil, I should be very sorry to see them going with uncovered faces till they have a religion which requires purity of heart instead of outward restraint, and which knows neither polygamy nor divorce."[417] The suggestion here being that unveiling might actually result in more polygamy and divorce, since if Muslim men were able to see readily the beauty of women in public, they would quickly give into the lustful thoughts and deeds. Here the missionaries conceded to the idea – also held by many Muslims – that men were helpless to resist their desire, and the responsibility was upon women.[418]

Missionaries used examples of societies in which Muslim women did not veil to confirm their fears. A missionary in Indonesia writing about the freedom of Javanese Muslim women, states, "The native women in Java seem to go too far; a few of them even practice wrestling."[419] While perhaps a somewhat amusing scandal today, it reveals the limits of proper womanhood in the missionaries' minds. One missionary discussing Nigerian Muslims observes that the women are generally better off in terms of divorce law and have a greater mobility in society, but continues by highlighting how this freedom has been used by women to cause a general degradation of society. "Girls are generally tempters, and young

[416] Annie Stocking, "The New Woman in Persia," *The Moslem World* 2:4 (1911), 368. There is perhaps an additional interesting dynamic in this critique of colorfulness. Michael Tausig in *What Color is the Sacred* (2009) argues that Westerners have tended to endorse a chromophobic view on clothing, in contrast to many of the societies they colonized, which often embraced brightly and diversely colored clothing.

[417] Holliday, "Awakening Womanhood" in *Daylight in the Harem*, 129

[418] An idea that Qāsim Amīn both recognizes and criticizes.

[419] Zwemer, *Moslem Women*, 93.

men are led into sin who would not have sought it."[420] While some fault is placed on the girls, the author concludes that the original sin is man's, for practicing a "terribly degrading system of polygamy and slave concubinage" which "makes it impossible for the children to grow up clean-minded."[421] Here male sensuality still produces a system which lacks a "proper" home life, thus distorting women's sexuality. This makes it impossible for the development of the notion of "woman being the most holy and chaste and beautiful of all God's creation."[422]

In the long run, the missionaries thought that the education and Christianization of Muslim women would lead to a better home life, where the women would instill proper values in their children. Another missionary in Persia highlights this process and the connection to veiling, writing,

> The fact remains: these women and girls cannot be educated and emancipated, without bringing to bear on the social fabric influences which would result in its disintegration and destruction, with nothing better to replace it. Galling as are the curtain and the veil, they cannot be dispensed with, for fear of worse evils. Ignorance and seclusion are better than education and liberty without moral restraint.[423]

Only once a moral society had developed, a society in which men could control their urges and value women as partners rather than servants, could the veil properly be abandoned. Still missionaries took encouragement from the demonstrations of Muslim women casting aside the veil and putting on new clothes. These were seen as signs of changing sexuality – one which emphasized companionship within the marriage relation, moral leadership in parenting, and the cultivation of "civilized" (and hopefully soon Christian) social sphere.

[420] Sommers and Zwemer, *Moslem Sisters,* 122
[421] Sommers and Zwemer, *Moslem Sisters,* 122.
[422] Sommers and Zwemer, *Moslem Sisters,* 122.
[423] Sommers and Zwemer, *Moslem Sisters,* 237.

This narrative formulated by these missionaries throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was secured in a more popular form by Ruth Francis Woodsmall in her 1936 work *Moslem Women Enter a New World*. Woodsmall at the time of writing was the general-secretary of the Young Women's Christian Association, and had formerly served as Near East director of the YWCA's projects, based in Istanbul. Her work, which was an admittedly personal account, would become a major source for Western scholarship on Muslim women during the mid-twentieth century, used by both older and younger generations of Islamicists.[424] It gained general scholarly acceptance in part because, while Woodsmall's work featured the ideas of earlier missionary scholars, it limited the call for Christian evangelism instead focusing on women's rights, which was becoming a more acceptable narrative during the 1930s era of mission reevaluation. Woodsmall maintained the criticism of veiling and associated western style dress with modernity. She suggested that throughout the Muslim World there existed "Widespread dissatisfaction with a social system that sanctions polygamy and is typified by the veil."[425] Like earlier missionaries Woodsmall cited Muslim critiques of Islamic mores on gender to confirm her argument about the dissatisfaction with the religion.[426] However, in contrast to earlier missionary accounts, she did not explicitly argue that Christianity was the only solution, instead allowing for the potential of internal reform. Still in her critique of Islam as a system, the missionary mindset of a declining Islam was subtly maintained, and ultimately Islam is portrayed as an unviable source for women's rights.

[424] An example of the older and younger can respectively be found in the citations of Brockelmann, *History of Islamic Peoples (1947)* and Wilfred Cantwell Smith, *Modern Islam in India* (Lahore: Minerva, 1943).

[425] Ruth Woodsmall, *Moslem Women Enter a New World* (New York: Round Table Press, 1936), 377.

[426] For instance she cites Naẓīra Zayn al-Dīn (1908-1976), a Lebanese Druze woman who wrote two controversial books critiquing the status of women in her society: *A Young Woman and the Shaykhs* (*al-Fatat wa al-Shuyuk*, 1928) and *Unveiling and Veiling* (*al-Sufur w'al-Hijab*, 1928). See Woodsmall, *Moslem Women Enter a New World*, 403.

In much of the popular and even scholarly discourse about gender in Islam today, many of these tropes and themes remain firmly rooted. Veiling still too often consumes the lion's share of attention in writings about Muslim women. Likewise, the education of women remains a marker of civilized society and the aim of "liberating" Muslim women remains a popular aim among Christian missionaries, politicians and many feminist scholars.[427] While the definition of a "liberated" woman would be contested by each of these groups, the basic issues remain the same, and Islam is consistently demonized as a detriment to women. There are of course counter-narratives. Muslim apologists (men and women) have challenged these tropes. Likewise there has been much subaltern and critical scholarship carried out addressing the lives of Muslim women in various contexts, which evaluates and critiques these ideas. Still, it is notable that so much of the discussion surrounding the topic of Muslim women echoes at least in subject-matter, if not in policy, the same narratives Christian missionaries articulated a century ago. The topics of education, veiling and dress, marriage and divorce, continue to dominate both the popular and the scholarly landscape.

Women Teaching Islamic Studies

We have seen now both how missionary women became involved in scholarship and some of the general themes as well as challenges they offered within that scholarship. One final question remains: did this scholarly inclusion translate beyond mission circles into the

[427] In terms of missions, many organizations still argue that Christianity will help oppressed Muslim women. Such as the Crescent Project which dedicates the month of May to praying for Muslim Women, "Many of them face social injustices such as - religious persecution, domestic abuse, female genital mutilation, rape, nikah mut'ah (temporary wife), and honor killings" (Crescent Project Monthly Newsletter, Email to author, 3/25/11). In the case of politics the war in Afghanistan serves as another easy example, where justification for the invasion was in a large part argued as for the betterment of women in the region. Laura Bush's comments on *Meet the Press* (Nov 30, 2008) illustrate this, "The plight of women and children in Afghanistan is a matter of deliberate human cruelty carried out by those who seek to intimidate and control."

larger academic world. In what follows I consider the effectiveness of this inclusion by examining the ways in which scholarly writing translated into attainment of academic positions. Women teaching about Islam at the university level were almost unheard of in Europe and the United States until well into the twentieth century. Yet, in mission circles and their training programs many women began to find places for inclusion, which served as one of the earliest sites for the professionalization of women as Islamicists. As was the case with such programs, the emphasis remained largely on evangelization techniques, and women were still often asked to lecture on women in Islam. For instance, among the earliest examples of women teaching Islamics was Anna Thompson, who worked as a lecturer alongside Zwemer and Gairdner at the Cairo Study Center (CSC) beginning in 1914. Thompson had arrived in Egypt in 1871 to work with the Egypt Mission of the UPCNA. She was also heavily involved with the temperance movement. Thompson was brought on board at the CSC with her years of experience in mind, in order to teach two courses, "St. Matthew's Gospel for Moslems" and "Methods of work among Mohammedan women."[428] Of course, the focus of her teaching was clearly evangelical, centered more on methods than on Islam itself. Still, as we saw in her article on the Zār, Thompson was also invested in direct study of Islam without abandoning such evangelical perspectives. At the CSC Thompson lectured to both men and women, most of whom had completed college education. While the school was by no means a university-level site for Islamics, it is none-the-less notable to see a woman teaching an educated mixed audience.

Thompson set a precedent for others at the CSC and similar institutions. At the School of Religion (SOR) at Constantinople/Athens (which later merged with the School for

[428] CSC Reports 1914-15, 1915-16, 1917-18, Box 1 School of Oriental Studies: Folder 1 [AUC].

Religious Workers in Beirut to become the Near East School of Theology), Ruth Woodsmall was included in the faculty register.[429] A number of other missionary women also lectured short-term at the SOR on topics ranging from "Woman's Progress, Problems and Ideals" to "Women of India." Again the abiding theme was women's life, and while the SOR was less evangelical and more ecumenical, there was still a Christian slant to the talks. Numerous women missionaries gave talks at the various missionary-established training schools and seminaries within the Middle East. At the Newman School of Missions, prominent missionary administrator Constance Padwick was invited over the course of the 1930s and 40s to lecture on topics such as "Islam and Prayer" and "Islamic Mysticism."[430]

The participation of women in these places did not just come by chance, but through intentional promotion among mission agencies. As we have seen in earlier chapters the thorough education of missionaries about Islam was increasingly valued, and as it developed it came to require both male and female perspectives, so much so that one Church Mission Society/Society for the Propagation of the Gospel policy proposal called for, "In every area there should be at least two experts (*a man and a women*) who would maintain sympathetic touch with Moslem opinion and who would also be in a position to guide the studies of other missionaries in Islamics." The promotion of expertise, which had gained force around the turn of the century, was now being expanded to women, as well as men. The proposal went on to highlight that "Both societies [CMS/SPG] are seeking for a trained leadership *by men*

[429] Course Catalogues School of Religions (Constantinople/Athens), 1922-23 [NEST]. She continues to appear in the catalogues for several years.

[430] NSM Occasional (#17, 1944) Folder 693 and NSM Occasional (#17, 1944) Folder 693, Newman School of Missions Collection [NEST].

and women with wide and expert knowledge, and for a close co-operation that will make the work of each society doubly effective."[431]

Still the transition from missionary training institutions to universities was slow in coming. For example, Constance Padwick's effectiveness as a missionary scholar earned her an endorsement from Dutch ecumenist Hendrik Kraemer to replace Arthur Jeffery at the AUC School of Oriental Studies in 1937. Kraemer wrote to Watson, "In many respects one might say in my opinion that Miss Padwick would qualify rather well, because she is a woman of rare gifts and knowledge." Kraemer, however, did observe that her knowledge was more practical (as a missionary) than historical, and might disqualify her from being considered a true "scholar in the field of Islamics."[432] And that was the rub – at the same time missionary women were being increasingly valued as scholars of Islam among missionary-affiliated institutions, missionaries were being excised increasingly from the realm of proper scholarship.

These schools in places like Egypt and Turkey, while they were working towards it, were still not widely regarded as centers for research in Islamics. While many missionary women were able to publish and lecture occasionally on the subject, this did not translate to jobs in fledgling fields of Islamics back within the United States. Yet, even though these missionaries did not find themselves in American institutions teaching on Islam, they helped prepare the way for the first women to do so. Such was the case of Chicago professor Nabia Abbott.

Abbott was not a missionary, nor was she interested in the missionary cause. Born in Southwestern Turkey, the daughter of an Arab Christian trader, she attended Isabella

[431] The Call from the Moslem World (1926), 54; 73. Emphasis mine.

[432] Letter from Hendrik Kraemer to Watson (August 19, 1937), Charles Watson Collection Box 9: Folder (School of Oriental Studies – Jeffery, Arthur) [AUC].

Thoburn College in Lucknow, India, during WWI, and after graduating became acquainted with Gertrude Bell, who secured Abbott's appointment as superintendent of Women's Education in Iraq. After several years in that position, Abbott immigrated to the U.S. to take a position as a history professor at Asbury College in Kentucky, before completing a doctorate with Martin Sprengling at the University of Chicago, where she was subsequently hired as a professor in the Oriental Studies department in 1933.[433] Abbott's primary research revolved around early Islamic texts and traditions, from which she published on numerous topics, including her early work, *Ayesha, Blessed of Muhammed*, which examined the life of the wife of the prophet.[434] So, if Abbott was not particularly invested or immediately connected with Christian missions, what does she reveal about the missionary involvement in Islamic studies?

Abbott's story indicates another important facet of the missionary educational project, illustrating ties between colonialism and missions in the production of knowledge, as well as in the production of producers of that knowledge. Her work reflects the indirect influence of missions on the study of Islam. And the tie-in was her education at Isabella Thoburn College. The college was named after the American Methodist missionary who in 1870 founded a Christian girl's school, which evolved into the college. Thoburn was invested in education for the various ethnically and religiously diverse women living in the region. The school later became affiliated with the University of Allahabad, and granted degrees in conjunction with it.[435] Although it benefited from close partnership with British

[433] Nabia Abott Memoriam: First woman faculty of Oriental Institute. 1933; Letter from Sprengling to Goodspeed (Dec 2, 1942) Goodspeed and Nef Collections Box 8, Folder 17 [University of Chicago]; and Information Sheet for Nabia Abbott (Aug. 29, 1940) Archival Biographical Files [University of Chicago].

[434] In such a topic, we see again a tendency for women to write about women, with a focus on marriage. Although, when considered within her larger catalogue of works, this theme is not pronounced.

[435] http://itcollege.ac.in/history/ -- The school is still functioning today.

colonial interests in the region, and many of its teachers were English women, it advanced typical Christian missionary ideals with regard to education and women's rights and hosted missionary conferences, such as the aforementioned conference on women in Islam (the basis for *Daylight in the Harem*). Its profile, in other words, was not unlike that of the ACFGC in Turkey.

Abbott was a product of the missionary educational system, which sought to educate young women in the hopes that they would be transformative agents of the so-called Muslim World for the spread of a particularly Western understanding of Christianity. She benefited from this education, but she was also critical of the structures behind it. At Chicago, Abbott wrote to a colleague, "There is a tendency (easily enough understood) in the Western World to equate Civilization with Western Civilization. A diagnosis and treatment of the ills of any civilization must ultimately take into consideration the pertinent experience of all civilizations."[436] In this she evidenced her broader vision, reflected in her studies of Islam. Yet, at the same time, her focus on Islam (considering she was not herself, Muslim) highlights the influences of a missionary education that was concerned especially with that religion. She was the product of a system designed to invest students in consideration of Islam, yet she took that investment out of evangelical categories and into academic ones. That Abbott was the first woman in the U.S. to reach a prominent academic position in the study of Islam is rather amazing considering that she was "non-Western" as well.

[436] Letter from Abbott to Nef (Sept 22, 1943). Goodspeed and Nef Collections Box 24: Folder 2 [University of Chicago].

Conclusion

The missionary women of the nineteenth and twentieth century worked hard to carve out a place for themselves within the scholarly world. Missions facilitated a role for women outside of the home, and helped justify women's higher education. They further established a place for women in the production of scholarship. It was foremost among Christian missions that women were valued as contributors in writing scholarship on Islam. Women working among Muslims attained a position of authority in scholarly missionary writings on Muslim women. With access to the private lives of Muslim women, missionary women could provide unique insider accounts, which men were unable to write. By using evidence and details from their encounters with Muslim women, they challenged some existing tropes about the decadence of Muslim life. As such women earned a scholarly space as experts on the woman question in Islam. Yet at the same time, missionary women remained on the whole highly critical of Muslim womanhood. These missionary women pushed educational values as the key to evangelization, and cited their own education development in their advocacy. However, despite the improved position of these women in scholarship, they typically were limited to dealing with the work of women for women, and mostly within missionary affiliated publications and institutions. There was little space for writing, speaking or working beyond the subject of woman in Islam and women missionaries' scholarship was largely limited to discussion of gender and sexuality in Islam.

Scholars of Islam are still confronting tropes about the religion which were founded in the works of these missionary women. While the scholarship of most of these missionary women was not widely cited, their arguments and anecdotes bolstered male writings, confirming biases of Western scholars regarding women in Islam. In recognizing the debt

contemporary scholarship on Islam has to these women missionary writers we become more aware of the burdens placed upon that scholarship by missionary perspectives and aims.

V

"VOICES FROM THE NEAR EAST" AND THE DIVERSIFICATION OF THE FIELD

> And this world is so small, and so closely knit together, that we can see how the progress of Christ's gospel in one place affects people away over on the other side of the earth. A man comes from America and teaches in Aintab; later, he spends his last days with his son in China, where that son, born in Turkey, is a missionary. And today men who were his students in Aintab may be teaching and preaching in Lyon and Marseille, or in Cairo and Alexandria, or in Buenos Aires.[437]

So wrote the missionary Charles T. Riggs in 1929, reflecting on the increasingly global and interconnected Christian missionary circles of the twentieth century. A product of technological and transportation development, in addition to changing views on the role of converts in Christianity, missions were undergoing significant changes by the 1930s. Rigg's assessment recognizes the inclusion of non-Americans, having received missionary education, becoming teachers and traveling elsewhere. At the same time a continuing spirit of Western patronage remained among missions, where it was by virtue of Western education that non-westerners could participate.[438]

This chapter examines how non-Westerners came to be involved in the study of Islam within English-speaking contexts. We will consider how missionary policies reflected

[437] Letter from Charles T. Riggs (March 23, 1928), Log Book Athens School of Religion (1925-28) [NEST], 149.

[438] I am using the terms "west" and "east" loosely in the chapter. Such categories are not inherently distinct entities, but rather products of scholarly imagination (See: Said, *Orientalism*). At the same time the Orient and Occident functioned in this period as meaningful markers for both American and European scholars, as well as their counterparts in places such as Syria and India. While the categories East and West may be constructed, they possessed a tangible substance as representational realities in the lives of many of the individuals we will attend. Thus, I use them with this understanding in mind, considering how certain thinkers affirmed and challenged these normative structures. West in this case should be associated with Anglo-European and American identity, which often carried with it explicit phenotypical expectations of lighter skin mapped onto racialized social hierarchies.

scholarly racial hierarchies in the U.S. and Europe, as well as how these policies were transformed in later missions' reevaluation of the inclusion of non-Western Christians. The inclusion of non-Western so-called natives in mission-associated Christian colleges also facilitated the diversification of faculty addressing the subject of Islam within the United States. Within this we will attend to the limits of that missionary contribution, emphasizing that while Western Protestant missions were important to this diversification, they were often uncomfortable with growing participation by non-Western individuals, and it was largely by rejecting mission expectations that a new generation of immigrant scholars found a place teaching in America. In other words, missions were a central component in promoting the diversification of the study of Islam by non-European/American scholars, even though such promotion was often inadvertent and undesired. Much as we saw in women being constrained to work for their "fellow sisters," national Christians were expected to stay in their home countries and work for the good of their compatriots along religious and national lines. While early immigrant scholars came to the U.S., to an extent, in spite of missionary expectations, these non-Western participants in the study and teaching of Islam, nonetheless internalized much of the Orientalist discourses about Islam, Arabs, and "Easterners," in turn reifying many of the basic assumptions, even as they provided counter points.

This chapter is framed primarily around the case of the Syrian Protestant College (SPC)/American University of Beirut (AUB) and its affiliate institutions in Beirut. It is worth noting at the outset that similar cases occurred in other programs elsewhere in the Middle East, as well as in India (e.g. John Subhan at the Henry Martyn School of Islamics, who later came to the U.S.). The focus on AUB is used to illustrate generally processes of

exchange and institutionalization facilitated by Protestant higher educational programs. The focus is loose, as we began with an exploration of the work of the Edward Wilmot Blyden (1832-1912),[439] who had a brief residence at the SPC to study Arabic. Yet, his experiences serve as an early example of the acceptable modes of participation permitted to non-"white" scholars of Islam within a racial dynamic. Within this, some explanation of nineteenth and twentieth century developments of racial/racist discourse is necessary. Following this discussion we turn more directly to the work of missionary educational efforts among "natives" in Lebanon and the formation of the Syrian Protestant College, as it connected with their ambitions to see the gospel spread among Muslims. It was in missionary colleges such as the SPC that many of the prominent early non-Western scholars of Islam received their formative education, and that training effected deeply how they viewed and taught about Islam. We will conclude by attending to three scholars in particular, who reflect broadly the different experiences of non-Western scholars of Islam more generally.

From West to East: Blyden and Islam in Africa

> I venture to think that if the desire is to convert Mohammedans, Christians should give up their bitter hostility and study Islam - not at second hand, but as far as possible in its original records – with greater sympathy and liberality.[440]

Chapter One opened with a quote from C.C. Adams in 1926 calling for a more thorough and sympathetic study of Islam. It is notable then, four decades earlier Edward Wilmot Blyden made such a similar plea. Blyden, a missionary affiliate of the PCUSA turned Liberian politician and scholar, produced one of the earlier contributions of American

[439] Blyden is perhaps better known for his articulation of a Pan-African ideology, though his work on Islam made waves both in his day and beyond.

[440] E.W. Blyden, *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race* (London: W.B. Whittingham, 1888), vi.

scholarship on Islam with his publication of *Islam, Christianity and the Negro Race* (1887).[441] Blyden was a free "negro" born on the Danish Isle of St. Thomas, where he was mentored by a white Presbyterian minister who encouraged him to pursue education in the United States.[442] Following this advice, Blyden traveled in 1850, at age seventeen, to the U.S. where he directly encountered American racism and discrimination during the tense years leading up to the Civil War. Blyden arrived intending to study at Rutgers Theological College (his mentor's alma mater), but was barred entrance because of his race. After seeking admittance at several other seminaries, Blyden ended up in New York, where he met several leaders of the Presbyterian American Colonization Society. Concerned about his rights and freedom in the United States, Blyden forwent his educational plans, and departed for Liberia at the end of 1850 as a missionary of the PCUSA to Liberia to work in a mission-founded high school. During this time he also received ordination as a Presbyterian minister. He remained in that position for several years before accepting a professorship at the College of Liberia in 1862. Two years later he made his entry into Liberian political life serving as Secretary of State, while still teaching courses at the college.

Recognizing the growing presence of Islam on the African continent, Blyden became convinced of the need to study Arabic with the aim of incorporating it into his curriculum. He traveled to Syria and Egypt, and eventually settled on taking courses at the Syrian Protestant College in Beirut in 1869. Upon his return, he fulfilled his goal of creating a small Arabic studies program at the College of Liberia. After 1870 he held varying positions

[441] The book was largely a compilation of Blyden's lectures and articles between 1870-1885. This is notable as during this period he was still formally affiliated with the Presbyterian church.

[442] Today part of the U.S. Virgin Islands, together with the Islands of Saint Croix and Saint John, after their acquisition by the United States in 1917. As point of reference slavery was abolished on the Island in 1848. At the time St. Thomas the population was distributed over three main categories in terms of power, a small white population governing the island, "mulattos" who filled in the middle gap, and "negroes" who were at the bottom. Blyden claimed pure "negro" – African – blood (Thomas Livingston, *Education and Race: A biography of Edward Wilmot Blyden* (San Francisco: Glendessary Press, 1975), 16).

within Liberian politics, as well as worked with British colonial efforts in the region. Throughout his years in Liberia, Blyden had a complicated relationship with Christian missions, and he left the Presbyterian Church in 1885 to become a "minister of truth," subsequently publishing his best known work.[443] His experiences as a black Christian in America and in West Africa greatly shaped his view of both Christianity and Islam, as he developed personal relationship with Muslims.[444]

The collection of papers and talks in *Islam, Christianity and The Negro Race,* published first in 1887, demonstrates an early and significant consideration of Islam on the African continent. Blyden viewed Islam with a great degree of sympathy. While he saw Islam as Christianity's main competitor in Africa, he also promoted it as a civilizing influence, and preferable to what he viewed as rampant and backward paganism on the continent. In particular, Blyden saw Islam as a religion promoting equality of the races. Muslims were unified and evaluated by faith, not by skin color. When Africans converted to Islam they were not made subservient to Arabs or Turks, but to the Qur'an.[445] This Blyden contrasted with Western Christianity, which appropriated "the country of another people as a reward for giving them the highest form of religion."[446] Blyden's highlighting the racialized Christianity spread by missionaries as part of the greater colonial effort was a significant and controversial critique. Likewise, his relatively positive evaluation of Islam – and critique of the West – led to his denunciation by many missionaries and accusations that he had

[443] Sherman Jackson, "The Third Resurrection and the Ghost of Edward Wilmot Blyden," *Islam and the Black American* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 62.

[444] This is certainly in part a product of his personal relationships with Muslims. In 1871 Blyden referenced the cultivation of these relationships, "I am in daily intercourse with the Mohammedans with whom I sometimes read the Arabic scriptures."(Quoted in Turner, "Blyden and Pan-Africanism," *The Muslim World* 87:2 (1997), 179).

[445] Blyden, *v* and16. It is in this regard that Blyden would be read by many later black American Muslims, including Malcolm X who affirmed this universalizing equanimity of Islam as a religious tradition.

[446] Blyden, v

converted to Islam.[447] At the same time Blyden reified many of the racialized conceptions of the missionaries, maintaining Africa as a backward, uncivilized place in need of some civilizing through religion (preferably Christianity, but at the least Islam). For Blyden religion was the catalyst of progress, and his work remained missionary in a broad sense. This type of assessment, which connected religion and civilization, characterized much of the missionary English-language scholarship on Islam, and was generally adopted by minority and non-Western scholars as well. Scholars such as Blyden engaged with the Islamic tradition, challenging the limits of many prior accounts, while at the same time maintaining certain tropic discourses about the tradition and its adherents.

Blyden saw himself as a scholar of Islam, and was particularly concerned with the deficiencies of American scholarship on Islam. He wrote, "American scholarship has as yet, as far as we are aware, produced nothing of importance," regarding Islam, with the exception of Princeton Seminary's J. Addison Alexander and New York University's John W. Draper.[448] Blyden's own interpretation of Islam drew upon the work of R. Bosworth Smith, the British Orientalist, who similarly challenged Christian scholarly attempts to "vilify and misrepresent" Islam. Blyden would be cited by T.W. Arnold in *The Preaching of Islam*, who traced why Islam was succeeding and challenged many Christian-scholarly stereotypes (e.g. Arnold explicitly called out F.D. Maurice for his portrayal of the spread of

[447] There is a remaining debate over whether Blyden eventually converted to Islam. It was a fair question, as R.B. Turner discusses in his article on Blyden, there is a reasonable case to be made for his internal, if not official, conversion to Islam by the end of his life, particularly if one allows for Blyden's possible polysemy, merging Christian and Muslim conceptions within a framework of a general Pan-Africanism (Turner, "Blyden and Pan-Africanism," *The Muslim World* 87:2 (1997)). Jackson also enters into the fray noting there is little to show a definitive conversion, and Blyden remained fairly consistent in promoting Christianity as the best tool for civilization in Africa (62-63).

[448] Blyden, 4. Despite Blyden's claims that these individuals were important to Islamic studies, there is little evidence to suggest they had any long term impact, or even short term. Alexander was a professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature at PTS from 1838-60. Draper was an NYU chemist, but later dabbled in historical surveys. His *The History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (1873) discussed Islam rather unsympathetically in its relationship with science. Neither of these authors factored visibly into the development of the study of Islam in the U.S.

Islam as only by the sword).[449] Many decades later, Blyden's evaluation of Islam and Christianity, would also become important to figures such as Malcolm X, as a point of postcolonial critique of Christianity.

What the case of Blyden reveals is a general experience of non-"white" participants of mission as it relates to Islam. On the one hand, Blyden was encouraged in his mission by white American patrons, who supported his work, and hoped he would play a central role in Christianizing Africa. Here we see the idea that became prevalent among missions in the late nineteenth- early twentieth-century: that "natives,"[450] supported by white missionaries were best suited to reaching their own people. Blyden was well fitted to go to Africa, precisely because he was black and in sympathy with the white sponsored PCUSA mission and American Colonization Society.[451] On the other, when his work began to have implications outside of what was deemed his sphere of influence (e.g. Liberia and West Africa), many missionaries reacted with hostility because he called out Western Christian racism and colonialism. In the preface of the second edition of his book, Blyden responded to a particularly critical review of the work published in the November 1887 issue of the *Christian Mission Intelligencer* – a premiere organ of missionary news and theory. He noted his long personal struggle against racism, "Wherever I turned for light and guidance, I found only what the dominant white man had said in his own way and for his own purposes."[452] Through his experiences he pointed to the larger systems of exploitation, in which he viewed

[449] Turner, 174.

[450] Blyden's status as "native" is convoluted by the history of slave trade.

[451] The American Colonization Society (ACS) had been founded in 1817 to help freed black people "return to Africa." With such aims in mind it founded a colony in 1822 on the coast of West Africa, which later developed into the nation of Liberia. The records of the ACS are held by the Library of Congress (https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/african/afam002.html).

[452] Blyden, i. Later in the work Blyden also called out the "radically defective teachings" of many Christian periodicals regarding race/racism, singling out in particular the American South magazine *DeBow's Review* (41).

Christianity as often complicit. In critiquing missionary links with colonialism, he did not mean to disparage the religion as a whole, but rather call Christians to reject racist and colonial structures – something he believed Muslims and their religion offered as an example.

Blyden's was a case of a western minority traveling east as a missionary to engage with Muslims, who consequently discovered the limits of black participation in missionary circles. As we will see, his story is similar to that of many "Eastern" participants of missions as they entered into the study of Islam. "National/native" participants were assigned a limited function within the mission scheme, within proscribed geographical and cultural spaces, and their scholarly contributions were expected to affirm existing missionary categories. As in the case of Blyden, the actual scholarship produced often upset these expectations, while at the same time maintaining elements of the missionary discourse, in particular, the idea of religion (and especially Christianity) as a civilizing force.

Western Missionaries, Eastern Christians

As missionaries arrived in Muslim lands, they imported Western conceptions of race fairly typical of colonialists and Orientalists. The missionaries drew upon the philological and linguistic racial categories defended in the work of European scholars such as William Robertson Smith and Ernest Renan.[453] These provided a framework for missionaries coming from Europe and North America in conceptualizing the "Oriental" world as distinct from their own. Nineteenth century scholars reconstituted Islam (the proverbial enemy of Europe)

[453] While these two disagreed on particulars, they both affirmed an essential Oriental/Semitic nature, which was limited to its tribal, pastoral, desert heritage – an unchanging figure which was the primary constitution of those living in the East, and which was hierarchally below Western man. See Said's synopsis and critique of their racial understandings in *Orientalism*, 231-236.

as the quintessential Semitic religion. Muslims were effectively a Semitic people, bound to certain types of thought and behavior, which typically included a warrior and despotic element.[454] Missionaries drawing upon these scholarly articulations argued the only way forward for these cultures was through adoption of western Christianity. For the missionaries of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, the western quality of this efficacious Christianity was central. Missionaries defined their Christianity over-against existing forms in the region, which as with Islam were seen as largely stagnant and trapped in an archaic Semitic mindset. Yet, while the missionaries accepted the Orientalist types, in their stressing of western Christianity as a path forward, they broke with increasingly secularist scholars and colonialists such as Renan.

With the failure to convert Muslims, missionaries in many locations (though especially within the Levant) narrowed their aims to proselytizing among existing Christian churches. In order to understand how missions contributed to the diversification of the study of Islam, we must first see how "Eastern" scholars came to be valued. As Christopher Johnson has noted, Western missionary approaches towards Eastern Christians was itself a form of Orientalism, a "semi-Orientalism."[455] An "Oriental" character pervaded everything in the broadly construed Orient; depictions of the Eastern Churches were little different from depictions of Islam. Stagnant, unchanging, traditional – the same characterization that Orientalists levied against Islam as being lost in an age of decadence was also applied to Orthodox and other Eastern Churches. Yet, it was this semi-Orientalism that compelled Protestant missionaries to view these as the best entry point for their gospel. Missionaries

[454] Masuzawa, 179

[455] C. D. L. Johnson, "'He Has Made the Dry Bones Live': Orientalism's Attempted Resuscitation of Eastern Christianity," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 82, no. 3 (2014), 813. Johnson actually derives this term from Maria Todorova's discussion of Orthodoxy in the Balkans.

thought, if only these churches could be resuscitated, then they (precisely because of their shared Oriental character) could become the vanguard in converting Muslims.[456]

The racializing of the East was pervasive throughout the nineteenth- and twentieth-century. For instance, Johnson notes one missionary in 1861 "ranks from least to most corrupt: Greek, Coptic, and Ethiopian, the last of which shows 'the utmost amount of superstition with which a Christian Church can be overlaid without perishing altogether.'"[457] This ranking corresponds rather neatly with racial hierarchies of his day.[458] While the twentieth century saw public calls for ecumenism and the universal brotherhood of man preached among Christian missionaries, in private they often betrayed a continuing distaste for their missionized constituents. One missionary wrote to another in 1934, regarding the need to stir of evangelical sentiment among local churches in the Middle East, which he regarded "very backward and need education in this matter of their evangelistic responsibility for Moslems."[459] Even as they were preparing local Christian populations to take more responsibility, there remained a widespread view among missionaries that such communities were not ready. Not all missionaries were as harsh, as they worked publicly and privately for increased partnership, but Western missionaries remained the guiding force. For example, a missionary passing through Beirut circa 1925 recorded his impressions:

> This great Eastern world needs all the help and inspiration which the Church of Jesus Christ can give it in its struggle upward towards clearer light and truth. The West has much to learn from the East as well, so that it may have a better understanding of the way it can best help the East. There are vast

[456] Johnson, 831; Todorova 16.
[457] Quoted in Johnson, 822. (Stanely Reference 1861 [1907]:89–90, 62).
[458] The linguistic/philological ordering of three categories of humans: Dravidic(Aryan), Semitic, and Hamitic.
[459] Letter from R.C. Byerly to S.A. Morrison (Feb 2, 1934), Syrian Mission Files Box 13: Folder 7 [Presbyterian Historical Society].

> riches of truth in all these lands of the Orient and increasing signs of an earnest seeking for the light.[460]

The patronage of the West was essential to social uplift of the East. Yet, in this was an admission that the West must learn more from the East. A clear divide between the two existed, but Westerners must seek knowledge *of* the other *from* the other. Here benevolent Orientalism is clear – production of knowledge is equated to a munificent aim. The relationship between East and West in the mind of this missionary was certainly unbalanced, but it opened a door for increased participation. The inclusion of national Christians became an agenda of twentieth-century missions, which found resonance at the 1910 World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh (despite its limited inclusion of non-American and European participants), and was fostered over the next several decades.[461]

Beyond merely mimicking European racial theory, the American educationalist missionaries incorporated distinctly American conceptions of race in their work. For instance, a brochure for Robert College and the SPC describes the schools as the "'Melting Pot' of the Near East, in the same sense that America is the 'Melting Pot' of the world."[462] Such statements present the obvious American exceptionalism of many mission efforts, rooted within a theory of race and civilization connected with religion. America, once the city on the hill and light of the world, was now a melting pot where people could come and become just like any other. Through mission this city could also be exported. Such

---

[460] H.L. Bates, "Impressions," Logbook Athens School of Religion (1925-28) [NEST], 152.

[461] Hutchison notes in *Errand to the World* that despite ideas that Edinburgh represented a broad, ecumenical Christian mission movement, it in fact was fairly limited to a handful of major mission board representations. "the bulk of the delegates, and nearly all the American speakers, came from the nine largest organizations." (127), and that "of the 1,200 delegates, over 1,000 were British or North American. Only 170 came from the Continent, and a mere 17 represented the 'younger churches' of the non-Western world." (135). Yet, the fact that the conference desired to be seen a global endeavor (even if it was not in reality) shows changing perspectives on Christians elsewhere.

[462] Joint Brochure Robert and SPC (1920), Robert College and SPC Funding Brochures Folder 641 [NEST], 7.

benevolent ideas of shared equality betrayed a great deal of homogenizing of white-cultural Christian establishment, not to mention the melting pot in America was realized in rhetoric only. The contestations over the positions of converts within Christian churches and non-western faculty within these educational institutions, reveals deep hesitancy and continuing racialized hierarchy.

SPC/AUB's Religious Education and its Precedents

It is with this racialized backdrop in mind that we now turn to a case study examining the higher educational side of missions in the Middle East and its role the shaping of Islamic studies in the United States. To understand how such American education abroad influenced scholarship on Islam we must look at how these institutions conceptualized and taught religion. We will examine as a case study the project of the Syrian Protestant College/American University of Beirut (SPC/AUB) and its reevaluations of the meaning of teaching religion. Changes within curriculum on religion occurring in the early twentieth century at missionary institutions such as AUB reveal participation in a broader American conversation about the meaning of religion and religious education, contextualized to fit within local parameters.[463] The missionary educational aims of these schools were rooted in the belief of the racial and religious expediency of American Christianity. The contestations

[463] Though it must be noted that Robert College, AUB, and AUC all severed formal ties with mission boards upon their founding. This is not to say they were not aligned with missionary aims, but that they desired independence from mission board control. In a sense, they acted as independent missions, often working alongside and with other mission agencies, but not bound by the same strictures. Their founders were all missionaries, who resigned their official posts, to start these colleges for the education and in turn evangelization of the communities they worked in. In their own words, "The American University of Beirut, although a separate and independent organization, is a direct outgrowth of the work of the Syrian Mission which, in 1862, directed one of its members, Dr. Daniel Bliss, to go to America and undertake the inauguration of an institution of higher learning for Syria." (1920-21 AUB Course Catalog [AUB], 3).

over such views, impacted missionary and national views on Islam and religion, and in turn lead to the reshaping of those topics back within the United States.

The curriculum changes at SPC/AUB had significant influence on the scholars emerging from that institution. The requirement for religious education would be maintained at the college throughout the nineteenth century and well into the mid-twentieth century. However, what was included under the rubric of religious education dramatically changed from strictly Christian pastoral and doctrinal study into a broader comparative theology and study of religions. What these changes reveal is both internal encounters with the diversity of religious affiliations in Lebanon (e.g. Christians, Muslims, Jews, Druze, Bahai, etc.), as well as participation in higher education discussions of religion in the United States and Europe (Higher Criticism, *Religionswissenschaft*, comparative religions).

SPC opened in Beirut in 1866 with the aim of providing general education which would serve as the basis for Christian spiritual formation. The initial prospectus of the college defined its objective as enabling "native youth to obtain, in the country, the literary, scientific, and professional education." The emphasis on locating this education within the country, became a consistent theme for missionaries who largely discouraged emigration. At the same time the college was promoting a broad liberal arts curriculum, it also maintained that instruction would be conducted on "strictly Christian and evangelical principles, but it will not be sectarian in such a sense as to exclude from it pupils from any of the various sects of the country, Christian, or non-Christian, who will conform to its rules and regulations."[464] These regulations included mandatory religious instruction. Throughout the nineteenth century this instruction included, in addition to morning and evening prayer

[464] Prospectus and Programme of the Syrian Protestant Collegiate Institute, Beirut (undated), Syrian Mission (1840s-1870) [Microfilm Lamont Library, Harvard University].

meetings and Sunday services, weekly lectures on Christianity, which would "familiarize the students with the spiritual meaning of the Bible and thus make of true value the thorough knowledge of its facts and history."[465] So, while the Bible was admitted as a valuable historical artifact, this historical value was subservient to its Christian spiritual service.

Over the subsequent decades, the precise phrasing of the religious instruction requirement underwent various iterations, adding emphasis on this religious education's value to "daily life;" noting the lectures as "informal in character;" and encouraging students to ask "questions and to present their difficulties in matters of religious faith and practice."[466] Courses in this period were listed variably under the headings such as Religious Studies (*al-durūs al-diniyya*) or Bible (*kitāb al-muqaddas*), but the courses themselves were always limited to biblical exegesis and Christian interpretation in connection with the formation of personal spiritual life directed towards Christianity. In the first several decades of the twentieth century, dramatic shifts took place in the requirement of religious education, due to increased resistance from non-Christian students at the schools, yet these personal spiritually-pragmatic aims remained in the teaching of religion at SPC/AUB.

George Sabra has suggested that the teaching of religion at AUB can be mapped to four distinct phases, two of which fall within our timeline of interest: "Classical missionary concern" of the Daniel Bliss Administration (1866-1902) and "The Modern Missionary Ideal" of the Howard Bliss (1902-1920) and Bayard Dodge (1923-1948) administrations. In the first period the college was open to students of all backgrounds, with no explicit expectation of conversion, but with the understanding that students would not leave the school without learning something about what the faculty and administration believed as

[465] Catalogue 1887-88; Courses of Study (Collegiate Department), Course Catalogs SPC (1871-1924) [AUB], 24.

[466] Catalogue of 1897-98, Course Catalogs SPC (1871-1924) [AUB], 23.

truth. The second period, which Sabra titled after an essay by Howard Bliss, was characterized by a vision of Christianity that was private and ethical, without particular emphasis on institutional forms.[467] What these two phases have in common is a distinctly Christian evangelical character, even if the conception of what evangelism and Christianity meant was shifting. As Sabra further notes, the difference between these phases was not pronounced, as both Blisses and Dodge shared much in common, "All three – and these were really the towering founders of SPC/AUB, always emphasized moral life over truth, religious feeling over doctrines, spiritual consciousness over theological knowledge. Religion was not really something to be studied in the university; it was to be practiced."[468] Daniel Bliss was a pioneer of this liberal Protestant educational mission, and the cause was furthered by his successors.

Likewise, SPC/AUB remained committed to Western models of higher education in thinking about religion. Religious education at SPC/AUB was meant to promote "social uplift." As Daniel Bliss said in 1885, "The very object of a religion…consists in lifting a man out of a bad condition into a good condition or in keeping him from falling from the good into the bad."[469] It is important to recognize that such religious aims were not unique to missionary colleges, but reveal alignments with higher education within the United States. The same principles of religious education were being employed in most American colleges and universities in the late nineteenth century. While some debate took place regarding the compulsory or voluntary nature of religious education during this period, SPC represents not a break from American educational norms, but its confirmation as a system worth exporting.

[467] George Sabra, "A.U.B. and Religion: Never the Twain Shall Meet… Again?" Paper Delivered at the General Lecture Series of the Anis Makdissi Program in Literature, AUB (April 6, 2005), 2 and 7.
[468] Sabra, 17.
[469] Quoted in Sabra, 7.

It predicts the spirit of Rev. Josiah Strong's plea in the 1890, "Not America for America's sake; but America for the world's sake…. If I were a Christian African or Arab, I should look into the immediate future of the United States with intense and thrilling interest."[470] Schools like the SPC/AUB were founded with such American exceptionalist imperatives in mind.

As it relates to the study of religion, part of higher education in the late nineteenth, early twentieth century was to teach some degree of "religion." Religion in this case was a limited affair. As D.G. Hart observes in his account of religion curriculum in American colleges, "The study of religion was synonymous with instruction in the Bible or its curricular cousin, ethics."[471] Hart additionally recognizes, "Religion was a socially cohesive, intellectually integrative, and morally reassuring entity… needed to provide a proper education not just for Protestant students but for all Americans."[472] Take for instance the case of the University of Chicago, which as Hart describes, "Of all the emerging universities dedicated to the newer ideals in higher education, such as Cornell, Johns Hopkins, Clarke, and Stanford, Chicago was the only one to have what today would resemble a department of religious studies."[473] With that said, even at Chicago the policy for religious education within its register was that "Officially the University provides for positive and constructive religious education on the condition that it is a normal part of education in general, and an element of complete living."[474]

[470] Josiah Strong, *Our Country* (new York: Baker & Taylor, 1890), 218.
[471] Hart, *The University Gets Religion* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 93; 98.
[472] Hart, 79.
[473] Hart, 52.
[474] University of Chicago Register 1907-08, Annual Registers of the University of Chicago [University of Chicago], 197.

The parallels to the language of SPC/AUB are apparent. Further, while the rhetoric of SPC and its mission affiliates often took on an Orientalist racializing tone, which demeaned the "backwardness" of those in the region, the principle aim of education was the same in United States and in mission colleges. The shared aim can be seen in the president of the University of Missouri's 1904 speech on higher education. In this address he argued that religion was meant "'to lift… students to higher life socially and religiously."[475] In this we can see that the educational strategies at AUB served as a mirror in which educators could affirm a vision of proper American education. Yet, the experience of SPC/AUB differed in significant ways as well; whereas for most U.S. schools, religious diversity of students typically meant a variety of Protestant denominations and a handful of Catholic and Jewish students, in Beirut the college encountered substantial religious diversity among its students. As John R. Mott, the famous evangelist of the Student Volunteer Movement, noted about his visit to the SPC, "Never have I had such an opportunity to hold forth the claims of the Living Christ to ambitious young men of so many religions in one college, and in no foreign land have I found young men better prepared, more open-minded, or more interested in the message…. throngs of warm hearted, earnest students of the Moslem, Jewish, and Christian communities."[476] The diversity of students confirmed the purpose of the school as a Christian institution, but it also forced SPC educators to adapt their views on teaching religion.

The first major concession the College administration granted on religious education followed a student protest in 1909. Prior to 1909 all students, Christian and non-Christians, at the SPC were required to participate in the lectures on the Bible, daily prayer meetings

[475] Quoted in Hart, 71.

[476] Copy of Personal Letter of John R. Mott (April 6, 1911) in Collated Edition of Board Letters of the PCUSA 1910-1914, [NEST], 105.

and weekly chapel services. However, in 1909 a number of Muslim and Jewish students at the College protested the requirements of this Christian education. This commotion caused the faculty and trustees to reevaluate the aims of the college. While they reached a decision to maintain the requirement of "religious education" for all students, the nature of the course work began to shift perceptibly through this encounter with local protest. Beginning after this year, alternative courses were promised for students with conscientious objections to the more overtly Christian propaganda courses.[477] While the options were few at first, by the time the Syrian Protestant College was renamed the American University of Beirut in 1920, Bible courses were on the decline and being replaced by courses on more general subjects such as Psychology of Religion, Philosophy of Religion and History of Religion reflecting similar trends within the United States. Courses featured the works of William James' *Varieties of Religious Experience,* Barton's *World Religions*, and J. Estlin Carpenter's *Comparative Religions*.[478]

What is notable is that both at SPC/AUB and at colleges in the United States, religion (or Christianity) was not taught so much as an intellectual academic pursuit, but as

[477] However, such changes did not come into effect immediately. As Sabra notes, "The Board of Trustees did not accept to make religious instruction voluntary and did not initiate 'Alternative Exercises' except after World War I had begun when the Ottomans forbade SPC to teach religion except to Christians. That was when 'Alternative Exercises' were developed for non-Christians who had conscientious objections to attending Christian religious instruction," (Sabra, 9).

[478] See 1918-19 AUB Course Catalogs for Carpenter and James; note Bible courses also continued. Also See 1920-21 Course Catalogs for Barton. Also: J Estlin Carpenter, *Comparative Religions* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1913). Carpenter was principal of Manchester College in England. The book opens with a quote from Max Muller, showing its intellectual heritage. From this understanding of religion it takes up a discussion wide swath of traditions, including Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, and Buddhism (e.g. World Religions, See Masuzawa). Carpenter notes that the student of religion is faced with many questions and challenges, "What are the actual features in different religions which are susceptible of comparison? How can we distinguish between resemblances which are deep-seated and spring from the fundamental principles of two given faiths, and those which are only on the surface, and probably accidental? How far can such parallels be ascribed to suggestion through historical contact, and, if they lie too far apart for possibilities of any form of mutual dependence, out of what common types of experience are they derived, what forces of thought have shaped them, what feelings do they express?" (19). Likewise he argues against any concern for definitions of religion (that is the philosopher's task): "The study of 'Comparative Religion' assumes that religion is already in existence. It deals with actual usages, which it places side by side to see what light they can throw upon each other," (31).

character forming. Both schools in the U.S. and Beirut, saw the teaching of religion primarily as a vehicle for inculcating positive values and ethics in young men (and women). This served as an important model for how the scholars emerging from these programs conceptualized Islam.

At this point we should return to dynamics of the local context in informing the religious education program at the AUB. Sabra has argued that developments in the religious education program were "not simply or even primarily responding to its context of increasing non-Protestants and non-Christians among students and faculty."[479] His observance that American notions of religion certainly guided the school is well-taken, but I contend he underestimates the nuanced contextualization of religious education and its influence upon Middle Eastern alumni and teachers at the school, which in turn was reflected back to the United States as several emigrated there to become professors. AUB students emerged with a practical vision of comparative religion, seeing its efficacy in terms of its civilizing effect, not unlike Blyden. They would be instrumental in shaping interfaith and interreligious studies, particularly emphasizing – from their own experiences – Christianity and Islam. Thus the inclusion of American-system educated Arab (Christians) shaped the teaching of religion in the region, as well as in the US. I quote at length one student's assessment of his AUB education and its bearing on a reconsideration of missionary methods:

> Consider the American University of Beirut, formerly known as the Syrian Protestant College. In the broadest sense of the word it is a missionary institution. It does not aim to proselytize. It cares little for the outward garb or name the students carry. It aims at broadening the mind, uplifting the character, and bringing men near to their God and to their fellow-men. It is the most effective weapon we have for destroying the religious and social barriers that are separating the different inhabitants of these lands. It

[479] Sabra, 16.

> inculcates the spirit of justice, fair play, consecration, and brotherhood. It interprets to the Near East the highest ideals of American Christian people, and thereby bestows an inestimable benefit on all the peoples of the Near East.[480]

It was through the internalization of the liberal protestant values of AUB that graduates would influence how Islam was studied in America. American Christian values were the basis against which civilization was judged, and were essential to the development of the region. As students traveled from their homelands and found higher educational positions within the United States, they modified many of these ideas, without wholly abandoning them. Likewise, such faculty emigration was made possible in part by their affiliation with schools like AUB.

Controversy and Change at the SPC

In 1909 a group of Muslim and Jewish students protested against the religious educations policies of the SPC.[481] These protesters rightly critiqued the spirit of ecumenism taught but not practiced by the administration, which required all students – regardless of religious affiliation – to attend Bible classes and chapel services. While the immediate response of the faculty to the controversy had limited immediate impact on campus policies, it set in motion the reconsiderations of religion as well as race/ethnicity at the school. At the same time this controversy was occurring, the faculty and trustee boards were also reevaluating the position of Arab faculty at the school. From its founding the SPC had hired non-American staff as instructors, primarily for language courses, but also as assistants in various humanities and sciences. The ratio between American and national staff stayed

[480] Shehadi A. Shehadi, "Syria" in *Voice from the Near East*, Milton Stauffer (ed.) (New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1927), 121.

[481] For a thorough account of the controversy consult Betty Anderson, *The American University of Beirut* (Austin: University of Text Press, 2011), 82-89.

mostly consistent during the nineteenth century – ranging from 1/5 to 1/3 of the staff. [482] This inclusion led to debate regarding promotion and rank obtainable for national staff. The debate over the place of the Arab faculty is visible clearly in the career of Jabr Ḍūmiṭ, the first Arab staff member to receive a full professorship at the college. Ḍūmiṭ was hired in 1889 (he was a graduate from SPC in 1876 – notably during a period in which Arabic was still the language of instruction at the college) as an Arabic instructor, amidst an ever changing Syrian staff. Ḍūmiṭ impressed the faculty and was promoted from "instructor" (*mu'allim*) to "lecturer" (*mudarris*) in 1892.[483] He was soon after given the title of Adjunct Professor (*nā'ib ustādh*) of Arabic Language. In 1900, the college conferred upon him a M.A. degree, "in view of his long and acceptable service, and his recent publication of a text book on Arabic Languages."[484] In 1909, after many long years of teaching at the college, years in which new American faculty arrived with professorial tenure and left, Ḍūmiṭ along with four other Arab adjunct faculty members were granted the title of Professor.

Yet this title obscures the continuing discomfort of the American administration with the promotion. While the new professors received a pay increase, they were not granted seats on the faculty board proper, meaning Ḍūmiṭ and these other Arab professors did not have voting rights in college decisions.[485] It is not coincidental that at the same time a crisis was occurring at the school on the nature of religious instruction, the faculty evidenced

[482] For instance in 1883 the college reported that it had ten American Professors, adjuncts and instructors, and five native Syrian lecturers and instructors. SPC Report (Dec 1883),. By 1899 "The entire number of professors and instructors is now 26 Americans, 9 Syrians, 1 Swiss, and 1 Waldensian." Syrian Protestant College Reports (1866-1902) [Microfilm, Lamont Library, Harvard University].

[483] SPC report 1892," Syrian Protestant College Reports (1866-1902) [Microfilm, Lamont Library, Harvard University].

[484] 1900 Board Minutes," Syrian Protestant College Reports (1866-1902) [Microfilm, Lamont Library, Harvard University].

[485] Letter from H. Bliss to James S. Dennis (April 29, 1909), Howard Bliss Collection Box 14 [AUB]. This pay scale was also not entirely equal. Penrose in history of the school notes that at the beginning of the Dodge Presidency of the school, American/European faculty maximum salary was 2,000 dollars, whereas for Syrian/Arab staff it was capped at 1,250.

remaining hesitancy towards fully incorporating their national colleagues. The racialized view of the capability of "Semites," continued to concern the faculty, so while Bliss endorsed these adjuncts as examples of the school's uplifting mission, noting the new professors were "Graduates of our own College and during their many years of teaching have proved themselves capable and reliable men devoted to the interests of the College," he betrayed a certain skepticism as to the full level of this commitment within the American aims of the college.[486] For the next decade national professors remained second-tier to their American counterparts, denied voting rights. It was not until the rebirth of the school as the American University of Beirut in 1920 that national professors would be extended the full rights of faculty.

Still, greater participation of nationals on the faculty eventually led to the change. Philip Hitti, while he was a professor at the university voiced his support of the school's changing vision of education. In an address in 1921 he discussed the name change of the Syrian Protestant College to the American University of Beirut, reflecting on it as "our new responsibility" (*mas'ūliyatuna al-jadīda*) and indicative of a shift in the university's philosophy. He discussed the principles of democracy the university was promoting among students and the responsibilities that accompanied them.[487] It is likely he also had in mind the changing status of Arab faculty within the college, finally granted voting rights. Hitti as a student of the college in the first decade of the 1900s and then as a professor in the University in the 1920s had seen the contestations between American administration and faculty and Middle Eastern staff and students. At last the University was recognizing the equality of Syrian/Arab and American staff, and Hitti in his address was responding to the

[486] Letter from H. Bliss to James S. Dennis (April 29, 1909), Howard Bliss Collection Box 14 [AUB].

[487] Philip Hitti, "Our new responsibility [مسؤوليتنا الجديدة]" *Al-Kulliyah* (7: October 1921) -- from address of Hitti on February 4, 1921. Philip Hitti Collection Box 1: File 3 [AUB].

lingering American's fears of the privilege and responsibility being granted. Hitti was aware that the success of such faculty was important to maintaining equality and thus emphasized responsibility. This resistance to Syrian inclusion was found at most of the missionary-affiliated Colleges in the Middle East and India. AUB was one of the model institutions, upon which other colleges based their inclusion of local/indigenous faculty. So while by the twentieth century, a significant number of Syrians/Arabs were being employed in missionary schools and colleges (though the administration remained in the majority of cases under the American-based trustee boards), they were often still treated as second tier.[488]

Speaking Back: *Voices from the Near East*

As representatives from the local populations gained ground within missionary and scholarly circles, they also found more space to speak directly to Western audiences. In 1927 the U.S. Missionary Education movement released a book, *Voices from the Near East* featuring a dozen essays written by Middle Eastern Christians.[489] The book's editor, Milton Stauffer a mission administrator,[490] opens the book with the observation,

[488] For instance Watson at the AUC solicited advice regarding greater inclusion of nationals as voting members of faculty in 1929. In the letter it is worth noting that some of the resistance came from the Egyptian members of the AUC themselves. He wrote to Bayard Dodge at AUB, "following your practice and rules for putting non-American teachers on the same footing as Americans with reference to academic promotion and allowances and salaries other than special allowances relating to travel to America. We have run into certain opinions held by Egyptians which seem to indicate that certain phases of our treatment of Americans would not be acceptable to them. This was rather startling to us when we first discovered it for we brought ourselves with some difficulty to the place of allowing them these privileges in our plan and it surprised us to then find that they did not find these arrangements altogether attractive,"(Letter from Watson to Dodge (Jan 29, 1929), Charles Watson Collection Box 9: Folder American University in Beirut – Dodge, Bayard [AUC]).

[489] The book was part of a larger series *Christian Voices from Around the World*.

[490] Stauffer was a graduate of Princeton University and Union Theological Seminary. He then studied under Harland Beach at Yale, with the aim becoming a professor of missions. He spent a brief time as a missionary with the RCA's Amoy mission in China. He later became involved with the Student Volunteer Movement in America. ("A New Educational Secretary" *The Student Volunteer Movement Bulletin* (3:4, 1922), 155-56).

> That there are Christian leaders today in almost every land who are sufficiently able to interpret the Christianity of their communities to parent communities in the west, is living proof of the prophetic insight of pioneer missionaries who long ago by faith first caught the vision of this day.[491]

It is a sentence which affirms the value of Eastern Christianity in the production of knowledge, while maintaining the unbalanced dynamic of Western "parental" Christianity, and simplifying the complex history of missions in the region. Yet, the book remains an impressive opening of inclusion for non-Western authors. In a way, the work reveals the participation in Orientalism to those it delineated as its object of study. The contributors of the book take up the task, attempting to respond to past Orientalist depictions, while maintaining the Orient as a discrete entity. By looking at several illustrative examples from the book, we will see how the participation of these scholars reveals challenges and limits to the discourse of Orientalism as it pertains to study of Islam.

In the first chapter of the book, Anis Ilyas Khuri, an instructor at the American University of Beirut, writes on the history of the Arabs. He draws upon Robertson-Smith, Ernest Renan and others to confirm a concept of Semitic religion dominating the region. "The Arabs rose under the banner of Islam," where Arabness is defined mostly along linguistic lines – such linguistic cohesion was only possible through Islam.[492] For Khuri, "Moslems, Christians, and Jews have a common heritage, and all of them, as appears from pre-Islamic heritage, are rightful heirs to the Arabic tongue."[493] In such statements Khuri attempts to distinguish Arab from Muslim, while maintaining a historical dependence on Islam as a unifying force. Khuri continues tracing the importance of that Arabo-Islamic heritage for the world, and especially in terms of the scientific contributions of Arab

[491] *Voices*, ix
[492] Khuri in *Voices*, 2.
[493] Khuri, in *Voices*, 3

scholars. Europe in Khuri's mind was profoundly influenced by Arab and Muslim thought "beginning with the Renaissance and continuing until the dawn of the modern era."[494] The influence of AUB education is evident. Religion, for Khuri and the liberal protestant AUB faculty, is a civilizing force. Khuri highlights this within his treatment of Islam. Unlike Blyden, who focused on the contemporary moment in noting the civilizing effect of Islam, Khuri observes the historical precedent of the religion as an important contributor to both the eastern and western world. This same idea was widespread among AUB graduates and instructors, and would be established in the United States through the work of Hitti at Princeton.

At the same time, Khuri and other authors in the book buy into the trope that Islam was in need of reform. Another author, Kamil Effendi Mansour takes up explicitly the question of reforming Islam.[495] Mansour was himself a convert from Islam to Christianity and noting this connection he writes, "So I trust I am able rightly to depict the present status of Islam and the thoughts of its believers."[496] His firsthand experience is cited as the basis for his scholarly right to critique Islam regarding educational, social and religious qualities. He begins with a criticism of Muslim approaches to education, which emphasize memorization, and counters this by vaunting the modern pedagogy of missionary schools. "When the Christian missionaries first entered our country [Egypt], the true light of education started to shine upon us."[497] So while, historically Islam may have been a

[494] Khuri in *Voices*, 13

[495] His title in the book is given as Secretary of the Moslem Converts' Society of Egypt, although little info on the existence of the group is available. In any case, Mansur was promoted by missionaries in Egypt (especially Zwemer) as an example of the experience and risk of conversion. For more info on Mansur, including his trial for defaming Islam, see Heather Sharkey, *American Evangelicals in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 68-69, 117-120.

[496] Mansour in *Voices*, 37.

[497] Manour in *Voices*, 39.

civilizing force, it was now the Christian educational mission that served that function. Additionally, Mansour notes Christian education as challenging social norms among Muslims, especially in relation to women's rights. In this the tropic rhetoric of so many missionaries and Orientalists is apparent. He also discusses the changes in the religious life of Islam, noting what he sees as hopeful developments in Quranic textual criticism, and a more open attitude towards Christian evangelization, developing out of the crisis of modernity for Muslims. The liberal Protestant view of scripture (openness to Higher Criticism) is thus praised by Mansour as part of what makes Christianity efficacious, and perhaps such reforms in Muslim thought will likewise result in progress – especially if progress means conversion to Christianity.

The book was not just concerned with depicting and critiquing the state of Islam in the Middle East. Several authors take up the question of Western-Eastern relations. None are so hostile to colonial Christianity as Blyden was, but many do offer critiques. One anonymous author from Turkey cautions missionaries against living too luxuriously, exhorting them to maintain simpler lifestyles and engage more with local society. Several authors question divisions among Christianity as problematic and suggest need for greater cooperation between various local and missionary Christian groups. Yet all the authors in the book affirm the need for continued involvement of American and western missions. Whether their inclusion in the book was dependent upon this admission is unclear, but it does show how the views of American missionaries were adopted in part by those they missionized.

The essays in this book reveal the increasing desire of the "missionized" in Christian mission to participate more equally in missions. The participation of various national

Christians in mission had been a long developing dynamic. This had been the aim of the missionary enterprise as the path to the conversion of Muslims, yet it was also a hard fought process, with Western missionaries often concerned about the "genuineness" of these Christians. These essays allowed "native" voices to speak, yet at the same time much of what is said reveals the successes of missionary education. The influence of schools like Robert College and the American University of Beirut in producing a certain type of ecumenical/liberal Christian is evident. These authors did not particularly challenge depictions of Islam in missionary scholarship, but expanded it to demonstrate the development of an Arab Christian sensibility – on the one hand indebted to Islam as part of Arab heritage, yet ultimately agreeing Islam's ill-fit for modernity. The authors affirm the value of Western mission, and as such receive affirmation from that mission and its values.

Yet, if this book shows the valuation of non-Western voices on Islam and the East, a series of lectures at the Newman School of Missions in Jerusalem shows the limits of their inclusion in broader missionary-aligned scholarship.[498] In 1928, lectures on five major Muslim thinkers (Ibn Khaldun, Ibn al-Arabi, Al-Ma'ari, al-Shafi'i, and al-Hallaj) were delivered at the school by Shukri Muhtadie, Hussain Ghunaim, Nabih Faris, Eric F.F. Bishop and O.H. Thompson, respectively. The collaboration of both Middle Eastern and missionary Christian scholars in lecturing at the school evidences a spirit of partnership. Yet, when it came to inclusion beyond the geographical confines of the Middle East, a clear divide between missionary and Middle Easterner becomes apparent. *The Moslem World* journal published two of the lectures from the series as articles – those by Thompson and

[498] Three lectures given in the Newman School of Missions, Thabor, Jerusalem, during the Christmas term 1928 [NEST].

Bishop.[499] That *The Moslem World* as the premiere missionary journal on Islam ignored the work of Middle Easterners is telling. It reflects the conflicting desire among missions on inclusion and promotion of non-Western Christian voices. Whereas *Voices from the Near East* was published for a Western audience, soliciting opinions from Middle Eastern Christians on how best to engage the Muslim world, these lectures were scholarly presentations on particular figures from Islamic history. The difference between the missional and scholarly aims seems to be part of the reason for the promotion of the former over the latter. Missionaries on the whole wanted to "uplift" the local populations and in turn show them off to their patrons, but were not so much interested in having them as equal partners. This tension is evident also in the cases of non-Western scholars going to the United States to teach on Islam.

From East to West: Entering America

It is notable that at the same time American missionaries abroad were encouraging greater inclusion of local Christians, the U.S. was becoming more racist and exclusionary in its immigration policies. Turn of the twentieth-century-America experienced a wave of Middle Eastern and South Asian immigration and with it an increased nativist tendencies in the country. The U.S. had long possessed a rather binary definition of race as it applied to immigration and the influx of not easily-classifiable immigrants led to arbitration over racial identities. The 1790 Naturalization Act had granted citizenship to "white" immigrants and was modified by 1870 with the addendum allowing African Americans citizenship. The binary was one of black and white, and immigrants from the Middle East and South Asia did

[499] Eric F.F. Bishop (1929), "al-Shafi'i (Muhammad Ibn Idris) Founder of a Law School." *The Muslim World,* 19: 156–175. And O.H. Thompson (1929), "al-Hallaj Saint and Martyr". The Muslim World, 19: 383–402.

not fit neatly in such categories. These legal statuses were adjudicated in U.S. courts, whose judges relied upon scientific racism, as well as cultural, ideological and religious arguments. When we consider the debates in the U.S. alongside the missionary rhetoric this period, we can see how contestation over race and national identity in America was connected with mission policies abroad. Despite the rhetoric of inclusion, missionaries still maintained racial and ideological frames asserting that these Middle Eastern and Indian Protestants ought to remain in their own cultural setting. We will also see how the early immigrant scholars of Islam challenged and maintained certain elements of these debates.

In the American context, Middle Easterners and Indians were often classified in this period as non-white (and in turn not eligible for citizenship). The legal rationale for this required the participation of pseudo-sciences, which argued for the racial inferiority of "Semites" and Indians, developing as we have noted out of comparative philology and comparative religions. For instance Josiah Strong's *Our Country* gives an early example of the discourse that would be marshaled well into the 1920s. As historian Rogers Smith notes of Strong's case, "The many intellectual, political, economic and social problems that seemed to him resolvable by a commitment to Anglo-Saxon Protestant Americanism required abandoning the old cause of racial equality. In so moving Strong was blazing a path that many liberal Protestants and later progressives would follow."[500] Strong praised America as the most progressive nation and it is precisely this progressiveness that he saw as threatened by de-homogenizing of society. Strong notes the poor education of many foreigners as an impediment to the country. He was vehemently anti-Catholic, contrasting Catholicism in ethnic terms against pro-Anglo-Saxon superiority, and drawing explicitly on

[500] Smith, 355.

scholars such as H.B. Adams at Johns Hopkins and J. Burrows at Columbia.[501] So "white" was interpreted largely to mean European (despite some argument for Caucasian, which was ultimately deemed too inclusive).

With such racial definitions in mind, we now turn to the directions in which the study of Islam was shaped as these mission-educated scholars traveled to the United States to teach in universities and seminaries. As we have seen in the above, in the early twentieth century mission educational institutions began including more local Christians among faculty and staff. These Middle Eastern educators shifted discussions of Islam, characterized in ways unique to their experiences, though mixed with their educational training. One of the results of this promotion of greater inclusion of non-Western Christians as it pertains to our study, was in the diversification of scholars of Islam, and in turn their scholarship. In the United States this diversification began largely through connections between American Protestant missionary institutions and Middle Eastern Christians.[502] The first cadre of Middle Eastern scholars to find work in American institutions had to balance their frameworks for understanding Islam, while still accommodating the expectations of their American patrons. There were many scholars who came to the U.S. to teach in connection with their missionary background.

One of the earliest examples of this mission connection facilitating professorship for immigrant scholars is the case of Abraham Yohannan (1853-1926). Yohannon was born in

[501] Smith, 355.

[502] That they were Christians is significant. Most of the first scholars to come to the US came as Christians (converts or otherwise) in association with missions. This remained the case through the mid 20th century, though the shifts began to appear. Take for instance the recommendation of the dean of Chicago Theological Seminary of a scholar Nuri Khaledy in the 1950s, where he noted Khaledy "technically a Muslim," though "He is heartily respected by the Christians in the group, even for the quality of his Christian judgments upon many matters…" Letter from Dean of Chicago Theological Seminary on (annual) Congregational church meeting with American Board (1958), Carleton Papers Box 13:37; Folder: 15:1 [Houghton Library, Harvard].

Persia and attended the Presbyterian-founded Urmi College. After completing his education there, he came to the United States in 1895 to study Semitics with Richard Gottheil at Columbia University where he received his M.A. Yohannan remained at Columbia as a lecturer and later professor of Oriental languages. However, Yohannon was more involved in producing scholarship on Syriac and Persian, and on Assyrian Christianity, and was not heavily involved in the promotion of Islamic Studies.[503]

While Yohannon is a notable early participant in the development of Oriental studies in the U.S., the more significant impact in Islamic Studies by Middle Eastern scholars began in the 1920s. Three individuals provide an instructive model for examining the contributions and constraints placed on scholars: Lutfi Levonian, Philip Hitti, and Edward Jurji. While I am lumping them under this moniker of Middle Eastern Christians, each came from a different religious-ethnic-cultural background, the significance of which requires some further contextualization. Each of these scholars, however, was affiliated with Protestant institutions founded in the Middle East, and through this affiliation became connected to the emergence of the American study of Islam – navigating the limits and opportunities in different ways. Likewise, each was understood by their American missionary colleagues as national/Middle Eastern Christians. Thus, they confirmed the missionary desire to include more non-Westerners, while simultaneously pushing for these individuals to remain based in their own homelands: an aim for cultural homogeneity born of early twentieth century racial conceptions of culture and society.

[503] He was still, like so many other non-American scholars, a participant in discussing the function of missions to Muslims. Over his years at Columbia he presented a number of lectures on missions in the Middle East. His view was summed up by the assertion "that the object of a missionary was to bring those people of uncivilized countries nearer to God but that this end was not always effected. The reason of this was that there were so many religions and creeds, preached to the barbarous nations that the inhabitants know not which one to adopt." (*Columbia Daily Spectator*, Volume LVII, 67: 15 Dec 1913).

Much of the rhetoric used by missions to talk about the backwardness of the people they were evangelizing was marshaled in defense of their cultural inferiority. While on the whole racism was prevalent against these groups, among the non-Western scholars who succeeded in participating in Islamic Studies, many of these same traits were identifiable. That is to say, individuals like Levonian, Hitti and Jurji were able to see greater welcome precisely by embodying many of Strong's criteria. So while they remained racialized as Easterners, they also represented the success of American imperialism: these individuals were highly educated (in American/English institutions) and sympathetic to Protestantism (even though Hitti remained Maronite). In turn, they attempted to re-envision their "Semitic" place in Western civilization, and to broaden the definition of "white" beyond Anglo-Saxon limits.

a. Lutfi Levonian (18?? – 1951)

> *Some say it with words,*
> *some say it with acts,*
> *but Dean Lootfy says it*
> *with hundreds of tracts*[504]

Lutfi Levonian was a Turkish-speaking Armenian Protestant affiliated with the American Board for Commissioners of Foreign Missions. Levonian can be seen as a representative case of what American missionaries were hoping to accomplish through their efforts in the region. Levonian began his rise to prominence within the mission working at the Central Turkey College. The college, founded by the ABCFM in 1877 in Aintab (Gaziantep), Turkey, was primarily attended by Armenian Protestants, and as such dedicated most of its efforts to developing Christian leadership in the region, reflecting a major aim of

[504] From a series of short poems about the faculty and students at the school (recorded by Nicol, Dec 17, 1942) Logbook Athens School of Religion (1928-32) [NEST].

American educational missions. The young Levonian served as the head of the Turkish language department in the early 1900s – reflecting the language-teaching component that often facilitated diversification of staff. Levonian's work in Turkish fit into the mission's desire to create a bridge between the Armenian speaking Christians and the mostly Turkish-speaking Muslims of the city. Levonian attracted attention in the mission through his dedicated work and was advised to pursue further education abroad. He traveled to Sellyoak, England to attend Woodbrooke College, a Quaker institution, and study under James Rendell Harris.[505] He spent two years in England studying from 1910 to 1912, and remained in contact with Sellyoak and his mentor for years to come. Likewise, his work in Turkish was notable enough to secure Levonian's membership in the Royal Asiatic Society in 1913. Following his studies he returned to teach at the Central Turkey College. Shortly into his resumed tenure, the Central Turkey College was disrupted by the Ottoman government's forced expulsion of Armenians. The school was effectively closed from 1915 until 1927, when it reopened under a new name and in a new city, Aleppo College.

Levonian was forced out of Turkey along with many other Armenians in 1915 and the details of the next few years are hazy.[506] He eventually reappeared in Istanbul teaching at a Turkish government school. In 1919, Levonian returned to England to study further with Harris. His interest in Islam as a religion and in Christian missions to Muslims, became

[505] Harris (1852-1941) was at this point director at the Friends Settlement for Social and Religious Study at Woodbrooke College. He was Cambridge educated, and like Macdonald, he had spent many years teaching in the United States in Biblical Studies – first at Haverford College and later at Johns Hopkins University. He later went to Leiden to teach before taking the post at Woodbrooke in 1903. Harris' work was focused on early Christian texts (mostly in Syriac). During a trip through Turkey he became connected with the Armenian community, thus he was amenable to Levonian's coming. (See Sabra, *Truth and Service,* 131+) as well as the *Cambridge biographical* note: http://venn.lib.cam.ac.uk/cgi-bin/search-130418.pl?sur=Harris&suro=w&fir=Rendel&firo=c&cit=&cito=c&c=all&tex=&sye=&eye=&col=all&maxcount=50 (Accessed 11/12/2014).

[506] In his *Moslem Mentality* (London: G Allen and Unwin, 1928), Levonian relates briefly his experience in 1915 and thoughts on Turkish nationalism (87-90).

particularly evident in this period. In 1921, after delivering a series of lectures in England, Levonian recalled a familiar refrain among missionaries stating in a letter to the mission on the state of Islamic Studies in the West (with particular attention to missionary preparation), "the ignorance of Islam is appalling."[507] Correcting this ignorance became his driving force over the next three decades directed primarily in two corresponding directions: educating Christians about Islam through his teaching and lectures, and the education of Muslims about Christianity via tracts and other evangelical writings. Levonian, with his fluency in Turkish, was particularly concerned with the future of religion in Turkey after the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1922. His writing in this period focused on what seemed to be the disintegration of Islam in that country and the rise of secularism, which he called for Christians to combat.[508] Importantly to the missionaries, Levonian remained a resident of the Middle East (despite taking frequent forays to England and the United States to lecture). He was convinced his place was as a worker in his homelands. Regarding his stay in England in 1921, he noted that he could stay longer, but saw little point and "desire[d] to get back to work in the East."[509] Levonian as such reflects the ideal Middle Eastern Christian of the missionaries – an educated Protestant connected to the American mission and remaining devoted to work among Muslims in the region.

In 1922 he rejoined the Christian educational effort in Turkey. He worked with F.F. Goodsell and several others to found the School of Religion in Constantinople/Athens, which in 1932 merged with the School for Religious Workers in Beirut to become the Near

[507] Levonian Letter Extracts to Central Turkey College (May 7, 1921), Central Turkey College/Aleppo College 1871-1929; Microfilm 16.9.6.1; Reel 674 [Lamont Library, Harvard].

[508] Levonian was one of the contributors to *Voices from the East* (chapter 2), where he emphasized the need and possibility for coexistence between the different "national groups" of the Near East. It is telling that in the work his name is misspelled as "Loutfri."

[509] Levonian Letter Extracts to Central Turkey College (May 7, 1921), Central Turkey College/Aleppo College 1871-1929; Microfilm 16.9.6.1; Reel 674 [Lamont Library, Harvard].

East School of Theology in Beirut (NEST).[510] Notably, during the 1930s and 40s the NEST partnered with AUB as its religion department. During his time working at the SOR/NEST Levonian maintained his work in "Islamics" teaching numerous classes on the religion, and establishing an annual Islamic Workshop (1932-1950). Levonian's work can be characterized within the missionary apparatus of his day, seeking answers to the "problem of Islam." His solution to that problem was focused on positive dialogue and education (he argued strongly against polemics and controversy for the mission). Still, his scholarship on Islam was done with Christian evangelism in mind. At a conference in 1938 in Aleppo he made clear his first aim was the preaching of Christ, and articulated two main reasons for this: "Because I am a Christian and I want all to obtain the grace [*ni'ma*] that I have obtained;" and "Because I am an easterner [*sharqī*] and the East is my homeland [*waṭanī*] and its sons are my brothers and brother is accountable [*masū'l*] for his brother."[511]

One of Levonian's students gives us a bit of insight into what was taught in the NEST Islamics program, describing "The class for Moslem work, which has an attendance of about twelve students, was organized by prof. L. Levonian, including the president of the School as one of the twelve." The course in Islamics consisted of weekly lectures and discussion, as well as prayer for the Muslim world. Students would give reports on "religious, social, educational and moral problems which the students may chance to find in

[510] This school's history is informative for its experiences in changing Turkey. The SOR and Goodsell were affiliated with the ABCFM, whereas the SRW was connected with the PCUSA. The SOR was founded as "a coeducational, interconfessional, international school"(Logbook School of Religion 1925-28 [NEST]). The dual location of the SOR reflects another expulsion of non-Turks from the nationalized Turkey in 1922-23, which meant Levonian and several other staff members as well as students had to flee and reestablish their efforts in Greece. George Sabra discusses both of these schools in more detail. Sabra notes that the latter was perhaps less liberal, although the aims of the school remained largely intact. As far as the NEST is concerned, the school still runs in Beirut training Protestant and other Christian theologians.

[511] Levonian, "Why it is necessary I preach [*ubasshira*] Christ [*al-masīḥ*]," Aleppo Conference Report (Arabic; My Translation). Syrian Mission Files RG115 Box 6, Folder 5 (Presbyterian Historical Society).

Turkish papers," assigned in advance by Levonian.[512] The student insisted the class was important for three main reasons: "1) in teaching us about Mohammed's biography and about the organization and the doctrines of the Koran. 2) Likewise, he has been useful in lecturing to us about both Moslem and other scholars in Islam. 3) Above all, he has impressed us by presenting to us a new method of approach to Islam."[513] As such, Levonian as both a teacher and a researcher was training a generation of Christian scholars and evangelists in the Middle East. It fit the pragmatic mold of missionary training, aiming to educate students about Islam with evangelical purpose in mind. However, because of his decision to remain in the region his work did not have significant direct impact on scholarship in the West.

What is important to recognize about Levonian's presentation of Islam is his emphasis on it as a widespread religion, which was stressed precisely because of his Christian commitment.

> Islam is one of the most difficult problems of the world, and every day it is getting more important in international circles, and is attracting the attention of leading politicians as a world problem. But the problem of Islam is essentially a religious problem rather than an education or political. Intellectual or political developments cannot ultimately solve the Moslem problem. It needs a religious solution and that is the calling of Christian churches and the missions. But so far, Islam, as a religion, has defied all methods of approach to it, and the Moslems firmly believe as ever that their religion has proved superior to all the others as the only true and absolute religion. It is very easy to ascribe this obstinate fanaticism of the Moslem, but on the other hand it is a time for us to investigate into our presentation of Christianity to the Moslems.[514]

---

[512] "The Class in Islamics" (ca. 1927; signed "a member of Moslem class G.S. Faradjian") Logbook Athens School of Religion, 1925-28 [NEST], 103-104.

[513] It is worth noting that in addition to Levonian's lectures that year, W.H.T. Gairdner also spoke as a guest lecturer presenting five lectures titled: "Muhammad as Prophet and Ideal," "The Legal Aspect – Sunna and Shariah," "The Mystic Aspect – Sufism," "The Outlook Today," "Brotherhood – Islam's and Jesus Christ's," ("The Class in Islamics" Logbook [NEST], 103).

[514] L. Levonian "Islam and the Christian Work" (Constantinople, 1922), Near East Mission 1860-1931; Microfilm 16.5 Reel 504 [Lamont Library, Harvard].

As I have argued, this emphasis on Islam as religion was one of the distinctive contributions of missionaries over against the colonial and traditional-academic Orientalists. Levonian was a contributor to that project. He also demonstrated the missionary shifts towards a less theological/denominational Christianity, and a more ecumenical version, stating, "Our presentation of Christianity as a religion must not be external, but personal, not rigid, but living."[515] By these he meant that missionaries should worry less about theological doctrines (such as the Trinity), and instead emphasized the personal qualities of Christ and God. His approach to Islam as religion was grounded in psychological theory, which he saw as essential in determining ways to evangelize Muslims. In his report to the Committee for the Restudy of Christian-Moslem Relations (1947-48), Levonian offered some autobiographical perspective on his work. He argued for positive evangelism (non-controversial) contrasting Pfander (the controversialist) and Hocking (Islam can reform itself) as "two extremes of Christian thought regarding Islam." This is a result of limited knowledge of Islam: "We know little of Islam, and we are just beginning to study the great Islamic books. We must know what is going on on [sic] the minds of the Moslem."[516] In this he linked texts with mind, and promoted the study of key works of Islamic thought as a way of understanding Muslims.

b. Philip Hitti (1886-1970)

> To tell you the truth, I don't mind a bit impersonal, objective criticism, whether made in public or in private. Attack – full of venom – has been directed against me in both print and conversation… but I always kept my silence. Life is too short to bother with such attacks which often work as a

[515] Ibid.
[516] Levonian, Report 11: "The Psychological approach to Islam and to Moslem Evangelism" (1947).

> boomerang and do more harm to the reputation of the attacker than the one attacked. As in your case my silence never means that I had no answer…[517]

We have already seen a bit of the young Hitti in his evaluation of AUB, but we will now turn to a closer examination of his life and work, which contrasts in many ways with that of Levonian. Philip Hitti remains well known for his influence upon the academic study of the Middle East and Islam in the United States. Born in small village in Lebanon in 1886 to a Maronite Christian family, Hitti became closely connected to the American mission's educational work in Lebanon. He was an impressive student and completed his B.A. at Syrian Protestant College in 1908, then stayed on as a lecturer in History, thus experiencing the shifting landscape of religious education at the school.

Hitti greatly impressed the staff of the college, and to a large degree represented the future sort of leader the American Christian administration wanted to fashion. Reflecting this valuation of Hitti, the mission nominated him as a delegate to the World Christian Student Federation, which he attended Turkey in 1911. He made enough impression at that conference that two years later John Mott, the president of the organization, invited him - expenses paid - to attend another conference in New York, and he was encouraged by SPC president Howard Bliss to attempt some doctoral work while in the U.S. He completed a Ph.D. at Columbia in 1915, looking at the history of the Arabs. Because of WWI he remained several more years at Columbia lecturing, before returning to the reminted American University of Beirut. AUB promoted Hitti to full-professor in Oriental History, but his time there was short-lived. In 1926, Hitti was offered a position at Princeton University to fill a newly-founded chair of Semitic literature. It was from this position that Hitti would cultivate a department of Near Eastern studies (officially inaugurated in 1947),

[517] Letter from Hitti to Calverley (Feb 4, 1940), Calverley Collection Box 126: Folder 2296, 60759 [Hartford Seminary].

which played a significant role in both Middle Eastern and Islamic studies in the U.S, where he would remain for the remainder of his career.

Despite leaving the Lebanon, Hitti remained appreciative of the American University of Beirut and its work. Likewise he valued the American mission's educational work in Lebanon. In fact, he explicitly contrasted missionaries with colonialists, highlighting the hypocrisy of Western presence in the East, while valuing the missionary work, "There is a striking contrast between the humanitarian ideas professed by western missionaries, teachers, and preachers, and the disregard of human values by European and American politicians and warriors."[518] This serves as a significant counter statement to that of Blyden, who half a century early had condemned missions as a facet of the colonial enterprise. That said, he was less interested in Christian evangelical aims than in the educational work from which he had benefited. As far as he was concerned mission work among Syrian Christians ought to "vitalize and vivify rather than proselytize and convert."[519] It is a sentiment he perhaps saw playing out in his own life, where he remained Maronite, yet valued his Protestant education.

Hitti emphasized the role Christianity played in Arab/Syrian history. In addition, he saw the study of Islam as crucial to Arab history. Like Levonian, he bemoaned the lack of knowledge among Westerners about Islam, but Hitti differed from Levonian in his distance from the Protestant evangelical aims. Hitti noted in 1944, "Islamic Studies, Arabic Studies, have not been hitherto seriously cultivated in the United States. It is true that, following the European precedent, a few leading universities have for decades maintained chairs in Semitic languages and literatures but incumbents generally occupied themselves with the

[518] Philip K. Hitti, "Current Trends in Islam," in Islam in the Modern World, Dorothea Seelye Franck (ed.) (Washington, DC, 1951) 8.
[519] Hitti, *Syrians in America* (G.H. Doran, 1924), 122.

pursuit of Hebraic studies and Assyriology."[520] Hitti took aim at the state of American Oriental studies, which had grown out of theologically understood interest in Semitic languages and the study of the Old Testament. In critiquing it, he also believed that America was poised to take a lead in Islamic studies. Princeton became the heart of his efforts to reformulate the study of the Near East and Islam.

At Princeton Hitti would contribute a framework of Near Eastern Studies as the lens for Islamic Studies in the United States. Hitti organized in 1935 a six week summer seminar on Arabic and Islamic studies. The general principles emerging from this seminar was that knowledge of Islam and Arab heritage was essential to understanding the development of world history. Similar to the approach we saw in *Voices of the East*, Hitti argued that Islam and its Arab interlocutors were major contributors to Western Civilization. He posited Islamic/Arabic civilization as the third component of so-called Judeo-Christian society and values.[521] Hitti wanted to add Islam along these other two, seeing the religion intimately linked with historical Arab identity. The committee organizing the seminar stated it as follows:

> It has also been admitted that Islam, the third monotheistic religion and still one of the most vital and aggressive faiths of the world, is worthy of special study….through Spain and Sicily, which the Arabs held for centuries, and through Syria during the period of the crusades, their literary, artistic and scientific contributions found their way into Europe and played an important part in stimulating its renaissance."[522]

[520] Hitti "America and the Arab Heritage" in *The Arab Heritage*, N.A. Faris (ed.) (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944), 12.

[521] D.G. Hart suggests the idea of Judeo-Christian heritage of the West was gaining traction in 1930s and 40s America (*The University Gets Religion*, 12). Kathleen Moore has further noted Syrian American use of this idea in their legal battles, specifically *Re Dow* (1914), which ultimately failed to convince a circuit-court judge that Syrians should be considered white for the purposes of immigration (Moore, *al-Mughtaribun*, 52).

[522] Quoted in *al-Kulliyya* notice "Dr. Hitti to direct summer Seminar in Arabic and Islamic Studies" (V 21:5, May 15, 1935), 148.

Notably the emphasis made in the committee's statement is on the intellectual and cultural contributions of Muslims, rather than religious life of Islam. The success of the first seminar, led to its triennial hosting with the support of the ACLS and in collaboration with Princeton Theological Seminary.

Likewise Hitti, through this conference, was instrumental in the establishment of the ACLS committee of Arabic and Islamic studies in 1938. This committee reflects the coming together of the numerous threads we have seen throughout this and previous chapters. The committee was established "to consider and to recommend what the Council can best do to improve the status of Arabic and Islamic studies in America and to initiate and administer such preliminary or exploratory enterprises as may be undertaken to this end."[523] The committee consisted G. Howland Shaw (State Department), Philip Hitti (Princeton), Arthur Jeffery (Columbia), William Thomson (Harvard) and Edwin Calverley (Hartford). In this we see the inclusion of Hitti as a Middle Eastern scholar participating fully in the American scene. Likewise it evidences the heavy involvement of missionary-educators and seminary-educated (Jeffery and Calverley being former missionaries and Thomson as a student of Macdonald) in shaping the field as it was renovated at mid-century. Finally, we also see in the inclusion of Shaw the inklings of more immediate U.S. governmental interest in the study of Islam and the Middle East. Hitti's role in this would be to attempt a balance between state and Christian interests.[524]

The political-social climate of the United States in this period is important to consider in understanding Hitti's desire for Judeo-Islamo-Christian frameworks. As we have

[523] Letter from Mortimer Graves (Asst. Sec ACLS) (April 1, 1938) Calverley Collection Box 125: Folder 2285, 60242 [Hartford Seminary].

[524] As I have discussed in the introduction, Zachary Lockman has discussed this committee in his book *Field Notes* (2016). Although Lockman overlooks the missionary connections in his account of the organization, his summary of the committee and its impact is otherwise excellent.

seen, Arabs in the first half of the nineteenth century were facing significant impediments to their citizenship. Hitti's attempts to include Arab-Islamic civilization as part of the heritage of the West must be seen in part as an attempt to challenge American civic definitions of "white" culture. Hitti was committed to the Syrian community in the U.S. and his academic work reflects his desire to remain Syrian/Arab.[525] He had no desire to give up his identity upon coming to the U.S., but rather to enfold that identity within the accepted American spectrum. As Talcott Williams endorsing Hitti's first book *The Syrians in America* (1924), states in rejection of melting-pot ideas, "No melting pot is the United States. It never has and it never will reduce our population to a common amalgam."[526] Hitti was attempting to carve a niche for Arabs in the U.S. through his work, without giving up Islamic-Arab civilizational heritage.

While Hitti fondly remembered Protestant missionary work in Lebanon, he was never particularly connected with their work. Hitti did contribute an article to *The Moslem World* in 1941, though it was mostly to publicize Princeton's growing Islamic studies program.[527] It was not that Hitti opposed the Christian perspective, but rather that his primary focus was on Arab (Syrian) heritage. In turn his study of Islam was cultivated through this lens, as an essential part of the Arabic literature, science and philosophy. His focus was on Islam in connection to the Arabic speaking world, and not so much as a religion. Rooted in the cultural context of Lebanon, Hitti recognized religion as a product of birth, more so an ethnic identification than a statement of personal belief. In fact, Hitti was

[525] Hitti's use of the term Syrian/Arab changed over the years. For more on Hitti's involvement in Syrian social and political work in the United States see Ussama Makdisi *Faith Misplaced* (New York: Public Affairs, 2010).

[526] Williams in Hitti, *Syrians*, viii. Notably a challenge to Robert College/AUB's claims to being melting pots in the Middle East at the same time.

[527]Hitti, "Arabic and Islamic Studies in Princeton University" *The Moslem World* 31:2, 1941.

interested in reappraising the history of the discipline of Oriental and Islamic studies, citing the work of Yusuf Sam'an al-Sam'ani (from Tripoli), who was educated at the Vatican, and became, "the man who introduces Oriental studies into Europe, especially Syriac and Arabic, long before they were introduced into any European university."[528]

Hitti downplayed the idea of Islamic decadence, instead linking Arab-Muslim history closely to the development of western civilization. This was perhaps Hitti's most important contribution, challenging a clear binary between West and East. Still he maintained the idea of an eventual break in the progress of Muslim civilization,

> Remember that Islam is historically an offshoot of Judaism and Christianity, that it also shares in the Greco-Roman heritage and traditions. What we added to our philosophical inheritance was mainly mechanical and industrial. Furthermore, the distinction between the Near East and the West from the thirteenth to sixteenth century was more artificial than real. There was the same outlook on life, the same philosophy of life, the same presuppositions, and the same assumptions on the part of all people of the West and the Near East, as late as the early 16th century.[529]

Divergence began then as West embraced experimentation and east stayed "static."

Hitti had a large influence on shaping the study of Islam in America, and he did so by linking it intimately with Arab history. To call Hitti a scholar of Islam is in fact a bit of misattribution. He was a historian of the Near East, and contributed to the common positioning of the study of Islam within such Near East departments. Yet, his influence was wide and not so limited. As we saw above Khuri's treatment of Islam reiterated much of the Arab historical perspective on Islam. Yet, other scholars like his pupil Edward Jurji pushed the study of Islam back into its religious dynamics, without abandoning Hitti's perspectives.

---

[528] Philip Hitti's address, A dinner for Charles Malik (Tuesday, Nov 20, 1945; Syrian-American club, Washington DC), 20. Sent for by Pope Clement IX; collected a large library of Arabic,syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic manuscripts (at Vatican) and famously wrote the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* -- a major source of Eastern (especially Church) history.

[529] Hitti, "Current Trends in Islam" in Dorothea Seelye Franck (ed.) *Islam in the Modern World* (Washington, D.C.: Middle East Institute, 1951), 8.

c. Edward Jurji (1907 – 1990)

Hitti drew many graduates of the AUB to Princeton, and built up a cohort of Middle Eastern scholars around his program. One of these students was Edward Jurji. Jurji in his contributions to the study of Islam represents a blend of the missional approach of Levonian and the historical-cultural approach of Hitti. Jurji was a contributor to the study of Islam within comparative religion, and through this became committed to interreligious dialogue. A Protestant of Lebanon, he completed his B.A. at AUB in 1928, where he developed a close relationship with many American missionaries and teachers there. After completing this work, he traveled to the United States with plans for advanced work at the Columbia University. On his way he stopped at Princeton to visit Philip Hitti, who convinced him to attend Princeton instead. In 1936, Jurji completed his doctorate under Hitti. John MacKay, president of Princeton Theological Seminary, convinced Jurji to supplement his doctoral work with a theological grounding, and so Jurji went "across the street" to the Seminary, where he worked as an instructor, while simultaneously obtaining a bachelor of theology in 1942. Jurji became a long-term fixture at PTS, from which he retired in 1977. Jurji's work balanced his dedication to his Protestant faith, with his deep love of intellectual pursuits. He was hired at the Seminary as Samuel Zwemer's replacement as professor of Islamics and Comparative Religion. Jurji's doctoral work had been heavily invested in Islamic Studies in connection to Arab heritage, reflecting the pedigree of Hitti. But Jurji's valuation of comparative religion directed him away from the strictly historical inquiry.

Jurji got his start in Princeton along with the development of Hitti's Arabic and Islamic Seminar. That seminar had a significant impact on how Jurji came to value the

Islamic contributions within Arab civilization. Jurji participated in the Arab intellectual scene in the United States, and argued in particular that the Qur'an is comparable to the works of Shakespeare in English, and its study is essential for Christian Arab scholars. In this valuation of the Qur'an Jurji had primarily in mind its literary and linguistic contributions. The Qur'an was valuable to Arabic studies. Jurji praised the Seminar itself as a moment of "Intellectual Aggression" by Arab scholars asserting themselves into the scholarly realm.[530] Gone were the days where Arab scholars would sit subservient to Western scholars – it was time for direct participation, and a restoration of Arab heritage. Hitti, Jurji, and the cohort of Arab Christian scholars at Princeton, were fighting for inclusion not only in the scholarly realm, but in American society more generally.

Yet, while Jurji was invested in Arabic studies at Princeton, he also took up the question of Islam as religion, and this began first as an inquiry into missionary approaches to Muslims. It was with this agenda in mind that Mackay had been eager to hire him and pushed him to complete theological training. In a letter in 1941, Mackay extended an invitation on behalf of Calverley at Hartford to present on "Islam in the Present Crisis" to the Fellowship of Professors of Missions – a group that Mackay hoped Jurji might then join formally.[531] This reflected Jurji's coursework at PTS, where his courses on Islam focused on "Christianity and the Moslem World." He took a comparative approach in his teaching, aiming to address historical, psychological and theological relationships between Christianity and Islam from antiquity to contemporary imperialism and missionary efforts. He characterized himself increasingly as scholar invested in the History of Religions. As he

[530] Jurji, "Intellectual Aggression" *The Syrian World New York* (August 8, 1935), Jurji Collection Box 3 [Princeton Theological Seminary].

[531] Hartford to join Letter from Mackay to Jurji (May 1, 1941), Jurji Collection Box 3[Princeton Theological Seminary].

became more firmly established at the seminary, he broadened the scope of his teaching, and in 1963 petitioned to have his position renamed Professor of History of Religions.[532] It was more than just a semantic change, Jurji showed that he was not limited to Islamics (or Middle Eastern Studies), but invested in the study of religion as a whole, right at the time Religious Studies opened up significantly as a field.[533] Jurji saw the seminary as the best place for his time to engage in such studies.[534]

In comparison with Levonian however, Jurji's career was somewhat of a disappointment to the missionary effort among Muslims in his homeland. The American Mission had great hopes that Jurji would return to the region and help lead the Christian community there. In 1947 the president of the Near East School of Theology, Gaius Greenslade, extended a professorship offer to Jurji, saying it would be an opportunity for him to "come back to your own country and use your talents and training for the Near East."[535] Greenslade also suggested that Jurji might also work within the National Evangelical synod in Beirut. Jurji replied, thanking Greenslade for the generous offer,

> I find myself in agreement with you, also, as regards the strategic importance of the Near East. Aside from international and cultural

[532] In redefining his position in this way, Jurji was not necessarily attempting to abandon his Christian commitment to the study: See Letter from Jurji to McCord (Feb 7, 1963) Jurji Collection Box 3 [Princeton Theological Seminary], "It would also serve as a timely signal in connection with plans now under consideration for a more aggressive confrontation with the World Religions. Above all else, it would seem to me that the new title, in emphasizing the History of Religions, might well afford us a more adequate opportunity to advance the cause of the Reformed tradition, as well as serve to proclaim the truth of the Christian religion along the most enlightened and progressive standards of the new age." Notably in this Jurji blends any distinction between History of Religions and World Religions.

[533] Religious Studies as a field in public education developed especially after the Schempp decision of the Supreme Court in 1963, which ruled mandated bible reading and prayer in public schools as unconstitutional. While not immediately apparent, this decision has been heralded as opening the teaching about religion (as opposed to the teaching *of* religion) in public schools, and it was following this decision the term religious studies emerged as disciplinary constellation in U.S. Universities (e.g. The University of California, Santa Barbara, 1964)

[534] As example of this Jurji turned down an offer for a professorship at Princeton from Hitti in 1947 stating, "In view of what I am doing at the Seminary this job is not for me." Letter from Jurji to Hitti (April 6, 1947), Jurji Collection Box 3 [Princeton Theological Seminary].

[535] Greenslade follows up (July 19, 1947), Jurji Collection Box 3 [Princeton Theological Seminary].

> significance, it is a key, I think, to the whole picture of missionary enterprise. Within the confines of the Near East, the issues implied in the meeting of East and West come to the forefront. And therein worldwide Christianity faces its grimmest crisis in the modern world.

Continuing from this however, Jurji declined, affirming his scholarly commitment to the study of religion.

> The nature of my work at Princeton has been technical and highly specialized… For over a decade now my professional goal has been to be a professor at Princeton. I have done everything I know to put Comparative Religion on the map. I have reached the rank of Associate professor here. It is my ambition now to use my chosen field for the interpretation of Religion - non-Christian and Christian alike - as a contribution to church expansion and Christian scholarship. It would seem highly inadvisable now for me to abandon an endeavor in which I have been fairly successful in favor of another for which my only preparation happens to rest upon the mere accident (!) of birth.[536]

The last phrase, "accident of birth" in particular stands out. Jurji was making a clear statement to his ability to work wherever and towards whatever aims he felt important. He was not bound to the mission/AUB agenda, even while he remained appreciative of the work. From his position Jurji contributed much to the study of Islam, and more broadly religion, in the United States particularly within the framework of interreligious dialogue. In the latter years of his career Jurji worked closely with others invested in Religious Studies, while at the same time linking it closely with interfaith dialogue and ecumenism. Jurji organized in 1963 a conference on world religions, which included notable speakers such as W.C. Smith, Joseph Kitagawa, Mircea Eliade, H.A.R. Gibb, Paul Tillich. Jurji's name may not be as famous as these, but he was among this cohort of individuals in the U.S. reevaluating the study of religion. In this Jurji encouraged meticulous, though confessional scholarship, while at the same time allowing for value in other traditions. As W.C. Smith stated in opening the conference, "If we're to understand Buddhists… we must see not

[536] Jurji to Greenslade (August 25, 1947) Jurji Collection Box 3 [Princeton Theological Seminary].

merely something called Buddhism; we must learn to see the world, so far as possible, through Buddhist eyes."[537] So Jurji felt about Islam.

In these three figures and approximately a half century, we can see the expansion of Islamic studies through the efforts of Middle Eastern Christians in connection with the American Missionary work in the Middle East. It was missionary schools and Christian seminaries in that region that first afforded Middle Easterners opportunities for admittance into American academic life. While the American missionaries and their affiliated institutions often misunderstood and misrepresented Middle Eastern Christians, they did provide avenues for advancement and participation in the conversation about Islam and the Middle East. The missionaries hoped that the students they were training would become the leaders of a Christian expansion in the Middle East. They encouraged the study of Islam with these aims in mind. But the students they trained took up this cause to varying degrees. Levonian remained dedicated to the mission cause, and stayed in the region. Hitti, while highly appreciative of the missionaries, was not particularly interested in their evangelistic project, though he did support their educational aims. Jurji balanced these positions – studying Islam within a History of Religions framework, encouraging the phenomenological study of religion in general. He remained invested in Christianity, yet his approach was not missional, but one of interfaith dialogue and coexistence. Inclusion of Middle Eastern Christian scholars in the study of Islam, both in the U.S. and in the Middle East has been central to the development of that study.

[537] 1963 Conference organized by Jurji, Jurji Collection Box 4 [Princeton Theological Seminary].

Conclusion

There are many other individuals that could be discussed regarding the participation of non-Western scholars in the modern study of Islam.[538] Yet, the small selection we have examined demonstrates the contributions and the limits of mission connection in facilitating the diversification of the study of Islam. In the period between the Civil War and World War II, the U.S. instituted numerous internal exclusionary policies, while at the same time engaging in increasingly imperialistic efforts abroad. Christian colleges around the globe influenced their pupils' thought, emphasizing certain American articulations of religious freedom and equality, while simultaneously failing to enact fully these principles. Minority scholars such as Edward Blyden quickly discovered the racial limits of participation in scholarship within the U.S., yet persevered as a scholar of Islam abroad. In such a story the boundaries of missionary scholarly inclusion were set. The missionaries desired to educate "natives" in order that they might participate in the missionary project within their own countries. However, as we have seen, many alumni challenged these limits. While they might appreciate missions and American educational programs abroad, they also saw their place as equals alongside Western faculty. They pushed back against the missionary expectations and forged new directions in the study of Islam.

[538] For Example: Nawfal Tarabulsi, Farid Audeh, John Subhan, Siraj ud-Din.

CONCLUSION

THE STUDY OF ISLAM IN AMERICA

In the preceding pages a portrait of the involvement of missionaries in the development of the academic study of Islam emerges. Institutionally, the earliest programs of Islamic Studies in the U.S. developed as part of missionary training. Thus the concerns of missionaries shaped both the content and contours of the study. Missionary scholarship focused on the religious beliefs and practices of contemporary Muslim communities around the world. While these studies were bound to Protestant conceptions of religion, they also provided foundations on which later scholarship developed. While the legacy of missionaries in scholarship on Islam has largely been ignored or downplayed, it was fundamental in the formation of the field.

As a means of conclusion, a final case is instructive in bringing together the various conceptual and institutional dynamics of missionary-affiliated scholarship: the study of Muslim communities in the United States. The study of Islam in America highlights the directions and limitations of missionary expansions of the field.

It was in the pages of *The Moslem World* that some of the earliest attempts at scholarship on Islam in the United State appeared. These attempts emerged out of missionary concerns. While the articles on the topic were still comparatively limited in number, they offered one of the few sources of such content. At the same time these early discussions of Islam in America, reveal American-Christian racial and religious biases when

approaching the tradition, and also, I suggest, justified American insecurities about Muslims in America, which persist today.

In Zwemer's 1911 survey of the Muslim world, he included population statistics on Muslims in North and South America, estimating that 8,000 Muslims lived in the U.S. In response to the anticipated questioning of the significance of such a small minority, Zwemer wrote, "Such a small fraction of the population might well be omitted in our survey were it not that undoubted testimony comes in regard to the activity of Islam."[539] In this, Zwemer's interest in Islam in America was connected to his perception of the tradition as a threat. This notion might be expanded to discuss the missionary study of Islam around the world. The reason for the study emerged primarily from missionary concern about the "activity" of Islam.

I would suggest that little has changed regarding the discussion of Muslims in America today. Although Muslims are tiny minority of the population (estimates range from 2-8 million people), they receive a disproportionate amount of scholarly and popular attention, which seems directly linked to the perpetuation of the concept of Muslims and their religion as a threat. While the cause of that feeling of threat may have changed, such that it is now tied to security rhetoric rather than a competing missionary agenda, the basis for the study often remains as the "problem of Islam."

The first article *MW* exclusively devoted to Muslims in North America appeared in 1919 and opened with a similarly themed anecdote in which the author remarked to a woman "of the fact that there are Mohammedans in America," to which the women replied, "They have no business to be here."[540] That such a statement made nearly a century ago,

[539] S.M. Zwemer, "A General Survey of the Moslem World," *MW* 1:4 (1911), 414.
[540] M.M. Ajian, "The Mohammedans in the United States," *MW* 10:1 (1919), 30.

could easily be heard today, highlights the persistency of the narrative of Islam as a problem and as un-American. This article was not particularly rigorous in its scholarship. The author observed the difficulty of ascertaining population figures on Muslims in the U.S. While he noted the diversity of the population (including Muslims from India as well as the Arab world and Turkey), he often conflated ethnicity with Muslim identity. For instance, in describing the state of the "Muslim-press" in the U.S., he included the Arabic newspaper, *Kawkab Amrika* – notably published by Orthodox Christians. Here, we can see another element of understanding of Muslims in America which persists today – the conflation of Arab and Muslim. In this conception ethnicity and religion were blurred by these Protestant writers. This itself can be seen in relation to the categorization of Islam as a Semitic religion as discussed by scholars such as Tomoko Masuzawa. In many ways despite their understanding of the diversity of Muslim populations, scholarship on Muslims in America maintained Orientalist categories of an Arab and Semitic core of Islam.

Such conflations are further highlighted in Zwemer's 1923 update "A new census of the Moslem World," in which he added three thousand to the U.S. Muslim population, bringing the total to 11,000. He cited the source for the new statistics as an "estimate based on 1920 census racial statistics."[541] Yet, notably in 1920 the census on racial statistics included only six distinct racial categories: "White," "Black" and "Mulatto," "Chinese," "Japanese," and "Indian" (referring to Native Americans), as well as an additional option of "Other." How exactly Zwemer derived such updates from this racial census data is unclear – though it seems more likely he was considering disclosures about "persons place of birth" or the father's, mother's and person's "native tongue," which were also included in the

[541] Zwemer, "A New Census of the Moslem World," *MW* 13:3 (1923), 284.

census.[542] Whatever the case, the use of the source reveals the institutionalization of conflations of ethnicity and race with Muslim-identity as they were solidified in this missionary scholarship, whereby existing Orientalist racial understandings of Muslims were combined with American popular and legal definitions, and received scholarly validation.

The racially bounded nature of Muslim identity in *The Moslem World* as it intersected with American racial formations can be seen most clearly in Pierre Crabites 1933 article, "American Negro Mohammedans." Crabites, an American consul in Egypt, opened the article with a narrative about African American Muslims visiting Cairo on their way to Mecca and the problems this caused for the American embassy in light of the Egyptian government's policies regarding religious identity. While in this regard, the article sheds light on American-Egyptian relations in the early-twentieth century, what is perhaps more important is the way the author conceived of race in relation to Muslim identity. On one hand, his anecdotal evidence offers a glimpse into the often historically inscrutable lives of the black American Muslim community. However, more clearly visible are Crabites' biases, which drew upon broader Orientalistic tropes about Islam and localized them in American racial stereotypes.

[542] The list of U.S. Census questions is available online at: https://www.census.gov/history/www/through_the_decades/index_of_questions/1920_1.html (accessed 4/10/2017). Beginning in 1930 the census expanded the categories (including the category of "Hindu" which was a catchall for South Asian Indians. It likewise instructed those not covered under these categories to "be written out in full." Population figures from the 1920 census based on race appeared as follows: The total Population was 105,710,620, approximately divided by race as White at 94.8 million, Black at 8.8 million, Mulatto at 1.6 million, Indian at 244 thousand, Chinese at 61 thousand, Japanese at 111 thousand, with almost 10,000 listed as Other. The Other category included Filipinos, "Hindus," Koreans, Hawaiians, Malays, Siamese, Samoans and Maoris (Table 1, "Chapter 1: Color or Race, Nativity and Parentage", *Fourteenth Census of the United States – 1920 – Volume II General Analysis and Analytical Tables*, 29). So from these figures it is hard to ascertain where Zwemer might have arrived at such conclusions. Instead it is likely he was using the data from the sections such as Table 2, "Country of Birth," 693. This section included stats on foreign born immigration from Europe, Asia, Americas and elsewhere. Here the conflation of Middle Eastern origin and religion are likely the base of Zwemer's new stats. In 1920 the statistics on Asian born individuals showed approximately 36,000 Armenia; 3,200 Palestine; 51,000 Syria; 11,000 Turkey; and 4,900 India.

> It follows from all of this that as he who is now Mohammed Ali Washington held on to his American passport he not only continues to be an American citizen, but his children, born or unborn, participate in this advantage. The corollary to this proposition is that if this Moslem American goes forth and multiplies, drinks up a fair share of the cheap whisky which abounds in these parts and then starts to shoot up the town, there will be a batch of black or near black babies added to the Cairo American community while he lingers in jail or stretches hemp and causes untold trouble for American consular and diplomatic officers"[543]

Setting aside the viciously racist scenario established, one appellation in particular stands out: Muslim American. This seems to be one of the earliest uses of the phrase. That it emerges in relation to U.S. foreign policy concerns underscores the long history of imperialistic frameworks for understanding Islam in the U.S. That it is printed in a missionary-affiliated journal highlights Christian anxieties about Islam and Muslims as they dovetailed with U.S. foreign policy. Such anxieties were racialized. On the one hand, the term *Muslim American* obscures racial signification, making religious affiliation the primary marker.[544] Yet, as the rest of the paragraph demonstrates, this is never far removed from racial/racist associations. When considered in light of the aforementioned conflations of ethnicity and religion in relation to Islam, the structures for understanding Muslim-American identity are embedded in racial formations. While questions of the intersections of race and religion in the perception of Muslim identity go far beyond the purview of the current argument, let it suffice that missionary-scholarship played a role in establishing certain understandings of Islam in America that entrenched white-American racial biases.

Crabites reiterates the notion of Islam as a threat to America,

[543] Crabites, "American Negro Muhammadans," *MW* (1932), 281.

[544] Relatedly, Amina Wadud discusses the problematic assumptions of the term Muslim American in contemporary America, as it conceals ethnic and racial diversity, and prioritizes certain (usually Arab) conceptions of American Muslim identity. See Wadud, "American Muslim Identity" in Omid Safi, *Progressive Muslims* (Oneworld Publications, 2003).

> If these converts return to the United States, the ardent spirit of the neophyte and the sermons, which they will preach make me shudder at the consequences which I see in store for America and particularly for the Southern States, not that I do not have the highest respect for the many Mohammedan friends whom I have made during these last twenty years, but because I am convinced that principles which are so admirably suited to the Levant would work incalculable mischief in my country.[545]

Here the Orientalist conception of the divide between East and West is explicit. Whereas Islam may be a perfectly reasonable religion for Egyptians, it would be destructive in America. What mischief that might cause is not explicitly outlined, but is probably connected to what Crabites mentions as the primary reasons why African Americans are drawn to Islam: Its simple creed, its spirit of equality and egalitarianism, and its condoning of polygamy. All three of which are connected to the racist underpinnings in his argument.

Crabites article also serves as an example of less than thorough scholarship presented in *MW*. Such scholarship sat alongside better attempts. Perhaps, the best example of scholarship on the diversity of Muslim communities in the U.S. can be found in G.H. Bousquet's 1935 "Moslem Religious Influences in the United States." Bousquet divided his study between what he called "traditional Islam" (by which he meant Sunni and Shi'i expressions) and "religious movements, the origin of which can be found in the Moslem religion."[546] He reported that traditional Islam was practiced in the U.S. almost exclusively by immigrants, around 25,000 in number, with the largest centers in Detroit, Pittsburgh, and Cleveland.

The study then turned towards an ethnographic account of the Muslim scene in NYC. Bousquet concluded that there is only one "real mosque" in the city, the Anglo-Mohammedan Association in Brooklyn (mostly attended by Russian Tartar Muslims).

[545] Crabites, "American Negro Muhammadans," *MW* (1932), 284.
[546] G.H. Bousquet, "Moslem Religious Influences in the United States," *MW* 25:1 (1935), 40.

Although he mentions also a small YMMA served as a mosque for Arab Muslims in the city. In discussing variant traditions he briefly noted the Baha'i movement as rooted in Islam, though its members were not often thought of as Muslim. He next turned to the Ahmadiyya movement (a modern Indian branch in Islam developed in India, which sent missionaries to the U.S. after WWI) estimating it at less 10,000 members, the majority of which were African American. This was an accurate assessment of the community's development out of the Ahmadiyya mission in South Chicago. Finally, he discussed the Moorish Scientific Movement (Moorish Science Temple of America, MTSA).[547] Bosquet's is a noteworthy early consideration of the group, which formed in 1913 and formalized under the current name in 1928. Almost nothing else had been written on them in scholarly circles, although the FBI opened a case file on the group in 1931, which included sermons and published materials.[548] This (and other) articles demonstrate the missionary interest in contemporary (and often controversial) Muslim movements that were of little interest to classical Islamicists.

In the examples of Crabites and Bosquet, the limits of *The Moslem World* scholarship are tangible. On the one hand the scholarship in *MW* explored the diversity of Islamic traditions in the United States. It broke with classically-oriented Orientalist work,

[547] MSTA is one of the early American-born expressions of Islam among African American communities – although to be accurate the theology of the group disavowed black identity instead declaring African Americans as Moorish, a term which they linked with a broader conception of a unity among peoples of color.

[548] The FBI was concerned that the MSTA was using religion as a cover for insurgency. The initial file on the group was limited: a copy of *The Divine Instructions from the Holy Prophet*, and other doctrinal writings, along with a set of memorandum requesting and providing summaries of the Philadelphia field office's early investigations of the group. See: https://vault.fbi.gov/Moorish%20Science%20Temple%20of%20America/Moorish%20Science%20Temple%20of%20America%20Part%201%20of%2031/view ; accessed May 2018, pps. 1-45.

The investigation escalated significantly in the early 1940s amidst war concerns. For a more thorough account of the FBI investigation of the group, consult: Sylvester Johnson, "The FBI and the Moorish Science Temple of America" in Johnson, *The FBI and Religion* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2017). Johnson observes the FBI's approach "was marked by a suspiciousness that anticipated its later responses to certain Muslim groups in the twenty-first century" (55). As with the missionary scholarship, perceived threat motivated the FBI's approach.

and instead considered Islam as a diverse, evolving, and living tradition. On the other, in connection to Christian missions it embedded anxieties about the threat or problem of Islam in America, and often did so through the reification of racist stereotypes. While I would not go so far to posit immediate correlation between current similar attitudes toward Muslims within much of American discourse, I will suggest that as part of the framework for the American academic study of Islam, this scholarship contributed to its expansion and justification in U.S. higher education. Even as they sought in the spirit of Macdonald to "understand" Islam, missionaries saw the religion and its practitioners as a "problem." It was for both of these reasons that they engaged in and promoted the study of Islam. In doing so missionaries became the primary motivators for its institutionalization in the United States, and thus in a sense the "problem" of Islam remains as part of the reason for its interest to many scholars and students.

The End of the Research Missionary

By the 1940s missions and missionary work among mainline denominations began to decline. Over the next several decades the mainline boards faced growing disinterest and even hostility towards their efforts from within the United States. As a corollary to this, missionary scholars began to disappear. Perhaps it was not so much that they disappeared, but that they gave up the missionary byline. Take Wilfred Cantwell Smith, who is hardly remembered as a missionary at all, although he spent many years in India serving precisely as such. Instead he is remembered for his significant contributions at McGill and Harvard in promoting the study of Islam and religion more generally. Similarly, many of those who had once been connected to missions and missionary-institutions also began to reevaluate that

project towards one of interfaith dialogue. For instance, under the editorship of Kenneth Cragg, *MW* increasingly promoted mutual understanding and exchange between Muslims and Christians, building upon the work Calverley inaugurated. Perhaps, the most telling indication of the journal's shift from missionary to scholarly focus was the publication of A.L. Tibawi's "Critique of the English-Speaking Orientalists" in July and October of 1963.[549] We discussed Tibawi's critique in the introduction, but mention it again as an example of the journal expansion to include even critiques of the missionary scholarly project, which had led to the foundation of *MW*.

Later scholarship for better and worse is indebted to the work composed by missionaries and their supporters. Missionary training programs in the U.S. set models for academic Islamic Studies programs, and in turned trained numerous scholars – men and women – who wrote and taught on the subject of Islam. Relatedly, missionary stations around the world formed networks, which supported scholars from disparate locations to also participate in that study. Understanding the missionary roots of Islamic Studies is essential in unpacking its development as a field of study in the United States. Missionary scholars promoted a conceptual emphasis on contemporary beliefs and practices of Muslims all over the world, and were essential in establishing institutional foundations for said study. It is not so much that missionary scholarship fell out of vogue after World War II, but that those who had once participated in it invited its critique and in turn adapted, abandoning in theory, much of the evangelical purpose that once motivated it.

[549] Tibawi, "Critique of the English-Speaking Orientalists, Part 1 & 2" *The Muslim World* 53: 3/4 (1963).

Bibliography

Special Collections and Archives

American University at Cairo, Cairo, Egypt

American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

Hartford Seminary, Hartford, CT

Harvard-Yenching Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Near East School of Theology, Beirut, Lebanon

New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, NJ

Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA

Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, NJ

University of Chicago, Chicago, IL

Journals

The Muslim World [The Moslem World]

Journal of the American Oriental Society

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

Revue du Monde Musulman

Der Islam

Neglected Arabia: Arabian Field Mission Quarterly

Books and Articles

'Abduh, Muhammad. *The Theology of Unity*. Translated by Ishaq Musa'ad and Kenneth Cragg. London: George Allen & Unwin LTD., 1966. 1897.

Abu-Rabi, Ibrahim M. "The Concept of the 'Other' in Modern Arab Thought: From Muhammad Cabdu to Abdallah Laroui." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 8, no. 1 (1997): 85-97.

Adams, Charles C. *Islam and Modernism in Egypt*. New York: Russell and Russell, 1933. 1968.

al-Banna, Hassan. *Al-Da'wa Wa'l-Daa'iyya*. Cairo: al-Zahra' Lililaam al-Arabi Press, 1990.

Alexander, John Romich. *The Truth About Egypt*. New York: Cassell and Company LTD., 1911.

Amanat, Abbas, and Magnus Bernhardsson, eds. *U.S. - Middle East Historical Encounters*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2007.

American Oriental Society. "Proceedings of the American Oriental Society at the Meeting in Boston, Mass. 1917." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 37 (1917): 1-22.

Anderson, Betty S. *The American University of Beirut*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.

Arnold, Charles Harvey. *Near the Edge of Battle; a Short History of the Divinity School and the Chicago School of Theology, 1866-1966* [in English]. Chicago: Divinity School Association, University of Chicago, 1966.

Asad, Talal. *Genealogies of Religion*. The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 1993.

Atiya, Asis S. *A History of Eastern Christianity*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.

Badr, Habib, ed. *Christianity: A History in the Middle East*. Beirut: Middle East Council of Churches, 2005.

Beaver, R. Pierce. "North American Thought on the Fundamental Principles of Missions During the Twentieth Century." *Church History* 21, no. 4 (1952): 345-64.

Bell, Gertrude Lowthian. *Amurath to Amurath*. Picataway: Gorgias Press, 2002. 1924.

———. *Teachings of Hafiz*. London: Octogon Press, 1979.

Bendroth, Margaret Lamberts. *A School of the Church : Andover Newton across Two Centuries* [in English]. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2008.

Bergman, Hermas J. "The Diplomatic Missionary: John Van Ess in Iraq." *The Muslim World* 72, no. 3 (1982).

Beyer, Peter. "De-Centring Religious Singularity." *Numen* 50, no. 4 (2003): 357-86.

Bijlefeld, Willem A. "The Muslim World: Hundred Years of Continuity and Change." *The Muslim World* 100, no. 4 (2010): 539-44.

Binder, Leonard, ed. *The Study of the Middle East*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.

Bliss, Daniel. *The Reminiscences of Daniel Bliss*. London: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1920.

Blyden, Edward Wilmont, and Christopher Fyfe. *Christianity, Islam and the Negro Race*. Edinburgh: Univ. Press, 1967. 1887.

Blyden, Edward Wilmot, and Culture Schomburg Center for Research in Black. *A Selection of Works by and About Edward W. Blyden 1857-1908*. Millwood, N.Y.: Kraus Microform], 1977.

Braun, Willi , and Russell McCutcheon, eds. *Guide to the Study of Religion*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
Breasted, Charles. *Pioneer to the Past: The Story of James Henry Breasted*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
Burke III, Edmund, ed. *Genealogies of Orientalism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008.
Byer, Peter. "De-Centring Religious Singularity: The Globalization of Christianity as a Case in Point." *Numen* 50, no. 4 (2003): 357-86.
Cabezon, Jose, and Sheila Davaney, eds. *Identity and the Politics of Scholarship in the Study of Religion*. New York: Routledge, 2004.
Calverley, Edwin E. *The Mysteries of Worship in Islam*. New Delhi: Kitab Bhavan, 1992. 1992.
———. "Samuel Marinus Zwemer." *The Muslim World* 42, no. 3 (1952): 157-59.
Cherry, Conrad. *Hurrying Towards Zion*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.
Clooney, Francis X. *Comparative Theology*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, 2010.
Cook, Michael. "On Islam & Comparative Intellectual History." *Daedalus* 135, no. 4 (2006): 108-11.
Cracknell, Kenneth. *Justice, Courtesy, and Love*. London: Epworth Press, 1995.
Curtis, Edward E. *Islam in Black America : Identity, Liberation, and Difference in African-American Islamic Thought*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.
Dallh, Minlib. "The Muslim World: A Historical Biography." *The Muslim World* 100, no. 4 (2010): 424-30.
Dirks, Nicholas B. *Castes of Mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
———. "South Asian Studies: Futures Past." In *The Politics of Knowledge*, edited by David Szanton. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
Doumato, Eleanor. *Getting God's Ear: Women, Islam, and Healing in Saudi Arabia and the Gulf*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
Ebenezer, Matthew. *American Prebyterians and Islam in India* (1885-1923) [Dissertation at Westminster Theological Seminary].
Ernst, Carl W. "The Study of Religion and the Study of Islam." In *Integrating Islamic Studies in Liberal Arts Curricula*. University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 1998.
Eschbach, Elizabeth. *The Higher Education of Women in England and America, 1865 - 1920*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1993.
Fleischmann, Ellen. "The Impact of American Protestant Missions in Lebanon on the Construction of Female Identity, C. 1860-1950." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 13, no. 4 (2002): 411-26.
———. "'Our Moslem Sisters': Women of Greater Syria in the Eyes of American Protestant Missionary Women." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 9, no. 3 (1998): 307-23.
Forward, Martin. "Syed Ameer Ali: A Bridge-Builder?" *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations* 6, no. 1 (2007): 45-62.
Foster, "Edward E. Salisbury: America's First Arabist." *al-'Usur al-Wusta* 9, no. 1 (1997): 15-17.
Foster, Shirley. "Colonialism and Gender in the East: Representations of the Harem in the Writings of Women Travellers." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 34 (2004): 6-17.
Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, edited by Donald Brouchard. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Gibb, H.A.R. *Modern Trends in Islam*. New York: Octagon Books, 1972.
———. *Mohammedanism: An Historical Survey*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.
Goldziher, Ignaz. *Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law*. Translated by Andras and Ruth Hamori. 1981.
Haddad, H.S. "Middle East History and the West." North Dartmouth: Association of Arab-American University Graduates, Inc., 1973.
Haddad, Yvonne. *Contemporary Islam and the Challenge of History*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982.
Haddad, Yvonne Yazbeck, and I. Qurqmaz. "Muslims in the West: A Select Bibliography." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 11, no. 1 (2000): 5-49.
Harlow, Barbara, and Mia Carter, eds. *Imperialism and Orientalism*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
Hart, D.G. *The University Gets Religion*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
Hirschkind, Charles. "Tradition, Myth, and Historical Fact in Contemporary Islam." *ISIM Newsletter*, 2001.
Hitti, Philip K. *Islam: A Way of Life*. Chicago: Regnery Gateway, 1970.
———. *The Syrians in America*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 1924 [2005].
Hodgson, Marshall G.S. *Rethinking World History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
———. *The Venture of Islam*. Vol. 3, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
Hourani, Albert. *Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
Hughes, Aaron W. *Situating Islam : The Past and Future of an Academic Discipline*. London; Oakville, CT: Equinox Pub., 2007.
Hughes, Thomas Patrick. *A Dictionary of Islam*. New York: Scribner, Welford & Company, 1885.
Humboldt, Wilhelm Von. "On the Historian's Task." In *Leopold Van Ranke: Theory and Practice (1821)*, edited by Georg and Molfke Iggers, Konrad Von. 5-23. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merril Company, 1973.
Humphreys, R. Stephen. "Tradition and Inovation in the Study of Islamic History." In *Islamic Area Studies Working Paper Series*. Tokyo: Islamic Area Studies Project, 1998.
Hussain, Asaf, Robert Olson, and Jamil Qureshi, eds. *Orientalism, Islam, and Islamists*. Brattleboro: Amana Books, 1984.
Hutchison, William. *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
Jackson, Sherman. *Islam and the Blackamerican*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
Johnson, C. D. L. ""He Has Made the Dry Bones Live": Orientalism's Attempted Resuscitation of Eastern Christianity." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 82, no. 3 (2014): 811-40.
Johnson, Sylvester and Steven Weitzman, eds. *The FBI and Religion*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.
Jordan, Louis Henry. *Comparative Religion: Its Genesis and Growth*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1905.

Jung, Dietrich. *Orientalists, Islamists and the Global Public Sphere : A Genealogy of the Modern Essentialist Image of Islam*. Sheffield, UK; Oakville, CT: Equinox Pub., 2011.
Kaplan, Robert. *The Arabists*. New York: The Free Press, 1993.
Kidd, Thomas. *American Christians and Islam*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
King, Richard. *Orientalism and Religion : Postcolonial Theory, India and 'the Mystic East'* [in English]. London; New York: Routledge, 1999.
Koelle, S.W. *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*. London: Rivingtons, 1888.
Kurzman, Charles, and Carl W. Ernst. "Islamic Studies in U.S. Universities." In *The Production of Knowledge on World Religions: The Middle East*. The University of North Carolina, Chaple Hill, 2009.
Lamb, Christopher. "The Editorials of the Muslim World, 1911-1968." *The Muslim World* 71, no. 1 (1981): 3-26.
Lange, Helene. *Higher Education of Women in Europe*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1890.
Lelvis, Patricia Marie. "The Henry Martyn Institute of Islamic Studies of India : Its History and Function." 1970.
Livingston, Thomas W. *Education and Race: A Biography of Edward Wilmont Blyden*. San Francisco: The Glendessary Press, 1975.
Lockman, Zachary. *Contending Visions of the Middle East*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
———. *Field Notes*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2016.
Long, Charles. *Significations*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
Lowe, Margaret. *Looking Good*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003.
Lowinger, Samuel, and Joseph Somogyi, eds. *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. Budapest, 1948.
Lowinger, Samuel, Joseph Somogyi, and Alexander Scheiber, eds. *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*. Jerusalem: Rubin Mass. Publisher, 1958.
Macdonald, Duncan Black. *Aspects of Islam*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1911.
———. *A Bibliographical and Literary Study of the First Appearance of the Arabian Nights in Europe*. Chicago: 1932.
———. *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*. Lahore: Premier Book House, 1960.
———. *The Life of Al-Ghazzali : With Especial Reference to His Religious Experiences and Opinions*. Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias Press, 2010.
———. *The Macdonald Presentation Volume : A Tribute to Duncan Black Macdonald, Consisting of Articles by Former Students, Presented to Him on His 70. Birthday, April 9, 1933*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Pr. u.a., 1933.
———. *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam*. Beyrouth: Khayats, 1965.
Macdonald, Duncan Black, and al-Safi Abu al-Fadail Majid Ibn al-`Assal. *Ibn Al-'Assal's Arabic Version of the Gospels* [In English with some Arabic text.]. Zaragoza: M. Escar, 1904.
MacHaffie, Barbara J. *Her Story : Women in Christian Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
Mahdi, Muhsin. "Nabia Abbott." oi.uchicago.edu.

Makdisi, Ussama. *The Artillery of Heaven: American Missionaries and the Failed Conversion of the Middle East*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.
———. *The Culture of Sectarianism: Community, History and Violence in Nineteenth Century Ottoman Lebanon*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
———. *Faith Misplaced*. New York: Public Affairs, 2010.
Marr, Timothy. *The Cultural Roots of American Islamicism*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
———. ""Out of This World": Islamic Irruptions in the Literary Americas." *American Literary History* 18, no. 3 (2006): 521-49.
———. "Strangers in the Spider's House: Transcultural Intelligence in American-(Middle)-Eastern Encounters." *American Literary History* 23, no. 1 (2011): 189-204.
Martin, Richard, ed. *Approaches to Islam in Religious Studies*. Oxford: One World, 2001.
Martin, Richard C. *Islamic Studies : A History of Religions Approach* [in English]. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1996.
———. "Islamic Studies in the American Academy: A Personal Reflection." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 78, no. 4 (2010): 896-920.
Mason, A. and Barny, F. *History of the Arabian Mission*. New York: The Board of Foreign Missions Reformed Church In America, 1926.
Masuzawa, Tomoko. *The Invention of World Religions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
Mazon, Patricia. *Gender and the Modern Research University*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.
McCutcheon, Russell. *The Discipline of Religion*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
McDonough, Sheila. "A Muslim Response to Harnack." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 3, no. 2 (1992): 292-303.
McLoughlin, Seán. "Islam(s) in Context: Orientalism and the Anthropology of Muslim Societies and Cultures." *Journal of Beliefs & Values* 28, no. 3 (2007): 273-96.
Miller, Glenn T. *Piety and Profession : American Protestant Theological Education, 1870-1970* [in English]. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Pub., 2007.
Mitchell, Timothy. "The Middle East in the Past and Future of Social Science." In *The Politics of Knowledge*, edited by David Szanton. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
Moore, Kathleen. *Al-Mughtaribun*. Albany: State University of New York, 1995.
Nanji, Azim, ed. *Mapping Islamic Studies*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997.
Neill, Stephen. *A History of Christian Missions*. New York: Pelican Books, 1990 [1964].
Norris, Harry T. "Aspects of the Sufism of the Rifa'iyya in Bulgaria and Macedonia in the Light of the Study Published by Canon W. H. T. Gairdner in the Moslem World." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 7, no. 3 (1996): 297-309.
Pacini, Andrea. *Christian Communities in the Arab Middle East: The Challenge of the Future*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
Patrick, Mary Mills. "Report for 1911- 1912." Constantinople: The American College for Girls at Constantinople, 1912.
Porterfield, Amanda. *Mary Lyon and the Mount Holyoke Missionaries*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
Presbyterian Church in the, U. S. A. *A Report on a Survey of the Theological Seminaries and the Assembly's Training School of the Presbyterian Church in the United States*.

Louisville, Ky.: Dept. of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, 1928.
Pruitt, Lisa Joy. *A Looking-Glass for Ladies : American Protestant Women and the Orient in the Nineteenth Century* [in English]. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2005.
Rahman, Fazlur. *Islam & Modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
Ranke, Leopold Von. "On the Character of Historical Science." In *The Theory and Practice of History*. 1973.
Reeves-Ellington, Barbara. *Domestic Frontiers*. Amherst, 2013.
Rich, Paul, ed. *Iraq and Gertrude Bell's the Arab of Mesopotamia*. New York: Lexington Books, 2008.
Richter, Julius. *A History of Protestant Missions in the Near East*. New York: American Mission Society Press, 1910. 1970.
Robert, Dana Lee. *American Women in Mission : A Social History of Their Thought and Practice*. Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1996.
Robinson, Neal. "Massignon, Vatican Ii and Islam as an Abrahamic Religion." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 2, no. 2 (1991): 182-205.
Sabra, George. *Truth and Service*. Beirut: Antoine, 2009.
———. "A.U.B. and Religion" *General Lecture Series of the Anis Makdissi Program in Literature*. American University of Beirut, 2005.
Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1978.
Sbaiti, Nadya. "Lessons in History: Education and the Formation of National Society in Beirut, Lebanon, 1920-1960s." Georgetown Univeristy, 2008.
Scovel, Raleigh Don. "Orthodoxy in Princeton : A Social and Intellectual History of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1812-1860." 1973.
Scudder III, Lewis R. *The Arabian Mission's Story*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing, 1998.
Sedgwick, Mark. *Muhammad Abduh*. Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2010.
Selden, William K. *Princeton Theological Seminary : A Narrative History, 1812-1992*. [Princeton, N.J.]: Princeton University Press, 1992.
Sha'ban, Fuad. *Islam and Arabs in Early American Thought*. Durham: The Acorn Press, 1991.
Sharkey, Heather. *American Evangelicals in Egypt: Missionary Encounters in an Age of Empires*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
———. "Christians among Muslims: The Church Missionary Society in Northern Sudan." *Journal of African History* 43 (2002): 51-75.
———, ed. *Cultural Conversions*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2013.
Sharpe, Eric. *Comparative Religion*. La Salle: Open Court, 1986.
Smith, Jane I. "Christian Missionary Views of Islam in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 9, no. 3 (1998): 357-73.
Smith, Rogers M. *Civic Ideals : Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. *The End of Religion.*
———. *Islam in Modern History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.
———. *Modern Islam in India.*
Speer, Robert E. "The Christian World Mission." *The Moslem World* 33, no. 4 (1943): 235-36.

Stauffer, Milton, ed. *Voices from the Near East*. New York: Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada, 1927.
Street, Elwood. *A Living Vision : A Brief Story of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1833-1958* [in English]. Hartford: Hartford Seminary Foundation], 1958.
Tarabulusi, Nawfal Ni'mat Allah. *Kitab Sawsanat Sulayman Fi Usul Al-'Aqa'id Wa-Al-Adyan (History of Religions)*. Beirut: American Mission Press, 1876.
———. *Sanajat Al-Tarab Fi Taqadamat Al-Arab (History of the Arabs)*. 3rd Edition ed. Beirut: Dar al-Ra'id al-Arabi, 1972.
Tejirian, and Simon. *Conflict, Conquest, and Conversion*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.
Thomson, Eveline A. "Constantinople College and the Future of the near East." *The Moslem World* 9, no. 2 (1919): 156-58.
Tibawi, A.L. *American Interests in Syria*. Oxford: Claredon Press, 1966.
———. *British Interests in Palestine*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
———. *English Speaking Orientalists*. Geneva: Islamic Center, 1965.
———. *Second Critique of English-Speaking Orientalists*. London: Islamic Cultural Center, 1979.
Turner, Bryan S. *Orientalism, Postmodernism, and Globalism* [in English]. London; New York: Routledge, 1994.
Van Sommer, Annie, and Samuel Zwemer, eds. *Daylight in the Harem*. Edinburgh: Oliphan, Anderson & Ferrier, 1911.
———, eds. *Our Moslem Sisters*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1907.
Waardenburg, Jean-Jaques. *L'Islam dans Le Miroir de L'Occident*. Paris: Mouton & Co., 1962.
Watt, Montgomery. *Islamic Fundamentalism and Modernity*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.
Wilson, J. Christy. *Apostle to Islam: A Biography of Samuel M. Zwemer*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1952.
———. "The Apostle to Islam: The Legacy of Samuel Zwemer." *International Journal of Frontier Missions* 13, no. 4 (1986): 163-68.
Woodsmall, Ruth. *Moslem Women Enter a New World*. New York: Round Table Press, 1936.
Young, R. F. "Obliged by Grace: Edward Jurji's Legacy in the History of Religions at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1939-77." *Theology Today* 69, no. 3 (2012): 333-43.
Younis, Adele L. *The Coming of the Arabic-Speaking People to the United States*. New York: Center for Migration Studies, 1995.
Zwemer, Samuel. *Arabia: The Cradle of Islam*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1900.
———. *Christianity the Final Religion*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns-Sevensma Co., 1920.
———. *The Disintegration of Islam*. Fleming H. Revell Company, 1916.
———. *How Rich the Harvest*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1948.
———. *Islam: A Challenge to Faith*. London: Darf Publishers Limited, 1984.
———. *The Law of Apostasy in Islam*. London: Marshall Brothers, 1924.

———, ed. *The Mohammedan World of to-Day. Papers Read at Missionary Conference on Behalf of the Mohammedan World in Cairo, April 4th-9th, 1906*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1906.
———. *The Moslem Christ*. London: Morrision and Gibb LTD, 1911.
———. *The Moslem Doctrine of God*. New York: American Tract Society, 1905.
———. *A Moslem Seeker after God*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1920.
———. *The Origin of Religion*. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1945.
———. *Raymund Lull*. New York: Funk and Wagnalis Company, 1902.
———, ed. *Th Vital Forces of Christianity and Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1915.
———. "A Working Library on Islam." *The Moslem World* 2, no. 1 (1912): 32 - 36.
Zwemer, Samuel and Amy. *Moslem Women*. West Medford: The Central Committee on the United Study of Foreign Missions, 1926.
Zwemer, S. & Cantine, J. *The Golden Milestone*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1938.