Conversion and conflict in Palestine : the missions of the Church Missionary Society and the protestant bishop Samuel Gobat

Leest, C. van der

1

Christians and the Protestant missionary interest in nineteenth-century Ottoman Palestine

Introduction

In the nineteenth century, after Napoleon's campaign in Egypt and Palestine in the years 1798 and 1799, the European Powers became increasingly interested in Palestine. At the time, the Ottoman Empire was on the wane and became the so-called 'sick man of the Bosphorus'. Through various wars, coalitions, and treaties European influence in the Empire increased. By providing protection to different Christian denominations European countries tried to assert their influence. By means of treaties Russia protected the Orthodox in the Empire in the same way as France supported the Roman Catholics. England and Prussia tried to create a similar protectorate function regarding the Protestants.

In addition to the increasing political interest in the country, the religious interest in Palestine as the Holy Land was also renewed in the early decades of the nineteenth century. This was closely connected with the Evangelical revival or 'Awakening' among Protestants in Europe. The religious interest was encouraged by the millenarian idea of the restoration of the Jews in the land of their forefathers. As a result many missionary societies were established. Their efforts in Palestine were made easier by the reform regime of the Egyptians in the 1830s which opened up the country to Europe. It was especially the LJS which took advantage of this liberal climate and established a mission station in Jerusalem.

This chapter provides the historical background for the subject matter of this book, and discusses the position of Christians in nineteenth-century Palestine, the Ottoman reforms, the renewed Protestant interest in the Holy Land, and the first endeavours of Protestant missionaries to set up a mission station there.

Christians in the Ottoman Empire and the European Protectorate

In nineteenth-century Palestine the Christians formed the second largest group within the population, after the Muslims who were by far the most numerous, and before the Jews. Actual population figures for the Ottoman Empire are uncertain and a topic of discussion among scholars, not only because of inconsistency in the figures given in the primary sources, but also because of the contemporary political context.[32] One of the most recent estimates for the population figures for nineteenth-century Palestine derives from Justin McCarthy. For the years 1850-1851, McCarthy estimates the number of Christians in Palestine at 27,000 on a population of about 340,000 people. This means that the Christians constituted 8% of the population. The Muslim inhabitants were estimated at 300,000 (88% of the population) and the Jews at 13,000 (4% of the population). Towards the end of the century the number of Christians had increased by 2%.[33]

At the beginning of the nineteenth century about one third of the population in Jerusalem was Christian, distributed over different denominations. The three largest

[32] Michael Marten, for instance, shows the discrepancy between sources regarding the Jewish population in Palestine between 1850 and 1914 by giving the estimates of four scholars based on a variety of sources. Marten, *Attempting to Bring the Gospel Home*, 21. Razmik Panossian discusses the differences in estimated population figures for the Armenians, especially in the Ottoman Empire, between historians close to the Turkish view, who downsize the number, and those sympathizing with the Armenians, who try to keep the number as high as possible. R.S. Panossian, *The Armenians. From Kings and Priests to Merchants and Commissars*, New York, 2006, 158-159. For a discussion of demographic history, an evaluation of the different sources, and the problems in studying the Ottoman population in the nineteenth century, see H. Gerber, "The Population of Syria and Palestine in the Nineteenth Century", *Asian and African Studies. Annual of the Israel Oriental Society* 13/1, Jerusalem, 1979, 58-80 and K.H. Karpat, "The Ottoman Demography in the Nineteenth Century: Sources, Concepts, Methods", K.H. Karpat, *Studies on Ottoman Social and Political History. Selected Articles and Essays*, Brill, 2002, 185-201.

[33] J. McCarthy, *The Population of Palestine. Population History and Statistics of the Late Ottoman Period and the Mandate*, The Institute for Palestinian Series, New York, 1990, 10, 37. McCarthy bases these figures on known Ottoman data, corrected for the under-representation of women and children. Although the estimates for the years before 1877 were less precise than the ones McCarthy presents for the years after 1877, and the Palestinian population was listed as a whole, not broken down into districts, McCarthy states that the ratios between the three religious groups before 1877 are accurate in general. As to the boundaries of Palestine, McCarthy stuck to the provincial boundaries of the three districts or *sanjaks* in which Palestine was divided from the late 1880s until 1948, i.e., Jerusalem, Nablus, and Acre. Before the late 1880s Palestine was part of the larger province (*vilayet*) of Syria. By 1886 Syria was divided into provinces, and Palestine was divided into the districts of Acre and Nablus, both belonging to the *vilayet* of Beirut, and the independent *sanjak* of Jerusalem. These were administrative rather than natural boundaries. McCarthy, *The Population*, 5-8.

denominations were the Greek Orthodox, the Latins and the Armenians.[34] Until the 1830s no records or travel reports mention a Protestant presence in Jerusalem. This comes as no surprise, as the first Protestant mission station only opened its doors in the 1830s; until then Protestant missionaries had only visited Jerusalem. Ben-Arieh estimates the number of Protestants in Jerusalem in 1850 at fifty,[35] but as a result of the growing Protestant missionary activities, the number of Protestants in Jerusalem increased in the course of the century. In 1900 about 1,000 Protestants resided in Jerusalem, and in that year the Protestants were the third denomination in the city after the Greek Orthodox with ca. 5,000 members, and the Latins with ca. 2,850 members.[36]

In the early nineteenth-century Ottoman Empire non-Muslims or *dhimmis* were organized in three separate formally sanctioned religious communities, called *millets*: the Greek Orthodox, Armenian, and Jewish *millets*. These religious communities were hierarchically organized and had a political function. The heads of the *millets*, who were members of the clergy (the patriarch or the chief rabbi), were elected by the *millet*, but their election had to be approved by the Sultan. They represented the *millet* in personal and general affairs with the Ottoman authorities. These leaders were mostly free to arrange the affairs of their communities, as long as they remained loyal to the Sultan. A council of laymen and clergy assisted them in their efforts. The *millets* had autonomy in spiritual affairs and in some administrative affairs regarding their own

[34] On the basis of reports by Western travellers, Ben-Arieh estimates that at the beginning of the nineteenth century there were 1,400 Greek Orthodox, 800 Latins, and 500 Armenians. Alongside these communities various smaller groups inhabited the city: the Copts (50), the Ethiopians (13) and the Syrians (11), which adds up to 2,774 Christians on a population of approximately 9,000 people. According to several of these travel reports the Roman Catholics in Jerusalem were generally Arabs or considered to be Arabs. One of these reports explicitly mentions that only a small number of the Latins were non-Arab foreigners. Y. Ben-Arieh, *Jerusalem in the 19th Century. The Old City* (hereafter *Jerusalem. The Old City*), Jerusalem, 1984, 105, 194-195. Cf. Y. Ben-Arieh, "The Population of the Large Towns in Palestine during the First Eighty Years of the Nineteenth Century, according to Western Sources", M. Ma'oz (ed.), *Studies of Palestine during the Ottoman Period*, Jerusalem, 1975, 50-53.

[35] Ben-Arieh, *Jerusalem. The Old City*, 194. For more information about the first Protestant enterprises in Palestine, see later in this chapter.

[36] Ben-Arieh, *Jerusalem. The Old City*, 194. At the time, the Armenians were the fourth denomination in Jerusalem with about 850 members, and the Greek Catholics the fifth with ca. 200 members. For information on the numbers of inhabitants of other large towns in Palestine during the nineteenth century, such as Jaffa, Acre and Haifa, see Ben-Arieh, "The Population", 49-70.

property, such as churches, schools and cemeteries, and were allowed to act in judicial matters, such as marriage and divorce.[37]

During the nineteenth century other religious communities also achieved recognition as *millets*. The Armenian Catholics, for instance, were granted this status in 1831, while the Greek Catholics were accepted as a *millet* in 1848.[38] Two years later, the Protestants were also recognized as a distinct *millet* by the Sultan.[39] By 1914 there were more than ten separate *millets*.[40]

Non-Muslims did not have the same rights as Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. Until the reforms in the 1830s, which will be discussed later, several restrictions were imposed on the Christians and Jews in the Empire in return for non-interference in their internal affairs.[41] Non-Muslims were subject to the political authority of Islam and were, for example, not allowed to build new places of worship or to perform public

[37] B. Masters, *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Arab World. The Roots of Sectarianism*, Cambridge, 2001, 61; A. O'Mahony, "The Religious, Political and Social Status of the Christian Communities in Palestine c. 1800-1930", A. O'Mahony, G. Gunner and K. Hintlian (eds.), *The Christian Heritage in the Holy Land*, London, 1995, 241-242. Masters adds that the concept of the *millet* as a designator for Ottoman non-Muslims was a relative latecomer to the Ottoman political scene. *Millet* politics emerged in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. In the earlier centuries the term was not the label typically used for non-Muslims. They were indicated by the term *ta'ifa* instead, which means "group" or "party". This term was used for almost any collective economical or social group, such as merchants, residents of particular quarters and so on. Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 61. See also B. Braude, "Foundation Myths of the *Millet* System", B. Braude and B. Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Empire. The Functioning of a Plural Society* 1, New York, 1982, 72; D. Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, New Approaches to European History 17, Cambridge, 2000, 173. For more information about the term *ta'ifa,* and the discussion of the term *millet* as used for non-Muslim communities within the Ottoman Empire in earlier centuries, see Braude, "Foundation Myths", 69-74; A. Cohen, "On the Realities of the *Millet* System: Jerusalem in the Sixteenth Century", Braude and Lewis (eds.), *Christians and Jews* 2, 7-18; Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 61-65.

[38] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 108-111.

[39] A.L. Tibawi, *A Modern History of Syria including Lebanon and Palestine*, London, 1969, 114. The Latins were not recognised as a *millet*, as they were not regarded as a local community. They were, however, granted special rights concerning judgement and internal administration. A. O'Mahony, "Palestinian Christians: Religion, Politics and Society, c. 1800-1948", A. O'Mahony (ed.), *Palestinian Christians. Religion, Politics and Society in the Holy Land*, London, 1999, 21.

[40] Among which, for instance, the Syrian Catholic and the Maronite *millets*. K.S. Abu Jaber, "The Millet System in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire", *The Muslim World. A Quarterly Review of History, Culture, and the Christian Mission in Islamdom* 57/3, 1967, Hartford, CT, 214, n. 18; A. O'Mahony, "Church, State and the Christian Communities and the Holy Places of Palestine", M. Prior and W. Taylor (eds.), *Christians in the Holy Land*, London, 1994, 14-15.

[41] The social containment of Christians and Jews was laid down in a treaty known as the "Pact of 'Umar". Although there is no consensus about the historic origins of this pact, it had become an integral part of the Muslim legal tradition by the ninth century. The pact governed how Muslim rulers treated their non-Muslim subjects until the Ottoman reforms of the nineteenth century. Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 21.

religious ceremonies, such as carrying a crucifix in public, ringing church bells, and public processions. Muslim men were allowed to marry non-Muslim women as long as the children were raised as Muslims. These non-Muslim wives were allowed to worship according to their own religion. However, Muslim women were not allowed to marry non-Muslim men.[42] The testimony of a *dhimmi* was accepted and valid in Muslim courts, as long as it would not result in the imposition of criminal sanctions against a Muslim.[43] In addition, non-Muslims were not allowed to convert Muslims, and all male non-Muslims had to pay a polltax or *jizya*.[44] Until 1829 Christians had to wear distinctive dress and headgear. In that year, these clothing laws, which not only distinguished people by religion but also by occupation and rank, were abolished by Sultan Mahmut II (1808-1839) for all except clergy. The 1829 law obliged all men to wear the same headgear or fez. There were to be no indications in dress of occupation, rank, or religion.[45]

Over the centuries the different Christian denominations were 'protected' by various European countries as a result of several treaties or 'capitulations' between the Ottoman authorities and the European powers. These treaties secured certain rights and privileges concerning the subjects of these European countries who were working or travelling in the Ottoman Empire. France was the first European country to obtain several rights and privileges. In February 1535 an agreement of 'amity and commerce' was made between the Ottoman Sultan Suleyman I (Sultan from 1520-1566) and King Francis I of France (1494-1547). This treaty was to become the model for future capitulations between the Ottoman Empire and European powers. The agreement decreed that all subjects of the French king had the right to practise their own religion, and could not be made into or regarded as Muslims unless they desired it themselves and professed it openly.[46] During the time of Louis XIII (1601-1643), the French ambassador

[42] Abu Jaber, "The Millet System", 219; M. Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform in Syria and Palestine 1840-1861. The Impact of the Tanzimat on Politics and Society*, Oxford, 1968, 10; Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 22-23.
[43] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 23, 31. For more information, see also Masters, 31-37.
[44] Abu Jaber, "The Millet System", 219; Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 17, 23. According to Masters the tax on the religious communities was often assessed collectively. He adds that it was rarely financially debilitating as the rate was based on one's ability to pay. Masters, 17.
[45] Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire*, 141-148. For more information about the dress laws, the change of policy in 1829 and people's reaction to this, see also D. Quataert, "Clothing Laws, State, and Society in the Ottoman Empire, 1720-1829", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 29/1, Cambridge, 1997, 403-425.
[46] Article 6 of the treaty. J.C. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East. A Documentary Record: 1535-1914* 1, Princeton, New Jersey, 1956, 3. For the whole treaty, see Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 1-5.

in Constantinople received instructions to protect not only the western Catholics, but the Ottoman Christians in general.[47] The treaty of 1535 was renewed and expanded over the centuries, for the last time on 28 May 1740.[48] Since then, Roman Catholic France in practice considered itself the protector of all Catholics in the Ottoman Empire. Not only did France sometimes interfere in the affairs of the Latins in the Empire, but close relations were also established and developed with the Maronites, Greek Catholics and other uniate Christians.[49]

The Russians claimed a similar right to intervene in favour of the Orthodox subjects of the Sultan, on the basis of the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca made in 1774. This agreement between the Russian Empress Catherine the Great (1729-1795) and the Ottoman authorities ended a six-year war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire, which lasted from 1768-1774. In this treaty the Porte (the Ottoman authorities) promised to protect "the Christian religion and its churches" and allowed the establishment of a new Greek Orthodox Church in Constantinople. This church should "always be under the protection of the Ministers of that Empire [i.e., Russia], and secure from all coercion and outrage". The Russians, however, claimed the right to intervene on behalf of all Orthodox subjects of the Sultan.[50]

In the course of the nineteenth century, after the Protestants had settled in the Ottoman Empire and their number had increased, Britain and Prussia acted on their behalf. In addition to the 'protection' of the Protestants, the British protectorate was extended to include a substantial part of the Jewish people, particularly non-Ottoman subjects. The other Jews were protected by Russia, Prussia, France and Austria.[51] By virtue of their protectorate function the European Powers intervened in some conflicts between the denominations. Sometimes such interdenominational conflicts turned into a conflict between the consuls or countries protecting the denominations in question.

[47] C. Soetens, *Le Congrès Eucharistique International de Jérusalem (1893) dans le Cadre de la Politique Orientale du Pape Léon XIII*, Louvain, 1977, 208.
[48] Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 1.
[49] Tibawi, *A Modern History*, 102. As we will see in Chapter 5, Roman Catholic Austria, Spain and Sardinia sometimes also fulfilled a protectoral function for the Catholics in the Ottoman Empire.
[50] Articles 7 and 14 of the treaty Küchük Kaynarca. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 56-58; for the whole treaty, see Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 54-61. In this treaty the independence of the Crimea and the Northern coasts of the Black Sea from the Ottoman Empire was also declared. Cf. Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700-1922*, 40.
[51] Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform,* 216.

In some cases the Ottoman authorities seemed almost powerless to stop it.[52] The quarrels between the Greek Orthodox and Latins about the Holy Places were especially likely to get out of hand, in particular in Jerusalem. The conflict about the Holy Places, which had already lasted for centuries, was one of the causes of the Crimean War in the 1850s, as we will see below.

Reform under Egyptian rule and the establishment of European consulates

Some events in the nineteenth century strongly influenced the position of the Christians in Palestine, creating possibilities for Western missionary societies to settle in the country. One of these factors was the Egyptian occupation of Palestine from 1831 until the end of 1840.

In 1831, Syria and Palestine were occupied by the forces of the governor of Egypt, Mohammad Ali (1769-1849), commanded by his son Ibrahim Pasha (1789-1848).[53] Ibrahim Pasha appointed a governor-general over Palestine and Syria, who resided in Damascus, and was represented by civil governors in each town.[54] Under Egyptian rule Palestine was subject to several reforms that changed the social structures of the country. Ibrahim Pasha introduced a liberal policy towards Christians. They obtained equality of rights with their Muslim fellow citizens. Non-Muslims were now permitted to restore old places of worship or build new ones and had the right to be represented in the town councils.[55] Ibrahim Pasha also introduced general conscription, and individual responsibility for both Muslims and non-Muslims for the payment of taxes to the state. Muslims had avoided this obligation for centuries, unlike non-Muslims who had to register in order to pay the *jizya*.[56]

Under Egyptian rule Palestine was opened up to Europe: consulates were established in Jerusalem and missionary activities in the country were permitted. In 1838,

[52] Kamel S. Abu Jaber mentions the example of France's protection of the Maronites in Lebanon in 1860. In this year France landed 6,000 troops to protect the Maronites during the inter-communal troubles, without consulting the Porte. Abu Jaber, "The Millet System", 217.
[53] This took place during the sultanate of Mahmut II (Ottoman Sultan from 1808-1839).
[54] Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform*, 12; Ben-Arieh, *Jerusalem. The Old City*, 107.
[55] Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform*, 17-18; Y. Ben-Arieh, *The Rediscovery of the Holy Land in the Nineteenth Century*, Jerusalem, Detroit, Michigan, 1979, 67; A. Schölch, "Britain in Palestine, 1838-1882: The Roots of the Balfour Policy", *Journal of Palestine Studies* 22/1, 1992, 40; Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 135-136.
[56] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 135.

Britain was the first country to receive permission to set up a consulate in Jerusalem. After the Egyptian defeat many countries followed the British example and established consulates in Jerusalem. Prussia created a consulate in 1842, France and Sardinia in 1843 and America followed in 1844. In 1849 Austria established a consulate; in the same year the Sardinian consulate was closed. The Russians opened a consulate in 1858, but in the 1840s a Russian consular representative had already been present in Jerusalem.[57] The European consuls protected Christians and Jews. They were involved in judicial, economical and political affairs. As the countries' protection was linked to the various denominations, the consuls sometimes also intervened in interdenominational disputes.[58]

The Tanzimat era: a period of Ottoman reforms

During the occupation of Palestine by Egypt the liberal regime had changed the position of the Christians in the country. After the Egyptians had withdrawn in 1840, the position of the Christians in Palestine was also influenced by two reform edicts: the *Hatt-ı Sherif* of Gülhane and the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*. These reform edicts were part of a larger movement towards a transformation of the Ottoman Empire, which also included a reorganization of the army. With these changes, the Porte hoped to secure the survival of the Ottoman Empire in a period when it was under attack from many sides.[59] The first edict was proclaimed by the Ottoman Sultan shortly before the Egyptian defeat, and the second shortly before the peace negotiations following the Crimean war.

The Hatt-ı Sherif of Gülhane of 1839

Shortly before the Egyptians were defeated by the Ottomans, who were supported by Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia (France kept its distance),[60] Ottoman Sultan Abdülmecit I (1823-1861) had started to introduce several reforms. It was the beginning of the Tanzimat era, a period of Turkish reforms. This began with the promulgation of the *Hatt-ı Sherif* or "noble prescript" of Gülhane on 3 November 1839, proclaimed in the presence of European diplomats.[61] The timing of the proclamation seemed to have

[57] Finn, *Stirring Times or Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856* (ed. by his widow) 1, London, 1878, 84; Ben-Arieh, *Jerusalem. The Old City*, 185. Schölch, "Britain", 40-41, 52.
[58] See Chapter 8.
[59] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 134.

been calculated to coincide with the Ottoman need to gain European support against Mohammad Ali.[62] However, as mentioned earlier, many of the generation of the Tanzimat reformers were themselves also eager to introduce further changes and to include minorities in the political life of the Ottoman Empire.[63]

The *Hatt-ı Sherif* dealt with the welfare, i.e., "perfect security for life, honor and fortune", of the Ottoman subjects, with a "regular system of assessing and levying taxes",[64] and with regulations for the military service. Just as the innovations Ibrahim Pasha had introduced during the Egyptian occupation, the reform edict proclaimed general conscription and individual responsibility – for both Muslims and non-Muslims – for paying taxes.[65] Furthermore, the edict proclaimed that the administration of justice should be public and just. In a remarkable passage the *Hatt-ı Sherif* officially declared Muslims and non-Muslims equal before the law, as it stated that "these imperial concessions shall extend to all our subjects, of whatever religion or sect they may be; they shall enjoy them without exception".[66]

The Crimean war (1853-1856)

Local disputes between different Christian denominations could turn into international conflicts as a result of the protectorate function of the countries involved. This happened with the dispute about the Holy Places in Palestine between the Roman Catholics and Greek Orthodox, which contributed to the outbreak of the Crimean war. The conflict soon acquired international dimensions, as the Latins were supported by France and the Greek Orthodox by Russia.[67]

The spark that ignited the quarrel between Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholics was an incident at the end of 1847 in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. The

[60] A "Convention (London) for the Pacification of the Levant: Austria, Great Britain, Prussia and Russia with the Ottoman Empire" was signed in 1840. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 116-119. See also Tibawi, *A Modern History*, 92.
[61] Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 113.
[62] Tibawi, *A Modern History*, 94.
[63] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 137.
[64] Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 114.
[65] Like non-Muslims, Muslims were now to be registered as individual taxpayers. Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 135. The edict also proclaimed the necessity to establish laws to reduce the term of military service to four or five years for the benefit of agriculture and industry. Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 114-115. For a translation of the whole edict, see Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 113-116.
[66] Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 113, 115. See also Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform*, 22; Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 135.
[67] W. Baumgart, *The Crimean War 1853-1856*, London, 1999, 10.

silver star in the Church, a symbol of the Latin rights in the Holy Place, was stolen, with the Roman Catholics accusing the Greek Orthodox of stealing it.[68] Moreover, the Roman Catholics were already displeased because, unlike the Greek Orthodox and Armenians, they did not posses a set of keys to the main doors of the church and so were forced to enter the church by a side door. For the Roman Catholics the theft of the star was a reason to raise the question of the Latin privileges and rights regarding the Holy Places. They asked the French government for help in this affair.[69]

Early in 1849 the French government met the Roman Catholic demands. It ordered the French ambassador in Constantinople to ask the Ottoman authorities to 'restore' the Roman Catholic rights to the Holy Places as defined in the treaty of 1740. The French ambassador in Constantinople was supported by his colleagues from the other Roman Catholic nations: Spain, Sardinia, Belgium, Portugal, and Naples. Among other things, the French ambassador demanded equal possession of the sanctuary of the Nativity in Bethlehem for the Roman Catholics, the replacement of the silver star, permission to carry out repairs to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, and the right to restore the Tomb of the Virgin in Gethsemane.[70]

In reaction to the French claims, Cyrill, the Greek Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem (from 1845-1872), asked permission to repair the cupola of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Russia supported his request. As a consequence the conflict started to become an international matter.[71] The French pressure on the Ottoman authorities resulted in the proclamation of an imperial order or *firman*, issued on 9 February 1852, which granted extensive rights to France and the Roman Catholics.[72] These rights, however, conflicted with those of the Orthodox.

At the beginning of 1853 Tsar Nicholas I (1796-1855) of Russia sent Admiral Alexander Menshikov to Constantinople to discuss the conflict about the Holy Places and the status of the Orthodox Church. One of the Admiral's demands was the with-

[68] D.M. Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War*, London, New York, 1994, 78.
[69] Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War*, 78; C. Ponting, *The Crimean War. The Truth Behind the Myth*, London, 2004, 1.
[70] C.A. Frazee, *Catholics and Sultans. The Church and the Ottoman Empire*, Cambridge, 1983, 306; Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War*, 79; Ponting, *The Crimean War*, 1-2. Both Ponting and Goldfrank mention that Austria did not support the French. Frazee, on the contrary, mentions Austria and leaves out Portugal and Naples.
[71] Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War*, 79; Ponting, *The Crimean War*, 2.
[72] Frazee¸ *Catholics*, 306; Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 12.

drawal of the concessions to the Roman Catholics, with the exception of the possession of the keys of the Church of Nativity in Bethlehem. All former privileges of the Orthodox Church regarding the Holy Places had to be renewed and confirmed. Furthermore, Menshikov demanded the official sanction of the status of the Orthodox Church. He also requested the right for Russia to protect the Sultan's Orthodox subjects. This last demand was a particularly important issue for Russia, as it implied that Russia would have the rights to interfere in the affairs of about one third of the Sultan's population. In return for meeting the Russian demands, Menshikov offered the Ottoman authorities a defensive alliance to protect them in case they felt threatened by France. However, after more than two months of negotiating, the Russian mission failed. Russia did not receive what it had asked for.[73] Tsar Nicholas I had issued an ultimatum to the Ottoman authorities to meet the Russian claims, threatening to occupy Moldavia and Wallachia or the 'Danubian Principalities' if the demands were rejected. Consequently, when the Ottomans turned down the Russian demands Russia invaded the Danubian Principalities. In spite of several attempts of the four great European Powers at the time, Britain, Prussia, Austria and France, to mediate between the Ottoman government and Russia, the Ottomans declared war on Russia on 4 October 1853.[74]

Although Britain, France, Austria, and to a lesser extent Prussia were involved in the conflict between Russia and the Ottomans, it had not become an international affair yet. The dispute about the Holy Places was not the only reason why the countries intervened in the matter. Britain was mainly drawn into the conflict because it feared Russian activity in an area that was very important for the British commercial routes through the Middle East, especially the route to India. Also, the Ottoman Empire had become an important market for British industrial products.[75] As we have seen, France had already been interested in the Ottoman Empire since the sixteenth century, as

[73] Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War*, 131; R. Heacock, "Jerusalem and the Holy Places in European Diplomacy", O'Mahony, Gunner and Hintlian (eds.), *The Christian Heritage*, 206; Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 13-14; Ponting, *The Crimean War*, 8-10.

[74] Goldfrank, *The Origins of the Crimean War*, 225; Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 14; Ponting, *The Crimean War*, 10-13.

[75] Heacock, "Jerusalem", 207; Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 6.

demonstrated also by Napoleon I's campaign in Egypt and Palestine in 1798-1799.[76] When Napoleon III came to power in 1848,[77] he chose to rely on the Roman Catholic Church in his national policy and therefore directed his attention to the Holy Places in Palestine. He also realized that the conflict about the Holy Places might increase the French diplomatic influence in the Ottoman Empire. At the end of March 1854 both France and Britain declared war on Russia.[78]

Although Austria had been suspicious of Russia regarding the Balkan since the eighteenth century and the Prussian King Frederick William IV (1795-1861) had a religious interest in Palestine, both countries were non-belligerent, refraining from military involvement in the Crimean war.[79] Nevertheless, Austria played an especially important part in the discussion with Britain and France about the general aims of the war. Prussia, which had declared itself to be a neutral party, was partly excluded from these negotiations.[80] At the start of 1855 Sardinia also became involved in the Crimean war by joining France and Britain.[81]

More than a year after it had started the war came to an end. On 25 February 1856 peace negotiations started in Paris. The peace treaty was signed about one month later on 30 March 1856. Countries present at the conference were France, Britain, Russia, the Ottoman Empire, and Austria. Sardinia, as a belligerent power, was also admitted to the conference. Prussia was welcome in a later phase as it was one of the five Powers.[82] One week before the peace conference the Ottoman Sultan issued a new reform edict, the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*, which proclaimed full equality of Muslims and non-Muslims in the

[76] Because of this expedition Palestine had become a focal point of international interest. A. Carmel, "A note on The Christian Contribution to Palestine's Development in the 19th Century", D. Kushner (ed.), *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period. Political, Social and Economical Transformation*, Jerusalem, Leiden, 1986, 302-303.

[77] In December 1848, Napoleon III (then Louis-Napoleon) was elected President of the Republic France. In 1852 he became Emperor Napoleon III.

[78] Britain declared war on Russia on 27 March and France one day later on 28 March 1854. Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 7, 14. In the conflict about the Holy Places France also saw a means to increase its influence in European diplomacy by weakening the alliance of the conservative powers Austria, Russia and Prussia. See also Heacock, "Jerusalem", 206; Ponting, *The Crimean War*, 3-5.

[79] Heacock, "Jerusalem", 207; Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 6-7.

[80] For more information about the general aims of Britain, France and Austria, see Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 17-18.

[81] Sardinia entered the war in order to put the unification of Italy on the agenda at a future peace conference. Heacock, "Jerusalem", 207; Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 89.

[82] Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 203-204.

Ottoman Empire. The announcement of this edict was recorded in the ninth article of the treaty of Paris:

> His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, having in his constant solicitude for the welfare of his subjects, issued a Firman, which while ameliorating their condition without distinction of Religion or of Race, records his generous intentions towards the Christian population of his Empire, and whishing to give a farther proof of his sentiments in that respect, has resolved to communicate to the Contracting Parties the said Firman emanating spontaneously from his sovereign will.[83]

In their turn, the European Powers present at the conference recognised the "high value" of the reform edict in the peace treaty. In addition the treaty stated that the edict did not give them "the right to interfere, either collectively or separately" in the Sultan's relations with his subjects.[84]

The Hatt-ı Hümayun of 1856

The *Hatt-ı Hümayun* or "imperial prescript" was published by the Sultan on 18 February 1856, only one week before the peace conference. Like the proclamation of the *Hatt-ı Sherif* of Gülhane, this decree was also promulgated at a time when European pressure was intense and the Ottomans needed European support.[85] The edict confirmed and consolidated the *Hatt-ı Sherif* of Gülhane and stated that "efficacious measures shall be taken in order that they may have their full entire effect". The *Hatt-ı Hümayun* went much further than the *Hatt-ı Sherif* in specifying the equality and position of the non-Muslims, who were mentioned as "Christians, or other non-Mussulman subjects" in the edict.[86]

The edict declared that non-Muslims were allowed to restore places of religious worship, schools, hospitals and cemeteries in towns and villages where there were groups of non-Muslims professing the same religion, or where people with the same religion lived together in quarters. In case non-Muslims wanted to establish new

[83] George Douglas Campbell, Duke of Argyll, *The Eastern Question from the Treaty of Paris 1856 to the Treaty of Berlin 1878, and to the Second Afghan War* 1, London, 1879, 17.

[84] On the subject of the Holy Places the treaty of Paris remained silent. Campbell, *The Eastern Question*, 17; N. Moschopoulos, *La Terre Sainte. Essai sur l'histoire politique et diplomatique des Lieux Saints de la chrétienté*, Athene, 1956, 308-309 ; Baumgart, *The Crimean War*, 207-208; Ponting, *The Crimean War*, 327-328.

[85] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 137.

[86] Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 150; Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 138. For the translation of the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*, see Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 150-153.

buildings, these plans had to be submitted to the Porte after the communities' heads had approved them. The decree further stated that every sect possessed the freedom to exercise its religion. Moreover, no one should be compelled to change religion. It proclaimed that no distinction would be made on the basis of religion, language or race. All commercial and criminal lawsuits between Muslims and non-Muslims were to be referred to mixed tribunals consisting of members of various religions. These tribunals would be public and the testimony of the parties' witnesses had to be received without distinction. Every community was also permitted to establish public schools, and civil and military schools were required to accept all subjects of the Ottoman Empire.[87]

As to military service, both Muslims and non-Muslims, including Christians, were "subject to the obligations of the law of recruitment". It was permitted to obtain substitutes or purchase exemption from military service. The edict added that a law would soon be published concerning the admission of non-Muslims into the army.[88] A year after the promulgation of the *Hatt-ı Hümayun* a tax was introduced that institutionalized the obtaining of exemption for military service: the *bedel-i askeriye*, "substitute for military service". This army exemption tax was imposed on all non-Muslim males.[89] Furthermore, the edict proclaimed that steps would be taken to reform the constitution of the provincial and communal councils, in order to "insure fairness" in the choice of Muslim and Christian deputies and those of other religious communities. It further decreed that it would be lawful for foreigners to purchase landed property in the Empire, as long as they conformed to Ottoman law.[90]

Both the Tanzimat reforms and the European pursuit of influence in the Ottoman Empire contributed to the transformation of the Christians' situation in the Empire. Christians and other non-Muslims had acquired legal equality with their Muslim neighbours. In this process, however, religious identity became more openly political; it affected many issues, such as conflicts between individuals of different religions or denominations. Although Ottoman policy was designed to diminish the influence of *millet* politics, the developments during the nineteenth century encouraged Christian communities to stress and cultivate their religious identity as a way to acquire political

[87] Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 151.
[88] Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 152.
[89] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 138.
[90] Hurewitz, *Diplomacy* 1, 152.

power.[91] The readiness of the European countries to interfere in the affairs and conflicts of the various Christian communities contributed to the Christians' confidence in "pressing their demands to the Porte".[92] The competition between the European powers for influence in the Ottoman Empire furthered the politicization of religious identity, as did the arrival of missionary societies from Europe.[93] The local Christian communities were well aware of their crucial position and regularly "played the European countries off against each other".[94]

Understandably, this combination of Tanzimat reforms allowing the Christians to build churches, hold processions and sit on provincial and communal councils and the capitulatory system, which allowed the Christians to use their European connections, caused feelings of alienation and discontent among the Muslim inhabitants of the Empire.[95] In 1856, the *Hatt-ı Hümayun* caused a riot between Muslims and Christians in Nablus, in which according to the British Consul one Christian was killed, and the mission house, together with several private houses of Christians, was demolished. One of the immediate causes of these riots was an action by the Protestant bishop in Jerusalem, Samuel Gobat (1799-1879). After the news of the reform edict had reached Jerusalem, Gobat hurried to Nablus install a bell in the chapel. He started ringing it on his own initiative without the approval of the authorities. When the governor of Nablus asked Gobat whether he had official authority to act as he did, the bishop cited the *Hatt-ı Hümayun*. Another cause of the riot was the consular agents from France, Prussia and England hoisting their national flags in honour of the birth of the Crown Prince of France.[96] There was also opposition to the reform edict from Christian circles. For instance, with regard to the army exemption tax Christians complained that it actually was the same as the former polltax. The Muslims, however, were also unhappy

[91] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 133-134. Masters states that the Europeans helped to deepen the sectarian gap by favouring religious differences in their reports about the events in the Ottoman Empire. Their stress on sectarianism (both real and imagined) had an effect on the issues the home government raised with the Ottoman authorities. Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 132-133. For a detailed discussion of this process in the Lebanese region, see Makdisi, *The Culture of Sectarianism*.

[92] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 133-134. See also Chapter 8.

[93] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 146.

[94] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 152-153. Masters adds that this was especially true for the various Catholic communities in Syria, who played off Austria, Spain and Italy (after its unification) against France. Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 152.

[95] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 132. According to Masters "it was not so much equality with the non-Muslims that the Muslims were protesting, but their perception that the Christians were now in the ascendancy", ibid.

[96] Tibawi, *British Interests*, 115-116; Ma'oz, *Ottoman Reform,* 226.

with this tax, as they thought it unfair that Muslims were required to defend the empire whereas Christians could stay at home.[97]

Evangelical Protestant interest in the Holy Land

In addition to the expansion of European political influence in nineteenth-century Palestine, Protestants in Europe also showed an increased interest in Palestine as the Holy Land. People became interested in the biblical topography, and the scenery of the Holy Places in Palestine was the subject of many paintings. Protestant pilgrims who wanted to see the places where Jesus Christ lived and died also travelled to Palestine. Their experiences and feelings, recorded in travel reports, testify to the special position Palestine occupied in their minds.[98] The concept of Palestine as the Holy Land gave an additional impetus to the missionary activities there. From the late 1810s onwards Protestant missionaries visited the country in order to explore the possibilities for establishing a permanent mission.

The religious interest in the Holy Land and the growth of missionary societies were closely connected with the Evangelical revival or 'Awakening' among Protestants in Europe and in America ('the Second Great Awakening'). The Evangelical revival was an international movement; it manifested itself not only in Britain and other English-speaking countries, but also in Germany as the *Erweckungsbewegung*, and in Switzerland, France and the Netherlands as the *Réveil*. It was an intercontinental affair, and there was close cooperation within the intercontinental Evangelical network, especially in the missionary field. The Basel Mission, for instance, trained missionaries who were then sent overseas by societies such as the Netherlands Missionary Society or the British CMS.[99]

[97] Masters, *Christians and Jews*, 138.

[98] With regard to the attraction of both Protestants and Roman Catholics to the Middle East as Bible Lands and the Holy Land discourse, see the introduction and article by H.L. Murre-van den Berg, "William McClure Thomson's *The Land and the Book* (1859): Pilgrimage and Mission in Palestine", Murre-van den Berg (ed.), *New Faith in Ancient Lands*, 10-13, 43-63 and the article by B. Heyberger and C. Verdeil, "Spirituality and Scholarship: the Holy Land in Jesuit Eyes (Seventeenth to Nineteenth Centuries)" in the same book, 19-41.

[99] *The Encyclopedia of Protestantism*, 205-206. For information about the Evangelical network, see among others K.S. Latourette, *Christianity in a Revolutionary Age* 2: *The Nineteenth Century in Europe. The Protestant and Eastern Churches*, London, 1959; T.C.F. Stunt, *From Awakening to Secession. Radical Evangelicals in Switzerland and Britain 1815-35*, Edinburgh, 2000; N.M. Railton, *No North Sea. The Anglo-German Evangelical Network in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century*, Leiden, 2000.

Although Evangelicalism on the Continent was not entirely similar to that in Britain and America, one important common characteristic of the Evangelical movement in Britain, the 'Second Great Awakening' in America, and the *Erweckungsbewegung* and *Réveil* on the Continent was the activism, the desire to spread the Gospel. A direct result of the Evangelical revival was the foundation of missionary societies.[100] In England and on the Continent, as well as in America, many such organizations were founded towards the end of the eighteenth century and during the nineteenth century, such as the CMS (1799) and the LJS (1809) in Britain, the Basel Mission (1815) in Switzerland, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (1810) in America. As Palestine was considered by several missionary societies to have the highest priority, a relatively large part of their global missionary force was used for the mission in Palestine, or, more broadly speaking, for the mission in all so-called biblical lands. Compared with other mission fields in the world, however, the area seemed less promising. For instance, although the LJS used one third of its global missionary force for its efforts and investments in Palestine throughout the nineteenth century, the activities there were not very successful in comparison with its other mission stations.[101]

The religious interest in Palestine was encouraged by the millenarian hopes of many Evangelicals, especially in Britain. These hopes consisted in the belief in the imminent coming of Christ which would be the start of God's thousand-year reign. The conversion and restoration of the Jews in the Holy Land would hasten Christ's coming. This eschatological belief in the restoration of the Jews was based on a specific interpretation of biblical prophecies, particularly of the books of Daniel and Revelation. In contemporary events millenarians saw signs of the coming of Christ as they were predicted in the Bible. One of these signs was the French Revolution. Because millenarians considered the Pope to be the anti-Christ, and France had been the fiercest supporter of the Roman Catholic Church until the French Revolution, it was believed that with its downfall the end of time was at hand.[102] On the basis of the Book of

[100] See for this and other leading features of Evangelicalism David Bebbington's four characteristics of Evangelicalism. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, 2-17, here 12. We will return to the characteristics of Evangelicalism in Chapters 6-8.

[101] Perry, *British Mission*, 7-11, 208. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions also considered their mission to the so-called Bible Lands very important. Around 1860 the funds for the mission ran to almost 45% of the total budget. Murre-van den Berg, "William McClure Thomson", 44.

[102] From the extensive literature on millennialism I will only mention M. Vereté, "The Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought 1790-1840", *Middle Eastern Studies* 8/1, 1972, 1-6; S. Kochav, "'Beginning at

Revelation many millenarians believed that the fall of the Ottoman Empire was imminent and would prepare the way for the restoration of the Jews to the land of their forefathers. In Britain, many millenarians believed their country to be the agent of this restoration.[103] The restoration of the Jews was the main aim of several missionary societies. One of such societies in Britain was the LJS. This society was established in 1809 and had as its headquarters 'Palestine Place' in London.[104]

Early Protestant endeavours: establishment of a Protestant mission in Jerusalem

Although it took the Egyptian occupation of Palestine to change the political climate so that it became favourable for Protestant missionary activities in the country, already in the late 1810s several missionary societies started to direct their energies towards the Holy Land. About ten years after its foundation in 1809, the LJS decided to explore the possibilities for a Jerusalem mission. Just before this decision the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (hereafter ABCFM) also resolved to send two missionaries to Jerusalem. Before the missionaries of the LJS and the ABCFM could get there, the city had already been visited by missionaries from other Protestant societies. In 1818, the Swiss minister Christian Burckhardt from the British and Foreign Bible Society arrived in Jerusalem and distributed Bibles in different languages.[105] Soon after Burckhardt James Connor, an Oxford graduate, visited Jerusalem on behalf of the CMS.

Jerusalem': The Mission to the Jews and English Evangelical Eschatology", Ben-Arieh and Davis (eds.), *Jerusalem in the Mind of the Western World, 1800-1948*, 92-93; T.A. Idinopulos, *Weathered by Miracles. A History of Palestine from Bonaparte and Muhammed Ali to Ben-Gurion and the Mufti*, Chicago, 1998, 73-75; S. Orchard, "Evangelical Eschatology and the Missionary Awakening", *The Journal of Religious History* 22/2, 1998, 132-151. For the connection between millennialism, Evangelicalism and anti-Catholicism, see Wolffe, *The Protestant Crusade*, 113-116; Klaus, *The Pope*, 124-125.

[103] The belief in the imminent fall of the Ottoman Empire was based on Revelation 16, 12: "the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared". The drying up of the Euphrates symbolized the fall of the Ottoman Empire. This would prepare the way for the restoration of the Jews. Kochav, "Beginning at Jerusalem", 92-93; O. Anderson, "The Reactions of Church and Dissent Towards the Crimean War", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 16/1, 1965, 212-213. Anderson also discusses the difficulty experienced by many Protestants in Britain in believing that Protestant Britain had been called by God to fight alongside the leading Roman Catholic power, France, in the Crimean war, and their problem of reconciling support for "doomed Turkey" with submission to God's plan. Anderson, 211-212.

[104] Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, 82.

[105] Burckhardt spent a whole evening with Spanish Franciscans who wanted to examine the Spanish translation of the Bible to see whether it contained heresy. Hajjar, *L'Europe*, 35-36; Stransky, "La Concurrence ", 203.

Connor ruled out Jerusalem as a permanent mission station, among other reasons because of the interdenominational strife in the city which he considered to be stronger than elsewhere.[106]

In November 1819, the ABCFM sent Levi Parsons (1792-1822) and Pliny Fisk (1792-1825) to the Middle East in order to establish a Palestine mission, based in Jerusalem if possible. The first object of the mission was the restoration of the Jews.[107] From the instructions the Board gave to Fisk and Parsons, however, it becomes clear that the ABCFM did not want to restrict its activities to the Jews. The instructions stated that the missionaries had to try to reach "those who are 'Christians in name' and the Jews". The missionaries were urged to have "two grand inquiries" ever present in their minds: "*What good can be done*, and *by what means*? What can be done for the Jews? What for the Pagans? What for Mohammedans? What for Christians?" Moreover, the instructions ended with the prayer that the mission might be accepted by both Jews and Gentiles. Fisk and Parsons were also instructed to learn several languages. First of all they were to learn Arabic, but also Turkish, Hebrew, Greek, French and Italian.[108]

After they had left Boston, Fisk and Parsons travelled via Malta to Smyrna, where they arrived in January 1820. At the end of the same year, Parsons left Smyrna in order to visit Jerusalem. During his stay there Parsons distributed Bibles and tracts, and met people of various religious groups and denominations. When he left the city after a couple of months he was optimistic about Jerusalem as a place to establish a mission station. However, he died on 10 February 1822 when he was in Alexandria together with Fisk.

Before the end of the year the Board sent a successor for Parsons, the missionary Jonas King (1792-1869). In 1823 he and Fisk visited Palestine, together with the LJS missionary Joseph Wolff (1795-1862). Just as Parsons had done when he visited Jerusalem, they also distributed Bibles and religious literature and engaged in conversations on religion. Unfortunately for the missionaries their activities were not very

[106] A.L. Tibawi, *American Interests in Syria 1800-1901. A Study of Educational, Literary and Religious Work*, Oxford, 1966, 19; Stransky, "La Concurrence", 203-204.
[107] C.J. Phillips, *Protestant America and the Pagan World. The First Half Century of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1810-1860*, Harvard East Asian monographs 32, Cambridge, Harvard, 1969, 135-136; G. Greenberg, *The Holy Land in American Religious Thought, 1620-1948. The Symbiosis of American Religious Approaches to Scripture's Sacred Territory*, Lanham, Maryland, 1994, 113-114.
[108] Tibawi, *American Interests*, 14-16; Phillips, *Protestant America*, 136.

successful.[109] One of the reasons for the lack of success was the opposition to the missionaries' work. In 1823 the Maronite patriarch issued an encyclical letter that condemned the Protestant version of the Bible and all contact with Protestant missionaries.[110] The Arabic version of the Bible distributed by Protestant missionaries was in fact a reprint of the Arabic Bible printed in Rome in 1671, omitting the Apocrypha. It was criticised because of this omission, and for being full of mistakes. In 1824 a condemnation from Rome followed: on 5 May Pope Leo XII (1760-1829) issued a Papal Bull against the printing of a corrupted version of the Bible in the vernacular and its distribution among Roman Catholics by a "certain Bible society".[111] Things went from bad to worse for the missionaries when on 14 June 1824 the Ottoman authorities proclaimed a *firman* prohibiting the import and circulation in the Ottoman Empire of all Bibles and Psalters printed in Europe, as they had caused disturbance among the people. Since the Papal Bull and the *firman* coincided, Protestant missionaries thought this was a conspiracy between Roman Catholics and Ottomans. However, there was no evidence for this, as the *firman* did not mention a specific edition and language of the Bibles.[112]

During the first years of their stay in the Middle East the ABCFM missionaries had established mission stations in Malta and Beirut. When Fisk died in October 1825 the ABCFM was not permanently present in Jerusalem. Instead, the missionaries visited the city from time to time.[113] A year after the American Board had sent its first missionaries to Palestine, the LJS sent the Swiss missionary Melchior Tschoudy (1790-1859) to the area. In May 1820 he left London. About two months later he arrived in Malta and then went on to Palestine. When Tschoudy's mission appeared to be unsuccessful the LJS

[109] Tibawi, *American Interests*, 16-23; Phillips, *Protestant America*, 136-137; Greenberg, *The Holy Land*, 116-118.

[110] H. Badr, "American Protestant Missionary Beginnings in Beirut and Istanbul: Policy, Politics, Practice and Response", Murre-van den Berg (ed.), *New Faith in Ancient Lands*, 214-215.

[111] Tibawi, *American Interests*, 26-28, n. 2; Badr, "American", 214-215. Eight years earlier, in 1816, his predecessor Pope Pius VII had also censured Protestant Bible societies. Stransky, "Origins", 144-145.

[112] The secretary of the CMS, Josiah Pratt, stated that the Eastern anti-Christ cooperated with the Western anti-Christ. Stock, *The History of the CMS* 1, 230-231; Tibawi, *American Interests*, 26-29. Stock adds that no one at the time would have thought the secretary narrow-minded for calling the Pope the Western anti-Christ, as "Bishops and divines beyond all suspicion of Evangelicalism habitually did so then". Stock, *The History of the CMS* 1, 231.

[113] Tibawi, *American Interests*, 22, 29.

terminated the cooperation.[114] The Jewish convert Joseph Wolff was the next LJS missionary going to Palestine to explore the field. Wolff, the son of a rabbi, was baptised as a Roman Catholic when he was seventeen, and became a member of the Church of England when he came to Britain in 1819. He was accepted by the LJS as a missionary and went to Cambridge to study Theology, Arabic and Hebrew. Backed by private funding, he left for the Middle East in 1821. In March of the following year he arrived in Jerusalem where he stayed for a couple of months,[115] and reported to the LJS that the doors of Jerusalem were wide open. This encouraged the organisation to send two other missionaries: in 1823 they dispatched Lewis Way (1773-1840) and William Lewis to Jerusalem in order to establish a permanent mission in the city. Way was never to reach Jerusalem: he had to return to Britain because of ill health. Lewis, however, did go on and entered the city on 13 December 1823. In a report to the LJS, he unfolded his ideas about a permanent establishment in the city. It stimulated the LJS to send another missionary, George Edward Dalton with the aim to set up this permanent mission.[116]

In 1825 Dalton arrived in the Holy City, where he met Lewis. He explored the situation with regard to the founding of a mission station. Because of riots, Dalton had to leave the city for a while, but returned to Jerusalem, where he and his family took up residence on Christmas Day 1825. In January 1826 reinforcement arrived in the form of LJS missionary John Nicolayson (1803-1856). However, at the end of that month Dalton died of fever.[117] Within a month after Dalton's death Nicolayson left the city, so that there were no LJS missionaries left in Jerusalem. Nicolayson first went to Beirut and then travelled around for some years, working in different towns and cities. From time to time he visited Jerusalem. In the meantime, Palestine had come under Egyptian rule, which meant a more liberal attitude towards missionaries. In 1833 the first step towards a permanent LJS mission in Jerusalem was taken. Nicolayson rented a house for the mission, and in October 1833 he and his family settled in the city. The renting of the house marked the start of a new era. From then on a start could be made with the establishment of a Protestant community.[118]

[114] W.T. Gidney, *The History of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews. From 1809 to 1908* (hereafter *The History of the LJS*), London, 1908, 118; Tibawi, *British Interests*, 7; Perry, *British Mission*, 16-17.
[115] Tibawi, *British Interests*, 8; Kochav. "Beginning at Jerusalem", 96; Perry, *British Mission*, 17-19.
[116] Perry, *British Mission*, 19-20.
[117] Tibawi, *British Interests*, 12-13; Perry, *British Mission*, 20-21.
[118] Kochav, "Beginning at Jerusalem", 97; Perry, *British Mission*, 25.

A year after Nicolayson had taken up residence in Jerusalem, the American Board missionaries George Whiting (1801-1855) and Asa Dodge (1802-1835) also settled in the city. Dodge, however, died within three months after his arrival. Whiting cooperated with Nicolayson but neither missionary could do much more than distributing Bibles and tracts and talking to people. Nevertheless, Whiting's wife did set up a girls' school at home early in 1836. Both ABCFM and LJS sent people to strengthen the missionary team in Jerusalem in the following years.[119] In March 1843 the Jerusalem mission of the ABCFM decided to terminate the Jerusalem station and the American missionaries went to Lebanon.[120] This decision might have been stimulated by the establishment of the Protestant Anglo-Prussian bishopric in Jerusalem in 1841, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Concluding remarks

Under the influence of the Evangelical revival among Protestants in nineteenth-century Europe religious interest in Palestine was renewed. Spurred on by millennialism and driven by 'geopiety', Protestant missionary societies started to direct their energies towards establishing missions in the Holy Land. During the liberal Egyptian regime, the British LJS succeeded in founding a permanent mission in Jerusalem. In 1840, after the Egyptian withdrawal, the climate was favourable for the expansion of the Protestant missionary activities. Just before the Ottomans had defeated Egypt the Ottoman Sultan had proclaimed a reform edict, which declared Muslims and non-Muslims equal before the law. This edict was consolidated in a second reform edict, proclaimed soon after the Crimean war, which further specified 'equality'. Also, the British and Prussian influence with the Porte had increased due to their support of the restoration of Ottoman rule in Palestine. What is more, before the Egyptian defeat Britain had established a consulate in Jerusalem, and Prussia followed some years later. The presence of consulates of these Protestant Powers must have strengthened the position of the Protestant mission and its missionaries, as the consuls acted as the 'protectors' of the Protestants. From now on France and Russia were not the only states acting as the 'protecting power' for part of the Christian population in the Ottoman Empire. Given all this the time seemed ripe for

[119] Tibawi, *British Interests*, 73-74.
[120] Finn, *Stirring Times* 1, 137; Tibawi, *British Interests*, 101, 105.

Prussia and Britain for the advancement of a new project: the establishment of a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem.