

Judith Becker and Brian Stanley

Introduction

Europe as the Other: External Perspectives on European Christianity

Over the last three centuries, the processes of exchange between European and non-European Christians have been diverse and complex. Europeans went abroad as traders and settlers, built colonial or imperial systems and integrated an increasing number of countries into their empires. But not all of the Europeans who went to work in foreign countries were driven by the lust for wealth and power. Others went in order to educate or to missionize, or to bestow the advantages of civilisation, as they saw it, – European civilisation – to the ›uncivilised‹ world. In so doing they all conveyed a certain image of Europe, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, to the non-European world. These images of Europe were inextricably intertwined with Christianity, since Europe was seen as a Christian continent. Whether Europeans openly advertised their Christian faith as did the missionaries, or worked in professions which did not have any obvious link to Christianity, they were all regarded as Europeans (or at least as foreigners from the West) and *therefore* as Christians. All Europeans working in Africa or Asia up to the end of the nineteenth century were assumed by indigenous observers to be Christians, and few repudiated the ascription. Even at the end of the nineteenth century they were perceived as Christians or had to make a clear distinction between themselves and European Christians. The pictures these Europeans conveyed of European Christianity, however, could differ widely.

At the same time, the expansion of European empires brought growing numbers of Africans and Asians to Europe, initially often as slaves but subsequently as traders, members of political or diplomatic missions, university students, or candidates for training for Christian ministry or priesthood. These African and Asian visitors to ›Christian Europe‹ often found the reality of the continent to be at odds with the impressions they had previously formed. Some of these visitors recorded their experiences of European religion or irreligion and transmitted their accounts to their compatriots. Others also tried to influence the European public by publishing books or tracts on Europe and on their own situation. The interchange of people between Europe and other continents but also the exchange of publications, ideas, cultural attitudes, and communication and the experience of living within a dif-

ferent culture were manifest in all centuries. Nevertheless, such encounters became more common and visible from the nineteenth century.

These encounters have been commented upon extensively by Europeans, both at the time in (travel) reports and scientific volumes as well as pamphlets, and nowadays in political and academic debates. This conference volume aims to add an external and wider perspective to the contemporary academic and public debate on the nature of European identity and its relationship to the historical phenomenon of European Christendom. It seeks to answer the question: What view, or views, did external observers form and hold of ›European Christianity‹?

As several of the chapters will show, ›external‹ observers were not necessarily non-Europeans, just as ›internal‹ commentators were not necessarily Europeans. The line between ›external‹ and ›internal‹ was not identical to the ascription of ›European‹ and ›non-European‹. The topic was much more complex and histories were entangled. However, those who commented on Europe and European Christendom from a distant viewpoint had usually at least had the experience of living outside of Europe for some time. The volume therefore also includes, in spite of its focus on African and Asian observers, examples of European-born people who distanced themselves from their origins in one way or the other and thus adopted external perspectives.

The very language which scholars habitually use to denominate the encounters between Europeans and Asians or Africans, and to characterise the independent initiatives taken by the latter in response to European political and cultural hegemony, tends to accord Europe a logical and historical priority. The default setting remains ›the West‹, a notion that was originally defined in strictly European terms in opposition to the encircling Islamic forces of the Ottoman empire, but which particularly since the Cold War has been understood in a looser and more ideological sense in which the United States takes the lead as the defender of western civilisation and broadly Christian values. What is ›non-western‹ is defined precisely by the fact that it is not ›the West‹, rather than, for example, Asians choosing to define themselves as ›non-African‹ or ›non-southern‹, or Africans choosing to label themselves as ›non-Asian‹ or ›non-eastern‹ (usage that may perhaps one day come into currency as Chinese economic hegemony in Africa grows apace). Even Latin America, a continent that had to be excluded from the scope of this volume (just as it was excluded from consideration at the seminal World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910)¹ still finds itself regularly co-opted

1 Brian Stanley, *The World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910* (Grand Rapids, Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2009), 49–72, 303–7.

in defiance of geographical logic into honorary membership of the ›non-western world‹ and it continues to bear a label that inescapably relates its identity to its historic colonisers from Latin Europe.

Throughout the chapters which follow issues surface regarding the scarcity and possibly unrepresentative nature of the extant written sources that record observations of Christian Europe by outsiders. As we have already noted, most of these sources originated by definition from educated minority elites, many of whom were as a result of their education cultural hybrids, with all the creativity and ambiguity that this status often implied. The indigenous voices in the conversations between various African or Asian communities and ›Europeanness‹ which this volume records were few and not necessarily typical of their host societies. Caution is therefore appropriate in making any attempt to draw generalised conclusions from the perspectives of those who by literacy or favoured proximity to Europeans found themselves in the unusual position of being able to leave written observations of their experience of European countries or Europeans working as missionaries or in other capacities in their own countries.

Some of the earlier indigenous voices who are cited in this collection had no firm basis for categorising as European those whom we know as Europeans. They were more likely to denominate them simply as ›foreigners‹. Thus for centuries Europeans were known in India and in other parts of the East as *Farangi*, *Parangi*, or *Pfarangi*. This was a term taken originally from the Muslim designation for the Franks with whom they had contested control of Palestine and the Iberian Peninsula in the era of the crusades. By extension it became the label attached by Urdu- or Tamil-speaking people to the Portuguese in India after 1498 and eventually became a synonym for Catholic Christians and indeed for Europeans as a whole.² The conceptual and linguistic legacy of such usage has been enduring, and for Christianity singularly unfortunate: the term endures in Hindi and Urdu as a derogatory term for ›foreigner‹. Since ›Europe‹ as a geographical and cultural concept was for many African or Asian peoples either unknown or only vaguely understood, the descriptive categories available for use were general and often polemical, such as ›foreign demons‹, ›western barbarians‹, ›people from far away‹, or simply ›white people‹. Alternatively, the particular national identity of whichever group of foreigners, such as ›Portuguese‹, happened to arrive first or in greatest numbers was taken to refer to Europeans, and indeed to Christians as a whole.

2 Robert Eric Frykenberg, *Christianity in India: From Beginnings to the Present* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 119–41.

Europeans have long been accustomed to thinking of themselves as occupying the centre of the global stage, with non-Europeans occupying the periphery of vision on the East and the West. Similar patterns of thinking can, of course, be observed among other cultures, notably among the Chinese, whose historic name for China was *Zhōngguó* (the Middle Kingdom). However, Europeans have been more successful than any other cultural entity in persuading (at least for a time) much of the rest of the world that this is not just a matter of perception, but an empirical description of how things really are. Such ways of thinking die hard, as any glance at a modern western atlas confirms. Conventional categories of historiographical periodisation and classification perpetuate the trend. What we term the medieval period takes its meaning from classic boundary markers in European history such as the collapse of the Roman Empire or the Italian Renaissance or the Protestant Reformation. The so-called modern age similarly derives its meaning from transformative European episodes such as the Enlightenment or the Industrial Revolution. Much the same can be said about ›post-modernity‹ or ›postcolonialism‹, both of which are fashionable concepts that in retrospect unconsciously privilege those historical varieties of modernity or empire initiated by European nations over similar processes of modernisation or imperial expansion initiated by non-western peoples. The concept of postcolonialism makes admirable sense to those, such as Indians or Nigerians, who have been liberated within recent memory from European colonial rule but very little sense to those, such as Tibetans, who remain subject to colonial rule from outside Europe, or indeed to those, such as members of the First Nations in North America, for whom European conquest is absolute and seemingly beyond contestation.

In a book on the external view of Europe, two perspectives have to be employed and two main questions asked. One perspective is on the external side and asks: What did Europe mean to the ›Other‹? This leads to approaches that draw on postcolonial methodology. The other perspective looks at Europe and asks: What is (or was) Europe? Here, theories of European studies enter the debate. This volume will focus on African and Asian encounters with Europeans. Oceania was represented at the conference, but the paper presented was regrettably not available for inclusion in this volume. In order to include South America, the focus of research would have had to begin much earlier than it is now, with the inception of Catholic missions to America in the sixteenth century. North America offers its own set of complicated issues. In the late eighteenth century, it was already largely dominated by (former) Europeans and when it entered the world stage as an active power, it was white and not indigenous people who exercised that power. Indeed, the question here would be what differences are discernible between European and North American missions or colonialism and also between the African/

Asian perceptions of these two forms of a Western presence. This question is tackled in several chapters in this volume. In many instances, North American and European missionaries or colonialists seemed very much alike and they were often viewed from the outside simply as ›Westerners‹ without any distinction between their continents of origin (see Klein, Kim).

Research has been conducted on how far Europe can be distinguished from other Western countries, and in particular from North America, and is indeed quite prominent in European studies. Scholars discuss the external, North American view of Europe and the extent to which Europeans became aware of the differences and became critical of the home continent once they migrated to America.³ They find commonalities as well as marked differences, and this kind of research expands our knowledge of what ›Europe‹ might mean. However, as seen from other, non-Western continents, Europe and North America often look very much alike and many people in Africa or Asia did not differentiate when they encountered white Western people. Therefore, much, though not all, of what is said in this volume could be applied to North America as well. Some of the papers deal specifically with European (as opposed to Western) countries and encounters. This is true of the three papers which focus on non-Europeans in Europe (Frederiks, Azamede, Killingray). Their results cannot be transferred to North America because the domestic political situation was very different at the time. Becker's results, too, could not be applied to North America. She deals with Europeans outside Europe looking back at their home countries.

The chapters in this volume as well as other literature on the subject suggest that both the differentiation between Europe and North America and that between Europe as a whole and single European countries may have been uneven and ambiguous: sometimes one term was used synonymously with the other and sometimes distinctions were deliberately made. Yet, it would be difficult to adopt a single and universally applicable definition of the differences and commonalities, particularly with an external perspective in view. This volume helps us to see the variety of perspectives on and definitions of

3 See e.g. Hartmut Kaelble, *Europäer über Europa. Die Entstehung des europäischen Selbstverständnisses im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt: Campus 2001); Adelheid von Saldern, »›North Atlantic Civilization‹ – Konzeptioneller Aufbruch zu einem neuen Verhältnis zwischen den USA und Europa in den 1920er Jahren«, in *Unterwegs in Europa. Beiträge zu einer vergleichenden Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte*, ed. Christina Benninghaus et al. (Frankfurt, New York: Campus, 2008), 271–300; id., »Identitätsbildung durch Abgrenzung. Europa und die USA in amerikanischen Gesellschaftsdiskursen des frühen 20. Jahrhunderts«, in *Europabilder im 20. Jahrhundert. Entstehung an der Peripherie*, ed. Frank Bösch et al. (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2012), 119–142; Jan Logeman, with Andreas Joch, Corinna Ludwig, Ashley Naran, and Barbara Reiterer, »Transatlantic Perspectives: Europe in the Eyes of European Immigrants to the United States, 1930–1980«, *GHI Bulletin* 48 (Spring 2011), 85–99.

what might constitute European identity rather than attempting to tie them to certain characteristics – an attempt which would immediately and rightly be contested.

Literature on the concept of Europe is abundant. Scholars try to define its boundaries or its ›spirit‹, some adopting an historical perspective, while others are more interested in contemporary Europe and its political identity.⁴ In historical research on Europe, two opposing approaches have been developed: Scholars following discourse theory insist that ›Europe‹ is only manifest in the realm of discourse and find their objects of research in historical debates on the idea of Europe.⁵ Others start from the assumption that there are certain characteristics common to European peoples and then show that these have been important in European history.⁶ A third group tries to mediate between the two and agrees with the preponderance of discourse but finds material sources of European identity or better said, material manifestations of European history and Europeans.⁷ The discourse of racial differences between Europeans and Africans manifested itself, for instance, in the building of separate church buildings in African locations, one for Europeans and the other for African indigenous people.⁸ All in all, however, these groups of interpreters differ from one another less than might be initially apparent because those with a more normative approach like their counterparts also rely on historical discourse and those who start from discourse may often return to an analysis of material manifestations.⁹

4 One of the many overviews can be found in Lutz Niethammer, »A European Identity?«, in *Europe and the Other and Europe as the Other*, ed. B. Str ath (Br ussel et al.: Peter Lang, 2000), 87–111.

5 See e.g. Logemann et al., »Transatlantic Perspectives«, 85–99.

6 See e.g. Heinz Duchhardt, »Was hei t und zu welchem Ende betreibt man – Europ ische Geschichte?«, in *Europ ische Geschichte als historiographisches Problem*, ed. A. Kunz (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1997), 191–202 or the volume by Joas/Wiegand on European values and esp. Joas' introduction: Hans Joas and Klaus Wiegandt, ed., *Die kulturellen Werte Europas* (Frankfurt: Fischer,  2010), 11–39. In both cases, however, the ascription of materialism would be false.

7 On the problematic see also Hayden White, »The Discourse of Europe and the Search for a European Identity«, in *Europe and the Other and Europe as the Other*, ed. B. Str ath (Br ussel et al.: Peter Lang, 2000), 67–86.

8 Sometimes, this followed a period of communal use of one church, see Fritz Hasselhorn, »Warum sollen wir nicht mehr in dem Gotteshause da oben feiern? Die Trennung der Gemeinden in Hermannsburg (Natal)«, in *Deutsche evangelische Kirche im kolonialen s udlichen Afrika. Die Rolle der Auslandsarbeit von den Anf ngen bis in die 1920er Jahre*, ed. Hans Lessing et al. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), 497–509; Rudolf Hinz, »An die Freunde der Colonie und des Reiches Gottes in der Heimath. Missionsgemeinde f r »Farbige« und Kirchengemeinde f r »Wei e« – von den Anf ngen in Windhoek«, in *ibid.*, 367–391.

9 See the example of Gothic architecture by Ulrike von Hirschhausen and Kiran Klaus Patel, »Europ isierung«, Version 1.0, in *Docupedia-Zeitgeschichte*, 29.11.2010, <http://docupedia.de/zg/Europ%C3%A4isierung>. Access date: 8 May 2012.

This example leads us to an important finding of contemporary research on Europe: Europe has often defined itself by reference to an ›Other‹. It was seen as being civilised in contrast to other regions where people were considered uncivilised. It was assumed to have a history as opposed to Africa or North America which existed without such an account in the eyes of many Europeans. A long list of dichotomies such as these could be assembled. Positive descriptions of what Europe might be, independent of any discriminations, are rare. Those few that exist are often criticised as being essentialist, normative, contingent, and, above all, being constructed in order to support a certain political or social position.

In many discourses, Europe was that which was not Asian, not African, not Islamic, etc. Most of the positive descriptions and definitions of Europe had their negative counterpart applied to non-European countries or cultures implicitly and oftentimes explicitly in the same argumentation. Europe could not be thought of by Europeans, without the non-European as its contrary. But, then, this is not entirely surprising or only a characteristic of European discourses of Europe. Many, perhaps most, cultures define themselves in opposition to an ›Other‹. But is, or was, Europe in any sense one cultural entity? Did Europe have, or does it have, a single culture?

These questions lead us back to the choice between defining Europe as a discursive concept or as a materially existing entity. How can European ›culture‹ be defined if it exists only as a discourse? In the discourse on Europe, Christianity has repeatedly been named as one of its major cultural features.¹⁰ Although Christianity is no longer dominant in all European countries and much has been written about secularisation, it cannot be denied that Christianity in its different forms has shaped all of the countries today belonging to the European Union. And indeed, Christianity is used as one of the arguments in the debates over which nations should or should not be admitted to the Union.

However, the issue of Christianity and its connection to Europe has also been contested in recent decades. On the one hand, politicians evoke Europe's Christian past and claim Europe as a Christian (or possibly Judeo-Christian) continent. On the other hand, theories of secularisation have been developed from a predominantly European perspective, and the end of Christianity as a factor in European culture and politics has been proclaimed.¹¹ Both assumptions have been proved wrong but continue to be discussed. They lead us to

10 See e.g. Duchhardt, »Was heißt«, 195; Mary Anne Perkins, *Christendom and European Identity: The Legacy of Grand Narrative since 1789* (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2004). See also the famous foundation for the identification of Christianity and Europe: Friedrich von Hardenberg (Novalis), *Die Christenheit oder Europa. Mit einem Nachwort von Arthur Henkel* (Krefeld: Scherpe-Verl., 1947).

11 See out of an immense amount of literature only José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern*

ask: What were the links between Christianity and Europe? Why and how was Europe perceived as a Christian continent – if it was perceived as Christian at all?

In this book, we want to offer a ›reverse-perspective‹ in which we seek to shift the focus from Europeans defining Europe and the world to how those considered to be the ›Other‹ conceived of Europe. The contributors do not, of course, hope or intend to arrive at a final definition of Europe, but we do want to add another piece to the puzzle of what Europe is or could be.

While European studies have often focused only on the European viewpoint, studies of imperialism and the Christian missionary movement after the publication in 1978 of the epoch-making study *Orientalism* by Edward Said have frequently focused on the perception and representation of non-Europeans and their suppression by Europeans. Only in more recent years has the interaction between Europeans and non-Europeans become a focus of research and discussion. Coming from a background of linguistics and history, Mary Louise Pratt has pointed out the ›contact zones‹ in which Europeans and non-Europeans lived in foreign countries. She has shown how their interaction could shape a new ›contact culture‹.¹² Homi K. Bhabha, in examining cultural encounters with reference to historical events and contemporary voluntary or involuntary migration, has analysed the meaning of ›third spaces‹ in history as well as contemporary culture.¹³ Since all cases of cultural encounters and more specifically of long-term mutual habitations between Europeans and non-Europeans were the basis on which the external perspective on Europe was founded, the approaches of Pratt and Bhabha are highly relevant to the studies in this volume. Europeans and non-Europeans, missionaries and indigenous Christians lived together and developed a new culture; in the case of Christians, this new community formed a missionary culture. Traditionally, such cultures were seen as almost exclusively shaped by European attitudes and wishes. Newer research, however, indicates that non-European attitudes and perspectives came into play as well and contributed to the forms these cultures took.

The focus on perception and representation also leads to another consideration: Perception and representation have always been two-way processes in the encounters between East and West, South and North. This general point has particular validity when we apply it to the perceptions and representations which African or Asian Christians have had of Europe and its Christian heritage, for indigenous converts to Christianity have been among the most

World (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); José Casanova and Hans Joas, ed., *Religion und die unstrittene Moderne* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010).

12 Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes. Studies in Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London, New York: Routledge, 1992), 4–7.

13 Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London, New York: Routledge, 1994).

educated and literate members of their own societies, frequently more inclined and better able than others to write about European Christians and in some cases to travel to Europe and describe what they have seen. Part of the benefit of reversing the gaze is that we may be able to form a judgment about the extent to which Asians or Africans, whether Christians or not, themselves succumbed to blanket objectifications of what European Christians or Christianity were like, or, conversely, the extent to which they noticed and emphasised difference and ambiguity. Insofar as they indulged in their own stereotyping, that will serve as a healthy reminder that cultural stereotyping is not confined to dominant groups but is in fact a normal human mechanism for coping with difference.

Following a subaltern studies approach, Dipesh Chakrabarty makes an important point that has to be taken into consideration: Europeans consistently saw non-Europeans as ›not yet‹ ready to enter a state of real equality¹⁴ – even though some of these same Europeans claimed to want some form of equality, as seen, for instance, in the expectations of many missionary societies to have indigenous peoples lead their own churches. Henry Venn, the long-serving secretary of the CMS, is only the best-known of several nineteenth-century missionary theorists who framed a plan to establish self-supporting, self-governing and self-propagating churches led by indigenous Christians.¹⁵ However, in the colonial period the missionaries never saw the indigenous Christians as having actually achieved a European level of competency: they remained ›not yet‹ ready to lead their own lives. One of the questions answered by the contributors to this volume is, to what extent non-Europeans adopted this viewpoint and when and how they challenged it.

From the early 1990s onwards, in line with trends in imperial history as a whole, several scholars of the missionary movement have demanded that postcolonial studies place different and often contradictory stories side by side in order to present a multi-perspective narrative of the deeply ambiguous relationship of missions to colonialism: the work of Andrew Porter, Jeffrey Cox, and Brian Stanley in this regard is particularly important.¹⁶ From this type of approach we gain invaluable insight not only about the mission areas (or the European perception of them) but also about Europe itself.

14 Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, N.J., Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000), 250.

15 See Peter Williams, »›Not Transplanting‹: Henry Venn's Strategic Vision«, in *The Church Mission Society and World Christianity, 1799–1999*, ed. Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000, 147–172; Andrew N. Porter, *Religion Versus Empire? British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, 1700–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 167–169.

16 See in particular Porter, *Religion Versus Empire?*; Jeffrey Cox, *The British Protestant Missionary Enterprise since 1700* (New York and London: Routledge, 2008); Brian Stanley,

The postcolonial approach also contributes to the question of how European culture and Christianity were linked. To be sure, this is not the main object of most postcolonial studies, but postcolonial concerns figure prominently in the majority of studies of Christianity and its (European) history by non-Europeans. Thus the Gambian, Lamin Sanneh, in his eminent study *Translating the message* demonstrates the long history of translation in Christianity, from its very beginnings in the apostolic age to its widespread reception in Africa and Asia.¹⁷ While European historians of Christianity focus predominantly on European Christian history, non-European historiography tends to broaden the focus and to underline the non-European influences on Christianity as well as non-European Christian history, for Christianity has never been entirely and solely a European religion. While the impact of Europe on Christianity from the Middle Ages to the modern period is not denied, these studies expose the fault lines that weaken any simple identification of Europeanness and Christianity.

The volume explores the answers to such questions as: What was the contribution of the indigenous people? How much influence did they have, and how did they use it? How did indigenous Christians or non-Christians perceive the Europeans who visited or lived in their countries? Did the indigenous people use mimicry as a strategy for their own ends, and if so, how? Which side did indigenous Christians normally take in conflicts between Europeans and indigenous peoples?

One of the main fields in which European Christianity and colonialism intersected was Christian missionary activity. Therefore, mission history offers a unique field of analysis which can be tackled from the perspective of postcolonial studies and also European studies. Its examination can contribute to both fields of research. It is therefore no wonder that most of the chapters in this volume focus on mission or missionaries. From an outside perspective, this focus is the result of the obvious: Those Europeans who went abroad to live in close contact with non-Europeans and who explicitly went as Christians were mostly missionaries. On the European side, however, it demands a bit more reflection: What was the connection between European Christianity and mission? Mission is one of the fundamental manifestations of Christian belief and one of the tasks of Christian churches. It has always been present in the history of Christianity. Nevertheless, looking at the whole sweep of church history, the times when foreign mission was both highly visible and influential in the ›home‹ countries were rare. One of these periods

The Bible and the Flag: Protestant Missions and British Imperialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (Leicester: Apollos, 1990).

17 Lamin O. Sanneh, *Translating the Message. The Missionary Impact on Culture* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2001).

was the second half of the nineteenth century when denominational missionary societies founded at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries attained their greatest popularity, attracting vast crowds to their anniversary meetings, publishing widely read periodicals and tracts, and sometimes even exercising significant political influence (in all its ambiguity).¹⁸ The history of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) that bears the Church [of England] in its name shows the ambiguity of the relationship between missionary enthusiasm and the life of the church at home: the CMS had been founded in 1799 in order to provide a distinctively Anglican form of an evangelical missionary endeavour, but it took several decades before it gained recognition from most of the Anglican bishops.¹⁹

Nevertheless, even in its heyday in the late nineteenth century, the number of members and supporters of the CMS was small in comparison to the size of the Anglican church-going community. The same is true for all other mission societies. Even the Basel Mission with its strong support base in Württemberg could only interest the evangelical elite of Württemberg's Christians. However, the Basel missionaries were influential, both through the broad distribution of their publications and in the ways that they were recognised by many (although not by all!) as the avant-garde of pious European Christians. The lives of these missionaries represented how ›true‹, evangelical Christians were meant to live, and they acted in the ways that all Christians were meant to act. As such, they served as role models to at least part of European Christianity, and what was said about them applied as much to other European Christians. Furthermore, what non-Europeans learnt about the ideal form of Christianity they learnt from the missionaries, and this later became an ideal with which to contrast their experiences of European Christianity as it actually was. This becomes particularly obvious in the contributions of Azamede, Frederiks and Walls to this volume.

When this volume investigates what views non-Europeans held of ›European Christianity‹ it focuses on such topics as their non-European understandings of Christianity, the descriptive terminology they employed and the nature of the contact they had with European Christians. It asks if Europe and Christianity were identified or how distinctions were drawn, how non-Europeans or external observers spoke about Europe and Christianity. Which terms were employed, when and why? It also asks what forms the contact

18 The references to the involvement of leaders of the mission movement in the abolition movement is one of the positive examples, the struggle for German imperialism by Rhenish Missionary Society director Friedrich Fabri in the last decades of the 19th century a counter-example.

19 Eugene Stock, *The History of the Church Missionary Society. Its Environment, Its Men and Its Work*, vol. I (London: Church Missionary Society, 1899), 382–403.

between non-Europeans and Europeans took and if the external perspective differed, depending on the country or the social level the person or group came from.

The volume begins with Judith Becker's analysis of the European formation of nineteenth-century Christianity and the meaning that Europe as the communal home continent had for evangelical missionaries from societies that cooperated internationally. She demonstrates that by their mutual cooperation the missionaries and the societies formed a European consciousness. In their periodicals, Europe was more often referred to than the home countries, partly simply for practical reasons. However, this continuous citation of Europe brought about a consciousness of communal Europeanness. Furthermore, the confrontation with non-Europeans led to comparisons being drawn with Europeans. These were not always favourable for the Europeans, but again, they resulted in a consciousness of commonalities. European history, too, was prominent within the mission project. The missionaries used examples drawn from European history in support of their argumentation for the necessity of mission. Moreover, historically, the shape of the Christianity the missionaries wanted to convey was formed by European culture, experiences and even climate (think of clothing!) as well. Before they left, the missionaries had only been partly aware of this. In their encounter with people shaped by foreign cultures and religions, however, they began to realize that what they considered as a ›Christian culture‹ was often a ›European Christian culture‹. Thus, from the outside, a consciousness of the Europeanness of Christianity arose. At the same time, the first fault-lines became visible, indicating how Christianity and Europeanness could be distinguished.

Werner Ustorf strengthens the point that ›internal‹ and ›external‹ are not identical with ›European‹ and ›non-European‹ when analysing the criticisms of European Christianity in the early twentieth century by Europeans and non-Europeans alike and drawing conclusions as to their commonalities and differences. ›Inside‹ and ›outside‹ in his case were not synonymous with ›European‹ and ›non-European‹ because Europeans could develop an ›external‹ view and non-Europeans had become so well acquainted with Europe and had adopted its perspective that their viewpoint became more or less ›internal‹. His examples range from Africa via Australia to European countries and from leading figures of a Christian mission and unity movement (J. H. Oldham) to those who wanted to substantially transform or even supplant Christianity (J. W. Hauer). The Ewe Christian, Hermann Yoyo, criticised European Christians – missionaries and those he had met during his three-year-stay in Germany – of non-Christian conduct; he claimed to be treated and listened to as a Christian with the same level of equality as Europeans, and he postulated a diversity of interpretations of Christianity, which for example allowed African polygamy. Simon Kimbangu from Congo was

the founder of a large African independent church. He criticised Western Christianity for its lack of spirituality. But he also saw himself as standing on solid biblical ground and constitutes an example of indigenous African Christianity criticising the West. Moses Tjalkabota from Australia linked aboriginal culture and Christian belief without criticising European Christianity but at the same time sought to inculturate Christianity. Hauer, a former Basel missionary, eventually questioned European Christianity and advocated neo-paganism as a means of making room for the raw primal religiosity which he believed to be natural in all human experience; he felt that Christianity had grown apart, not only from modern culture but also from natural religious experience. Oldham searched for a programme of renewal for Europe, and saw Europe as being as much in need of mission as non-European countries. As did several of the other protagonists, he discovered a lack of spirituality in Europe. Summing up, Ustorf finds three common critiques: the problem of a direct access to the sacred, the relation between Gospel and culture and the conflict between a multilateral and a unilateral understanding of Christianity (pp. 71 et seq.). It becomes evident that there were many ways of forming an ›external‹ view.

The Korean perspective on Catholic Christianity is discussed by Sebastian Kim. Kim relates the story of Catholicism in Korea from its beginnings when it was welcomed as a herald of new ideas in the sixteenth century to the persecutions of Catholics in the second half of the nineteenth century. During this period, the history of Catholicism was intermingled with the history of politics and of Korean dependence or independence. At the turn of the seventeenth century Korean envoys to China came into contact with Catholicism and ›Western learning‹ as transmitted by Matteo Ricci in Beijing. They did not differentiate between Catholic faith and Western science and philosophy. Both seemed to further Korea's modernisation. Shortly after the inauguration of the Catholic Church in Korea in 1784, however, disputes about the Catholic prohibition of ancestor veneration, which was seen as a fundamental part of Korean culture and identity, arose. First persecutions of Catholics ensued. The association of Catholicism and Western influence – mostly, Koreans did not distinguish between Europe and North America – became fatal in the nineteenth century when the Korean government, which was far from stable, tried to fend off Western imperialism. Korean Catholics sided with Western powers; a German adventurer, supported by Korean Catholics, defiled the tomb of the king's family. The Korean authorities came to perceive Catholicism as national treason because of its links with the West. For Korean Catholics, too, their faith remained seen as connected to Europe. Kim suggests that their main goal, however, was liberation and that European Catholicism was seen as a means to this end.

R. G. Tiedemann gives an overview of Chinese perceptions of European Christianity from the late sixteenth century.²⁰ Anti-Christian polemics began early in China, mostly launched by Buddhist monks, but also by the ruling class. Christianity seemed to threaten not only orthodox belief but also the Chinese moral and social order. Christian theology also remained alien to them. Nevertheless, Chinese people converted to Christianity and formed congregations which even survived persecution. However, these congregations did not always conform to European expectations. After 1860, anti-Christian propaganda was intensified and even became a kind of ›folklore‹ that had great success among the people. As opposed to other countries analysed in this volume, China was still convinced of its own superiority by the end of the nineteenth century – as were, as a matter of fact, the European missionaries. Tiedemann also recounts the struggles Chinese Christians had in finding their way between the New Culture Movement's reaction against traditional Confucianism and the anti-imperialist May Fourth Movement of 1919, which led them to develop a new form of inculturated Christianity. Any survey of the four centuries of modern Christian history in China shows the lingering fear and suspicion of Christianity as the ›Other‹.

Thoralf Klein approaches Chinese-Christian history from a different angle. He looks at anti-missionary propaganda. The Chinese did not distinguish between European and other Western missionaries. Therefore, the results of Klein's analysis pertain to all Western missionaries. Missionaries and all Western people were called ›foreign devils‹ or ›demons‹, a word that indicated danger (although not necessarily evil). However, the concept behind the term or rather the use of the term changed during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A characteristic of Chinese propaganda was its representativeness. For instance, because the word ›foreign‹ and the word ›goat‹ were pronounced in the same way, foreigners were often represented as goats. God – the Lord of Heaven – thus became ›the heavenly pig‹ (p. 127). Thus there were ample opportunities for play on words. More seriously, Klein recounts common allegations against Christians which ranged from sexual libertinism to poisoning. With the dissemination of these accusations in pamphlets and depictions, the masses became afraid of Christianity. This was later re-used by the Boxers, turning not only on foreign missionaries but also on Chinese Christians. In anti-imperialist propaganda, Chinese Christians also were connected to imperialism and linked to foreign cultures and powers on a lin-

20 Europeans presented themselves to the Chinese only as people from the »Western Country/ies« or as coming from »Europe«, thus producing a knowledge of European identity rather than diversity. The Pomeranian missionary Karl Gützlaff in the 1830s and 1840s was one of the first to try to improve Chinese knowledge of Europe by publications, something which became important after China had to take the West into account. As to Christianity, the differences between Protestantism and Catholicism seemed to puzzle the Chinese.

guistic basis: being described as »running dogs of the foreign imperialists« (p. 143). Klein demonstrates on a linguistic level what Tiedemann has shown in a cultural-political analysis: that China in the first decades of the twentieth century sought to illustrate its superiority. Anti-Christian Chinese propaganda was transformed into an anti-imperialist counter-discourse.

Jeffrey Cox takes a side approach to the topic, demonstrating how intermingled European and Indian Christianity were in Punjab. Starting from a survey of the main master narratives in mission history he tries to overcome the Western vs. indigenous divide by relating the history of the joint creation of a Punjabi Psalter. Cox calls the two main master narratives that have influenced the perception of mission the »Saidian master narrative« and the »Vennite point of view« (p. 151). The latter strengthens the agency of the missionised people and the indigenisation of Christianity. Both were anti-imperialist, Said from a secular, and Venn from a Christian point of view. Cox, however, found that European and indigenous influences and agencies could not be distinguished so easily. Sure enough, Psalm singing was introduced into Punjab by American Presbyterians who continued the tradition of Psalm singing from the Genevan Reformation. This seems to point to an indisputable European influence or even the imposition of an entirely European tradition. However, the Psalms were translated by a Punjabi pastor and poet, I. D. Shahbaz, and set to tunes by him and a group of missionaries and Punjabis alike. Furthermore, they seem to have been eagerly accepted by Punjabis of all kinds. Cox in his narrative intertwines the history of the creation and use of the Genevan Psalter and its use in nineteenth century America with that of the Punjabi Psalter, drawing parallels and pointing out differences and thus mirroring the inseparable history of European and Punjabi Christianity in his own historiography.

In a far-reaching survey, David Killingray recounts the history of Africans who were sent to Britain for training by missionary societies. The primary goal of the missionary societies was to train indigenous agents who could preach the Gospel for lower wages and with less risk to their health than Europeans and who could, as the missionaries thought, reach their compatriots better than Europeans. At the same time, these African agents were to become well acquainted with European Christianity from experience in Europe and imbibe some kind of European mind-set. Killingray delineates the history of the successes and failures of the different missionary societies in the nineteenth century one after the other. The reader thus gains an insight into the different approaches and their results. Depending on the missionary society, most or only few pupils returned to Africa and became ministers afterwards, one of the most famous being Samuel Crowther, later the Bishop of Niger, who was the first African student at the CMS Institution in Islington. Some of the students later worked in professions other than the church,

others died in Britain or entirely withdrew from the church. Thus, this training scheme was not a complete success although it was followed by most missionary societies at a certain point in time. What is remarkable is that not only male but also female African children were sent to Britain to study. On the views of most of the Africans on Europe little is known. Particularly in the early decades most letters that survived contained comments about their school or the weather. However, it is notable – and contrasts with Azamede's findings – that the Africans complained relatively rarely about racial prejudices. Killingray found several examples of Africans who considered themselves as belonging to the British Empire and thus represented some kind of ›insiders‹.

Kokou Azamede focuses on young Ewe men who were brought to Germany for missionary education. He draws extensively on archival records and highlights the discrepancies between the official statements of these young Africans about European Christianity and their stay in Germany – mostly positive – and their personal letters in which they harshly criticised European Christianity. In this chapter, Hermann Yoyo again appears prominently. In their official reports, the Ewe Christians seemed to appreciate European Christianity and appeared willing to transfer it to Africa. They seemed pleased with what they learnt and who they learnt it from. Unofficially, they reported on severe racism and on double standards of mission and missionaries as well as other European Christians. Isaak Kwandzo wrote a long poem on the obstacles of the Mission that leaves no doubt about his criticisms: duplicity, lust for money, for flattery, etc. Hermann Yoyo's attempts to accommodate Christianity to African culture by allowing polygamy (for himself as for others) are described in detail. Another problem Ewe Christians had regarding the European approach to Christianity was Europeans' non-belief in ›spiritual power‹, as seen in miraculous healings. This chapter demonstrates (1) the great discrepancies between European and African attitudes towards Christianity, (2) the differences between official and unofficial statements of Africans about European Christianity and (3) Africans' general and strong criticism of European Christianity.

Ottobah Cugoano stands at the centre of Martha Th. Frederiks' contribution. Having been enslaved in his early youth, he worked as a slave for a time in the West Indies and then came to London where he became one of the most outspoken critics of the slave trade and slavery and of the involvement of Christianity in it. Being a Christian, Cugoano praised Christianity and saw physical and spiritual enslavement, and physical and spiritual liberation, as connected, as did many of the slave-narratives. In order to strengthen his point, he also constructed new biblical verses, sentences that sounded biblical but were either modifications of biblical verses or inventions of his

own in biblical style. He used a particular interpretation of Bible episodes, references to well-known Bible stories, and new and inverted interpretations of legends or wordplays to serve his end. The use of the term ›Europe‹ was often interchangeable with ›Great Britain‹ or ›England‹, terms which occupied a central place in the book, even though other European countries were mentioned as well. Europe was opposed to Africa and in this case was identified with Christianity and with advancement/civilisation and yet, at the same time, with barbarity and perfidy. Europeans could even be depicted as cannibals: here, slavery was put on a level with cannibalism. Cugoano's evaluation of European Christianity was based on the Methodist concept of holiness. He only knew of two holy Christians, and both were freed blacks. All others were criticised for different reasons, European Christians mostly for their involvement in slavery. His writings remind one of modern postcolonial approaches. Although, as Frederiks points out, it would be an absurd anachronism to call Cugoano a postcolonial author – and thus to impose on him yet another external label.

The volume is concluded by Andrew Walls' study of two leading figures, one from Asia and one from Africa, who crossed cultures. Both were well rooted in their original cultures but knew European Christianity from personal experience. Walls shows how they differentiated between those aspects of European Christianity that should be kept and those that should be rejected – and how they did the same with their original cultures. Rev Tiyo Soga had been educated partly in South Africa and partly in Scotland. He married a Scottish woman, became a preacher of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland and was sent as a missionary to his own land of South Africa. He preached Christianity and education to the Africans but criticised Europeans for not behaving according to Christian doctrine. Soga appealed to his Xhosa compatriots to discriminate between things to be adapted from Europe and things to be rejected. The same should be done with their traditional culture. The basis of his evaluation was his experiences with Europeans and black and white Africans. Rev Behari Lal Singh from India was the only participant from a non-Western country at the 1860 Liverpool Conference on Missions. Being a missionary himself, Singh at the same time represented the countries that were objects of European missions. He voiced his opinion openly at the conference. Besides criticisms of mission strategies he also criticised the export of European denominationalism. Still, he supported British rule in India and Christian mission and hoped for modernization. Walls underlines that both actors were fully at home in the religious and social discussions of their time as well as in those on civilisation and appropriated whatever seemed good to them. They were, at the same time, both insiders and outsiders with regard to European Christianity.

This volume in itself could perhaps be regarded as evidence that Europeans are belatedly forcing themselves to ask questions about how those »at the margins« have viewed those »at the centre«, rather than as evidence of the more fundamental mental revolution that may yet be required by the slowly increasing marginalisation of Europe in both religious geography and global affairs. One important aspect of the theme which is not covered in the essays which follow is the maps of the western world drawn by non-European people, notably Chinese and Islamic peoples, and what place, if any, the religion and holy cities of Europe occupy in such maps.

The nature of these representations from afar of Europe and its religion changed fundamentally once travel to Europe by Asians and Africans, and longer-term residence within Europe became more common. The number in the nineteenth century was larger than is often supposed, as David Killingray's essay emphasises. The steadily increasing number of those sent to Europe for education was of particular significance. After the Second World War the steady stream of Africans and Asians coming to Europe became a flood, first owing to the expansion of university education and government programmes for training colonial elites, and then from the 1960s as migration flows driven by the lure of economic opportunity or political freedom gathered in strength.

In religious terms such travel and residence in Europe afforded some greater opportunity than had been available in the homeland to espouse Christianity for themselves. In the nineteenth century those who converted to Christianity while in Europe tended to espouse European cultural identity as part of the conversion process. Others came to Europe, especially in the twentieth century, having already become Christians, or, at least, having received a mission education up to secondary level, and were then shocked or disillusioned by what they experienced of European spirituality or secularity. For some of these, residence in Europe marked a significant stage in their development away from mission Christianity. Jomo Kenyatta, the first president of independent Kenya, had been baptised and educated in the Church of Scotland Kikuyu mission, but spent the years from 1931 to 1946 studying and learning his political apprenticeship in Britain, and, more briefly, in the Soviet Union. By the time of his return to Kenya, Kenyatta had moved some distance from orthodox Christianity, though he never lost his fascination with the message and symbolism of the Bible.²¹ Many more, especially in the cases of Indian or Chinese visitors to Europe, had little first-hand contact with Christianity when they arrived, and frequently returned still knowing or having experienced very little of Europe's historic faith. For a significant

21 See the article on Kenyatta by Bruce Berman in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*: <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/31305?docPos=1>. Access date: 14 September 2012.

minority of the educated elite, however, postgraduate study in Europe (or, perhaps more often, in the United States) did mark the beginning of Christian commitment, often made as a result of the hospitality and evangelistic zeal of Christian witness in the universities. For the leadership cadres of Communist China in the twenty-first century, the implications of such conversions are substantial, and are yet to be fully revealed. To that extent, the questions raised by this work of religious and cultural history remain of key significance for today.