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ABSTRACT

Missionizing Photography: Amanda Jefferson’s Photograph Album, 1892-1898

Sharon Murray

Missionary history is a recent topic of scholarly interest although foreign mission photographs have not been afforded the same attention. The lack of scholarship on missionary photography as a category (although arguably a subset of colonial and ethnographic photographies) means that little can be said definitively about the role of photography in overseas missions.

This thesis looks at a late-nineteenth century photograph album compiled by Miss Amanda Jefferson (1860-1947) – a Canadian missionary to Western India. Jefferson’s album serves as a case study in unpacking the meaning of photographs generated by foreign missionaries. As her 1892 letter indicates, Jefferson intended to send the album home to her friends and Christian community in New York so they could see something of the mission field and her new surroundings. Through an analysis of Jefferson’s selection, organization and captioning of the album’s fifty-one photographs, this thesis examines the use of photography for this single woman missionary: how photography itself was missionized and used as a tool for visualizing the harsh realities and everyday experiences of mission work, the missionaries’s goals and biases, and the contradictions and ambiguities of this kind of cultural imperialism. This thesis considers both the public and private functions of this album as well as Jefferson’s desire for the album to speak for itself despite the cultural and physical distance that divided the viewers from Jefferson and the people and places pictured.
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INTRODUCTION

In 2004 I inherited an album of photographs from the late 1890s, assembled and captioned by a distant relative, Miss Amanda Jefferson (1860-1947). Born Amanda Marie Stronach, she was orphaned at the age of eight after the untimely death of her parents. She was adopted by her mother’s sister – the Jefferson family of Berwick, Nova Scotia. On completion of her schooling in Berwick, Jefferson trained to be a teacher at the Truro Normal College and then attended the Northfield Seminary in Massachusetts for six months.¹ For reasons unrecorded, Jefferson moved to New York City sometime in the mid 1880s where she worked for seven years at the New York City Mission. There she met her life-long companion, Miss Emily Terry Minor (1857-1938), an American from Connecticut and a graduate of the Mount Holyoke Seminary. In 1891 both Jefferson and Minor were appointed to Western India as foreign missionaries for the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America (PCUSA). They sailed out of New York on September 5th that same year, arriving at the main, Western India station in Kolhapur – approximately 320 kilometres southeast of Bombay – later that fall. In the first months of 1892, Jefferson and Minor moved to Ratnagiri, India, their permanent station and their “home.”²

England was the first to popularize foreign missionary work in the 1790s. They were joined soon after by the United States followed by British North America, later known as Canada. The impetus of this “great era” of foreign missionary work was primarily the zeal of evangelical Protestants backed by scripture, the Gospel: Jesus Christ’s command to “Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every Creature”
(Matthew 28:19). Some Christians believed they were called to convert those of other faiths, that it was their duty as servants of their Lord.

In 1852, under the direction of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, Rev. R.G. Wilder and his family established the Kolhapur mission. The mission was adopted by PCUSA in 1870. In time, and with the addition of new missionaries to the station, the Western India mission expanded to include surrounding villages and towns – Panhala, Sangli, Ratnagiri, and Miraj. The Ratnagiri station, northwest of Kolhapur, was founded in 1873 by Rev. W. P. Barker although the presence of missionaries there remained small until 1892 when Jefferson, Minor, Rev. and Mrs. W.H. Hannum, and Miss Jennie Sherman were posted to that station. Jefferson was part of the “golden age of missionary expansion” that began in 1880 and lasted until 1920; the outbreak of the First World War initiated the decline. In the years of Jefferson’s stay, the missionaries at Ratnagiri established a church, Sunday schools, many small schools for local girls and boys, and an orphanage. Jefferson and Minor were also known for their visits with women and children in surrounding villages and homes, the home for widows, and the leper asylum. Their work was known as “woman’s work for woman” which aimed to “educate” Indian women and children about the “true religion” of Christianity and “the benefits [of] our western civilization.” With the exception of three, one-year furloughs to Canada and the United States, Jefferson and Minor worked in Ratnagiri and surrounding areas until 1931 when they retired and together returned to North America. In fact, according to the issue of Western Indian Notes in the year of Minor’s death, Minor and Jefferson were apart from one another only on the occasion of their furloughs
which they took “at different times, so that each might aid in carrying on the other’s work.”

The initial boom in the foreign missionary movement coincided with the introduction in 1888 of the roll film camera – the Kodak – and therefore the rise of amateur photography. It is no surprise that missionaries, like tourists, chose to employ the camera as a means to document their adventures on foreign and native soil. The portability of this small box camera made the medium accessible to many who did not want to develop the skills needed to operate large view cameras and develop film. Rather, the Kodak ushered in the “snapshot” which gave amateur photographers the opportunity to document their daily lives and activities no matter where in the world they were. It also increased the exchange of pictorial depictions of everyday life in vehicles like the photograph album and lantern slide-show which, in the case of travellers, brought the world home. What this “world” looked like, however, was largely determined by the perspective of the photographer.

Jefferson’s album is a hardbound book with a gold coloured cover and red trim. It measures 19 x 25 centimetres and contains fifty-one albumen photographs, one to a page, fifty of which are roughly the same size (11 x 16 centimetres), and one considerably larger (25 x 19 centimetres). Each image has been carefully centred on the page and captioned with one or two descriptive lines. Jefferson inscribed the album: “To My Dear Friends Mr and Mrs Parker, from Amanda M. Jefferson Ratnagiri India.” The first forty-three photographs are dated 1892 and mainly depict Kolhapur, India, where Jefferson was posted for her first three months of service. The last eight images in the album range in dates from 1893 to 1898 and picture Jefferson’s permanent posting at Ratnagiri where, as
Emily Minor observed, “antagonism, prejudice, hostility, and ignorance prevailed.” No provenance is given for any of the album’s photographs although those from 1892 are likely attributed to Dr. William James Wanless (1865-1933), a medical missionary who worked alongside Jefferson and Minor.7 Attached to the last page of the album is Jefferson’s letter of 1892 (appendix A) explaining that she intended to send the album to the United States to her friends, Mr. and Mrs. Parker of New York. Her hope was that it would “be of service in interesting others in the needs of this great field.” This letter also indicates that Jefferson owned her own camera and hoped to take “views” of the Ratnagiri station at a later date, once she was “feeling more settled.” It seems likely that Jefferson took some of the last eight photographs in the album.

It is unclear how Jefferson’s album came back into my family. After Jefferson and Minor retired from mission work and returned to the United States, they made a number of trips together to Nova Scotia to visit Jefferson’s family. My grandfather, J. Gordon DeLong, met Jefferson, his great aunt, on a number of occasions and heard stories of her work and life in India. In fact, she influenced his call to mission work there – he and my grandmother, Alma (Blackadder) DeLong, served as Canadian Baptist missionaries in Southeast India from 1945-69. The album seems to have passed through many hands since Jefferson’s death in 1947 although none of my family members know exactly who gave it to my grandparents, or when it came back into the family. In 2004, on my return from a six-month stint in India, I laid eyes on this album for the first time. My grandparents knew I had an interest in photographs of India, particularly those taken by missionaries, and felt that this album would be put to better use in my hands than in
theirs. Though they would never have anticipated scholarly interest in this album, I hope that this thesis rewards their generosity and trust.

It is difficult to say whether Jefferson’s album and its photographs reflect any kind of norm for overseas missionary photography during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Most missionary photographs are preserved in church archives and private collections. Missionary history is a recent topic of scholarly interest although few writers have chosen to address photographs as anything other than visual reinforcement of historical facts – as data. In short, researchers and scholars have continued to think of and employ missionary photographs much as their makers did: as useful documents that support textual information. The lack of attention to this aspect of Western visual culture has resulted in a fragmented visual history, especially that which predates 1900. There are exceptions. Efforts like those of the Basel Mission and their on-line Picture Archive of over 28,000 mission photographs of Africa, India, China, and Hong Kong have resulted in a more accessible and visible archive of this piece of photographic history. It also attests to the number of photographs produced by foreign missionaries – to the significance of the medium to missions. The archives of the Presbyterian Historical Society, which houses documents pertaining to Jefferson’s mission, has more than 8 cubic feet of catalogued, foreign mission photographs, the bulk of which are from the twentieth century. Archives such as the Presbyterian Historical Society’s are largely reliant on donations, meaning that their holdings are by no means a full spectrum of historical documents, nor does the collection account for all of the Presbyterian mission photographs. There are still photographs in private collections (mine, for example), those that are unrecognized as related to missionary work, and those that have been destroyed.
Sheer numbers notwithstanding, the lack of scholarship on missionary photography as a category (although arguably a subset of colonial and ethnographic photographies) means that little can be said definitively about the role of photography in overseas missions. Furthermore, prior to 1900, inter-continental circulation of photographs was limited, meaning that few of the photographs taken by overseas missionaries in the latter part of the nineteenth century would have been seen by Western eyes. Foreign missionaries did send photographs home to be published in denominational, mission, and anthropological journals, even some newspapers and local publications, but this practice was not popularized until after the turn of the nineteenth century. It follows that photographic prints were not being made in multiples, meaning that people were looking at missionary photographs in reproduction more than photographs themselves. If Jefferson did send her album to North America, the photographs in this book might have provided some Westerners with the first photographs of the foreign world as well as their first comprehensive view of everyday life in an Indian village.

My study of Jefferson’s album will serve as a case study in unpacking the meaning of photographs generated by foreign missionaries – the meaning for Jefferson and other Western Christians in her time, and the meaning gained through a contemporary and theoretical reading. Furthermore, through an analysis of Jefferson’s album, I seek to understanding the use of photography for this single woman missionary, how photography itself was missionized, used as a tool for visualizing the harsh realities and everyday experiences of mission work, the missionaries’s goals and biases, and the contradictions and ambiguities of this kind of cultural imperialism. A particular challenge of this case study is that the textual information available on Jefferson and her work in
Ratnagiri is limited to what the Board of Foreign Missions chose to record and archive about its worker. In fact, this album tells me more about Jefferson’s life in Ratnagiri than her entire personnel file in the Presbyterian Historical Society’s archives. However, by unlocking Jefferson’s album, and, in the words of Martha Langford, engaging in its “suspended conversation,” this album reveals pieces of the story Jefferson aimed to tell through her compilation and captioning. It is possible that the orality—the narrative—of this album may cut through some of the ambiguities inherent in mission photographs. While an individual photograph cannot tell the story of its intended meaning, by reading this album and unpacking its intended narrative we are provided with evidence of what this missionary believed her photographs from the field could communicate, what she believed they would mean to viewers at home. Jefferson, through her album, was conversing with a white, middle-class Christians back in the United States and Canada. This album reveals some of the codes of viewing for Western missionaries and viewers of nineteenth-century mission photographs. It also reveals something of what this missionary invested in photography, the power she believed it had to objectively communicate, bring the world to the doorstep of Western Christians, confirm their sense of identity and superiority, give agency to women’s mission work, plead for foreign aid, and even save souls.

My reading of this album is not meant to interpret the meaning of these photographs for the objects of Jefferson’s mission— for Indians. Rather, because I know that this album and its photographs were intended and constructed for a Western viewer, I will attend to the meanings generated by and for this audience. I do recognize, however, that an entirely different reading can be made of this album and its images through the
lens of nineteenth-century Western India and the peoples of Kolhapur and Ratnagiri. Perhaps, when this album is brought to light, those different readings will emerge. But here I seek to unpack the meanings in this album as a relational object— a concept developed by Elizabeth Edwards, a lecturer in visual anthropology and the Head of Photograph Collections at the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford, England—between Jefferson and her Western, Christian community, both near and far. As I see it, this album and its photographs present a semblance of a coherent community, a community bound together by faith, if not by race, class, and culture. Jefferson’s authorship generates a composite photographic image of the very message these missionaries intended to bring to the peoples of Western India: one of being bound together and uplifted by one God, one faith, one church. But perhaps more uniquely, this album provides a look into a Western, single woman’s vision of the foreign world.

My study begins with a review of the literature that deals with mission photography, with the aim of situating my own approach to the subject in general, and this album in particular. This will be followed by an overview of literature across many disciplines that examines the culture of photography around the time Jefferson compiled her album, paying specific attention to the relationships between photography and power, imperialism, and Western culture’s self-conception. This review is meant to establish the framework through which I will construct my reading of Jefferson’s album.

Chapter 2 focuses on unpacking Jefferson’s intentions for the 1892 series and narrative. Considering Jefferson’s sense of the public purpose of the album, the photographs and captions compiled across 48 pages are addressed according to Laura Wexler’s theories on the violence of “domestic images.”13 I examine the album as a
means for Jefferson to visualize her place on the field, her new community and missionary identity, and to translate Kolhapur, particularly its people, into a comprehensible language for the sake of her “dear friends” at home and ultimately, herself.

Chapter 3 addresses the last eight photographs in the album (1893-98) and their contribution to the album’s narrative. This part of the album is read as a private or personal album, built upon more heavily coded and obscure meanings. The bulk of this chapter focuses on the last photograph in the album which pictures two Indian girls dressed in Western frocks. This photograph and its caption provide a rare look into an intimate relationship between a missionary and the heathen, and the single woman’s construction of family on the field. It is also a testament to the power of the image of conversion, saving by means of a photograph.

I will conclude with a reflection on how Jefferson missionized photography through her this album and with questions about the significance of this kind of object to current scholarship on visual culture and in our supposedly post-colonial society.
CHAPTER 1

Mission Photography in Context

Mission photography has only recently been adopted as a topic of scholarly interest, with articles and book chapters written by scholars across many disciplines. These studies have appeared in mission journals like the *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* and a number of journals on African arts and culture. Most of these articles and chapters revolve around mission photographs from Africa, particularly those connected with the Basel Mission to West Africa. The British Methodist missionary, Reverend George Brown (1835-1917), has been afforded much attention for his photographs of the Pacific Islands during the mid-nineteenth century. Brown, a prolific and legendary preacher, traveller, and missionary, photographed the people and culture of Somoa, Tonga, Fiji, New Britain, New Ireland and New Guinea. He used these photographs both to promote his mission to British at home and to encourage conversion amongst the peoples of the Pacific.¹ His photography, therefore, had an agenda: to *missionize*. As Virginia-Lee Web writes in “Missionary Photographers in the Pacific Islands: Divine Light,” “For the most part, the modes of representation and the tropes employed by Brown derive from his own aesthetics, beliefs and feelings, both positive and negative towards peoples and cultures. He used the local surroundings as backdrops to picture the various people within their own environment.”² This view of Brown’s and other mission photography is in keeping with opinions of other scholars. Most who have written on the subject agree that photography served as a tool for missionaries to communicate their agenda, reinforce stereotypes, and establish a false dichotomy.
between the missionary and the *missionized*. Photographs were also used to recruit fellow Christians to either join the cause or offer support. This is what David Morgan calls *Missive imagery*, or “those [images] used to mobilize and instruct domestic efforts to undertake missions.”³ Morgan’s text does not address photography specifically – his studies/work concentrates on published illustrations, posters, and religious works of art – although his analysis of the role of images for missions here applies. He continues:

Missive imagery...provided a powerful way of shaping the understanding of religious and racial otherness, the international stature of the United States, and the cultural burden of Christianity. Missive images are especially important as domestic representations of foreign cultures. Encoded in them is a worldview and a national mission, a vision that regards national purpose in explicitly religious terms.⁴

Much like missionary writing, photography was part of the mission’s promotional material to be disseminated in the West. Mission photographs were used in a variety of ways: lantern-slide shows to be viewed by both those at home and non-Christians; postcards distributed to solicit support and encourage those who were already contributing; images for illustrated books on the mission; missionary magazines; exhibitions; and by anthropologists to support ethnographic studies. Missionaries had a clear purpose in distributing images of the mission. As Geoffrey Oddie writes in “Missionaries as Social Commentators: The Indian Case,” “In what the missionaries wrote there was no attempt at any kind of dispassionate objectivity. They were passionate one-sided advocates resolutely determined to turn the world upside down.”⁵ Furthermore, he suggests that missionaries were under pressure to provide proof of their claims, especially if they were requesting support from churches at home. He writes: “The very success of their reform crusades depended on their collection of reliable and trustworthy
information and on convincing the sceptics and unbelievers.” And what could be more convincing than a photograph?

Missionaries used photography as a means to visualize their aims, to reinforce their beliefs, and to prove the importance and necessity of their work. One could even go so far as to say that they constructed these things photographically. By producing and disseminating images such as those in Jefferson’s album, missionary zeal was generated in the field and at home. Others were influenced by what was considered visual evidence of the validity of mission work and thereby entered the mission field with a pre-formed vision of the peoples they were meant to reform. The result was the photographic confirmation and recapitulation of tropes or types of the other. Before-and-after photographs or images of heathens in their uncivilized or primitive environment provided valuable “proof” of the validity of mission work. These uncivilized peoples were defined by visual signs of illness, unsanitary or unkempt living and working environments, immorality, and poor economic circumstances. Most scholars on missionary photography agree that images of the exotic other created a visual dichotomy between the savage and the civilized, the heathen and the Christian. Where scholarship diverges, however, is on the meaning of these images to missionaries and lay viewers, be they Christians or the host culture.

Paul Jenkins, the retired chief archivist of the Basel Mission House, is a leading authority on the subject of mission photography. Jenkins turned his attention to the archive's collection of photographs in the early 1980s when Christraud Geary, the conservator of the photographic collection in the National Museum of African Arts in Washington, D.C., came to him looking for mission photographs for her 1988 exhibition
on German photography in the Kingdom of Bamum during the period of its German colonization (1884-1919). Since then, Jenkins has written numerous articles on the subject of mission photographs with the aim of drawing attention to the fact that mission photographs are more than just data or supporting documentation for a text. He argues that they should be regarded as having complex meanings requiring interpretation and criticality. In his most recent article, the proceedings of his presentation at a symposium marking his retirement, Jenkins wrote, "I aim to create a space for reflection between the observer and the image, so that even if the supporting data is lacking or, apparently, unambiguous, people know very well that in principle behind the simple message of photographs in media and advertising are complicated lives lived with passion, even if we do not know concretely what they are." He also contends that photographs without any contextual information are, in fact, useless. Useless as sources, I agree, but not entirely useless. Jenkins, in his writings, seems to have overlooked mission photographs being useful to scholars outside of anthropology and history – an oversight made by many. Mission photographs, it seems, have often been ignored as visual objects; rather they have been, and continue to be, viewed by most as windows on history, records of cultural relations between the missionary and the missionized, the colonizer and the colonized. This is not to say that they do not function as records, but rather that the photograph as visual object should also be part of that "space for reflection" that Jenkins seeks, though reflected upon differently.

What has been taken up by many scholars is the contestability of the apparent dichotomies in many missionary photographs – the visual construction of the other, the comparison of the heathens to the civilized missionaries. More recent articles have
challenged traditional perspectives claiming, instead, that photographs show us ambiguities, slippages, even incongruities. Despite what nineteenth-century missionaries may have thought, their photographs are more opaque than transparent. Kim Greenwell, in her article "Picturing 'Civilization': Missionary Narratives and the Margins of Mimicry," introduces the notion of the "savable savage" or "a category that reflected the paradoxical nature of the civilizing process itself and into which Aboriginals were to be ushered but never quite allowed to outgrow." Greenwell's article focuses on Christian missions to the Aboriginals in nineteenth-century British Columbia which, although similar in many ways to overseas missions, differs in that both Aboriginals and missionaries called Canada 'home'. The citizenship that home missionaries promoted, therefore, was a doubled notion of belonging, not just belonging in the eyes of God, but in the eyes of Canadians. Photographs of the "savable savage" acted as a means to both promote the potential for the Aboriginals to be civilized but also as a means to enforce their difference, their otherness. We can see this most prominently in the before-and-after photographs that were readily produced by missions, particularly after 1900. As Richard Eves writes in "'Black and white, a significant contrast': Race, humanism and missionary photography in the Pacific," it was important in promoting missions that images purporting to show savagery or heathenism be coupled with images of conversion so that those supporting the mission would not feel that it was a lost cause. Eves's study focuses on Reverend Brown's and other images from the Pacific Islands and in particular those that juxtapose the natives with the white missionaries — "Studies in black and white." He complicates this dichotomy by suggesting that photographs showing close physical proximity and intimacy between the Pacific Islanders and the missionaries illustrate "a
common bond of humanity, which transcends differences.”¹⁰ To Greenwell’s “savable savage” paradigm, Eves adds paternalism to the relations between foreign missionaries and the host culture. Eves claims that some missions promoted the idea that peoples from the Pacific Islands belonged to “child races.” He writes:

Like children, they were believed not to be entirely responsible for their actions, their behaviour was deemed undesirable and they were in need of the correction and guidance provided by education. [...] Lacking the capacity for self-government, the ‘child-races’ of the Pacific required the benevolent paternalistic interventions and guiding hands of the missionaries to see them to the maturity of adulthood, as civilized Christians. While they could be seen as nominally equal to the European missionaries, ‘as brothers and sisters’ sharing one blood, they were in fact always seen as younger ‘brothers and sisters’.¹¹

Mission photographs reinforced this idea by forwarding the primitivity¹² of other cultures. Furthermore, by the very fact that converted Pacific Islanders did not share the same skin colour as the missionaries, they were set apart, beneath the benevolent “parents” who brought them “into the light of God.” It seems à propos that missionaries turned to a medium – photography – that is contingent upon, even created by, light. Missionaries aimed to mould the heathens in their image, a dark-skinned replica, but never an equal, not the same. So according to Eves, mission photographs, along with their potential to essentialize the indigenous peoples they pictured, had the ability to cut-through the visual binaries established by missive imagery. He further suggests that these more intimate portrayals of the Pacific Islanders and missionaries together presented a model of humanism to the viewer, of a common humanity. According to Christian beliefs, scripture supported this notion: in Acts 17:26 Paul tells the Athenians that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.” We see two conflicting agendas here: one, is to bring the heathens back into the light, redeem
them from their heathenistic ways; the other is to keep the native ‘beneath’ the missionary. Without this lesser status, there would be no reason for the mission, no need for the missionary to act as a guide or parent in the heathen’s assent to the so-called civility and salvation.

The ambiguous meaning of mission photographs has been taken up by other scholars who challenge readings of these kinds of images as didactic illustrations. Helen Gardner and Jude Philp, in “Photography and Christian Mission: George Brown’s Images of the New Britain Mission 1875-80,” suggest that Brown, like other mission photographers from that region and period, used photography and photographs as a means to connect, to form relationships with the local people – their potential converts. Brown’s photographs, therefore, are “moments of intercultural negotiation that reflect both Brown’s motives for exposing the plate and the local interest in the photographic process.”¹³ Christraud Geary, in her most recent contribution to subject, writes that by moving away from traditional notions of authorship – that of the photographer – to a poststructuralist understanding of the production of meaning which includes the subject, the viewer or audience, we can better understand the exchange and discursive systems that informed and made meaning for those very authors and subjects.¹⁴ What this boils down to is the inherent instability of a photograph’s meaning; it is not static. For instance, how would mission photographs be read if they were placed in the context of an ethnographer’s collection or in the portfolio of a photographer native to the area? Is the understanding of these photographs entirely hinged upon their context, of knowing who took them and why? Are these only missionary photographs because we know they were
taken by a missionary, or does our reading of them as complicit with cultural imperialism remain if their provenance is withheld?

To the mission photograph's ambiguity Elizabeth Edwards offers a model for expanding readings and accounting for multiple meanings. In her opening essay to the book *Getting Pictures Right: Context and Interpretation* – the published proceedings from the symposium marking Jenkins's retirement – Edwards writes that first, colonial photographs, including those from missions, must be considered *objects*. We must think "materially" according to Edwards, because the experience of viewing, the material form, can be as critical to the construction of meaning as the image itself. This is particularly important to a reading of Jefferson's album because the experience of viewing the book on the whole is much different than looking at each individual photograph. As Martha Langford writes in *Suspended Conversation: The Afterlife of Memory in Photographic Albums*, the album is a private collection that "domesticates a vast and unpredictable universe, setting its pleasures and terrors into a pattern of knowledge and experience inextricably linked with the self. The compiler/spectator is absorbed by and into the visible world through tangible possession of its photographic emblems and the waking dream work of the imagination." Thinking "materially" about images allows us to consider the context of the photograph in both time and space, their relationships to other images, surrounding texts, and objects when teasing out their meanings.

Perhaps more important to reading mission photographs is what Edwards calls "thinking relationally:"

The relational view is not simply different people bringing different readings to images. Rather it is an engagement with the whole social dynamic of photographs over space and time: [...] photographs as entities
between peoples, and the engagement with photographs as socially salient objects that both encapsulate and define relations between people.\textsuperscript{17}

This model offers access to the many meanings constructed by the missionary's use of photography – meanings for missionaries and Western and non-Western viewers – including the meanings that reinforced stereotypes, dichotomies and otherness. “Thinking relationally” allows us to see in mission photographs the complex and sometimes intimate relationships between the missionaries and the host cultures, the disparate missionary message and two-tiered equality they promoted, and all that might have been lost in translation between the missionary capturing a view of the foreign field and Western eyes seeing this exotic culture and land, possibly for the first time. This model also accounts for the way in which photographs and an album like Jefferson’s maintained relations between this missionary and her fellow Christians in the West. When “thinking relationally,” meaning is dynamic. As Edwards writes, photographs like these “articulate not only meanings – a shared discourse on what Africa or India were for example – but social networks.”\textsuperscript{18} The result is a consideration of the photograph and in this case the album within its context, as context, and its significance as a relational object between the missionaries and the viewing public in the West. In order to understand this set of relations, it is important to consider the meaning of photography in general to late-nineteenth-century North Americans and how this impacted the reception of overseas mission photographs at the time Jefferson compiled her album. This is the most understudied aspect of mission photography to date. Reception is key, however, to a reading of Jefferson’s album because, as her letter indicates, she compiled it for viewers in the West. Although it is impossible to know exactly how her “dear friends” would understand her album, scholarship on nineteenth-century photography from many
disciplines can shed some light on the likely codes of viewing for mission photographs from the period.

Missionaries, before going overseas, had a relationship with and to photography that was defined by the Western world. There was a certain culture surrounding photography in late-nineteenth-century North America, one that was very much influenced by the snapshot camera. The George Eastman company introduced its first "Kodak" camera in 1888 which was followed shortly thereafter by roll film. These inventions changed the face of photography, making it portable, affordable and accessible to the majority of the middle to upper classes. By the time Jefferson departed for India, average North Americans were making snapshots of their everyday lives. Simultaneously, tourism reached new heights fuelled by advances in transportation that allowed middle-class Americans to access near and distant lands. With snapshot photography and tourism exploding in tandem, the result was a new way of seeing the world - through the lens of a camera. For those who did not have the luxury to travel, friends and family could bring home their own personal views from overseas therefore informing the West on how to see the world, how the world looked. The impact of the middle class's new found ability to generate personal and unique (or seemingly so) views of the world is a point of speculation for scholars from many disciplines. At the roots of this new kind of world vision was colonial photography from the mid-nineteenth century and the imperialist perspective on foreign lands and peoples. Photographs of colonized countries in circulation prior to 1888 were mainly the product of advanced amateur photographers who, often under direction of colonial authorities, explored, photographed,
and sold their “views” to Westerners both at home and abroad. Their photographs were a way of depicting an Empire’s “worldly achievements.” In *Picturing Empire: Photography and the Visualization of the British Empire*, James R. Ryan argues that colonial photographs tell us as much about the way the Empire viewed the lands and peoples it colonized as they do about the actual historical moments and places pictured. According to Ryan, “photography is a culturally constructed ‘way of seeing’” and this construct expressed ideologies of imperialism and reinforced their dominion over colonized countries. Furthermore, the imperialist “views” that circulated during the mid-nineteenth century formed the visual foundations of photography by independent travellers. From here, authors like Peter D. Osborne, in *Travelling Light: Photography, Travel and Visual Culture*, have taken-up the task of unpacking the tourist’s use of the camera from the beginnings of photography onward. Osborne very much capitalizes on Ryan’s established idea that photography was a means to visualize the power relations between the colonizer and the colonized and to propagate shared assumptions about the foreign world. Travel photographs of colonized lands in the Victorian era were little more than “confirmation[s] of [their] own images” and legitimizations of the Empire’s sense of moral and social superiority. Photography was a powerful weapon and the snapshot camera enabled the middle class to assert and affirm its authority by wielding their cameras.

Significant to the culture of photography in the nineteenth century was the relationship of photography to the body. Allan Sekula in “The Body and the Archive” and Peter Hamilton and Roger Hargreaves in *The Beautiful and the Damned* offer reflections on the use of photography to maintain social order in the West. Belief in the
veracity of the photographic image enabled pseudo-scientists of the nineteenth century to photographically identify, classify and create statistics of physical characteristics and appearances that both adhered to and defied the assumed (white, middle class) norm. As Sekula writes, “photography came to establish and delimit the terrain of the other, to define both the generalized look – the typology – and the contingent instance of deviance and social pathology.” 23 In photography, physiognomy and phrenology found an irrefutable visual aide. As a consequence, even the simplest photographic portrait assumed an other or those who were the captured deviants of visual and moral order. Key to these visual assumptions was the era’s desire for, and belief in, visual empiricism which fuelled the nineteenth-century obsession with classification. 24 What resulted was the creation of a vast archive of images that were believed to define the other and therefore demarcate those who were considered part of the norm: Western, white, middle class, Christians (very important here although not as plainly visible).

The nineteenth-century fascination with classification encouraged anthropologists to employ photography as a tool for studying so-called exotic or primitive cultures. Much scholarship exists on this sub-category of photography and its role in the visualization of colonial power: Christopher Pinney, for instance, a professor of Anthropology and Visual Culture at University College London, has written numerous texts specific to ethnographic photographs of India. Most importantly, his 1997 book, Camera Indica: The Social Life of Indian Photographs, traces the changing face of photography in India beginning with photography’s birth during the height of the colonial era. Pinney’s writings on nineteenth-century images focus on the photographer’s use of types to define and classify the people of India. Of particular interest to the British was the caste system
which divided (and to some extent continues to do so) Indians into hierarchical social classes according to the circumstances of their birth – their heritage, family’s economic status, occupation and so forth. Perhaps the most well-known and extensive record of types in India is an eight-volume publication of photographs called *The People of India* dating from 1868-75. These 468 albumen portraits of Indians are erratically classified seeing that the images were collected from British civilians and army officers who photographed as they travelled. There was no regulating system of classification. But despite the lack of precision and consistency in cataloguing the prints, in its time this publication was considered an authoritative and official text for studying and understanding the peoples of India. It had a specific political aim: to provide a set of visual clues for detecting those groups who were loyal or resistant to British rule. Consequently, and as Pinney writes, “subjects and individuals become substitutable elements in a hierarchical structure of categories in which all that matters is to be representative or indicative of some wider group.”

Chirstraud Geary and Virginia Lee-Webb, in their edited collection of essays on ethnographic postcards, explain that during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries the circulation of ethnographic images in and outside of the West served to “construct, disseminate, and perpetuate stereotypical images of non-Western peoples.” Ethnographic postcards were part of an imperialist vision of the other and a means to appropriate, possess and exchange images of those who were considered to be the antithesis of Western civilized society. As Geary writes in her contribution to the collection, “Western conceptualizations of race and character, a system of binary oppositions operated in both textual and pictorial productions.” With that in mind, these
postcards were a visualization of what Sekula defines as that assumed other of nineteenth-century, middle-class portraiture. Ethnographic postcards were readily available for sale in Europe and North America and commonly collected and placed in personal photograph albums. Geary includes missionary postcards from Africa in her study which, according to her assessment, were more overt in their production of tropes, stereotypes and even visual contrasts between dark and light – skin and clothing – than their colonial and anthropological counterparts. The aim was to reinforce and visualize the binary between the heathen and the missionary, the civilized and uncivilized and popularize this contrast. Ethnographic postcards made by missionaries and travelling commercial photographers alike were part of the wealth of material created for a Western audience which sought to dictate the way in which the West should view foreign peoples and therefore itself.

Photography put the foreign world into the hands of the middle-class, neatly contained and framed according to popular taste. As publicly circulating views of the foreign world filtered down into snapshot culture, photography became a way for Westerners to relate to the world both near and far. According to Geoffrey Batchen, vernacular photography had a certain social function during the nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Batchen writes: “these [photographic] objects are less about conveying truthful information about their subjects than they are about enacting certain social and cultural rituals through morphological design and object-audience interaction.” Batchen argues that traditional photographic history, built around the canon and individual masters of the medium, denies the social and cultural impact of the medium. According to Batchen, the study of vernacular images reveals this. During the
nineteenth century, images functioned in many different ways, serving a variety of social and political purposes: photographs were generated for both public and private consumption; they were used in publications and for promotion; they informed people of events; they served as aide-mémoire, as documents, and as scientific proof; photographs were readily compiled in albums; and photographic images regularly circulated in the form of stereographs, postcards and lantern slide shows. Photography not only reflected culture, it was part of its fabric.

It follows that missionaries like Jefferson who brought cameras to the mission field also brought with them culturally specific ideas about photography itself. Photography, like writing, was a means for missionaries to communicate and record their experiences for both public and private consumption. But these photographic records communicated with a specific language defined by the Western investment in photography as truth, a visual boundary protecting the norm, as a means to “see” the world, and a keystone for personal and cultural memory. The Western world’s investment in photography defined the codes of viewing for mission photographs. In addition to all of this was the missionary agenda, its Christian, civilizing mission, which is perhaps the only thing that differentiates mission photography from that of colonials and anthropologists. In this way, and as Ryan Dunch – an historian of missions to China – explains, missionaries believed that they were inducting indigenous peoples “into a transnational religious communion that was explicitly and in the fullest sense universal, spanning space and time.” Just as photography was used to delimit the Western norms, mission field photography served to define the visual parameters of this supposedly colour-blind religious community. Here the indigenous subject was both the assumed,
photographic *other* and the picture of moral and social order. This duality is most apparent in before-and-after photographs produced in quantity during the golden years of missionary expansion. Arguably, mission photographs served a similar purpose as missionary writing which was far from objective.

It is important to note that Jefferson, like many others of her day, was a single, working woman who chose a life of personally meaningful work over a husband and family. Missionary work was thought to appeal to the single woman's "capacity for self-denial [and] to her innate desire to relieve suffering." Mission work offered single women opportunities for activities outside of the home, higher education, leadership, travel, a certain amount of public recognition, and "an escape from the stigma that spinsterhood often carried in their own communities." Much has been written on the history and impact of the single woman missionary on the mission field and the advancement of the status of women in the West. Ruth Compton Brouwer in her 1990 book, *New Women for God*, brought into focus the work of Canadian Presbyterian women missionaries to India and the challenges they faced in trying to balance new liberties with the social limitations of missionary work. Although evidence suggests that women missionaries photographed the mission field, it was largely the male missionaries who were the chief correspondents (in word and image) with the mission board and Western public. Women's missionary magazines did publish writings by women missionaries, but photographs in these publications for the most part lack details about the photographer. This is in keeping with an understanding of photographs as *visual data* which was common in Jefferson's time. Recent scholarship on women photographers of the nineteenth century suggests that, despite the belief that women offered a view of the
private or domestic domain—a space considered to be apart from the harshness of the public world—white women photographers, in fact, had the same kind of dominating charge as their male counterparts especially in photographing other cultures. In *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U.S. Imperialism*, Laura Wexler writes that “domestic images” functioned within the same discursive structures and were “made to perform cultural work” just like imperialist photographs from the public sphere.\(^{38}\) What is important here is that domestic images *signify* the domestic realm even if they do not represent it expressly.\(^{39}\) On the mission field the domestic realm extended well beyond the home and encompassed the domains of woman’s work: the women and children of the host country, their home lives, education, and the moral betterment of society. Missionaries believed that the local women were the means of true cultural reform because they had the power to “exert moral influence.”\(^{40}\) The domestic sphere, therefore, was understood to be the ultimate site of social reform. Furthermore, women—particularly single women who did not have the responsibility of a husband and children—were believed to be the only ones who could reach women of the East who were “imprisoned” in an “uncolonized space”—the *zenana*, or the Hindu’s, private, domestic life.\(^{41}\) Accordingly, it is important to consider Jefferson’s authorship of her album as an extension of the *violence* of imperialist photography even though her album offers a uniquely domestic view of the mission field.

Scholars of mission history like Dunch, Oddie, and Brouwer provide engaged investigations of the social and political environment that enabled the popularization of mission work. Unfortunately the same consideration has not been extended to mission photographs which were, as missionaries have been described, “simultaneously *agents* of
the spread of modernity vis-à-vis non-Western societies, and *products* of its emerging hegemony." In order to “think relationally” about mission photographs we must first think “relationally” about photography, itself, which provided the foundation and perhaps impetus for the missionary’s employment of the medium. By putting mission photographs in context – the context of both the missionary agenda *and* the cultural weight of photography at the time – we begin to gain some semblance of their intended meaning and their reception when they were initially circulated. As photographic theorists insist, a photograph’s meaning is not fixed, it is determined by the social network in which it exists: the social relations between the photographer and the subject(s), the photographer and the viewer(s), the subject(s) and viewer(s), and so forth. Missionary work, like photography, is inherently relational. Meaning is therefore brought to the mission photograph, and in this case, the album, by this network and in accordance with the context in which the image was created and is viewed. And so a missionary such as Jefferson, embarking upon her journey into the foreign world, brought with her the tools to translate the shockingly different environment and culture of India into something familiar – an album of photographs.
CHAPTER 2
Bridging the Gap: the 1892 Album

As Amanda Jefferson's letter indicates, she intended to send the 1892 album home to her friends Mr and Mrs Parker of New York. She also hoped that it would be "of service in interesting others in the needs of this great field." This intention presented a challenge: Jefferson knew she could not narrate the album for her friends, or present it in the customary manner, according to Martha Langford, by "pointing, talking, filling in, holding forth."1 This kind of "oral-photographic performance"2 was impossible in Jefferson's case. So through selecting, organizing and captioning these 1892 photographs, Jefferson tried to retain some of the orality of her album. She wanted her presentation of India to be self-explanatory, self-contained. Because she could not fill in the gaps and silences in person, she attempted to construct a narrative that would be audible through the turning of pages, even by those across the world. In this way, Jefferson's album was intended as "suspended conversation"3 to be reactivated by her "dear friends" at home, the meanings revealed through Jefferson's hand rather than her voice. Her album is clearly constructed for a private audience, one who knew Jefferson, or other people like her, through a common community. At the same time, her album was intended to be used as a public document whose function depended on the receiver's understanding of the codes of viewing for personal photographic albums. Jefferson's 1892 series of images, therefore, exists somewhere between a public and private document, maintaining some of the compiler's private narrative and desire to evoke the memory of her - to remind - while designed to be comprehensible by a wider, public
audience. That said, this album was not meant to act as an aide-mémoire of her first months in Kolhapur, rather, it is a show-and-tell of the mission field and India meant to nourish and possibly calm the imaginations of her friends and future missionaries. Even though Jefferson may not have sent the album back to the United States to fulfil its relational purpose, the orality remains because the 1892 series was crafted to speak for itself, or so Jefferson hoped. In picking-up this conversation here and now, however, the meanings have changed. This album, as a relational object, requires a relational analysis – the actors and agents reawakened. Thinking about this album within frameworks and relationships of power will tease out the possible meanings Jefferson invested in her album. Likewise, relational thinking will help to unveil this missionary’s investment in photography itself as a means to speak to the people at home. In this way, and in the words of Elizabeth Edwards, we can unlock the album’s “shared and contested meanings,” enter into dialogue with both the album’s intended message and dynamic story.

All that is known about Mr and Mrs Parker is that they resided in Brooklyn, New York, which was also Jefferson’s home prior to her departure for India. I expect that the Parkers, like Jefferson, were members of the Dewitt Memorial Church in New York City, meaning they shared the same system of beliefs. Furthermore, Jefferson’s expressed hope that the 1892 series might be “of service in interesting others in the needs of this great field,” implies that the Parkers were involved with the foreign missionary community in their region or that Jefferson hoped that these friends would show her album to people in their church. I can therefore conclude that Jefferson’s intended audience was the community of American Presbyterians from the New York region, likely white and
middle-class. Furthermore, it is my contention that Jefferson designed this album with other potential women missionaries at the forefront of her mind because of the apparent domestic view of India, a point to which I will return later.

According to the date of the letter, Jefferson assembled this album soon after her move to Ratnagiri. At that point, she was reflecting back upon her time in Kolhapur which was also her introduction to India, mission life, and her life’s work. Her first months must have been a time of great adjustment, as Jefferson went from imagining India to experiencing it and translating her experiences into photography.

At the time of her departure from New York, photographs circulating of India would have been limited. What visual information Jefferson had about that country likely came to her via travellers and missionaries home on furlough and from mission journals in which photographs were infrequently published, illustrations being more common. This information was not always accurate, rather, it transformed facts about the foreign world into “Western fictions” defined by Western values and beliefs. Jefferson’s album, therefore, was part of a burgeoning network of images, photographic and otherwise, that were meant to communicate the foreign mission field – accurately or not – to the Western reader/viewer. Although snapshot photography was only in its infancy when Jefferson landed in Kolhapur, images produced well before her time likely influenced the ways in which the photographer, presumably Dr William James Wanless, photographed the region and Jefferson compiled her album. In other words, Jefferson’s vision of India was shaped by what Joan Schwartz calls pre-texts, or circulating images – from paintings, book or journal illustrations, travel literature, earlier photographs and so forth – that inform a traveller’s expectations of what s/he will see and photograph. Furthermore, and
as Schwartz explains, photographs were seen as neutral and transparent, offering a “means by which to describe, interpret, order and classify, and thereby come to know and comprehend the world.”

Nancy Micklewright’s book, *A Victorian Traveller in the Middle East*, explores albums compiled by Annie Lady Brassey (1839-1887), the wife of a British dignitary who travelled extensively on nearly every continent during the mid-nineteenth century. Micklewright’s concern, however, is principally for Lady Brassey’s photographic albums of the Middle East – primarily Egypt and Turkey. Jefferson’s album is comparable to Brassey’s in many ways, including the fact that Brassey’s construction of the Middle East was intended for viewers back home who desired to see (via photographs) the lands under the Empire’s political control. Brassey took only a few of the photographs in her many albums; rather she purchased them from photographers on location. Micklewright argues that Brassey’s construction of the Middle East was informed by illustrations and paintings of that region available to her in England prior to her travels – these were the pre-texts. Knowing that Jefferson compiled her album only a few months into her stay in India, begs the question whether her view of Kolhapur was more like a traveller’s – an illustration of her preconceived and imagined ideas of India rather than what she actually experienced or witnessed in that short time. In this way, Jefferson’s selection, organization, and captioning was a kind of authorship of India and perhaps even an “act of confirmation” of “Western fictions” about the East.

Jefferson’s album may have offered her friends at home not only some of the first photographs of India but also the first series of views, constructed in such a way as to create a personal narrative about the country and culture. In this way, the viewers of the
album were encouraged to be “armchair travellers,” acquiring what was believed to be knowledge of a place through the “visual immediacy of photographs.” Jefferson designed her album to help its viewers gain knowledge of and foster a relationship with her mission in India: this was their destination. Unlike a private or personal photographic album, Jefferson’s album was meant to reach a more public audience, meaning that she relied on an assumed, common set of values or cultural memory to shape the public’s understanding of the photographs. She also relied on the codes of viewing for personal photographic albums: influenced by its predecessors – cabinets of curiosity and bound books displaying private collections of visual and material culture – album compilation was part and parcel with the nineteenth-century “fascination with the exotic [...] and obsession with fact gathering.” Snapshot photography, however, was only in its infancy at the point at which Jefferson compiled her album yet most people were accustomed to seeing photographs in the private realm – primarily portraits – purchased from studios and commercial photographers. Furthermore, photographic albums were common in Western households particularly after the introduction of the Kodak when personal photographs lead to private visual narratives of the lives of the compilers. Jefferson relied on this common, cultural language when constructing her album, assuming that the viewers would understand this as a collection of “views” of India, ordered and classified to form a kind of narrative about Kolhapur and its people. At the same time, Jefferson had very ordinary, human aspirations for her album, hoping that it would help maintain relations with her friends and community at home. Consequently, this album attempts to bridge the gap between the public and the private realm: it assumes the viewer would know and understand something about reading albums and travel photographs but also
would understand Jefferson’s values and circumstances – a single woman missionary in India – which would in turn inform how her album would be read.

Not only do the photographs in Jefferson’s album need to be considered within their own historical context – the moment in mission history, the sway of the photographic record, the network of photographs of India circulating at the time, and the value of a the voice or point of view of a single woman missionary – but this album must be considered as context, as a means to frame and narrate one woman’s impression of India in her first months on the mission field. Furthermore, because of Jefferson’s intention for the album, whether or not she sent it home, she invested in these photographs an ability to bind together her near and distant community; this album is an expression of desire for connection with those at home and her new community in India. Her album offers us a means to cut through some of the ambiguities of mission photographs and see something of this particular woman missionary’s relationship to photography and the way in which she viewed these photographs. But at the same time, what these photographs convey through Jefferson’s selection, organization and captioning is a kind of *tender violence*, in the words of Laura Wexler, or the use of “domestic images” to perpetuate an imperialist perspective and the power relations between the dominant West and the uncivilized East. In this way Jefferson’s photograph album truly is a relational object – one that inscribes and maintains the power relations between the missionary and the missionized, the West and the East. That being the case, what does India look like according to Jefferson’s album? What is Jefferson telling its viewers about India?
The Natives and the Naturalized

Jefferson’s 1892 photographs can be categorized under three successive themes: the first (pages one through six) depict the missionaries and the Indian-Christian, or “Native Christians” according to the captions, at the Kolhapur station. The following group of nineteen photographs (pages seven through twenty-five) picture domestic scenes in and around the compound: tradespeople at work and servants performing domestic tasks, such as sewing, carrying water, sawing wood, carrying firewood, carpentry and so on. The last group of nineteen photographs (pages twenty-seven through forty-eight, with some blank pages, some of which appear to be intentional) mainly depict the Western India Mission’s infrastructure: various bungalows, hospitals, schools and sites mostly in Kolhapur plus some from Sangli and Panhala – nearby towns.¹⁴

The second page of the album contains the first 1892 photograph which pictures twenty missionaries, including Jefferson and Miss Emily Minor, on the Kolhapur compound (plate 1). This photograph conforms to traditions for Western group portraiture of the period: group portraits of this kind were typical for foreign missions and commonly published in mission magazines as seen in an 1898 issue of The Women’s Missionary Magazine of the United Presbyterian Church (plate 2). Here in her album, Jefferson has carefully captioned the group photograph with the titles and family names of each person pictured. Each has his or her individuality while being part of a group, a society, and a larger community that reaches far beyond Indian soil. The caption at the bottom of the page reads, “Group of Missionaries in the Kolhapur M[ission] India Jan. 1892.” This photograph establishes the subject position of the album’s author. It pictures Jefferson’s mission family and defines a set of visual codes for inclusion, acceptance, and
civility. It is the key – a template – for reading the remainder of the album. These are the people who belong to the culture and community established within Jefferson’s album. Furthermore, the album itself is standard issue; the outside cover conveys nothing of its exotic interior. With the first photograph picturing a group of Westerners against a backdrop that is not noticeably foreign, the viewer’s gateway to India is through a reflection of her/his known world.

The Kolhapur missionaries are organized in three neat and organized rows: twelve seated women in chairs (although no chairs are visible because of their billowing skirts) make up the two front rows, all carefully placed so that they are each visible to the camera; in the back row stand seven men and two women, the women evenly spaced between the men in positions three and six from the left. None are smiling, all are dressed in Western-style clothing. Behind the group are two stone bungalows separated by a number of leafy trees. This photograph proposes that the viewer should see what follows through the eyes of these missionaries, the subjects, who are white, Western, and Christian. It also establishes the dominance of this group of Westerners even on foreign soil: against this image all others should be considered and judged. According to Allan Sekula, every portrait from the nineteenth century was part of a vertical scale of “social and moral hierarchy.”15 A group photograph like this one was therefore “shadowed by two other more public looks: a look up, at one’s ‘betters,’ and a look down, at one’s ‘inferiors.’”16 In this case, the “look up” is likely metaphoric – looking to their ‘Better,’ to the heavens.17 The “look down,” however, is what the rest of the album constructs and requires from its viewer. If the viewer were unable to equate himself or herself with this
picted community, then Jefferson’s intended meaning would be lost, the faint orality silenced.

Following the missionaries’ group portrait are five photographs of “Native Christians.” The first, on page three, is a photograph of a large group of Indians and is captioned “Some of the Native Christians of the Kolhapur Mission 1892” (plate 3). The form of this group photograph is similar to that on page two, though there are more than double the number of people pictured here. The group is loosely organized, possibly in rows. The majority of them stand, none are seated in chairs. Some obstruct the view of those behind. The left-hand side of the frame cuts into the group which increases the haphazard feeling of the photograph and suggests an unknown end to their numbers. The group is composed mostly of men in turbans, the women all wear saris, and the children seated on the ground and standing in the front rows wear a variety of traditional costumes. Behind the group are a few trees and a brick bungalow much like the one pictured on page two. Standing on the porch, to the far right of the frame are people who appear to be three missionary women and two children (one may be an Indian boy in a turban). They are onlookers, probably unaware that they are in the frame.

On pages four and five are two photographs of small groups. The first is a formal portrait of five Indian men posed in a tier-like shape suggesting a hierarchy between them (plate 4). Jefferson has captioned this image “Native Christian Teachers.” Behind the men is a large hedge that almost appears as a backdrop. On page five is a picture of “Govind and Family. A Native Helper. Baptized at Ratnagiri” (plate 5). As in the portrait of the missionaries, the woman in this photograph is seated although she is not looking into the camera. On her lap is her younger son and her older stands behind his parents.
All are barefoot. They are backed by a stone wall that fills the frame like the hedge in the previous photograph. Page six contains the portrait of a family of fifteen (plate 6) – four men in turbans, six women in saris, and five school-aged children. It is captioned, “One of our Christian Families. Kolhapur.” The men and women stand together in two rows behind a row of seated children; the youngest child in the arms of his/her mother. They pose on a concrete slab, most likely a porch, with a wall and covered doorway behind them. They are on the cusp of the private domain of the household. Jefferson has given names to three of the family members – two women named Radhabai, Ruckmabai, and one man named Daniel. These are the last Indians to be named in the 1892 series of images.

The fact that these five photographs are featured at the beginning of the album gives them significance. They are the viewer’s introduction to Indian life and culture and by proxy they have importance – they are associated with the missionaries’s group portrait on page two in both position and style. These are all formal portraits of Indians although none quite as composed as that of the missionaries. These “Native Christians” – a wonderfully ironic double entendre – are accepted as civilized according to the visual codes established in album’s first photograph. Yet they are not quite as civilized as the model group: their groups are never quite as composed, their poses are less rigid, the framing is not as careful. These images are less tidy, less hygienic. Further to this, the contrast in these photographs is more apparent, which may be a factor only of their exposure and development yet accentuates the darkness of their skin against the whiteness of the men’s turbans and kurtas (long shirts). In these five portraits, the Indians have conformed to a Western model of self-perception marked by composure, formality,
and order. These Indians have retained the outward signs of their cultural identity – their dress – but through photographic cues and Jefferson’s act of naming (“Christians”), they have been allowed into the viewer’s community. Their mimicry is apparent, perhaps dictated by the photographer (Wanless?) who sought to mould the image of these new Christians in the likeness of the missionaries. Furthermore, in Jefferson’s organization of these photographs, she too has imposed a “social and moral hierarchical” upon these Indians. Claiming these people photographically for Christianity is just the beginning of Jefferson’s “look down” at her “inferiors.” 18

These five photographs of “Native Christians” force an appearance of order, of benevolence upon what is in fact a kind of imperial violence. According to Wexler, certain women of the nineteenth century used photography in order to promulgate an imperialist vision of race and class relations. This was all done within the private, domestic realm, however, so that their images appeared to communicate a softer, more human side to these hierarchical dynamics. Wexler contends that the woman’s “innocent eye” tapped into the viewer’s sentimentalism which veiled the violence of these encounters. Furthermore, their choice not to portray the power and dominance of relations in the domestic sphere was a kind of violence in and of itself. She writes:

It is not only what the women portrayed, therefore, but how they traded on their gender privilege not to portray that gave – and still gives – their photography its particular evidentiary value. In their work we can see that the constitutive sentimental functions of the innocent eye masked and distorted what otherwise must have been more apparent: hatred, fear, collusion, resistance, and mimicry on the part of the subaltern; compulsion, presumption, confusion, brutality, and soul murder on the part of the colonial agent. 19

In this way, white, Western women used images of the private life as a means to strengthen and support public (male) imperialist efforts. Furthermore, they virtually
erased the "violence of colonial encounters in the very act of portraying them." Power relationships in the domestic realm were naturalized within the photograph, making relationships between the "colonial agent" and the other appear comfortable, benevolent, civilized. We see this in Jefferson's selection and organization of the first seven photographs in her album: by placing the images of the "Native Christians" in juxtaposition to that of the missionaries, it both forces an awareness of contrast while the comparable compositions and Jefferson's captions allude to a naturalized, harmonized community. This message runs counter to the facts on the ground, for according to Minor, however, "antagonism, prejudice, hostility, and ignorance prevailed" in that region. Furthermore, even once they were admitted to the Christian collective, the album demonstrates that they were still "beneath" the missionaries on the social and moral scale, they being naturalized Christians rather than natural Christians. What follows in album's narrative, however, is that these "Native Christians" also "look down...at [their] 'inferiors'" — their uncivilized origins.

What's In A Name?

Following the five images of the "Native Christians" are nineteen photographs picturing scenes from everyday life in Kolhapur the bulk of which depict local Indians at work. Each is captioned with a few words describing the scene portrayed or the occupation of the Indian pictured. In addition, most have, in brackets, an English phonetic spelling of the equivalent descriptors in Marathi — the principal language of that region. These photographs are perhaps the most ambiguous images in the album. The previous six photographs of the missionaries and "Native Christians" are expected in a
missionary’s photographic album compiled to demonstrate the importance and needs of her mission. These ethnographic images have a much more obscure message – what did Jefferson want the viewers to see in these photographs? What was she hoping they would demonstrate about her mission?

The perhaps too obvious answer is that these images serve as examples of the primitivity of India and its peoples. They are photographic tropes of Indian life common to ethnographic photography of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries created by anthropologists, colonial photographers, and missionaries, among others. Ethnographic photographs were commonly used to survey and study other cultures, to classify differences and similarities within an ethnic group. As Christopher Pinney writes, photography had a crucial role in the treatment of India as a “laboratory for anthropometry.” Jefferson’s selection, organization, and captions do little to dispel an ethnographic, anthropometric reading; by most standards, this is a survey (albeit limited) of the peoples of Kolhapur in the early 1890s. In fact, the Table of Contents of Volume III of R.V. Russell’s 1916 anthropological study, The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India, reads like an extended version of Jefferson’s captions (appendix B). Furthermore, this part of Jefferson’s album contains a number of photographs that can be compared with those in the eight-volume publication for the British government in India, People of India of 1868-75. For instance, page seven of Jefferson’s album pictures “Indian Jugglers and Snake-charmers. (Bairajees)” (plate 7) is similar to photograph 205 from the People of India, captioned “Jogis, Snake Charmers, Hindoos of Low Caste, Delhi” (plate 8); and the “Carpenter” on page eleven of Jefferson’s album is comparable to photograph 236 from the Peoples of India, captioned “Carpenters, Hindoos. Lahore”
(plate 9). Although it seems unlikely that Jefferson or Wanless saw any of the photographs from this series, the similarities in these images suggest that the photographs in Jefferson’s album belong to a larger, Western visual narrative that determined what physical types were “typically Indian.”

The ethnographic series begins with two exotic images on facing pages – the one of “Indian Jugglers and Snake-charmers” (plate 7) on page seven and “A Holy Man. Beggar. (Fakir)” (plate 10) on page eight. In comparison to the “Native Christians” pictured on the preceding pages, these convey a very different picture of Kolhapur; they are in stark contrast to the portraits on the first pages. Compared to the images that follow in the album, these two photographs depict aspects of life in India that were well outside of Western experience. The placement of these photographs strikes me as no accident: the contrast accentuates the metaphoric distance the “Native Christians” had to travel in order to convert to their new religion. It also could be argued that these photographs represent what the missionaries saw as their biggest foes: superstition, native religions, and poverty. These two photographs, therefore, highlight the “need” for the mission. Furthermore, these Indian men are set apart from the photographic image of the Western, ideal, man in appearance in as much as their occupations. All three men pictured are barefoot, wear traditional pugri (headdress), and simple cotton clothes that hang loosely, the beggar’s more so than the snake charmers’ s. As Sekula writes, in the nineteenth century “the ‘average man’ constitute[s] an ideal, not only of social health, but of social stability and of beauty.” For Jefferson’s friends at home, this ‘average man’ is the imagined picture of civility that functions as the shadow for the album’s first depictions of uncivilized Indians, or those who have not been converted. These snake charmers and
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beggar emphasis difference or in Christraud Geary’s words, the “contrast between dark and light” \(^{28}\) even though the “light” is not pictured here, rather, assumed — the photographer, Jefferson, and the viewer. Furthermore, in placing these two photographs in juxtaposition to the “Native Christians” on the previous pages, Jefferson is asking the viewer to judge these heathen Indians by standards set by their converted neighbours. In that judgmental light, these three men wear shabby clothing, appear underfed, and generally unkempt. The jugglers sit on the ground, which none of the adult “Native Christians” do, and the beggar stands alone in a vulnerable, frontal pose. According to this album, unlike their Indian superiors, these men lack subjectivity — they are defined by their occupations as opposed to the “Native Christians” who are defined by their system of beliefs and given proper names.

Following this exotic introduction to the common people of India, Jefferson takes the viewer into daily life in Kolhapur. On page nine, we see a photograph of a man Jefferson describes as an “Oil Merchant (Thaylee)” (plate 11); on page ten, a man seated on the floor beside a sewing machine which is captioned, “Sewing Man (Dirgee)” (plate 12); the next photograph depicts a “Carpenter (Soothar)” (plate 13), followed on page twelve by “Indian Mode of Sawing Wood (Cohar)” (plate 14); page thirteen features a “Water-carrier (Bheesthee)” (plate 15); and on fourteen, a “Washerman carrying the clothes to be washed (Dhobie)” (plate 16). None of these functions are especially exotic to Western eyes. What is different here is the way in which these chores are performed and, in some cases, who performs them. The gender of the tailor and “Washerman,” in particular might have surprised Jefferson’s friends — in the late-nineteenth-century Western household, these were women’s duties. Pages nine through fourteen therefore
unite the Western viewer with the people pictured, allowing Jefferson's friends to relate to these people of difference. These pictures suggest a common humanity bound together by simple needs like shelter, food, and clothing. Moreover, it confirms mission doctrine that claims that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." However, by beginning with the exotic images of the snake charmers and beggar, Jefferson has asked the viewer to see Indian life, morals, and values in contrast with those of the West. With that, this series of "domestic images" points to the strangeness of the Indian's way of living and accomplishing familiar tasks; applying the theories of Sigmund Freud, these photographs are unheimlich or uncanny. As Wexler explains:

Domestic images may be — but need not be — representations of and for a so-called separate sphere of family life. Domestic images may also be configurations of familiar and intimate arrangements intended for the eyes of outsiders, the heimlich (private) as a kind of propaganda; or they may be metonymical references to unfamiliar arrangements, the unheimlich intended for domestic consumption. What matters is the use of the image to signify the domestic realm.30

In this way Jefferson uses "domestic images" in order to stress the primitivity of the Indians by placing them in silent opposition to images of Western domesticity — not necessarily literal images, but images in the mind's eye of the viewer who sees similar domestic scenes around her or him on a daily basis. As Wexler states, "domestic images" are "active, difference-producing mechanisms," difference here produced by the subjects's bare feet, the simplicity of their tools, their turbans and draped cotton clothing, that they are sitting on the ground or squatting (as is the case with the "Carpenter," "Sewing Man," and "Oil Merchant"), and, of course, the darkness of their skin. Difference is also established by the fact that all of these workers are pictured alone
unlike their converted predecessors who are evidently part of a community. Although this may not have been intentional, these men appear vulnerable because they are not associated with a larger group or community – one that might harden them against the mission’s efforts. Isolated from their own group, these are “savable savages,” according to Kim Greenwell, ushered into the civilizing process and narrative, yet stuck here (visually and figuratively) in the realm of the primitive. On the one hand, these labourers signify potential for civility, for development. On the other hand, the photograph has put them into stasis, suggesting that they can never fulfil this potential. It is interesting to note that the bulk of the successful converts to Christianity in India were from the low castes or low class.32 This may have been the result of perspectives held by the missionaries and the Western public who considered this group to be the most downtrodden and therefore most heavily targeted by the mission, or because the lower castes were offered social and spiritual benefits in converting. Either way, this series of ethnographic photographs depicts the group that Jefferson and the viewer believed to be the focus of their efforts. Accordingly, through the very comparison that produces difference, Jefferson’s selection and captions provide the viewer with hope: encouraging the viewer to relate to these Indians meant encouraging the idea that these uncivilized people have the potential to be saved, to rise to the visual and spiritual status of the “Native Christians.” And that potential is important because without any hope of progress, Jefferson’s “dear friends” at home might lose faith in the very mission they supported.

Nature and technology are in juxtaposition to one another in these images of labourers, adding another layer to the complex meanings of this ethnographic series in
Jefferson’s album. The scenes on pages nine through fourteen are somewhat picturesque or romantic depictions of these *primitives*. In this way, the history of art contributes to my reading of these vernacular photographs. Realism’s romantic fascination with rural and peasant life combined with Primitivism’s fascination with the “r awness” of *other* cultures find a perfect match in romantic depictions of *primitive* life in foreign fields. 33 Jefferson’s choice of characteristically domestic subject matter results in a series of images of, in Pinney’s words, a “romantic village setting and [...] scenes of rural artisanship.” 34 In this way, Jefferson’s “innocent eye” serves to convey a romanticised vision of life in Kolhapur, one that appears tame although *ignorant*. This tension between advancement and nostalgia is apparent within the album’s photographs. The “Sewing man” (plate 12), for instance, is seated on the floor next to his sewing machine – a machine on a table and with a chair. This man is literally dwarfed by this machine and it is only the colour of his skin that prevents him from being visually absorbed by the wall and the fabric which he sews. The symbolism is remarkable, especially considering the West’s obsession with new technology in the late-nineteenth century, the camera being part of this. Furthermore, the bulk of the ethnographic-style pictures are fixated on local modes of transportation and beasts of burden: the “Water-carrier” on page thirteen (plate 15) carries two large jugs of water by means of a shoulder yolk; the “Washerman” on page fourteen (plate 16) has the laundry strapped to the back of the bullock he rides; the “Traveling Jugglers (Bhaiyas)” on page fifteen (plate 17) use a goat as well as their backs to carry their load; “A Water-carrier and Bullock (Bail & Bheestee)” on page sixteen (plate 18) display a system for carrying even larger loads of water than the “Water-carrier” on page thirteen; the “Native Doctor (Vyuirod)” on page seventeen (plate 19) is shown in profile with a sack.
on his back; the “Bullock Cart (Bail Sadi)” on page eighteen (plate 20) looks like a small covered wagon with traditional wooden wheels whereas the “Stone Cart (Dugud Sadi)” on page nineteen (plate 21), driven by what looks to be a child, has stone wheels; a “Water Cart (Pani Sadi)” on page twenty (plate 22) is another less labour-intensive means to get water to where it needs to go; the job of the “Woman carrying Fuel (lakood valee)” on page twenty one (plate 23), however, looks rather hard on her body; the “Brahmin Family in a cart (Mundlee gari)” on page twenty two (plate 24) could be having fun; and the group “Carrying Wood to the Bazaar” on page twenty five looks like a team (plate 25), albeit malnourished. Jefferson’s choice to include so many photographs depicting how people get around suggests that she was fascinated with this aspect of life in Kolhapur, perhaps because it signified receptiveness to “honest work” and therefore a means to free the people from poverty. Missionaries believed that work enabled “character-building” and taught the “virtues of self-reliance and self-help” — key component of the mission’s agenda for social reform. Conversely, these images could be viewed in contrast to recent Western technologies that mechanized the greater part of this kind of manual labour. So, further to the shadow archive of images of white, middle-class, Western peoples that acted in silent contrast to these uncivilized heathens, were pictures of the late-nineteenth-century modernized world that both “looked down” on these primitive modes of transportation and romantically “looked up” at nature and a simpler life (which, of course, is another way of looking down, since those who have the power to shed their modernized identities are more “advanced” than those who are forced to live the romantic, “simple life”).
The majority of the Indians pictured must have posed for the camera, like the “Sewing Man,” (plate 12) for instance: the sensitivity or lack thereof of film at that time meant slow shutter speeds when photographing. Furthermore, evidence suggests that the photographer used a view camera rather than a snapshot camera.\textsuperscript{36} That being the case, capturing the “Sewing Man” and all the others pictured would have been a lengthy process that required the subject(s) to sit still possibly for several seconds. The photographer, therefore, was in a position of power in his ability to halt the sitter(s) in time. But the sitter had to comply in order for these photographs to succeed in their description of “typical” life in Kolhapur. Although this series of ethnographic photographs on the surface appears to reinforce the visual binaries customarily attributed to mission photography, the binaries at play go well beyond the “light” versus “dark,” \textit{civilized} versus \textit{uncivilized} and so forth. These photographs do represent power relations that began when the photographer set up his camera in order to capture these views. Jefferson, in her authority selected, edited, and organized the visual fragments available to her, creating order out of what might have felt like chaos at that early point in her mission. But this is an eliding vision of domestic life in Kolhapur, one that omits as much as it includes and limits the intended meaning to a very specific viewer.

\textbf{Domesticity In Context}

Jefferson was quite progressive for her time. She was of the first wave of single women who went overseas to take on what became known as women’s work for woman after a missionary journal of that same name.\textsuperscript{37} Jefferson’s album is a record of the dominant presence of unmarried woman missionaries on the foreign field: in the group
photo on page two (plate 1), thirteen of the twenty missionaries pictured are women, seven of them unmarried. The irony is that despite Jefferson’s call to woman’s work, few of the native subjects in the album’s photographs are female. This is despite the fact that records show there was an equal number of male and female converts in the Western India Mission.\textsuperscript{38} Jefferson’s lack of inclusion of images of Indian women might have been a result of the photographs available to Jefferson: the photographer, presumably a man, may have chosen to picture more men than women because he, likely a missionary, was more concerned with the lives of and the activities that involved local men and boys. The mission field was modeled on the West, therefore split between public and private life, male and female spheres. Missionary women were responsible for the education of Indian women and reform of the domestic realm, which, accordingly, was considered private. What is unique about Jefferson’s album, therefore, is her domestic view of the Kolhapur mission – a private view of the realm that was her concern. This is especially apparent in comparison to Wanless’s photograph album from the collection of his records and papers held by the Presbyterian Historical Society.

Wanless’s album is similar to Jefferson’s – the books themselves are obviously from the same supplier the only difference being that Wanless’s cover is red whereas Jefferson’s is gold. It contains fifty-five photographs, one to a page, all of which are roughly the same size as those from Jefferson’s album (11 x 16 centimetres). The inscription on the inside front cover of Wanless’s album reads, “Miraj 1890-1900.” The photographs, all of which are captioned but most without dates, primarily depict the construction and life of the local hospital, along with a handful of scenes of Wanless’s mission home life and a few views from the Western India Mission. This album appears
to be a family album intended to keep memories of Wanless's life, work, and accomplishments on the field. Its patterns of organization are not easily discernable nor are the photographs's captions descriptive enough to offer any amount of information to a viewer who was not already aware of the circumstances of Wanless's life in Miraj – the captions appear to function as personal aide-mémoire. Wanless did publish, on at least two occasions, a few of the album's hospital photographs in mission journals from the United States. The first article marked the occasion of the opening of the Miraj hospital on July 4th, 1894 and then nearly a year later, a second was published as an update on the hospital's successes and needs. It is clear that even though Wanless's album appears to be private, the photographs therein were also used for the public promotion of the mission.

There are fourteen images that appear in both Wanless's and Jefferson's albums and two that are similar – the same scene but from different angles. Of these sixteen intersecting images, two are from the group of "Native Christian" photographs from Jefferson's album, four are from the group of ethnographic-style photographs, and the other nine are from the last group in Jefferson's album which pictures sites from Kolhapur, Sangli and Panhala. This indicates that Wanless had in his collection many more views than he chose to put in his album, suggesting that he may have been photographing the area for purposes other than his own. It also indicates that Wanless and Jefferson constructed very different visions of the same mission field: Wanless's political/public and Jefferson's domestic, as already established. What a comparison of the two albums offers is a better understanding of Jefferson's intended viewer and therefore her intended message. Without knowing what kind of images were officially
promoting and being produced for the Western India Mission, it would be difficult to ascertain the particulars of Jefferson's view and her communication objectives. Wanless's album is part of the relational network of Jefferson's album.

If the order of Jefferson's groupings indicates anything about their significance to her message then the people of the mission were of paramount concern to this single woman missionary. It is as if she has ranked the people pictured according to their status: she and her fellow missionaries first and the women of Kolhapur last. Whether or not this was intentional, the only woman pictured alone in Jefferson's album is featured on page twenty-one, "Woman carrying Fuel," (plate 23) which is fifth from last of the series of ethnographic photographs. The woman pictured carries a large bundle of what appears to be sticks on top of her head. Her face is in complete shadow making it illegible. Of all the "types" pictured in the album, her subjectivity is most lacking. Within the ethnographic series, women are seen in only four photographs ("Traveling Jugglers" on page fifteen, "Woman carry Fuel" on page twenty-one, "Brahmin Family in a cart" on page twenty-two, and "Carrying Wood to the Bazaar" on page twenty-five) – they are pictured less often than the bullocks. Women in this album appear to have two identities: wives and gatherers. Within the group of photographs of "Native Christians," however, women are seen in all but one photograph (the "Native Christian Teachers" on page four). In Wanless's album, Indian women are discernable in five photographs: on pages five (plate 26), thirty-five (plate 27), forty-three (plate 28), forty-six (plate 29), and fifty (plate 30). All but one of these photographs – that on page five – depict "Native Christians," all of whom are pictured with male counterparts, presumably their husbands. The photograph on page five is captioned "Female Ward, Miraj Hospital." This photograph is not about
the women, but about the institution. What this implies is that Jefferson chose to include images of Indian women whereas Wanless's album suggests that Indian women (particularly unconverted women) were incidental to life in Western India. Although this may not have been Wanless's outlook, it is indicative of the way in which different aspects of the culture were relegated to gendered domains on the mission: the male missionaries attended to the infrastructure and public (male) life whereas the women were concerned with the domestic and private (female) aspects of the field. This is not surprising considering the social environment of the West in the late-nineteenth century which largely consigned women and men to separate spheres. What is unique here is that Jefferson has managed to maintain this domestic view while using images created within the male domain. Furthermore, unlike the official visual documents from the mission, the bulk of which were created and circulated by men who were the chief correspondents, Jefferson's album provides a window on how single women missionaries visually constructed their world. Unlike writing and correspondence which was required of all missionaries, regardless of their gender and marital status, photography on the Western India mission, especially that pre-dating 1900, appears to have been a male-dominated activity. Wanless photographs have to date been the most recognized from that mission. This may also have been the case of other overseas missions, as indicated by the scholarly attention given to the photographs of Rev. George Brown. There are exceptions – the photographs of Anna Wurhmann are an excellent example – but the lack of scholarly attention to this category of colonial photography means that only provisional conclusions can be drawn about the number of male versus female photographers on foreign fields. Nonetheless, I expect that the prevalence of male missionary's
photographs of the field was, in part, a result of the Western sexualization of private and public life where men were considered to be the representatives of the public sphere and had the ability to travel – and therefore photograph – freely. Therefore, the views of nineteenth-century foreign missionary work that remain are by and large public, official and from a man’s point of view. The history of missions has been written accordingly.\textsuperscript{41} Furthermore, it is difficult to estimate the role of mission boards and archives in prioritizing the male vision of missions – what they deemed to be important, official records were therefore preserved. This is not to say that male missionaries did not photograph indigenous women, rather, official records de-emphasized the domesticity of the mission field in the late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-centuries publications (as, until recently, did the history books) despite the fact that by the time Jefferson arrived in Kolhapur, more than half of the missionaries were women. The exceptions to this were publications specifically targeting Western women which tended to advance a domestic view of the mission field.\textsuperscript{42} So whereas Wanless prioritized the infrastructure of the mission in his album – the hospital (of course), the churches, bungalows, schools, wells, roads and so forth – Jefferson placed these at the end of her 1892 images probably because they showed little of her so-called domain in India. This last look at the Western India Mission in 1892 also stresses what might have been viewed as progress or achievements – it alludes to the missionaries’s superior \textit{civilization} – yet Jefferson’s patterns of organization emphasize that which was not as commonly seen: the women’s sphere. Jefferson and Minor’s “Bungalow at Kolhapur” is pictured on page twenty-seven (plate 31), “Mr. Goheen’s Bungalow – Kolhapur” on page twenty-eight (plate 32), and “The Girls’ School and Dormitory – Kolhapur. Miss Patton in charge” on page twenty-
nine (plate 33). From there we see the sights of Kolhapur, not the mission: the “King’s Palace” (plate 34), the front and back of the state hospital (plates 35 and 36), a roadway “shaded by Tamarind Trees” (plate 37), and the Town Hall (plate 38). Sangli follows with the traditional images of the Mission Church (plate 39), the boy’s school (plate 40), Wanless’s Dispensary (plate 41), followed by local infrastructure – a “Well” (plate 42) – but then, a twist: a “Native Whiskey Shop” (plate 43) and a “Hindu Temple”\(^43\) (plate 44). The photographs of Panhala are even more exotic: a “Nautch Girl’s Tower” under which supposedly “a nauleh girl (Dancing girl) was buried alive” (plate 45); and the “Queen’s Summer Palace” where “Human sacrifices were once offered” (plate 46). The 1892 series closes with a picturesque photograph of “A Big Tree” in Panhala (plate 47), put into perspective by the small horse and carriage to the left. This last photograph communicates nothing about India, rather, it speaks symbolically: this is a romantic vision of India, of a culture closer to nature than to civility. And thus are communicated the “needs of this great field.”

Knowing that Jefferson’s view of India is domestic, one could assume that she constructed her album to reach a more domestic viewer – other women. It is my view that this album was constructed, intentionally or not, to appeal to a nineteenth-century, unmarried white women’s taste, so that more women could be recruited to foreign mission work. By putting on display these largely unseen aspects of life in and around the Kolhapur mission, Jefferson created a domestic narrative of India, one that attempted to visualize woman’s work for woman and the rising authority of the single woman missionary in the field. This view gives women’s foreign missionary work agency. That said, the photographs themselves plus Jefferson’s captions and organization function as a
system of classification and a nearly scientific attempt at objectivity. Furthermore, nowhere in the 1892 series are Indians and missionaries pictured together. Again, this may have been a function of what was available to Jefferson, but her organization of the album suggests not. As Jefferson attempted to create an album that speaks for itself, it seems that she constructed an India that was supposed to do the same. Her classification of the unconverted Indians speaks to standards in the so-called sciences of the day which aimed to study other cultures. She subscribed to the myth of photographic objectivity: that, assisted by photographic technology, Westerners could get a hold of the people of Kolhapur. But considering that Jefferson’s 1892 images were compiled in a short period of time and all of the photographs are from the same year, she presented a temporally fixed view of that region. Unlike most family albums that grow and evolve with the family, this album had a distinct purpose that was believed to function outside of time. Jefferson’s intent was not to document Kolhapur, and arguably India, but to describe it categorically for the sake of an unknowing viewer. As a consequence, Jefferson created a static view of the culture, itself, never changing or evolving – tropes were sufficient. In this album, India is reduced to a series of types that convey nothing of the past or future of the people; rather, the culture’s context is determined by its otherness. The exceptions to this is the photograph of the “Sewing Man” (plate 12) whose uncivilized appearance – he is seated on the floor – is in tension with the sewing machine which connotes progress, industry, and civility. The divide between the tailor and his machine, however, implies that despite colonial advancements, the (lower caste) culture is static. The “Native Christians” are the only Indians in the 1892 series who are not defined in this way, rather
their images rely on a temporal understanding. These Indians represent change whereas the other uncivilized Indians are fixed, other.

Through the process of compiling this album, Jefferson ordered and compiled a narrative about her own sense of community and belonging. At the same time, she tried to act as a translator between India and home, using photography as a “universal language.” Moreover, through selection and grouping, Jefferson constructed meaning for these photographs – photographs that are ambiguous at best – which reflected her own perspective and her expectations about what the people at home would see in these images and how they would read them. Through her album she aimed to bridge the gap between the foreign and the familiar and in so doing made India fit into a Western framework. Jefferson herself may have done this as a means to order or make sense of this vastly different terrain and way of living. It is worth considering that part of Jefferson’s intended meaning of the 1892 series may have been wrapped-up in her integration into that culture – her culture shock. As Sherrie A. Inness describes in her article about Mount Holyoke Missionaries, women were often ill-prepared for the adjustments to the culture and the environment: they felt isolated, they encountered drought, disease and hostile people, and some never integrated into their new society.44 According to Frederick J. Heuser, the biggest challenge for these women missionaries may have been learning to accept the culture and people of the foreign land. Furthermore, the lack of training and access to “accurate” depictions of foreign cultures meant that missionaries arrived burdened with opinions and biases about the host country and people. As a result, correspondence from new missionaries on the field often reproduced the idea of the “depraved, ignorant heathen in need of salvation.”45 Considering that
Jefferson compiled her album during her first few months on the field, it seems likely that India appeared as exotic to her as it would have to her friends at home. That being that case, she was in the perfect position to attempt to translate her surrounds into a comprehensible Western language – the photograph album. At that early point in her mission she still saw India through Western eyes, comparing it to white North American middle-class values and experiences. This begs the question of whether the album’s “suspended conversation” was in fact reflexive – an attempt to put the seemingly raw world around her it into the symbolic order. In this light, the ideal viewer for whom Jefferson constructed this album was, in fact, she herself, preserving the memory of how she viewed India when she first arrived so that she could pick-up this conversation again once her vision had changed. Regardless of whether her ideal viewer was Jefferson or her “dear friends,” the narrative Jefferson intended to be accessible to the public is heavily coded and all too reliant on a very particular point of view in order to be well understood by the twenty-first century reader. What was intended to justify or document what Jefferson believed to be the purpose and “needs of this great field,” reads now as an ambiguous message about this woman’s vision of India and its people. What is clear, however, is that Jefferson invested meaning in these photographs from the mission field, meaning that she hoped and believed would speak to her “dear friends” at home. Whether the album ever fulfilled this purpose is a different story.
CHAPTER 3
Mission to Save: Jefferson’s Family Album

The last eight photographs in the Amanda Jefferson album form a group whose compilation – acquisition and annotation – cannot securely be dated. It seems unlikely that Jefferson sent the album to New York in 1892; instead, she continued to add photographs and captions as the years passed. The captions for the three photographs of 1896 (pages fifty-two to fifty-four) – “Hot Season Group” (plate 48), “Wedding of the Gardener” (plate 49) and “Mary Hannum & Robert Henry Hannum” (plate 50) – indicate that an explanatory letter was meant to accompany these photographs. This letter is missing from the album. That Jefferson wrote the letter suggests that she still intended this album for her friends at home although she believed that these photographs were less able to speak for themselves than the 1892 series.

The last eight photographs are indeed more coded and selective than those from the 1892 group. This is a personal collection, meant for private consumption. The captions continue to explain the photographs, though the narrative is obscure. Two images on pages forty-nine and fifty, are dated 1893, depict Jefferson and Minor outside their school for Hindu girls and their shared bungalow (plates 51 & 52). Page fifty-one features a large group photograph from 1896 of the missionaries at Ratnagiri (plate 53), which is captioned on the facing page. Also on page fifty-two is a smaller photograph from that same year of the “Hot Season Group” (plate 48) which includes Jefferson. Following this are two more photographs from 1896: the snapshot from the Gardener’s wedding (plate 49) and the posed portrait of the Hannum children (plate 50) – two
children of missionaries at Ratnagiri. The single photograph from 1897 that follows is
captioned, “Famine people; workers on Miss Jefferson & Miss Minor’s Compound”
(plate 54). The image is quite faded but it appears to show Jefferson standing beside a
large group of near-to-skeletal workers, adults and children alike. The last photograph in
the album (page fifty-six) pictures two Indian girls dressed in Western frocks (plate 55).
Jefferson’s caption reads: “Muktie Savitni 1898. Little Hindoo girls adopted by Miss
Minor & Miss Jefferson.”

In the late-nineteenth century, compiling photographic albums was a relatively
common practice for women.¹ As Marilyn Motz writes in Visual Autobiography:
Photograph Albums of Turn-of-the-Century Midwestern Women, albums created by late-
nineteenth-century American women were a “construction of [their] lives as they saw
them and as they wished to have them seen by others.”² Jefferson, according to these last
eight photographs, was a teacher, domestic partner, friend, mother, and, of course,
missionary. This is how she chose to photographically present her identity. Furthermore,
these pages conform to some of the standards of the family album. Martha Langford
writes that family albums often contained a “repertoire of photographic types includ[ing] persons, objects, places, and occurrences. A vast composite array opens up under the
umbrella of daily life, photographs of people whose portraits are cast in the familiar light
of habits, hobbies, and mundane affairs.”³ Jefferson’s fellow missionaries and the
Christian community are depicted in these 1893-98 as a kind of family, bound together
by a set of cultural and religious values, as well as their mission. Moreover, in each of the
eight photographs in which Jefferson is pictured, so is Minor, with the exception of the
photograph on page fifty-five where Minor is only present in name – in the caption.
Jefferson’s captions bind Minor and her together as a pair. These two women were companions and, for all intensive purposes, a family.

Although the last eight photographs do not appear to have the same kind of message as the 1892 series, they still communicate what Jefferson found meaningful in the field and what was noteworthy. Much like a family album, this is a collection of souvenirs and memories linked together by a private narrative. This album’s orality is coded, however, and the keys have been lost with the missing letter. The context of this album has therefore changed: a reading of the 1893-98 photographs and captions is contingent on meanings brought to it by contemporary viewers. We are now the key actors and agents in the relational network of this album.

Assuming that Jefferson did not send the album home in 1892 and that she added these later photographs over time, it is worth considering the last eight photographs as part of, although distinctly different from the 1892 series and narrative. Jefferson’s captions indicate that she did not see the 1892 series as closed or complete: as explained in Chapter 2, the captions accompanying the 1892 photographs include some Marathi translations of the English descriptions. The ink in which these Marathi words is written is darker than the original captions, suggesting that Jefferson added these words at a later date when her knowledge of Marathi had developed. These additions also indicate that Jefferson looked back through the 1892 series with new and more acculturated eyes and desired to correct, if not counterbalance, the Western point of view of her early compilation. Her additional captions are yet another attempt at cultural translation for the sake of the viewer at home. The last eight photographs, however, do not include Marathi captions, perhaps because the photographs focus on mission life, which was assumed to
be sufficiently Western. As a continuation of the 1892 narrative, these eight images speak of Jefferson's personal experience of India and as a missionary. Again, these are markers of what she found meaningful.

The 1893-98 photographs are nearly identical in size and print quality to the 1892 photographs. Jefferson indicated in her 1892 letter that she and Mr Hannum each had cameras. It therefore seems likely that Jefferson and/or her fellow Ratnagiri missionaries were the authors of many of these images. The photographs mounted on pages forty-nine to fifty-one, as well as one image on page fifty-five, appear to be documents of life on the Ratnagiri compound: Jefferson and Minor with their pupils and again in front of their home (plates 51 & 52), a large group photograph of the missionaries taken in 1896 (plate 53), and Jefferson with famine victims who worked on the compound (plate 54). The large group portrait stands out from others in the album. The print is much larger than all of the other photographs and is in much better condition – it was properly exposed and fixed. It is also sharper and the grain is finer than the rest of the album’s photographs. It follows the same photographic conventions for group portraits that are seen in the first photograph in the album (plate 1), which pictures a group of missionaries standing and seated in neat rows. These characteristics suggest that the picture may have been taken by a commercial photographer or at least printed in a different darkroom than the rest. The size and condition of this group photograph gives it significance in the context of the album. The occasion was important, warranting a better than normal photographic record. This image, like that of Jefferson and Minor depicted alongside their pupils and their bungalow, may have been part of a wider effort by the missionaries to photographically document their work and field.
The photograph of Jefferson and Minor with their pupils is the first image in the album that pictures missionaries and Indians together. It conforms to what Christraud Geary maintains are “pictorial strategies and iconographical codes” that were common for mission photographs from the period. She writes:

An obvious visual characteristic of many mission postcards is the contrast between dark and light, with the missionary father or the nuns, often clad in white, being the white/light (thus “pure”) protagonists, and the missionary charges presenting a distinct difference in clothing and race. [...] Frequently the missionary or missionary sister dominates the Africans from a privileged position by standing in the centre of or towering over a group of students, or by being seated, surrounded by missionary pupils. This common iconographic convention reinforced the centrality of the missionary, the hierarchy between the knowing and the unknowing, and thus the ultimate superiority of the whites.

The photograph of the large group of “Famine victims” (plate 54) is yet another example of this treatment, except here the contrast between “dark” and “light” is further accentuated by the effects of age on this poorly preserved photograph. Due to fading, Jefferson, who is pictured on the far right, appears to glow. She wears a pale-coloured blouse and skirt that cover her from neck to toe, a pale hat on top of her head, and she holds a white parasol in her left hand. Her face is nearly indiscernible, blending into her clothing and the white wall behind. In contrast, the dark-skinned, near to skeletal workers mainly wear dhotis (waist-cloths) that blend with their skin tones. Some hold baskets on top of their heads which are of similar tones as their skin. This photograph most certainly was taken in order to solicit support from the people at home, as a visual appeal for aid. It seems that using photographs as proof of need was not uncommon: a similar kind of photographic plea can be seen in the June 1898 issue of The Women's Missionary Magazine of the United Presbyterian Church, which pictures a number of children seated in front of a white building – presumably their orphanage (plate 56). The photograph is
captioned “Our Famine Orphan Children in India.” These children, however, look much more robust than the people pictured in Jefferson’s album and wear more substantial and clean-looking clothing. This image fills the first page of the issue although it is not followed with an article explaining the needs of the missionaries, rather, it stands alone suggesting that it was believed to speak for itself, attesting visually to India’s dire conditions. Jefferson’s photograph is another documentary cry for help. But despite these good intentions, this photograph and the others picturing Jefferson and Minor alongside local Indians are another kind of tender violence. They are “active, difference-producing mechanisms”7 that use the domestic realm to confirm and maintain relationships of power between the West and the East. Within the context of an album that was meant to promote the mission and solicit support, these photographs – indeed, the album as a whole – proclaims that India needs care, needs saving.

The photographs on pages fifty-two to fifty-four and fifty-six do not appear to be documents intended for public consumption rather, they are records of Jefferson’s personal experiences and desires to remember. These are by far the most coded pages in the album. The captions indicate that Jefferson believed that the three photographs dated 1896 – “Hot Seasons Group” (plate 48), “Wedding of the Gardener” (plate 49), and the portrait of the Hannum children (plate 50) – were not self-explanatory, rather needed the support of a letter in order to be understood by the viewers at home. The “Hot Seasons Group” of five missionaries – Mr Seiler, Mr Graham, Jefferson, Minor and one unidentifiable woman (perhaps Mrs Seiler?) – are pictured in front of a building with substantial columns. It is larger and more ornate than the other buildings pictured in the album. The photograph from the Gardener’s wedding is equally obscure and perhaps the
most puzzling photograph in the album. Only Indians are in attendance and the costume of the bride and groom suggests that this is a Hindu wedding. Two things are surprising here: first, that this photograph is in Jefferson’s album, and, second, that the Gardener is not Christian. Presuming that a missionary took this photograph, what does it mean that she or he attended a Hindu wedding? If the photographer did not attend the wedding and was instead asked to take this picture for the Gardener’s personal memory, why did Jefferson have a copy? And why would she put it in her album? Presumably the letter would have answered these questions, but they linger for the contemporary viewer.

The photograph of Mary and Robert Hannum from 1896 is another oddity in the album. According to Robert Hannum’s autobiography, Mary Hannum died from diphtheria in 1897 at the age of four. It could be that Jefferson was close to the Hannums and chose to commemorate Mary’s death by placing this photograph in her album. This may have been the first death in Jefferson’s missionary family at Ratnagiri making it particularly poignant. Records show, however, that it would not be the last death the missionaries from the Western India Mission would experience, not even the Hannums. Illness was common amongst the missionaries making it difficult for the stations to maintain a full staff at all times. Famine also struck the region on more than one occasion making death amongst the local population even more common. The 1876-77 famine prompted the mission to open an orphanage at Kolhapur providing the missionaries with apt pupils, “especially in religious truths.” Rescuing orphaned or abandoned children became a common practice on Indian missions because of the number of orphans at the hand of famine. In an 1898 letter published in The Women’s Missionary Magazine,
Josephine L. White, a American missionary in Rawal, Pindi, asked that the children of the West pray for young famine victims in India:

This great famine has given a great many little ones to different missions in India. These little ones here might never have known anything of our dear Saviour if the famine had not left them starving to death for want of food and for the body which perisheth. I want you to pray that they may never again lack for that which perisheth not with the using. Pray that they may grow up children of the King, serving Him and striving in everything to do His will and by so living by the means of bringing many to the Lord.\textsuperscript{12}

The last photograph Jefferson mounted in her album seems to answers those prayers.

**Daughters of Difference**

According to the caption, the photograph on page fifty-six pictures the adopted Indian daughters of Jefferson and Minor (plate 55). Two handwritten words at the bottom of the photograph – possibly their names – have been scratched out. The girls stand closely together, Muktie, the elder, with her hand resting on Savitni’s shoulder. Savitni cradles a doll in her left arm. The two are barefoot. Both girls have their hair tied up neatly, parted in the centre. They wear different patterned dresses; Muktie’s principally pale in colour and Savitni’s plaid. The dresses fit loosely. The way Savitni’s skirt hangs suggests that her stomach is distended. The girls stand in front of a potted shrub backed by a white wall. Palm leaves reach into the right of the frame. They are pictured on the “boundary marker of domestic space.”\textsuperscript{13}

Despite my search through the Jefferson’s letters and records held at the Presbyterian Historical Society of the United States, I have turned up no information that explains the image of Muktie and Savitni; nothing other than this photograph remains of
these two Indian girls and their relationship to this Canadian woman missionary. The conditions of their adoption remain a mystery. According to her relatives, however, Jefferson spoke of these girls to her Canadian family during one of her frequent trips to Nova Scotia from her retirement home in Dorset, Vermont.\textsuperscript{14} The presence of this photograph in Jefferson's album suggests that Muktie and Savitni were of considerable importance to Jefferson. Considering that the album's last eight images are reminiscent of a private album, Jefferson's choice to include the photograph of Muktie and Savitni, to preserve their image, and to document their adoption in her album, indicates that her relationship with these girls was meaningful. The image is attached to the last page of an album that was initially assembled for public viewing meaning that this photograph acts as punctuation for the 1892 visual narrative. As a travelogue on the path to Jefferson's acceptance of the \textit{heathens} of India and the confirmation of her purpose, this image marks the journey's end. It gives the album a kind of closure while raising many questions in the mind of the modern viewer: Who are these girls? Why were they adopted by Jefferson and Minor? What did "adoption" mean in this context? Questions aside, perhaps what is most important about this photograph is that it provides a rare look into an intimate relationship between the missionary and the \textit{heathen}, in the late-nineteenth century and an indication of the power missionaries gave to photography in their efforts to save souls.

There is no way of knowing whether Muktie and Savitni understood the conversion they were about to face — a presumed requirement of their adoption. Likewise, there is no way of knowing whether these girls ever saw this image or, if they did, whether they were able to comprehend the significance of their visual transformation, the
identities constructed for them with the camera and the resulting photograph’s placement within Jefferson’s album. What is known is that this photograph generates the image of conversion for Muktie and Savitni. Within an album that was intended for a white, Western, Christian viewer, Muktie and Savitni are pictured as belonging to the missionary community and culture Jefferson depicts in her album. This community is bound by the appearance of a common system of values, one that functions and is defined in contrast to images of heathen India. The resulting binaries established in and by Jefferson’s album – Christian versus “Hindoo,” cultured versus uncivilized, educated versus uneducated, West versus East – melt into one another in the last photograph in the album: the image of Muktie and Savitni. This photograph confirms the “global universals” that motivated missionary work and were prevalent in nineteenth-century missionary discourse. In “Beyond Cultural Imperialism: Cultural Theory, Christian Missions, and Global Modernity,” Ryan Dunch suggests that missionaries played a significant role in establishing and disseminating belief in universal truths during the development of the modern order. This belief in the normative, however, tended to produce cultural difference despite the missionary’s aim to bring humanity together under the auspices of a Christian God. Dunch asks: “might there be ways in which missionaries generated cultural differentiation within and between societies, whether through appropriations of parts of their message or through reactions against them?” The portrait of Muktie and Savitni embodies this friction between normative and difference: the girls are pictured as naturalized citizens adopted into a family of Western women, a Christian community, and Jefferson’s home culture while being labelled as other, as “Hindoo.” In the terms elucidated by Michael Taussig in Mimesis and Altermity: A
Particular History of the Senses, Muktie and Savitni are caught within the “insoluble paradox of the distinction between essence and appearance.”¹⁸ They are both altered and left unchanged by this image; their “inner substance” remains Indian yet they appear converted.¹⁹ By means of this photograph, Muktie and Savitni are both produced and defined by their difference yet they are “saved” with this image, twice born – their new identity constructed by mimesis and alterity. This image and their naturalized identities are a new “social currency” for Muktie and Savitni.²⁰

New Mothers

In the case of India (and arguably most foreign missions), Indian men were the primary focus of attention for missionaries. Although there was considerable concern for women – female education, childhood marriage, the fate of widows, the tradition of sati – prior to the last quarter of the nineteenth century, few missionary journals or reports attended to the status of Indian women. What changed was a shift in perceptions about Western women, particularly those who were unmarried and the resulting appointment of the Western single woman to the mission field.

The 1890s were the “boom” for single women: they could lead independent, adventurous, and somewhat glamorous lives in comparison to the prior constraints of the private sphere.²¹ No longer were women restricted to the private realm of the household nor did they need to forsake their “womanhood” in order to have a public life.²² New career opportunities available to unmarried women facilitated independence from men financially and physically.²³ Long-term, domestic relationships between single women were generally accepted as a substitute for marriage and were not uncommon for late-
nineteenth-century spinsters. According to the 1938 issue of Western India Notes, however, the longevity of Jefferson’s and Minor’s relationship and companionship was unusual for the mission field: their partnership was described as a “unique feature in their missionary life.” Jefferson and Minor retired from missionary service and settled together in a manor for retired missionary women in Dorset, Vermont. From there they made regular trips to Nova Scotia to visit Jefferson’s family and to the Columbia Bible College in South Carolina. After Minor’s death in 1938, Jefferson wrote in memory of Minor, that theirs was an “intimate relationship for over half a century” and that she owed to Minor “more than mere words can tell.” They were partners and the adoption of Muktie and Savitni meant that they became a family.

Jefferson and Minor were part of the golden age of missionary expansion which saw numerous North Americans enter the mission field, the majority of them women. Through foreign missionary work “even respectable women could become adventurers, and even ordinary women heroines.” Like their adopted mothers, the recreation of Muktie and Savitni was enabled by Christianity. Foreign mission work offered New Women like Jefferson and Minor independence. As this photograph suggests, Muktie and Savitni’s adoption gave them a certain “upward” mobility too – from the heathen “Hindoo” to civilized Christian. On the surface they are converted, freed of the depravity and ignorance of their origins, but tucked underneath their rigid pose, cotton dresses and photographic likeness is their “inner substance.”

As previously stated, the Western part of India was subject to a number of droughts and famines in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries as indicated by the photograph of the “Famine people,” dated 1897 (plate 54), which is on the facing
page to the portrait of Muktie and Savitni. Jefferson's placement of these photographs and their dates – a year apart – suggests a narrative in which the two girls were rescued from deprived conditions similar to that of the pictured workers. Accounts suggest that this was not an uncommon practice, that other missionaries at Ratnagiri “adopted” Indian orphans. Robert Hannum (1892-1974), the eldest son of William and Annabel Hannum, writes in his autobiography:

On the day of my birth, May 16, 1892, Father found a newly born boy deserted by the road and brought him home to my mother. “Now we have a dark son and a white son,” he told her. My parents adopted Vitthu Ragu and he was my early companion. He was cared for by a nursemaid in a bungalow next to our home.\textsuperscript{30}

According to Ruth Compton Brouwer in \textit{New Women for God: Canadian Presbyterian Women and India Missions, 1876-1914}, the famines of 1897 and 1900 prompted many missions in India to rescue orphaned children and homeless widows – relief efforts that were not without evangelism; the missionaries recognized that these orphans and women had the potential to become the “back-bone” of the growth of their Christian institutions.\textsuperscript{31} Dr Margaret (Maggie) O’Hara who worked as a medical missionary to Central India for the Presbyterian Church in Canada informally adopted three girls – a teenage mother and her two infants. O’Hara had a great affection for all three girls, affording them a good education with hopes that they might take her place once she retired.\textsuperscript{32} Brouwer suggests that for some single women like O’Hara, the care of orphaned children helped to sustain these women in the face of the despair they might have felt without a family life.\textsuperscript{33}

The care Jefferson and Minor gave Muktie and Savitni must have saved them from a certain amount of hardship. In the late-nineteenth century, India’s women were
still wholly reliant on men for support. Fathers were the providers for the family – they arranged marriages and supplied the dowries for their daughters – and husbands took over where fathers left off. Without a father to perform this role, Muktie and Savitni’s futures would have been the responsibility of the orphanage and likely very bleak. In some missionary-run girls schools, missionaries took on the paternal role for the girls but this was not the norm. It was in the interest of the mission, however, to wed their girls to Christian boys in order to continue the Christianization of the India. This also served to modernize Indian women, “saving” them from a life of gruelling labour and child marriage. Whether or not Muktie and Savitni’s adoption conformed to current standards of adoption, it was within the missionizing interests of Jefferson and Minor to see to the care, education, and proper marriage of their Indian daughters.

Despite the fact that these girls were not born of Jefferson and Minor, this image of them as adoptees taps into the tradition of photographic demonstrations of lineage. According to Langford, the family album is known as a forum for visual genealogy but also of identity. A photograph of the Hannum children is a good example of this—it demonstrates the Hannum line and their ability to maintain their Western identity even when surrounded by the heathen culture of India (the middle sections of the album). The image of Muktie and Savitni is a family photograph: a family of two Indians, headed by two Caucasians, all four female. This photograph both explodes and conforms to nineteenth-century ideals of the Western family with the gender, race, class, religion and nationality of the Jefferson-Minor family. It tells the viewer of the album that Muktie and Savitni will be raised in the likeness of their parents – progressive women who will rise above the limitations of their culture and time. Despite their Indian or “Hindoo” origins,
this photograph of Muktie and Savitni signifies a means for Jefferson and Minor to continue their work and identities as independent Christian women. The photograph demonstrates that these girls will continue the Jefferson-Minor line not in appearance, not even in name, but in their values and culture.

Dressing the Part

This 1898 photograph of Muktie and Savitni stands as a symbol and description of their adoption. This image is, in the terms of Mary Louise Pratt, a “contact zone” between these girls and their soon-to-be adoptive parents, culture, religion, and place within the context of Jefferson’s album. This image demonstrates what Taussig calls the merging of “copy and contact.” The likeness of Muktie and Savitni is “sensuous knowledge,” particularly a “knowing” through the visual and haptic senses. As a result, their likeness is affected by this contact, by what is other than them.

The dresses Muktie and Savitni are pictured wearing were not typical of late-nineteenth-century Indian girls’ clothing. Muktie and Savitni are dressed in Western-style frocks, most likely hand-me-downs from one or two Western families. These dresses are simple in both detailing and construction made of common, patterned fabrics with little or no ornamentation. The sleeves have a bit of the fullness associated with American girls’ garments from the 1890s, but the skirts are longer than what was typical for young girls like Muktie and Savitni. These dresses are not high fashion, they are practical and inexpensive frocks for everyday use, typical of work or play dresses in both rural and urban United States in the late-nineteenth century. Furthermore, the pale colour of their dresses against the darkness of their skin act as a kind of “contrast between
dark and light,” in accordance with Geary’s account of iconographical codes. Together they assume this contrast, wearing the allusion to purity as they do their Western frocks. According to Taussig, the mere act of putting on Western-style clothing meant these girls were coming into physical contact with the West: “the touch, the feel, like putting on a skin.” It is noteworthy that during the height of the British colonial rule in India, men, not women, adopted European fashion. As Taussig states, women were the “bearers of the appearance of tradition and...the embodiment of the Nation.” Muktie and Savitni are altered by this act of dress-up: their “inner substance” covered up, their “Hindoo” identity disguised. But there are cracks in the veneer: their bare feet, the bangles peeking out from underneath the sleeves of their frocks.

In the process of being photographed, Muktie and Savitni encountered another kind of physical contact with their adoptive culture. Compare this photograph to the 1896 photograph of Mary and Robert Hannum on page fifty-five of the album (plate 50). These children of missionaries are dressed in formal clothing, probably their Sunday best. The older child, Robert, stands slightly behind his younger sister, Mary, with his hand on her shoulder. Both children stare directly into the camera. The younger holds a doll in the arm opposite to her sibling. This photograph of the Hannum children mimics formal studio portraits of the mid-century although this image was taken outdoors. The end table on which Mary rests her right elbow contributes to the illusion of a studio; the patchy ground beneath them does not. Placed around the Hannum children are toys and other belongings, including a stuffed elephant at Mary’s feet. According to Laura Wexler, the “chief symbols of the nineteenth century, middle-class white children’s lives [were] hair,
dress, doll, game, and book.\textsuperscript{47} Even in India, these signs of middle-class America were reproduced.

The photograph of Muktie and Savitni mirrors the image of the Hannum children. The girls stand with a similar posture, the older with her hand on the shoulder of the younger. They stare straight ahead. Muktie's eyes are cast slightly to the right of the camera whereas Savitni gazes directly into the lens. She looks fearful, even sad. Her fingers on both hands seem thin, almost bony. Muktie's however, do not. These girls, like the Hannum children, are pictured outside with a white wall serving as a backdrop. Both of these images conform to the standards established by the first photograph in the album where the subjects in Western dress stand or sit formally against the backdrop of a wall, building, and/or tree. These are the visual codes of inclusion according to the album. Furthermore, the photograph of the Hannum children precedes that of the Muktie and Savitni in the album. The album, too, instructs the viewer on who is copying whom by the order of these images. Ideologically, the portrait of Muktie and Savitni benefits from proximity to the portrait of the Hannum children: the white, middle-class children recreate a visual trope from their own visual culture; this visual formula is "theirs" to mime. The Indian girls mimic the Hannum children's mimicry.

In all probability, the girls had little understanding of what their outward appearance suggested; rather, the photographer, possibly Jefferson herself, directed Muktie and Savitni to mirror the pose and style of the Hannum children portrait. Even if Jefferson was not the one who released the shutter, I expect that this image was taken by a missionary on behalf of Jefferson and Minor. It has a greater intimacy than most of the photographs in the album, especially those of other Indians; the girls are closer than any
other of the photographic subjects. And yet they are also the furthest away, the most
difficult to grasp. Despite the appearance of an intimate and composed portrait – ideal
Victorian girlhood in view – the image of Muktie and Savitni is in direct contrast to one
word: “Hindoo.” The album on the whole indicates that Jefferson has, in the words of
Langford, “invest[ed] power in naming.”48 The only other Indians in the album whom
Jefferson has named are a few “Native Christians” on pages five and six (plates 5 & 6).
By giving names to Muktie and Savitni Jefferson has given these “Hindoo” girls the same
status as the “Native Christians.” The juxtaposition of these two identities – the
naturalized citizen of Jefferson’s community and the heathen – creates a kind of “before”
and “after” photograph rolled into one. As Wexler writes about a nineteenth-century
“after” photograph of three Native American girls, they “replicate exactly the ideal image
of Victorian girlhood. The only contradiction is the darkness of their skin.”49 In the case
of the photograph of Muktie and Savitni, there are many more contradictions than just
their skin. Their bare feet play against their formal pose, the bangles against their frocks.
It is as if this present-based photograph is invested with powers of clairvoyance. Taken at
the point of transition, it predicts Muktie and Savitni’s future conversion to Christianity,
their rise in social status from orphan girls to daughters of missionaries – their salvation.

Without the “Hindoo” caption, Muktie and Savitni would be considered
converted, ushered into the community of “Native Christians.” Instead, they are captured
in the liminal space between being one thing and being another. Beyond the simple
photographic cut from time, this image is a cut from Muktie and Savitni’s cultural
identities. In her article on contemporary adoption narratives and trauma theory, Margaret
Homans writes that a child’s pre-adoption story is “unclaimed experience.”50 Particularly
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in the case of transnational or interracial adoptions, Homans suggests that the task is to integrate this past into the adoptee’s life rather than “inventing helpful fictions about the irretrievable historical moments.”\textsuperscript{51} The adoptee and adopter’s construction of an unknown and unattainable history for the child is the focus of Homans’s article along with the resulting “adoptive self-fabrication” that occurs when the adoptee is cut from his or her origins.\textsuperscript{52} Homans calls this being “twice-born,” a term she borrows from one of the narratives she examines in her text. Adoption is like a rebirth of identity: the new identity is seen as constructed whereas the birth identity is viewed as natural or given, “carv[ing] out a new self distinction from the one society assigned.”\textsuperscript{53} This idea of the adoption marking a separation from the adoptee’s origins is echoed by Barbara Yngvesson in her article, “Going ‘Home’: Adoption, Loss of Bearings, and the Mythology of Roots.” She writes:

The clean break separates the child from everything that constitutes her grounds for belonging to this family and this nation, while establishing her transferability to that family and that nation. With a past that has been cut away—an old identity that no longer exists—the child can be reembedded in a new place, almost as though he or she never moved at all.\textsuperscript{54}

Although Muktie and Savitni were not transplanted to Canada or the United States, these contemporary perspectives on transnational adoptions offer an interesting view of this image of Jefferson and Minor’s adopted daughters. The photograph marks the cut from the girls’ origins and the fabrication of their new Christian, Westernized identities. The construction of identity here is two-fold. First, their Hindu identity is only partially concealed by their imperfect mimicry of Victorian girlhood, their new “civilized” identities juxtaposed with their “heathen” past. Second, their supposed future identities as Christian, Westernized girls is visually constructed within this photograph,
their naturalized citizenship put on display. They wear this new identity, their rebirth, in this image although the caption alludes to their origins. This is an intriguing reversal of Homans’s notion of “self-fabrication.” The primary “self-fabrication: here is about Muktie and Savitni’s future, not their unknown past. Their origins are lumped together with the other visual tropes in the album—the simple, uncivilized, albeit exotic, heathen—which is the unseen, forcefully implied, “before” image of these girls. The focus in this image is on their new and fabricated identities that are described to the viewer with the girls’ clothing, posture and the photographic style. Although this image is not meant to picture Muktie and Savitni as available for adoption, it does ask the intended viewer of the album to accept these girls into their hearts and home despite their origins, history, and first births. As Lisa Cartwright writes about contemporary transnational adoption photographs, or images of “waiting children,”

[the adoptees’] looks might mystify or intrigue Western clients when they are not unambiguously marked with familiar attributes of European looks, Caucasian looks, Asian looks. These children are thus classified in ways that may not match local understandings of cultural identity, or their apparently ambiguous or unfixed identities may make them more easily viewed by agencies, clients, and human rights advocates as essentially stateless.55

To follow Cartwright is to understand the fate of Muktie and Savitni as determined by the meanings assigned to this image, meanings contributed by viewers invested in the girls’ conversion, naturalization, and adoption. This photograph determines their fate as the adopted daughters of missionary women, and good Christian girls of Canadian and American mothers.
Photographic Conversion

According to the viewpoint of the “dear friends” for whom Jefferson compiled this album, this photograph of Muktie and Savitni may have been of service to her mission field, presuming that it was meant to be a supplement to the 1892 series of images intended for a more public audience. The ambiguous relationship of the last eight photographs to the forty-three images from 1892 is just one of many binaries the album establishes – public versus private, personal content versus a political agenda. The binaries culminate in the final, punctuating image of Muktie and Savitni. By means of the girls’ portrait, viewers of the album were, in fact, encountering a reproduction of white, middle-class, Christian ideals and values in a depiction of Indian girls. The captioned photograph of Muktie and Savitni photographically reveals acculturated citizens, their belonging based on the appearance of conforming to a specific set of visual codes that symbolize the values of the album’s author. Hidden beneath the surface, however, is what is other: two Indian girls wearing an uncomfortable identity, a skin that is not their own. Savitni stares into the camera as if she knows what this moment amounts to. She sees that she is being looked at, perhaps she senses the alteration in the brief moment that the shutter is open. The creation of this image is the creation of an identity for these girls, not an identity that they necessarily chose, rather one that has been given to them. It is an adopted identity, one they may wear only in appearance or only for the camera – they have dressed for the photographer. What is captured by this likeness is not only “mimesis and alterity” but also the soul; Muktie and Savitni’s souls are at stake here. As Taussig writes, the photograph brings “spirit, soul, and image, into the one constellation.” It establishes a tension between past and the future, what is and what will become,
predicting their inevitable conversion and adoption of a system of beliefs. Muktie and Savitni’s portrait also predicts the reception of this image by Jefferson’s “dear friends” and their adoption of these girls as belonging to their white, middle-class, Christian community. But the future state of Muktie and Savitni’s souls is of little consequence; rather, they have already been brought into the fold, “saved” by means of their likeness.
CONCLUSION

Amanda Jefferson’s album demonstrates that during her time, photography was used to serve the mission and its efforts. The album, as compiled to 1892, indicates that Jefferson believed that by providing her “dear friends” and others from her home community with a vision of the mission field – its people, sights, challenges and successes – the agency of her work would be strengthened and others would be encouraged to support her cause. In this way, as I have argued, photography itself was *missionized*: it served the mission just like Jefferson, herself, and was invested with the power to speak for the mission’s efforts and communicate their view of the host culture. Once that precedent was established in the public passages of the album, the more private photographs added after 1892 served to support this belief, and to lace it into Jefferson’s most intimate portrayals of the field and her domestic life therein. Furthermore, by not sending the album home and instead adding personal photographs to the 1892 series, Jefferson shifted the entire album from a public document to a private aide-mémoire – the 1892 photographs now a reminder of her first months in Kolhapur and India as well as her initial feelings of shock towards a country and culture that seemed so foreign. That same terrain would become her home, the *exotic* transformed into the familiar. Thus the album’s intended *missionizing* message is neither infallible, nor immutable. Rather a contemporary reading reveals slippages, ambiguities even contradictions – meanings that were not necessarily intended, likely not even apparent to Jefferson and the album’s intended viewers, but are nonetheless significant. Despite Jefferson’s intent, her album does not *speak for itself*.
I have tried to unpack the ways in which Jefferson created meaning in her album and how that meaning was hinged upon the album’s intended Western viewers. But more importantly, I have endeavoured to show how Jefferson’s authorship created relations between Jefferson and India, the Western viewers and India, Indians and the West, and, of course, Jefferson and the viewers of the album. These relations were, and are, entangled with, if not defined by, power, imperialism, and colonialism, yet the meanings of the album are not limited to, in Dunch’s words, “a dichotomy between actor and acted upon.” It is easy to understand missionary photographs in such a way, reducing a complex set of relations to a set of simple meanings defined more by our current value system than an understanding of the construction of meaning at the time of the album’s creation. This is not to say that mission photographs like those in Jefferson’s album do not construct a dichotomy between the West and East, but rather that the meanings are not limited to this kind of binary thinking. Considering these photographs as parts of relationships of power allows for complex, ambiguous, even contradictory meanings to come into view. Likewise, and according to Elizabeth Edwards, thinking relationally also allows for an understanding of how these relationships have invested photographs with value. A photograph’s meaning is contingent upon its context and so I have attempted to unravel the original context both within and beyond the album.

To the degree that this single case study has revealed the complexity of meaning in these mission photographs and album, it raises many questions about the relevance or significance of this photographic object here and now. In awakening Jefferson’s “suspended conversation,” what can it tell us about our current vision of India? If in its time, Jefferson’s album fulfilled its purpose and communicated to her “dear friends” and
Christian community something about India, it begs the question of whether overseas mission photographs like these and their didactic view of the foreign world have informed contemporary understandings of other cultures. In other words, are mission photographs part of the “pre-texts” that define how we see beyond our borders?

My own experience is perhaps a case in point: my grandfather, a missionary to India, extensively photographed his work and family life in that country. This body of photographs has very much informed my vision and knowledge of India, how I understand that country and culture, even how I view Jefferson’s album. Furthermore, my grandfather, like many other missionaries, when on furlough in Canada and as part of his deputational work, visited many congregations and used his photographs and slides to demonstrate his work in India and the mission’s needs. Ostensibly, Jefferson’s album is an early version of this, her captions meant to replace the spoken narrative accompanying the slide show. The question remains, in our supposedly post-colonial society, how do we account for this aspect of our country’s visual culture?

Definitive answers to these questions are beyond the scope of any thesis. Yet I raise them to demonstrate the particular challenges of studying mission photography. Some of these questions were brought to public attention during what was arguably the most publicized display of the visual and material culture of Canada’s foreign missionaries: Into the Heart of Africa, the Royal Ontario Museum’s (ROM) controversial, 1990 exhibition of its African collection. On display were more than 375 objects collected by Canadian overseas missionaries and military during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. The purpose of the exhibition was to shed light on Canada’s contribution to the British colonization of Africa: the primary focus of the
show was the activity of Canadian soldiers and missionaries. Furthermore, donations by these people, and their proud heirs, comprised the bulk of the ROM’s collection of African objects and images. In a pre-exhibit interview, Jeanne Cannizzo, the exhibit’s chief curator, stated that “it [was] a very accidental collection in the sense that it came through donations. It wasn’t one person’s vision.” As Linda Hutcheon notes in one of her many articles about this exhibition, because of the lack of consistency with the collectors and their interest – military men tended to collect weapons, missionaries, religious, icons and artifacts of daily living – the African collection was fragmented and had little potential to “represent the cultural diversity, social complexity, or artistic achievement of the multiple peoples of Central Africa.” As a result, Cannizzo and her team sought to put on display turn-of-the-century colonial collecting practices, not Central Africa at the turn of the century. The result, however, was far from what was intended: Toronto’s African community was offended by the exhibition and made it known. Into the Heart of Africa was scheduled to travel across Canada and the USA but because of the controversy that erupted in Toronto, the tour was cancelled and the objects put back in the ROM’s vault. The ROM is now reluctant to show its African collection.

According to Hutcheon, Into the Heart of Africa drew attention to Canada’s colonial past, yet some did not like this new vision of Canada. As Hutcheon writes: “Canada was represented as having an uncomfortable dual historical identity as both colony and colonizing force.” One of the more controversial objects in the show was a large-scale photograph of Mrs. Thomas Titcombe, a Canadian missionary, with Yagba women in northern Nigeria (plate 57). The photograph was captioned, “A lesson in how to wash clothes,” within quotation marks. Like many other objects in the exhibit, the
intended irony of the quotation was not made clear to the viewer, meaning that some interpreted the words of the missionaries and military as the present-day voice of the ROM. It follows that many were offended by the suggestion that the ROM believed Yagba women needed to be taught how to wash their clothing – by a white, Canadian woman, no less. Within the exhibition, the meaning of this photograph shifted from an historical document of imperialism to a document of current racism. The greatest irony of *Into the Heart of Africa* was that the intent of the exhibition – to question, if not criticize, the role of colonial collecting practices in the museum – had the opposite affect: an imperialist frame was placed around the ROM instead of the missions and military. This exhibition, if executed differently, could have provided an opportunity for Canadians to learn about the role of visual objects in missions and military endeavours and question current assumptions about *other* cultures and Canada’s colonial past. This opportunity was lost, however, because of problematic curatorial decisions and an insensitivity to concerned communities, combined with immediate public reactions to what they saw.

Arguably, perspectives have changed since 1990 yet the controversy generated by *Into the Heart of Africa* speaks to the complexities of bringing Canada’s imperial past to light. Photographs still serve as a kind of evidence, especially volatile when they show things we would rather not see. But more importantly, photographs can be a powerful means of communication – something that Jefferson knew well and chose to exploit. Objects like Jefferson’s album are more than mere data or supporting visual documentation. They are *tools* that can serve many purposes. The person or persons who employ these tools determines their function. It follows that I, too, am part of this album’s relational network and have employed it, invested it with meaning just like the
album's creator. But as I hope to have demonstrated, mission photographs compiled to generate curiosity continue to generate meaning, here and now, and will so elsewhere and in the future.
Notes to Introduction

1 In its beginnings, Northfield Seminary was a school for students from impoverished backgrounds no matter what race or religion (“A Brief History of NMH,” http://www.nmhschool.org). This suggests that Jefferson may have come from a family of limited means who could not fund her education.


4 Historical Sketches of the India Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America known as the Lodiana, the Farrukhabad, and the Kolhapur Missions; From the beginning of the work, in 1834, To the time of its fiftieth Anniversary, in 1884 (Allahabad: Printed at the Allahabad Mission Press, 1886). From Record Group 360, Miss Emily T. Minor’s personnel file, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, P.A.

5 A. Adelaide Browne, “An Appreciation of Miss Emily T. Minor,” Western India Notes, April 1928: 4. From Record Group 360, Miss Emily Minor’s Personnel File, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA.

6 Document dated February 21, 1938, from Record Group 360: Miss Emily Terry Minor’s Personnel File, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, P.A.

7 The archives of the Presbyterian Historical Society (PHS) in Philadelphia houses the majority of the historical documents pertaining to the Presbyterian mission to Western India. Dr William James Wanless (1865-1933), the primary doctor in Kolhapur, opened the region’s first hospital in Miraj in 1894 and then the country’s first medical school in 1897 (now known as the Wanless Hospital), which is considered the most reputable medical institution in India. Wanless was an important figure in Western India and was decorated by the Indian government and knighted by the British government in India for his service to the people of that country. Amongst his documents at the PHS is a photograph album baring the title, “Photo Album Miraj, India, 1890-1915.” His album is similar to Miss Jefferson’s although the cover is a different colour. The photographs inside provide a detailed visual record of the construction of the hospital in Miraj, the hospital life once built, a number of photographs in and around the Kolhapur mission station, and images of Wanless’ home and personal life. Many of the photographs of
Kolhapur are found in Jefferson’s album. Based on the similarity in size, print, and paper quality between the images in the Wanless and Jefferson albums, it is my assumption that Jefferson obtained the photographs in her album from Wanless. Further to this, considering the nature of some of the more personal photographs in the Wanless album – images of the interior of his bedroom in Miraj, he and his family on the porch of their cottage in India – I expect that these images were taken by Wanless or, if nothing else, he hired a photographer to take them under his direction. Regardless, I attribute the authorship of the 1892 photographs in the Jefferson album to Wanless.

8 I recognize that a case could be made for mission photography on the whole — both home and foreign missions — because the use of photography by missionaries to the First Nations of North America has many connections to the use of photography on foreign fields. Considering the scope of this thesis, however, I will distinguish between the two specifically because during Jefferson’s time, overseas mission photographs could not circulate as easily as those from this continent.

9 The Picture Archive (Basel, Switzerland: Mission21) <http://www.bmpix.org/index.html>

10 Jefferson’s personnel file primarily contains biographical and medical records created the year she was appointed to service and numerous records of employment. These list her educational and work history, her reasons for entering the field, dates of departure, furloughs, and retirement, as well as her primary tasks at the Ratnagiri station. Aside from these records, her file contains three 1891 letters recommending her to foreign mission work, a personal statement attesting to her motive for wanting to become a missionary, and copies of four letters from the 1920s written by Jefferson addressed to the Board of Foreign Missions.


12 Mieke Bal and Norman Bryson, “Semiotics and Art History,” The Art Bulletin LXXIII: 2 (June 1991), 186. Bal and Bryson write that in order to examine the reception of a work, one must address the “codes of viewing” as a “process, not a given.” Furthermore, they write: “Access to the codes is uneven: codes have to be learned and their distribution varies (and changes) within a group, even in those cases in which a group defines itself through its ability to manipulate visual codes in distinct ways. That is, even when attention to the conditions of reception discloses a particular group, which operates codes of viewing in a unique way, analysis of reception must still distinguish between the degrees of access to those codes.” In this way, it is important to recognize that codes of viewing for the intended viewers of Jefferson’s album belonged to a community of shared values based in their religious beliefs combined with their social and economic circumstances — white, middle-class, and (North) American.

Notes to Chapter 1


2 Ibid., 15.


4 Ibid., 154.


6 Ibid.


11 Ibid., 740.

12 It is important that I acknowledge that my use of this term in no way connects with the art historical genre known as Primitivism, rather, I here use this word as missionaries and colonials did in their time – to connote a backward or basic way of life.


15 Elizabeth Edwards, “Thinking materially/Thinking relationally,” Getting Pictures Right: Context and Interpretation, Topics in African Studies 3 (Köln, Germany: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, 2004), 11
Langford, 63.
Edwards, 20.
Ibid.
Ibid., 19-20.
Ibid., 23, and Hamilton & Hargreaves, 5.
Christopher Pinney, Camera Indica: The Social Life of Indian Photographs (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 34.
Ibid., 42.
Ibid.
Wexler describes before-and-after photographs as being “a staple of Victorian charitable and educational institutions” (Wexler, 109). For more on this photographic
convention, see her analysis of the before-and-after photographs of three, American Indian girls in Chapter 3 of *Tender Violence* (Wexler, 108-13).

34 Oddie, 204.

35 Hill, 50.


37 Brouwer, 9.

38 Wexler, 57.

39 Wexler, 21.


41 Hill, 5, and Savage, 213.

42 Dunch, 318.

Notes to Chapter 2

1 Langford, 19.


4 Langford, 19.

5 Edwards, 11.


10 Schwartz, 30.


13 Wexler, 21.
The "Western India Mission," as it was called by PCUSA, included Kolhapur, Panhala, Ratnagiri, and Sangli although in 1892, the Ratnagiri station was in its infancy which may explain the lack of photographs from that area.

Sekula, 10.

Ibid.

In keeping with doctrine, each Protestant Christian has a personal relationship with Jesus Christ and through Him a relationship with God. God is therefore the sovereign authority and whom missionaries believed they were called to serve. (Harold Lindsell, "Missions," Baker's Dictionary of Theology, ed. Everett F. Harrison, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960), 359-60.)

Sekula, 10.

Wexler, 7.

Ibid.

Document dated February 21, 1938, from Record Group 360: Miss Emily Terry Minor's Personnel File, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, P.A.

Sekula, 10.

I suspect Jefferson added these bracketed words at a later date. Not only is the ink slightly darker than that of the descriptive captions, but records suggest that Jefferson was only beginning to learn Marathi in 1892 when she arrived at Ratnagiri. I will take-up this point in Chapter 3 when I discuss the later part of the album — the images post 1892 — but for now, the English language captions will be the focus.


R.V. Russell assisted by Rai Bahadur Hiralal, "Table of Contents," Vol. 3, The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd, 1916). Russell was the Superintendent of Ethnography for the Central Provinces of India. This four-volume series was published under the orders of the "administration" of the Central Provinces.

Pinney (1990), 267.

Sekula, 22.


Wexler, 21.

Ibid., 22.

Historical Sketches of the India Missions..., 156-57.
These ethnographic photographs bear some similarity to depictions of workers in Realist painting of the mid-nineteenth century – works by Honoré Daumier, Gustave Courbet and Jean-François Millet to name just a few examples. There is no evidence to suggest, however, that Jefferson had any interest in art.

Pinney (1990), 271.

Sushil Madhava Pathak, American Missionaries and Hinduism (A Study of their Contacts from 1813 to 1910) (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1967), 162.

The photograph on page fifteen of Wanless’s album includes the shadow of the photographer and the camera in the frame. The shape of the camera combined with the photographer’s position in relation to it suggest that the photographer was using a view camera rather than a snapshot camera which is not unlikely considering that the Kodak was released in the United States a mere four years prior to the creation of the 1892 photographs. It is likely that it took time for these lightweight, portable Kodaks to make their way to the foreign mission field probably by means of new missionaries like Jefferson and her friend, Mr. Hannum, who, according to Jefferson’s 1892 letter, had cameras.

The Woman’s Foreign Missionary Society (WFMS) of the Presbyterian Church (of the U.S.A.) began publication of Woman’s Work for Woman in 1871. This journal had a great influence on the way Presbyterian women viewed both the foreign mission field and woman’s work therein, coloured by the WFMS’s vehement opposition to some of the demands of the women’s rights movement. Instead, the journal promoted that those who joined the women’s missionary movement made better mothers and “more completely fulfill[ed] their obligation to provide moral and religious guidance to their families.” (Hill, 51-3).

Historical Sketches of the India Missions..., 157.

The first published article was found in Wanless’s personal scrapbook at the Presbyterian Historical Society’s archives. No provenance is given for the article and no date is provided other than the hospital’s opening date of July 4th, 1894. However, the following article in The Church At Home and Abroad from April 1895, suggests that the 1894 article may have been taken from the November, 1894 issue of that same journal. (The scrapbook of Dr W. J. Wanless from Record Group 92, Box 1, Folder 33, The Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA; W. J. Wanless, “Medical Missions in Western India,” The Church At Home and Abroad 17 (April 1895): 312-15.)

Anna Wurthmann served for the Basel mission to the Bamum kingdom from 1911-15. Christraud Geary has written about her photographs on a number of occasions, the first and most in depth analysis being in the 1988 exhibition catalogue, Images of Bamum: German Colonial Photography at the Court of King Njoya.

Hill, 23.

The Women’s Missionary Magazine of the United Presbyterian Church is a good example of this. Its articles and even photographs focus on the work of women
missionaries and the conditions for both indigenous women and children both on foreign and native soil.

43 It is interesting to note here that here Jefferson writes Hindu correctly, according to our twenty-first century perspective. In the post-1982 album, she spells it "Hindoo" which was customary for the time.

44 Inness, 375-379.


Notes to Chapter 3


2 Ibid., 63.

3 Langford, 130.

4 Despite the visual continuity, it is unlikely that Wanless was the photographer of these images considering that he lived in Miraj (which approximately 160 kilometres East of Ratnagiri). I suspect, however, that Wanless had a darkroom and potentially printed these photographs for Jefferson and the other Ratnagiri missionaries. This would explain the similarities.


6 Ibid.

7 Wexler, 22.

8 It seems that some missionaries were tolerant of converted Indians retaining some of their traditional customs and rituals including aspects of marriage ceremonies – they could partake in a seemingly Hindu ceremony but with the blessing of the local missionary clergy (Paul Roche, “The Marriage Ceremonies of the Christian Paraiyans of the Kumbakonam Area, India,” Asian Folklore Studies 36, no. 1 (1977): 84). There is no evidence to suggest, however, that the Presbyterian missionaries to Western India allowed this kind of ceremony to occur in Jefferson’s time.


10 In Robert’s autobiography he wrote that his brother of two years old died in 1904 (Ibid.), and Wanless’s first wife, Mrs. Mary Elizabeth (Marshall), lost many children on the field. She died of cholera 1906. Mr Ferris also died on the Western India Mission field in 1894 as did Mrs Graham in 1901, Mr Irwin in 1908 and Miss Patton in 1914.
(Record Group 360, the Missionary Personnel Records of Mrs Mary Elizabeth Wanless, Mr George H. Ferris, Mrs Mary (Bonnell) Graham, Rev. Joseph Morrison Irwin, and Miss Esther Edwards Patton, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, P.A.)

11 Historical Sketches of the India Missions..., 156.


13 Greenwell, 36.


15 Dunch, 321.

16 Ibid.

17 Dunch, 319.


19 Ibid., 136.

20 Wexler, 87.


23 Freeman & Klaus, 403.

24 Motz, 85.

25 Browne, 4.

26 Jefferson, 31.

27 Brouwer, 192.

28 Freeman & Klaus, 403.

29 Taussig, 136.

30 Robert Henry Hannum, 3.

31 Brower, 119-120.

32 Ibid., 172.

33 Ibid., 169.

36 Langford, 95.
37 Mary Louise Pratt's Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation (London: Routledge, 1992), 6. Specifically, in her introduction, Pratt defines the "contact zone" as "the spatial and temporal copresence of subjects previously separated by geographical and historical disjunctures, and whose trajectories now intersect. [...] A 'contact' perspective emphasizes how subjects are constituted in and by their relations to each other. [It stresses] copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power" (6-7).
38 Taussig, 21.
39 Although some literature discusses the influences of colonialism on men's and women's costume in India, little has been written about dress and children, particularly girls, during the nineteenth century. I do know, however, that in the nineteenth century, Western-style cloth and garments was imported to India and Indian tailors were instructed on how to sew them (often with few satisfactory results). Reject, Western-style clothing from colonials and missionaries therefore sold at a premium price at that time because the indigenous population had little access to the materials or patterns needed to mimic Western costume. See Emily Tarlo, Clothing Matters: Dress and Identity in India (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 36-7.
40 Estelle Ansley Worrell, Children's Costume in America 1607-1910 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1980), 188. Worrell writes that "A girl's skirt length was determined by her age," meaning that as a girl grew into a woman, her skirt lengthened according to what was considered "proper" at the time (129).
41 Ibid., 164-65.
43 Taussig, 191.
44 Tarlo, 25.
45 Taussig, 177.
46 Ibid., 136.
47 Wexler, 112.
48 Langford, 121.
49 Wexler, 111.
51 Ibid., 9-10.
52 Ibid., 12.
53 Ibid.
56 Taussig, 176.

**Notes to Conclusion**

1 Dunch, 318.
2 Edwards, 11.
5 For a full account of these events, see Shelley Ruth Butler, *Contested Representations: Revisiting* Into the Heart of Africa (London and New York: Routledge, 1999).
6 This, according to my conversation with Deepali Dewan, the ROM’s Associate Curator of South Asian Art, Department of World Cultures, March 10, 2006.
7 Hutcheon, 8.


*Historical Sketches of the India Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America known as the Lodiana, the Farrukhabad, and the Kolhapur Missions; From the beginning of the work, in 1834, To the time of its fiftieth Anniversary, in 1884*. Allahabad: Printed at the Allahabad Mission Press, 1886. From Record Group 360. Miss Emily T. Minor’s personnel file. Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, P.A.


Inness, Sherrie A. “‘Repulsive as the multitudes by whome I am surrounded’: Constructing the Contact Zone in the Writings of Mount Holyoke Missionaries, 1830-1890.” *Women Studies* 23, no. 4 (1994): 367-83.


Record Group 360, Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Board of Foreign Missions. Department of Missionary Personnel Record, 1832-1952.


Wanless, Dr William James. “Medical Missions in Western India.” *The Church At Home and Abroad* 17 (April 1895): 312-15.
——— *Photo Album Miraj, India, 1890-1915*, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA Record Group 92, Box 4, Folder 1.
——— Scrapbook. From Record Group 92, Box 1, Folder 33. The Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA.


PLATES

Unless otherwise indicated, the plates that follow are from Amanda Jefferson's photograph album, 1892-98. Both Jefferson's and William James Wanless's albums are the same size with the same sized photographs: the album pages measure 18 x 24 centimetres and the albumen prints, approximately 11 x 16 centimetres with the exception of plate 53 (from Jefferson's album) where the print measures 25 x 19 centimetres.
Plate 1. *Group of Missionaries in the Kohapur Mission* India Jan. 1892
Plate 2. *A Mission Society In India* (Published in *The Women’s Missionary Magazine of the United Presbyterian Church* 12, no. 3 (October 1898): 56. From the collection of the Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA)
Plate 3. Some of the Native Christians of the Kolhapur Mission 1892
Plate 4. Native Christian Teachers, 1892
Plate 5. Govind and Family. A Native Helper. Baptized at Ratnagiri, 1892
Plate 6. One of our Christian Families. Kohapur, 1892
Plate 7. Indian Jugglers and Snake-charmers (Bairajees), 1892
Plate 10. A Holy Man. Beggar (Fakir), 1892
Plate 11. *Oil Merchant. (Thaylee) Bazaar, 1892*
Plate 12. Sewing Man. (Dirgee), 1892
Plate 13. Carpenter. (Soothar), 1892
Plate 14. Indian Mode of Sawing Wood. (Cohar), 1892
Plate 15. Water-carrier. (Bheesthee), 1892
Plate 16. Washerman carrying the clothes to be washed. (Dhobie), 1892
Plate 17. *Traveling Jugglers. (Bhaiyas)*, 1892
Plate 18. A Water-carrier and Bullock. (Bail & Bheestee), 1892
Plate 19. A Native Doctor. (Vyuirid), 1892
Plate 20. Bullock Cart. (Bail Sadi), 1892
Plate 21. Stone Cart. (Dugud Sadi), 1892
Plate 23. Woman carrying Fuel. (lakood valee), 1892
Plate 24. Brahmin Family in a cart. (Mundlee gari), 1892
Plate 25. Carrying Wood to the Bazaar, 1892
Plate 27. Native Christians (William James Wanless, Photo Album Miraj, India, 1890-1915, Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA Record Group 92, Box 4, Folder 1)
Plate 30. *Native Christians* (William James Wanless, *Photo Album Miraj, India, 1890-1915*), Presbyterian Historical Society, Philadelphia, PA Record Group 92,
Plate 31. Bungalow at Kolhapur. The one in which I lived, 1892
Plate 32. Mr. Goheen's Bungalow - Kolhapur, 1892
Plate 33. The Girls’ School and Dormitory – Kolhapur. Miss Patton in charge, 1892.
Plate 34. King's Palace - Kolhapur, 1892.
Plate 35. *Front of State Hospital* - Kolhapur, 1892
Plate 36. *Back of Hospital - Kolhapur*, 1892
Plate 37. Roadway shaded by Tamarind Trees, 1892
Plate 38. Town Hall, Kolhapur, 1892
Plate 39. Mission Church - Sangli, 1892
Plate 40. Christian Boys’ Boarding School – Sangli, 1892
Plate 41. *Morning Scene at Dr. Wanless’ Dispensary – Sangli, 1892*
Plate 42. Well, 1892
Plate 43. Native Whiskey Shop, 1892
Plate 45. Nauchch Girl's Tower – Panhala. 'Tis said a nauleh girl (Dancing girl) was buried alive under this Tower, 1892
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APPENDIX A

"My dear friends,

I am so sorry I have not the other views, but I will send later & as you will see I have tried to group the pictures taken at the different stations. I expect to send picture [sic] of Kolhapur Church to put at the beginning of the Kolhapur collection then the Sangli bungalow to go opposite Sangli Church. Also Panhala Church & bungalows to fill the two vacant pages at the beginning of Panhala views. The Ratnagiri views are still to be taken. Both Mr. Hannum & I have cameras, but neither have had opportunity to use them but I hope to do better in the future, when I feel a little more settled. Things are in high state this A.M. We received word from S.S. Company that Miss Neary could not sail till Mar, 5th so we did not hurry about preparations. Yesterday a telegram came. "She can go 19th" so we are about as busy as possible packing to go with her to Bombay tomorrow. I am so sorry I have not more to send you but I hope these little things will remind you of one who constantly thinks of you and also that they may be of service in interesting others in the needs of this great field.

Lovingly,

Amanda M. Jefferson

April 15th '92"
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