

Article

Contesting ‘Truth’: A Late Ottoman Response to Protestant Missionary Writings

Zeynep Yücedoğru 

Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Faculty of Theology, Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Zonguldak 67000, Türkiye; zeynepyucedogru@gmail.com

Abstract: This study delves into the polemical exchange between the 19th-century Ottoman scholar Harputlu İshak Hoca (d. 1892) and the protestant missionary Karl Gottlieb Pfander (d. 1865). By examining the historical context surrounding their controversy, this research sheds light on the interaction between the Ottoman state and British and American missionaries, particularly during the expansion of missionary activities in Anatolia. This paper also explores the responses of the Ottoman authorities to the missionary printing activities and the impact of the Church Missionary Society’s work on societal and governmental levels. Furthermore, it provides an analysis of Pfander’s *Mizan ul-haqq* (*The Balance of Truth*) and Harputlu’s *Şemsü’l-hakikat* (*The Sun of Truth*) and *Ziyâü’l-kulûb* (*The Light of Hearts*), portraying them as not only engaging in interreligious polemics but also as creators of textual products that reflect the complex historical realities of their time. This research underscores the Ottoman scholars’ close attention and prompt responses to missionary literature.

Keywords: interreligious interactions; protestant missionaries; Ottoman polemics; Harputlu; Pfander

1. Introduction

This paper examines an intriguing polemical interaction between a nineteenth-century Ottoman scholar, Harputlu İshak Hoca (d. 1892), and a well-known protestant missionary, Karl Gottlieb Pfander (d. 1865). The former, with a close relationship with state authorities, was a prominent scholar of his time and one of the first authors who wrote to critique and refute anti-Islamic missionary writings. The latter also has a prominent place among protestant missionaries, particularly for his two ambitions: evangelical preaching and missionary apologetics. The present research aims to highlight the flow of events that brought Harputlu and Pfander into a written controversy in İstanbul by first examining the historical context. A brief overview of the Ottoman state’s relationship with British and American missionaries sheds light on the circumstances before this polemical exchange. By the middle of the 19th century, American and British missionaries were active in central Anatolia and the Near East. Working towards “the Great Awakening” within the Protestant millennialist framework, the initial purpose of the first British and American Protestant missionaries was to “evangelise” Jews in order to expedite the Second Coming of the Messiah (Makdisi 1997, pp. 684–85; Şişman 2015, p. 932; Perry 2003, p. 216). As crucial as Jews, the second target of the missionaries was eastern Christians and Muslims, who were also desperately in need of “evangelisation”.

Foreign diplomacy played a crucial role in strengthening the positions and ambitions of British and American missionaries for proselytising non-Muslim and Muslim subjects of the Empire. British ambassador Sir Stratford Canning pressured the Ottoman sultan to issue Tanzimat for the sake of protestant missionaries (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI)* 1860, p. 348). As a result, protestant subjects gained official recognition from the Empire in 1850 alongside other nominal Christian denominations. Later, the equality of Muslims and non-Muslims was officially announced with Tanzimat reforms. Between 1850 and 1861, American missionaries, schools, and stations expanded exponentially, reaching



Citation: Yücedoğru, Zeynep. 2024. Contesting ‘Truth’: A Late Ottoman Response to Protestant Missionary Writings. *Religions* 15: 1282. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15101282>

Academic Editor: Marco Demichelis

Received: 26 July 2024

Revised: 26 September 2024

Accepted: 7 October 2024

Published: 18 October 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

their most expansive boundaries in Anatolia by 1861 (Gümüş 2017, pp. 31–34). British Anglican missionaries of the CMS (the Church Missionary Society) were also excited about the achievements of their American counterparts, ABFCM missionaries, with their “splendid educational and literary works”. Nevertheless, the British missionaries thought the benefit from their literary output would be more remarkable “in opening the eyes of more intelligent members” of the nominal Christians with the prayer books supplicated by the SPCK (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge) (Stock 1899, p. 143). Therefore, the quantity of printed materials abroad and disseminated in Ottoman lands showed a rapid increase.

In the first part of the research, we look into the reactions of the Ottoman authorities to these intense and ever-growing missionary printing activities. Particular emphasis is placed on the state’s censorship and measures taken against missionary literature. We then examine the activities of the Church Missionary Society and the leading figure Pfander, focusing on the impact and significant consequences of their activities at societal and governmental levels. The second part of the paper analyses Pfander and Harputlu’s works. This examination provides a preliminary framework in which these two works are considered not only interreligious polemics defending their theological truths but also significant textual products of their time that strikingly reveal the complexity of historical realities shared by missionaries and Ottomans who reflected upon them varyingly. This research will show that Ottoman scholars closely followed and swiftly responded to missionary literature. Most importantly, this paper reveals the direct relationship between the works of Pfander and Harputlu and hitherto unknown bibliographic information on another missionary tract that also belongs to Pfander’s pen.

2. Relations Between the Ottoman Empire and Missionaries in the 19th Century

British and American missionaries became more openly active with the Reform Edict in Muslim communities in central Istanbul and Anatolia in the hope of successfully converting Muslim subjects of the state. Missionary reports with an exaggerated approach claimed a strong Muslim interest in İstanbul and central and eastern parts of Anatolia. Muslims of the Ottoman land regarded the rights given by the 1856 Edict as “a door to become Christians”. Missionary leaders gladly noted that “more than thirty-five hundred Bible copies were sold to Turks” (Gümüş 2017, pp. 139–40). According to Missionary sources, there were more than 20 Muslim converts in the first six years of the Reform Edict¹ (Gümüş 2017, p. 136).

As early as 1828, American and British missionary boards prompted a future program after a two-month conference in Malta not only for Armenians and Nestorians but also for Muslims, albeit through “a limited work” frame for the latter. Nevertheless, the well-determined missionary groups agreed that Turkish Muslims were “an ultimate goal” that should be achieved after and through the successful evangelisation of the Eastern Church (Werff 2000, pp. 105–7). The CMS reports also clearly stated that the “evangelisation of Mohammedans” was the ultimate purpose of the British mission (Stock 1899, p. 148). For Muslim conversion, missionaries were operating simultaneously in the eastern regions and the Balkans during the years 1858 and 1861. They regarded opening a station in Edirne under the administration of a Turkish-speaking missionary as an essential plan. News from highly active missionary stations, Maraş and Harput, that Muslims were “searching for God” was considered “a development of the mission” in the eastern region. The hope for the conversion of Muslims, along with native Christian groups, appeared to prompt more ambition and work for the missionaries. Gümüş explains that missionary leaders strived to “prepare” more writings for Mohammedan readers (Gümüş 2017, pp. 141–42; Sharkey 2017, pp. 138–40).

The Ottoman state elites and authorities’ initial impression regarding the impact of intense missionary activities on the local people appeared to undermine the potential effects as they trusted the locals who “were always capable of loyalty”. The initial positive impression of the Ottoman authorities in the late 19th century evolved into, as Şahin explains, a more suspicious opinion concerning missionaries and local communities. The

information from local governors and provincial administrations, who considered the missionaries as agents of disrupting the force of public order, impacted the impression of the central authorities in Istanbul. The authorities became more concerned about missionary preaching and other activities as they realised that the public in the central regions and especially locals in the countryside might be “confused by the evangelical message” (Şahin 2018, pp. 17, 28).

The Ottoman state’s position, perspective, and reaction to this matter were considerably complex because the Sublime Porte was under the tremendous strain of British diplomacy through the intermediary of Ambassador Stratford Canning and missionary groups pressing for rights of “religious liberty”. The provincial state officials and notables of non-Muslim minority communities, on the other hand, petitioned the central authority requesting the elimination of missionaries from the Ottoman lands (Kocabaşoğlu 1989, pp. 71–72; Sharkey 2017, pp. 138–42; Gorman 2019, pp. 7–11; Şahin 2018, p. 16; Deringil 2012, p. 66). Different congregations of Christian communities were also uncomfortable about British and American missionary activities. The central state administration received several complaints and petitions about the missionaries, whose activities jeopardised the integrity of their church and caused confusion among their members, especially youngsters. For the non-Muslim leaders and subjects of the state, as well as Muslim communities, the crucial problem in this context was the fear of conversion (Şahin 2018, pp. 25–28).

The Sublime Porte, in response to these pressing demands, developed new strategies and mechanisms in addition to the traditional ways of dealing with, monitoring, and restricting missionary activities. Evaluating the state reactions and measures taken against missionaries before 1880, Şahin claims that missionary affairs were primarily governed by local governors and officials acting upon the delegated authority and operating in the second tier of a “two-tiered” administrative system. As a reaction to rapidly growing missionary activities, the state’s policy later shifted to a more “proactive position” by moving missionary affairs to the first tier and governing the matters with direct orders of the central administration. Provincial and local governors saw the missionaries as the actors and speculators of the incidents that happened in public and demanded punishment for this. In response to this, while imperial ministers paid attention to the complaints of the local governors, they, on the other hand, exerted their authority to resolve missionary matters with a just approach² (Şahin 2018, pp. 29–30).

3. Reception of Missionary Religious Printings and Writings Against the Qur’an and Islam in the Ottoman Empire

Missionary printings were one of the crucial matters against which the state authorities took measures, perhaps more swiftly than they did for other missionary-related issues. The authorities issued press regulations and produced and employed central censorship mechanisms that inspected and gave (dis)approval for missionary printings. The censorship measures for missionary literature aimed to detect particularly anti-Islamic and anti-state promulgation. The censored missionary propaganda messages were centered around the arguments against the oppression of Ottoman Muslim officials, the superiority of Christianity to Islam, and eternal salvation only by Christianity and missionaries.

From the British missionaries’ printing base in Malta until its move to Istanbul in 1852, a great variety of printings, such as Bible translations, handbooks, school textbooks, and religious and liturgical tracts, were transferred to Ottoman lands in significant numbers (Werff 2000, p. 109; Cragg 2000, pp. 122–23; Erhan 2000, p. 208). Eastern Christians were supplied with many copies of the Arabic Bible as the primary receivers of these publications. Muslims were also another vital target for British and American missionaries, who were convinced that Muslims could be saved with immediate access to the message of the Bible in their language (Roper 1988, pp. 126–28; 2017, pp. 284–85). Roper explains that between 1825 and 1842, many editions of “Arabic and Turkish books, tracts and newspapers totalling more than 150,000 books in Arabic and Turkish, with the editorial and translation assistance of Arab and Turkish employees, transferred to Central and Eastern

Ottoman lands (Roper 1988, pp. 236–42; 2017, pp. 286–87). In the first half of the 19th century, the wide distribution of Arabic Bibles and other religious tracts encountered a significant setback from the Ottoman State and Orthodox and Catholic authorities of the Levant. The 1824 decree banned the distribution of Bible copies and other British and Foreign Bible Society printings. However, the enforcement of the decree seems to have had little effect, as British missionaries continued to print and distribute numerous books and copies of the Bible in Istanbul after the Malta printing base relocated there in the latter half of the century (Roper 2017, p. 285).

According to missionary accounts, interreligious interactions and encounters became more frequent between Christian missionaries and Ottoman Muslims after the 1856 decree. Missionary Jewett reported in 1857 on the increase and “readiness” in the engagement of Muslims with missionaries about the “merits of the Christian religion” (Werff 2000, p. 111). Taking upon the promise of Muslim readiness to receive the evangelical message, both American and British missionaries worked intensively among Muslim communities. The late 1860s marked explicitly a critical year in American missionary reports, which gladly inform other missionaries in the Near East and abroad about the conversions and baptisms of several Muslims (Werff 2000, pp. 122–23). British missionaries also provided parallel optimism regarding Turks, “showing a more favourable tone of feeling” towards English missionaries and, most importantly, “being ready for conversion”. Moreover, the Turks in central parts such as İstanbul and İzmir were “keenly interested to see the Bible” (Stock 1899, p. 151).

3.1. CMS Missionary Karl Gottlieb Pfander in İstanbul

This keen interest of Turkish Muslims in the Christian scriptures was an encouraging sign for CMS missionaries and prompted a mission to the heart of Istanbul. With a “firm education in Basel, missionary experience in India and Persia, and some sufficiency in Turkish, Armenian and Persian languages, German missionary Karl Gottlieb Pfander was the name “for the Turkish mission” (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI)* 1859, p. 48). Pfander came from a Pietist Lutheran background and was trained at Basel missionary with a curriculum that prepared missionaries with required language training in Arabic and Qur’an seminars, which was uncommon in contemporary missionary training and strictly excluded the newly emerging field of critical biblical studies. These two features of Pfander’s training were vital in structuring his knowledge of and subsequent literary output on Islam and interactions with Muslims. While he was almost exceptionally well-informed on Islam compared to many contemporary missionaries, he did not have sufficient knowledge of the arguments of biblical criticism, which put him in a very disadvantaged position during the Agra debate with Hindu Muslim scholar Rahmat Allah al-Kayranawi (Powell 1976, pp. 44–46; 1993, pp. 135–37). Pfander’s first mission was to Shusha, Caucasus, in 1825, and then he transferred to India in 1839 for the Agra mission and stayed there until his mission to Ottoman lands (Bennett 1996, pp. 77–78).

Pfander came to İstanbul just before 1859 and joined two critical members of the team, R.H. Weakley and S.W. Koelle, who both had vital qualifications for preparing missionary writings as intended for the İstanbul mission. The team also hired a local assistant and an interpreter. Stock, editorial secretary of the CMS, notes that the team cautiously did not preach or sell books in the streets simply because authorities would not allow these actions. Yet, as Stock informs us, Pfander’s team ambitiously worked to disseminate the message of the Gospel by distributing Turkish translations of scriptures and one-to-one conversations. *Mizan ul-haqq*, one of Pfander’s most famous anti-Islam polemical writings, was sold in the quarters of the Hagia Sophia Mosque (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI)* 1859, p. 48). Stock also points out that the perseverance of the missionary team resulted in the conversion of a Turk (Stock 1899, pp. 151–54).

The *CMI* journal, published just a year after Pfander took his position in 1859, likewise provides a pleasant picture of the mission directed by Pfander. Although Pfander had to work in “straitened and inconvenient” conditions, he had “the encouragement”. The article

in the volume excitedly underlines the vitality and potential impact of Pfander's writings on Turkish Muslims. Referring to earlier difficulties in distributing Pfander's books in Ottoman lands, the report, with a happy tone, informs its readers that this time, the books were circulated "freely and without difficulty". These fruitful conditions enhanced Pfander's enthusiasm as the report announced that he would be, as a first task, essentially occupied with having his works translated. Similar to American missionary reports' overestimated observations regarding the potential conversion of Muslims, the CMI's report portrays "Mussulman Turks, the Osmanlis" as themselves looking for "the means of understanding Protestant Christianity" (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI)* 1859, p. 48).

Although one should keep in mind the exaggeration of missionary reports regarding the success of missionary activities and conversions, especially among Muslim subjects of the Empire, to keep the evangelical spirit lifted, the narratives of Muslim conversions and the widespread distribution of Bible translation copies, anti-Qur'an and anti-Islam tracts among Muslims are one of the reasons that prompted various levels of responses from the imperial authorities between the years 1857 and 1864. Another important reason for the state's reaction to missionaries by restricting and monitoring their activities lies in unforeseen consequences and conditions aroused during the post-*Hatt-ı Hümayun* period. As explained above, British and American missionaries were excited about what the decree of 1856 would contribute to the existing flexibility and the ripe conditions of Muslim communities towards conversion to Christianity. Thus, the printing and dissemination of religious writings, public preaching activities, and scripture readings in bible rooms, relying on "the guarantee of freedom of belief and religious practice" by the edict's article 6, gained enormous momentum. For the Ottoman state, however, the rights provided by the edict were also equally extended to Muslim subjects whose religion, scripture, and "beliefs were exposed to missionary attacks" (Gümüş 2020, p. 423).

Amid this tension, the state's first press regulation, *Matbaalar Nizamnamesi*, was issued in 1857, which aimed to regulate, restrict and monitor the opening of printing presses in central and provincial regions and the inspection of publications both by locals and foreigners. Permissions for printing houses and publications were officially granted for the former through *Meclis-i Maarif* and *Sadâret* and the latter through *Hariciye Nezareti* (Birinci 2006, p. 297). However, as can be understood from the reports mentioned above in British and American missionary journals, this press regulation was not fully enforced until the following regulation in 1864.

Missionaries continued to operate existing printing houses and disseminate publications of Christian literature in vernacular languages among Eastern Christians and anti-Islamic works among the Muslim public in the hope of conversion (Sharkey 2017, p. 205; Ryad 2021, p. 21). In response, the state authorities gradually tightened the censorship measures, with additional press laws (1862, 1864, and 1877) and crime regulations (1858) in the following years to monitor all publications of non-Muslims and Muslims alike. Ottoman authorities, seeing the anti-state content of these writings along with polemically toned theological arguments against Islam and the Qur'an, regarded these printings as posing threats to the integrity of society and authority. Erhan notes that Ottoman officials especially became alarmed by missionary printings of anti-imperial discourse and the distribution of publications in 1860 by Russians and Greeks to Orthodox subjects calling for a political upheaval for independence from the Ottoman Empire (Erhan 2000, p. 208). In response to state authorities' call for the cessation of missionary preaching and the distribution of books and tracts with the charge of anti-government and anti-religion propaganda, missionaries denied charges of promulgation against the Sublime Porte. While the CMS absolutely denied the charge of publicly polemicising Islamic beliefs and the Qur'an, American missionaries blamed Pfander and his team for blatantly engaging in "public confrontation" and circulating these publications (Gümüş 2020, p. 424; 2017, pp. 153–54).

Alarmed by intense missionary activities, the authorities enforced censorship and restrictions on American and British missionaries' public preaching and selling Bible copies in the streets. No other than Pfander and his *Mizan ul-haqq*, one particular name and

publication, caused intense discomfort at the societal and state levels. As explained earlier, Pfander precipitately engaged in public preaching, translating and printing his works in vernacular languages after starting in his position at the İstanbul station. The summary report of the missionary conference held in İzmir in 1860 confirms Pfander and his team's intense publication and dissemination activities. According to the CMS journal, Pfander had just completed the translation of both *Miftah al-asrar* and *Mizan ul-haqq*. At the same time, Wolter had finished the translation of *Life of Christ* in Turkish and had just begun translating "Dr. Barth's Bible History". The report also provides several titles such as "The Word of Jesus", "Do you want a Friend?" and "The Christian's Journey to the City which is to come", which were also translated by Wolter. The conference report notes that upon the demand of Turks for Christian tracts in Turkish, further translations of "books and tracts as a most important part of work, considered" (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI)* 1861, pp. 3–4).

In addition to his aggressive missionary strategies and ambitious publication activities in central İstanbul, Pfander's notoriety in proselytising Muslims was already known through his missionary years in India and Persia. Similar to the discomfort and stir that Pfander's arrival and circulation of his books in India caused among the public and ulama of Agra, there was continuously increasing displeasure with his missionary output and activities among imperial authorities and Ottoman *ulamas*³ (Powell 1976, pp. 47–49; Gümüş 2020, p. 424).

3.2. *Mizan ul-haqq (The Balance of Truth)*

Mizan ul-haqq and Pfander's other interreligious writings are characteristically apologetic and polemical, although the CMS claimed otherwise that his books had no anti-Islamic content (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI)* 1864, p. 222). He denounces Islam as "a false religion" spread by violence and Muhammad as a person with a "licentious lifestyle". For Pfander, Islam will never be able to offer salvation to humanity (Smith 1998, p. 358; Grafton 2013, p. 28). Although his criticism of Islam and the Prophet is closely parallel to medieval Christian perceptions of Islam, it has been suggested that Pfander's apologetic and polemical approach to Muslims is different from the medieval Christian portrayals of Muhammad, describing him as "an imposter inventing a new religion" (Powell 1993, p. 151). That Pfander's controversial stance is dissimilar from his medieval predecessors is substantiated on the grounds that Pfander is primarily focused on the demonstration of Islam's fundamental shortcomings in comparison to Christianity rather than charging and proving Islam as a "false and heretical" religion (Powell 1993, pp. 144–45). His arguably nuanced attitude to Islam is also considered "a distinguished feature of Pfander" as a mis-siologist contrasted to other missionaries' "denunciatory" arguments against the Qur'an and the Prophet Muhammad⁴ (Powell 1976, p. 48). As will be seen in the remainder of the present study, the efficacy of Pfander's "nuanced" stance, to what degree it proved fruitful in reaching Muslims' minds and hearts for his evangelical purposes, remains questionable.

Mizan ul-haqq (The Balance of Truth) is the most celebrated literary output of Pfander's missionary endeavour, followed by two other books, *Miftah al-Asrar (The Key of Mysteries)* and *Tariq al-Hayat (The Way of Life)*. *Mizan*, written first in German in 1829 during his service at Shusha Mission, resulted from "Pfander's frustration" with unfruitful verbal discussions with Muslims there. Interestingly enough, after his transfer to the Agra Mission, *Mizan ul-haqq* was also the reason for another verbal debate with the prominent Muslim Hindu scholar Rahmat Allah al-Kairanawi (d. 1891). Pfander's argument against Islam in *Mizan ul-haqq* mainly relies on the criticism that Islamic revelation does not "satisfy the spiritual cravings of the human soul" and, hence, does not meet the criteria for "a true revelation" (Pfander 1866, pp. 3–4; Powell 1993, p. 140). Pfander's critique of Islam as not providing means and answers to the sinner for his "wants, cravings and necessities" and the journey to "eternal happiness" is understood in connection to his Pietist evangelical training in Basel seminary (Pfander 1866, p. 5; Powell 1993, p. 141). Pfander's rejection of reason as an "unsuitable and deficient intermediary in obtaining knowledge of God" and his

argument for the superiority of revelation over reason are essential elements of *Mizan ul-haqq*'s discourse. In line with his position on the superior authority of revelation, Pfander devotes two-thirds of *Mizan ul-haqq* to demonstrating that the Old and New Testaments are not corrupted nor abrogated. In contrast to Islamic scripture, he argues that the doctrines and teachings of the Bible conform to the five criteria of true revelation, which he sets as a prerequisite to testing the truthfulness of a divine message in the introduction (Pfander 1866, pp. 5–8, 93–94). The last section of *Mizan ul-haqq* deals with the main themes of Muslim–Christian polemics, such as the prophethood and proclamation of Muhammad in the Bible, the nature of the Qur'an as God's Word, and the expansion of Islam.⁵

In his rather harsh criticism of Islam and the Qur'an, Pfander occasionally refers to positive remarks in Islamic teachings, such as divine attributions of God as “the one, omniscient and eternal, all-wise, merciful, and benevolent, the absolute rejection of idolatry, post-apocalyptic punishment and resurrection”. Yet, Pfander reiterates at this point the traditional medieval Christian argument that the Prophet Muhammad “took these true doctrines and good precepts” from the Jews and Christians he encountered in Arabia on several occasions. After commencing his career, the Prophet Muhammad later inserted this information into the Qur'an while omitting the unsuitable parts, such as the sonship and deity of Christ (Pfander 1866, pp. 88–90; Whittingham 2012, pp. 3–4). Pfander also argues for the influence of Magian beliefs on Qur'anic beliefs in *mizan* (balances) and *sirat* (bridge) and of ancient Arabs on pilgrimage to *Kaa'ba* (Pfander 1866, pp. 91–92). He further elaborates on the contradictions between the Gospels and the Qur'an. Having confirmed earlier that the Bible is not corrupted and abrogated, Pfander now argues that the contradiction between the Qur'an and the Gospels is “sufficient proof that it is not Word of God” since the “word of God cannot be at variance with itself” (Pfander 1866, pp. 93, 101–2).

As noted earlier, Pfander's discussion of the Qur'an and Muhammad's deficiencies is based on “salvation from sin”. He tests the truthfulness of Muhammad's prophecy by his sinfulness and competency in saving sinners. For Pfander, “Muhammad cannot be the mediator for sinners for there is no other mediator than Christ” and because he does not believe in Christ. He adds that the Qur'an also confirms “Muhammad was a sinner”, referring to *Suras Ghafir* 40/55, *Muhammad* 47/19, and *Fath* 48/1–2. In these passages, Pfander sees a divine command to the Prophet, not just believers, as indicated by the word “you/thy” in the verse for repentance (Pfander 1866, pp. 94–96). Pfander further examines the Prophet's character and conduct to prove that he is not a true prophet (Smith 1998, pp. 358–59). Having set the performance of miracles as a prerequisite for a true prophecy, Pfander claims that Muhammad never performed a miracle and that he was destitute of the power of doing so⁶ (Pfander 1866, pp. 105–6). The contradictions and discrepancies in *hadith* reports narrated from the Prophet were also another critical proof for Pfander in demonstrating that Muhammad is not a true prophet (Pfander 1866, pp. 111–15). Muhammad's multiple marriages and “revengeful attitudes toward his enemies” were also clearly indicative for Pfander that Muhammad's personality and conduct were not suitable for a true prophet and that “he had no idea of inward purity” (Pfander 1866, pp. 115–20).

Like his ambivalent remarks about the Qur'an, Pfander's representation of the Prophet occasionally highlights his personality positively. Pfander regards some of the Prophet's actions, for example, regarding Jews of Madina and also Muslims with other matters, as signs of his “unstable mind” even though “his general conduct shows him to have been an acute and subtle man” (Pfander 1866, pp. 121–24). So, Pfander represents the Prophet Muhammad as a person “deluded” and destitute of prophetic qualities, while he also strategically mentions good features of him such as “a man of great intelligence. . . very benevolent to the poor” (Pfander 1866, pp. 118, 122). Powell explains the shifting attitude of Pfander as the result of his “unusual receptivity” of the recent research on Muhammad's biography of European Islamists, such as Gustav Weil, and his “readiness and ability to modify his views” on Islam and the Prophet Muhammad. However, Pfander's revision of his views and his milder tone in his anti-Islam and anti-Prophet rhetoric do not reflect a

change of ontological and epistemological perspective that might result from a deeper study and knowledge of Islam. Instead, this modification seems to be a strategic adjustment of his dialectical-polemical approach. Powell also confirms that Pfander changes the tone of his writings depending on his audience. When writing for European readers, for example, he openly uses more derogatory expressions to describe the prophetic reports of Muhammad as “gross fiction” and Islam as “a system of falsehood”. Later, his writings, such as *Mizan ul-haqq*, intended for Muslim readers, also underwent revisions in subsequent editions to soften the tone of language regarding the Prophet (Powell 1993, pp. 145–50). As also noted by Bennett, Rice remarks on Pfander’s lifetime revisions, saying, “Dr. Pfander was forty years perfecting his controversial works” (Rice 1910, p. 506; Bennett 1996, p. 77).

Despite Pfander’s statement that he wrote *Mizan ul-haqq* in pursuit of “a sacred duty” not to “revile Mohamaed nor anger” Muslims and his later revisions of the language and content of the books, his highly polemical and inherently orientalist perspective regarding Islam and the Prophet has been perceived as defamatory and disparaging among Muslims both in India and in Ottoman lands⁷ (Pfander 1866, p. 118). We will now move to Ottoman settings to see how Ottoman scholars reacted to missionary writings, particularly to *Mizan ul-haqq*, through the example of Harputlu İshak’s anti-missionary writings.⁸

4. Harputlu İshak Hoca’s Responses to Missionary Writings

Harputlu İshak Efendi, born into a family of scholars in Perçenç (Akçakiraz, today) village of Harput in 1803, received his secondary education at *Fatih Sahn-ı Seman Medresesi* and trained in classical Islamic scholarly branches such as *nahv* (linguistics), *mantiq* (logic), *hadith* (prophetic reports), *fiqh* (Islamic jurisprudence), *kalam* (theology), and *falsafa* (Islamic philosophy) as he narrates with the teachers’ names in his *İcâzetnâme*. Two years after his graduation, Harputlu was appointed as a teacher to *Sahn-ı Seman* and subsequently to the position of *Saray Şehzadegan Hocalığı* at the Palace as a responsible instructor and teacher for Ottoman *şehzades*’ education. Harputlu had good relations with Sultan Abdülaziz (d. 1876), and strengthened his position at the Palace, and attended, as a *muhatap* (roughly, primary instructor), to *huzur dersleri*, which were reading and teaching seminars on Qur’anic exegesis held only in the month of Ramadan in the presence of the Sultan.⁹ Being at the heart of the Sublime Porte and having a good network with the prominent ulama of the day provided Harputlu İshak several opportunities for scholarly encounters with foreign visitors and scholars. İshak Efendi also served as a member of the bureaucratic constitutions of the state, such as *Evkaf Nezareti*. He opted to retire after a service of forty years and to devote all of his time to scholarly studies until he died in 1892 in İstanbul (Demirpolat 2003, pp. 397–400; Kara 2000, “Harputlu İshak Efendi”, *DİA*).

Writing only in Turkish, Harputlu İshak authored several works in logic, Islamic theology and philosophy, as well as a translation of Ibn Sina’s famous *Shifa* and refutations of *Bektaşî* and *Hurûfî* beliefs.¹⁰ The structure and prose of Harputlu are technically built in question-and-answer form in almost all of his writings. This style of argumentation is explained in connection with his position for years as a *muhatap*, who conducts seminars by asking questions to *mukarrirs* at *huzur dersleri* and the influence of classical theological and philosophical works on his analytical thinking (Demirpolat 2003, pp. 400–1). Harputlu İshak also wrote two other works to criticise Christian scriptures and doctrines, aiming to respond to anti-Islamic missionary literature. We now turn to the examination of these polemical works to explain not only how Harputlu reacts to missionary argumentation about Islam but also to show his approach to biblical texts in the context of a heated debate initiated in Agra just a few years ago between Pfander and Rahmat Allah Kairanawi.

4.1. *Şemsü’l-hakikat* (The Sun of Truth)

Harputlu completed his first controversial book, *Şemsü’l-hakikat* (The Sun of Truth), against Christianity in 1861, very likely while working as a teacher at *Darü’l-Mearif*, which is the first Ottoman educational constitution established with *Tanzimat* reforms to educate and fulfil the need of civil servants to be employed at such newly established constitutions.

Harputlu İshak penned this work as a response to anti-Islamic writings of missionaries and particularly to answer to “the objections of an ignorant opponent”, as he puts it (Harputlu 1861, p. 2). Even though Harputlu does not disclose his opponent’s identity or any more detail about him, I argue that İshak Efendi writes primarily to refute Pfander’s *Mizan ul-haqq*.

Few existing works on *Şemsü’l-hakikat* have confirmed that Harputlu’s work is aimed at protestant missionaries (Puse 2010; Özervarlı 2018a, “Şemsü’l-hakikat”, *CMR Online II*; Rank 2015). However, none of them, except for Alıcı’s work, has noted the direct relation between *Şemsü’l-hakikat* and *Mizan ul-haqq*. Alıcı, on the other hand, observes the parallels between Harputlu’s seventy-two questions addressed to missionaries at the epilogue of *Şemsü’l-hakikat* and *Mizan ul-haqq*’s arguments and notes that *Şemsü’l-hakikat* is, in a way, a response to *Mizan ul-haqq*’s claims (Alıcı 2016, p. 34). Through his further research on another missionary tract, entitled *Râfi’uş-Şübuhat* (*The Remover of Doubts*), which is a counter-response to *Şemsü’l-hakikat*, Alıcı notes that writers of this anonymous tract appear to use *Mizan ul-haqq* as a source. Yet, Alıcı provides no further information about the connection between these two polemics, which are, in fact, straightforward refutations of each other (Alıcı 2016, p. 46).

A brief comparison of the two works instantly reveals that Harputlu is well aware of Pfander’s work, as he notes, “this ignorant opponent wrote a tract (*risala*) in Persian (*fâris’il-‘ibâra*) consisting of three sections with false allegations against the religions of Muslims.” (Harputlu 1861, p. 2). Harputlu then summarises *Mizan ul-haqq*’s introduction, where Pfander argues for five criteria of a true revelation, as explained earlier. İshak Efendi, for the rest of the book, first introduces Pfander’s objections, which are indicated in the margins of the pages as *suâl-i* or *kalam-i-nasârâ* (question or statement of the Christian) and then provides his responses. For his non-verbatim quotations from *Mizan ul-haqq*, Harputlu also provides page numbers and, most importantly, section numbers, which are also included but in Persian. These details clearly show us that Harputlu is reading *Mizan ul-haqq* and, in fact, is following a Persian translation copy at his disposal.¹¹ Likewise, the thematical structure of *Şemsü’l-hakikat* closely follows the topics discussed in *Mizan ul-haqq*, namely, abrogation (*naskh*) and corruption (*tahrif*) of Jewish and Christian scriptures, the divinity of Jesus, salvation and crucifixion, and the proclamation of Muhammad in the Bible. The opening of the section on *tebşîrat*, or biblical annunciation of Muhammad, also explicitly repeats the structural details of Pfander’s in Chapter 3 of *Mizan ul-haqq* (Harputlu 1861, p. 159).

İshak Hoca structures the general argumentation in *Şemsü’l-hakikat* through multi-lateral methods, which is unsurprising given his training in various branches of Islamic tradition. While Harputlu uses biblical proof texts to prove that Jesus was a human prophet and never claimed divinity in his prophetic teaching, he also employs rational theological (*kalam*) arguments to demonstrate the irrationality of the Trinity and Christological beliefs by examining the divergences in eastern Christian denominations, namely Jacobites, Nestorians and Melkites. Another central part of Harputlu’s argumentation is the discussion on the corruption of the Bible (*tahrif*) as a response to Pfander’s apologia for the authority of biblical scriptures. Harputlu claims, with a critical approach regarding the reliability of the Bible, that the contents of the Gospels are primarily compositions of human words and, hence, are not divinely revealed scriptures. He further underlines that Jews confirmed the change of thirteen letters in the Torah and that the change of even a letter of God’s revelation deems the scripture corrupted, which might be a reference to Pfander’s forced acceptance of minor textual changes in the Bible during the debate with Rahmat Allah Kairanawi in Agra (Harputlu 1861, p. 37). İshak Hoca continues expanding the contradictions and discrepancies in the texts of the Bible through a relatively close examination. The variety of biblical passages Harputlu quotes in *Şemsü’l-hakikat* is impressive, albeit with less accuracy on relevant chapter numbers and titles. For Harputlu, the centre of gravity of the discussion on the corruption of the Bible is to prove, on the one hand, that the Christian scripture, which is widely circulated by missionaries among Muslim and

non-Muslim communities, is not original revelation given to Jesus and not worthy of faith. Harputlu, on the other hand, strives to provide the best answer to Pfander's anti-Islamic and Quranic claims, which are dangerously confusing for Muslims.

As one of the early examples of 19th-century Ottoman refutations of Christianity, *Şemsü'l-hakikat*'s polemical characteristics are reminiscent of earlier Islamic tradition, while it also has significant unique features. In the limited scope of this paper, we will examine one striking example of this dual characteristic of *Şemsü'l-hakikat*. While refuting Jesus' divinity, Harputlu touches upon the well-known Muslim analysis of the biblical expressions *ibn* (son) and *ab* (father). İshak Hoca explains that the words son and father in the Bible signify nonliteral meanings (*mecaz*). He quotes John 20/17, "He is my and your father, and I will go to my God and your God", again a most widely used biblical citation in Muslim polemics. He explains that the word "father" in this passage is used as *itlâk-ı isti'are* (unqualified metaphor). He further clarifies that the word "father" in this context does not signify *ma'nâyî luğaviyye* (dictionary definition) as the contextual indicator (*karîne*) in the passage "my God and your God" clearly conveys. Harputlu goes on to expand, "The intended meaning (*murâd*) of the term father is God Almighty who gives providence, and guidance to his creatures as a father would graciously treat his son" (Harputlu 1861, p. 262). With a linguistically structured argument here, Harputlu claims that Jesus deemed himself equal to other humans and shows this using the words "father" and "son" in an unqualified meaning when he said "my God and your God" and that he undeniably clarified and admitted that he is created and nurtured by God. While most mainstream Muslim scholars also read these terms metaphorically, Harputlu's interpretation goes beyond this traditional reading and advances his argument with linguistic clarifications.

A comprehensive assessment of the degree of the strength and efficacy of İshak Hoca's polemic in rebutting Pfander's controversial claims against Islam and in making Muslim objects of the empire immune from missionaries' proselytising efforts requires a more thorough comparison of these two refutations. However, we know that *Şemsü'l-hakikat* instantly caused a disturbance for the CMS' İstanbul station team. The CMI Journal of 1864 reports that a Turkish book defending "Mohammedanism" and refuting Christianity was published at the Government Press, *Takvîmhane-i Âmire*, with official state permission.¹² The CMS is irritated at the government's support for this Muslim tract. While the report provides the title "The Sun of Truth", it gives no information about the author except "a Mohammedan divine of the old school", which clearly alludes to Harputlu's scholarly identity. The report's remarks on *Şemsü'l-hakikat* explicitly assert both the disquiet about the book, which "breathes the abusive and intolerant spirit of the Koran", and the discomfort about its "extensive sale and influence on those who were ignorant enough to be led away by its misrepresentations of Christianity" (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (CMI) 1864, pp. 222–23). The CMS İstanbul team hastily wanted to reply and disapprove of Harputlu's arguments and represent "the true character of Christianity". The report informs us that Pfander "drew up" *Râfi'uş-Şübühât* (*The Remover of Doubts*), but he "avoided all abusive and irritating language and was careful to keep within the bounds of legitimate controversy" (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (CMI) 1864, p. 223).

Earlier research already indicated that *Râfi'uş-Şübühât* is a missionary response to Harputlu's *Şemsü'l-hakikat* (Alıcı 2010, pp. 239–40; Alıcı 2016, pp. 32–33; Özervarlı 2018a, "Şemsü'l-hakikat", *CMR Online II*). Yet, the authorship of this tract has not been known so far since it was anonymously published with no place and date of publication. Thanks to the CMI journal, we now know Pfander is the author of this missionary response. The report also reveals that copies of the Turkish translation of *Mizan ul-haqq* were disseminated after the publication of *Şemsü'l-hakikat*, which conforms to the date of one located copy of the Turkish translation.¹³ It is arguably safe then, with this information, to suggest that *Râfi'uş-Şübühât* might have been published in 1862 or 1863, just after *Mizan ul-haqq*'s Turkish translation was put in circulation. Early 1864 might also be a possible date. However, this is less likely since it is known that the government issued a sale ban on Pfander's books in mid-1864, closed the CMS's bookstore in İstanbul, and confiscated existing publications,

including ten copies of *Râfi'uş-Şübühât* (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (CMI) 1864, p. 223). Furthermore, when the fact that the distribution of Turkish *Mizan ul-haqq* started in 1862 is considered, the year 1863 appears as a more accurate possible publication date.

As noted in the CMI report, the language of *Râfi'uş-Şübühât* is noticeably modified for Muslim audiences, with characteristically Islamic introductory remarks, “Lillahi'l-hamd” (to Allah be praise). The rest of the book likewise does not reflect either the earlier aggressive tone of Pfander’s *Mizan ul-haqq* or the CMI journal. It should also be noted that the language used for Harputlu and *Şemsü'l-hakikat* is highly polemical and disparaging, describing Harputlu as “a writer with scarce knowledge and lack of attentiveness” (*müellifin killeti'l-ilm ve adem-i dikkati*) and “obstinate and lack of conscience” (*inâd ve adem-i insaf*) (*Râfi'uş-Şübühât* n.d., pp. 3, 4). This is, in fact, a reciprocation to Harputlu’s disdainful comments about Pfander’s “ignorant approach” in *Mizan ul-haqq*. *Râfi'uş-Şübühât* consists of two main parts and refutes Harputlu’s criticism through sixteen points, though not including all of his objections. The themes of these points are almost the same topics discussed in *Mizan ul-haqq*, such as the abrogation and corruption of the Bible, the sonship and divinity of Jesus, the biblical proclamation of Muhammad, and the truthfulness of his prophecy. The sixteenth and last point is devoted to Christians’ doubts about the Qur’an.

4.2. *Ziyâü'l-kulûb* (*The Light of Hearts*)

Harputlu İshak, approximately fifteen years later, wrote another polemic against protestant missionaries. The book does not have a publication date and place; however, Harputlu’s reference, “since the hijra (the Prophet’s migration to Madina), it has been 1293 years”, indicates that it was published in 1876 (Harputlu 1876, pp. 112–13; Puse 2010, p. 10; Özervarlı 2018b, “*Ziyâü'l-kulûb*”, *CMR Online II*). The thematic content, polemical structure, argumentation and scope of *Ziyâü'l-kulûb* (*The Light of Hearts*) are similar to that of *Şemsü'l-hakikat*, albeit the former is a slightly longer text. The most significant difference between these two polemics of Harputlu is the extensive use of Rahmat Allah Kairanawi’s *Izhâr al-haqq*. İshak Hoca uses biblical texts for argumentative purposes in *Şemsü'l-hakikat* and reinterprets, at times, the Bible in an Islamic context, with an impressive repertoire of biblical quotations. However, he does not use any European or Western sources in his first refutation. Contrarily, *Ziyâü'l-kulûb* contains the primary arguments of the field of biblical criticism and Western sources that he cited as long sections from *Izhâr al-haqq*.

In the introduction, İshak Hoca clarifies that his writing aims to “expose the slanders and bases of protestant writings against Islam”. He further explains that missionaries carried on publishing anti-Islamic tracts and reiterating their old slanders as if they did not know *Şemsü'l-hakikat* and Rahmat Allah Kairanawi’s “prominent book” *Izhâr al-haqq*. He also adds that the protestant reverends (*rahibler*) “failed to respond to the questions addressed to them in both of the books, so he decided to write the book, entitled *Ziyâü'l-kulûb*” (Harputlu 1876, pp. 13–14). Harputlu’s clarification about the purpose of writing his book, though fifteen years have passed, raises the question of whether this written debate or, in other words, the fight over truth (*haqq*), which started with *Şemsü'l-hakikat* and continued with Pfander’s counter-refutation *Râfi'uş-Şübühât*, has continued. Harputlu responds to a few missionary tracts in *Ziyâü'l-kulûb*. However, he mentions a title only for one, which is *Gidâü'l-mülâhazât* (Food for reflections) of the CMS’ missionary Sigismund Koelle (d. 1902). A preliminary analysis of the content and İshak Hoca’s arguments directed against the anonymous tract(s) reveals parallels that point to the possibility that *Ziyâü'l-kulûb* might also partly be a response to *Râfi'uş-Şübühât*.

Harputlu cautiously explains that he does not, in writing this book, intend to either disparage or insult the beliefs of non-Muslim subjects of the Empire. Instead, he targets only protestant missionaries and takes responsibility for answering to their writings against Islam. Harputlu also adds that Christian communities of the Ottoman society, who strongly desire to preserve their faith and convenient position, both request and agree that missionaries should be silenced and defeated. Then, he underlines his respect for Ottoman Christians and asks for appreciation, as ongoing missionary activities in the empire also

aggrieved Muslims (Harputlu 1876, pp. 14–15). This acknowledgement of good intent might be an expected opening for an interreligious polemic. But I suggest it might also be a response to the accusation of Harputlu, in *Râfi'uş-Şübühât*, “of using highly defamatory expressions about all Christians and the author of *Mizan ul-haqq*” (*Râfi'uş-Şübühât* n.d., p. 6). The CMI journal of 1864 also reports similar accusations of “characterising Christians as an ignorant set of people, deaf, dumb and blind” (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer (CMI)* 1864, p. 223). The arguments of Harputlu likewise sound like responses to the sixteen points mentioned above summarised in *Râfi'uş-Şübühât*. In particular, Harputlu’s arguments against the claims that Muhammad, as a Prophet, did not perform even one miracle and that the Qur’an’s failure in not mentioning three hypostases are similar to the points summarised in *Râfi'uş-Şübühât*. However, the question of whether Harputlu read Pfander’s last anti-Islamic polemic and included its arguments in his second rebuttal requires further research by comparing Ottoman refutations and missionary literature. For now, we know that Harputlu, this time, aimed to directly refute Koelle’s work published in Turkish in 1873, which caused as much stir as Pfander’s *Mizan ul-haqq* did among Ottoman scholars. Koelle’s printing and distribution of controversial religious tracts continued after Pfander’s expulsion from İstanbul despite the state restriction on the publication and dissemination of missionary writings.

5. Conclusions

This research aimed to highlight the significant dimension of the contextual realities of missionary interactions in Ottoman lands. Towards this purpose, the present paper examined two famous polemics that were considered inspiring in their religious communities. After his service in India, Pfander embarked on an Istanbul mission with great ambition, hoping that the Ottomans were ready to receive the Gospel. Besides his works and translations, he oversaw the publication of other controversial missionary pamphlets in London and their transfer and distribution in Istanbul. However, Pfander encountered state censorship of publications after a while, considerably disrupting his publishing activities. Nevertheless, approximately seven years after he arrived in İstanbul and until the day he left, his intense activities, especially with *Mizan ul-haqq*, had a significant impact. The story of *Mizan ul-haqq* did not begin in the Ottoman Empire, yet it profoundly impacted the Ottoman context. One of *Mizan ul-haqq*’s responders, Harputlu İshak, in his metaphorical expression, viewed the anti-Islamic writings of Protestant missionaries, whom he considered guests in the Ottoman lands, as insults to the religion and beliefs of the host, Islam, and the Qur’an. He questioned the morality of this. A preliminary investigation into these refutations in the context of the religious controversy between protestant missionaries and the Ottoman state shows that these polemics have internal dynamics driven by their authors’ intellectual framework and external factors such as their historical circumstances. Another critical dimension of these polemics is the authors’ scriptural argumentation, which is yet to be examined by a close analysis of their methodology and, most importantly, compared with other missionary and Muslim polemics.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Notes

- ¹ The state’s reaction to these conversions was capital punishment (Gümüş 2017, p. 137). For the details of the counterarguments regarding the executions of Muslim converts both in Ottoman circles and missionary groups, see (Gümüş 2017, pp. 136–39, 148).
- ² For the state’s different reaction to the missionary-related incidents in the countryside, Şahin explains, “Similar cases required different methods in the countryside. As far as rural subjects were concerned, Ottoman ministers showed little or no tolerance of missionary activities and public disorder”. See (Şahin 2018, pp. 32–33).

- ³ For a detailed and thorough historical account of the encounters and correspondences between Pfander and the circle of Indian Muslim scholars, see (Powell 1993, pp. 163–91).
- ⁴ Powell argues that “Pfander’s linguistic skills, which are clearly shown in his books in Persian and Urdu, marks a new era in Christian missionary apologetics for Muslims”. She also considers Pfander’s use of Shi’i sources and being influenced by their discourse as a significant difference on Pfander’s part because missionaries were simply not aware of or interested in the division between Sunnis and Shi’is. Powell interestingly notes that Pfander realised through his missionary experience in India that polemicalising the internal controversies of Islam as the one between Sunnis and Shi’is is a winning strategy. See (Powell 1993, p. 148).
- ⁵ As Whittingham notes, Pfander is not interested in theological arguments when refuting the Qur’an as it is not a true revelation. See (Whittingham 2012, pp. 4–5).
- ⁶ Here, Pfander quotes a few Qur’anic verses to underpin his argument and further discusses the narrative about the Prophet’s moon-splitting miracles in detail. Then, he presents his objections to these reports. See (Pfander 1866, *Mizan ul-haqq*, pp. 107–9).
- ⁷ The character of Pfander’s missionary discourse, on the other hand, is noticeably “orientalist”, as Powell aptly puts it (Powell 1993, p. 144). For Pfander’s remarks on the Muslim society he encountered during his missions in different Muslim lands, see (Powell 1993, pp. 151–54).
- ⁸ Ottoman scholars swiftly responded to missionary anti-Islamic literature with polemical works. For bibliographic info see (M. Aydın 1998; F. Aydın 2003).
- ⁹ *Huzur dersleri* were first initiated in 1738 and conducted under the supervision of the leading ulama until the last *huzur dersi* in Ramadan 1924. See (İpşirli 1998). See also (Mardin 1966).
- ¹⁰ For the details of Harputlu’s works, see (Demirpolat 2003, pp. 400–9).
- ¹¹ According to the CMI 1864 report, Persian copies of *Mizan ul-haqq* arrived in İstanbul before the Crimean War, i.e., before 1853, to be distributed in İzmir, but were held up at customs. Thanks to the intervention of an American missionary named Dr. Schhauffler, they eventually received the book box but did not obtain the books. Although the book has not yet been published in Turkish, it appears on the list published by the Turks as ‘controversial’. This explains why and how Harputlu presumably obtained a Persian copy of *Mizan ul-haqq* sometime after 1853. See (*The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (CMI) 1864, p. 222).
- ¹² For *Takvimhane-i Âmire*, see (Sarıyıldız 2019).
- ¹³ See (Pfander 1861).

References

- Alıcı, Mehmet. 2010. Rafi’u’ş-Şübühât Yani, Cevab-i Risâle-i Şemsü’l-Hakika. *Milel ve Nihal* 7: 239–44. Available online: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/milel/issue/10462/128105> (accessed on 18 June 2024).
- Alıcı, Mehmet. 2016. Osmanlı Son Döneminde Müslüman-Hristiyan Tartışmalara Dair Bir Karşılaştırma: Şemsü’l-Hakika ve Râfi’u’ş-Şübühât y’ani, Cevâb-i Risâle-i Şemsü’l-Hakikat. *Mukaddime: Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7: 31–52. Available online: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/mukaddime/issue/19681/210202> (accessed on 18 June 2024). [CrossRef]
- Aydın, Fuat. 2003. Osmanlı Dönemindeki Misyonerlik Faaliyetleri ve Bu Faaliyetlerle İlgili Çalışmalara Yönelik Bir Bibliyografya Denemesi. *Sakarya Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi* 5: 114–30.
- Aydın, Mehmet. 1998. *Müslümanların Hristiyanlara Karşı Yazdığı Reddiyeler ve Tartışma Konuları*. Ankara: Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları.
- Bennett, Clinton. 1996. The Legacy of Karl Gottlieb Pfander. *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 20: 76–81. [CrossRef]
- Birinci, Ali. 2006. Osmanlı Devletinde Matbuat ve Neşriyat Yasakları Tarihine Medhal. *Türkiye Araştırmaları Literatür Dergisi* 7: 291–349. Available online: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/talid/issue/43472/530499> (accessed on 18 June 2024).
- Cragg, Kenneth. 2000. Being Made Disciples, the Middle East. In *The Church Mission Society and World Christianity, 1799–1999*. Edited by Kevin Ward and Brian Stanley. Grand Rapids: Erdmans Publishing Company, pp. 120–43.
- Demirpolat, Enver. 2003. Harputlu İshak Hoca’nın Hayatı ve Eserleri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 9: 397–411.
- Deringil, Selim. 2012. *Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Erhan, Çağrı. 2000. Ottoman Official Attitudes Towards American Missionaries. *The Turkish Yearbook of International Relations* 30: 191–212. Available online: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/845989> (accessed on 18 June 2024). [CrossRef]
- Gorman, Henry. 2019. American Ottomans: Protestant Missionaries in an Islamic Empire’s Service, 1820–1919. *Diplomatic History* 43: 544–68. [CrossRef]
- Grafton, David D. 2013. The Death of Christ upon a Cross: A 19th-Century Lutheran–CMS Missionary Pamphlet. In *Christian-Muslim Relations in the Anglican and Lutheran Communions*. Edited by David D. Grafton, Joseph F. Duggan and Jason Craig Harris. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 21–39.
- Gümüş, Hami Inan. 2017. *American Missionaries in the Ottoman Empire: A Conceptual Metaphor Analysis of Missionary Narrative, 1820–1898*. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag.
- Gümüş, Hami Inan. 2020. American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and the Ottoman Empire. Correspondence, Reports and Other Papers 1819–1914. In *Christian-Muslim Relations. A Bibliographical History: North America, South-East Asia, China, Japan, and Australasia (1800–1914)*. Leiden: Brill, vol. 16, pp. 419–32.
- Harputlu, İshak Hoca. 1861. *Şemsü’l-Hakikat*. İstanbul: Tâkvimhâne-i Âmire.

- Harputlu, İshak Hoca. 1876. *Ziyâü'l-Kulûb*. İstanbul.
- İpşirli, Mehmet. 1998. Huzur Dersleri. In *DİA: Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Available online: <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/huzur-dersleri> (accessed on 24 July 2024).
- Kara, Mustafa. 2000. Harputlu İshak Efendi. In *DİA: Diyanet İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Available online: <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/ishak-efendi-harputlu> (accessed on 20 June 2024).
- Kocabaşoğlu, Uygur. 1989. *Kendi Belgeleriyle Anadolu'daki Amerika: 19. Yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğundaki Amerikan Misyoner Okulları*. İstanbul: Arba Yayınları.
- Makdisi, Ussama. 1997. Reclaiming the Land of the Bible: Missionaries, Secularism, and Evangelical Modernity. *The American Historical Review* 102: 680–713. [CrossRef]
- Mardin, Ebü'l-Ula. 1966. *Huzur Dersleri*. İstanbul: İsmail Akgün Matbaası, vol. 1, pp. 338–39.
- Özervarlı, Mehmet Sait. 2018a. Şemsü'l-Hakikat. In *Christian-Muslim Relations Online II*. General Editor David Thomas. Leiden: Brill. Available online: <https://referenceworks.brill.com/display/entries/CMR2/COM-30752.xml> (accessed on 20 December 2023).
- Özervarlı, Mehmet Sait. 2018b. Ziyâü'l-Kulûb. In *Christian-Muslim Relations Online II*. General Editor David Thomas. Leiden: Brill. Available online: <https://referenceworks.brill.com/display/entries/CMR2/COM-30753.xml> (accessed on 20 December 2023).
- Perry, Yaron. 2003. *British Mission to the Jews in Nineteenth-Century Palestine*. London: Frank Cass Publishers.
- Pfander, Carl Gottlieb. 1861. *Kitab-i Mizan ül-hak* (Ottoman Turkish Translation of *Mizan ul-Haqq*). Available online: <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/994073673506421> (accessed on 18 June 2024).
- Pfander, Carl Gottlieb. 1866. *The Mizan ul-Haqq; or, Balance of Truth*. Translated by R. H. Weakley. London: Church Missionary House.
- Powell, Avril Ann. 1976. Maulānā Raḥmat Allāh Kairānawī and Muslim-Christian Controversy in India in the Mid-19th Century. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 108: 42–63. [CrossRef]
- Powell, Avril Ann. 1993. *Muslims and Missionaries in Pre-Mutiny India*. London: Routledge.
- Puse, Emine. 2010. Harputlu İshak Efendi ve Ziyâ'ul Kulûb Adlı Eseri. Master's thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey.
- Rank, Scott. 2015. Disputing Religion, Empire, and Modernity: Christian-Muslim Polemics in the Ottoman Print Sphere, 1861–1915. Ph.D. thesis, Central European University, Budapest, Hungary.
- Rice, Rev W. A. 1910. *Crusaders of the Twentieth Century* (1910). Available online: <http://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.1004> (accessed on 12 July 2024).
- Roper, Geoffrey. 1988. "Arabic Printing in Malta 1825–1845: Its history and its place in the development of print culture in the Arab Middle East." Unpublished. Doctoral dissertation, University of Durham, Durham, UK.
- Roper, Geoffrey. 2017. Printed in Europe, Consumed in Ottoman Lands: European Books in the Middle East, 1514–1842. In *Books in Motion in Early Modern Europe: Beyond Production, Circulation and Consumption*. Edited by Daniel Bellingradt, Paul Nelles and Jeroen Salman. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 267–88.
- Ryad, Umar. 2021. Introduction: The Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century. In *Christian-Muslim Relations A Bibliographical History: The Ottoman Empire (1800–1914)*. Leiden: Brill, vol. 18, pp. 1–26.
- Şahin, Emrah. 2018. *Faithful Encounters Authorities and American Missionaries in the Ottoman Empire*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Sarıyıldız, Gülden. 2019. Takvimhane-i Âmire, DİA. Available online: <https://islamansiklopedisi.org.tr/takvimhane> (accessed on 20 June 2024).
- Sharkey, Heather J. 2017. *A History of Muslims, Christians, and Jews in the Middle East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Şişman, Cengiz. 2015. Full Article: Failed Proselytizers or Modernizers? Protestant Missionaries Among the Jews and Sabateans/Dönmes in the Nineteenth-Century Ottoman Empire. *Middle Eastern Studies* 51: 932–49. [CrossRef]
- Smith, Jane I. 1998. Christian Missionary Views of Islam in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 9: 357–73. [CrossRef]
- Stock, Eugene. 1899. *The History of the Church Missionary Society, Its Environment, Its Men and Its Work*. London: London Church Missionary Society, vol. 3. Available online: <http://archive.org/details/historyofchurchm02stocuoft> (accessed on 25 July 2024).
- The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (CMI). 1859. London: The Church Missionary Society.
- The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (CMI). 1860. London: The Church Missionary Society.
- The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (CMI). 1861. London: The Church Missionary Society.
- The Church Missionary Intelligencer* (CMI). 1864. London: The Church Missionary Society.
- Werff, Lyle L. Vander. 2000. *Christian Mission to Muslims: The Record: Anglican and Reformed Approaches in India and the Near East, 1800–1938*. Print-On-Demand Edition. Pasadena: William Carey Library.
- Whittingham, Martin. 2012. "Deciding by the Gospel": Some Protestant Christian Responses to the Qur'an since the Nineteenth Century. Unpublished Conference Paper Draft. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/25585383/Deciding_by_the_Gospel_Some_Protestant_Christian_Responses_to_the_Quran_since_the_Nineteenth_Century_delivered_at_Campion_Hall_Seminar_Papers_on_Christian_Theological_Engagement_with_Islam_2012_part_of_the_Georgetown_Campion_Hall_Partnership (accessed on 20 June 2024).

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.