2017

Mission: Agnes C. L. Donohugh, early "apostle for ethnography"

Benjamin L. Hartley

George Fox University, bhartley@georgefox.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ccs

Part of the Christianity Commons

Recommended Citation

http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ccs/229

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Christian Studies at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - College of Christian Studies by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfc@georgefox.edu.
In the spring of 1915, the Kennedy School of Missions at Hartford Theological Seminary, the leading graduate school for missionary training in the United States at this time, offered the first graduate-level course on ethnology ever to be taught in America to missionary candidates.¹ The seminary's leadership had identified the need for teaching ethnology to missionaries-in-training as early as 1913—when the school of missions was just two years old.² This American curricular innovation followed a practice begun a decade earlier in Britain of teaching ethnology to missionary candidates (Kuklick 1991).³ Hartford Seminary President W. Douglas Mackenzie was also inspired to make this curricular change because he had chaired Commission V on "The Training of Teachers" at the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910. That Commission sounded a sobering call for more cross-cultural sensitivity in missionary training:

Christian missionaries do not always show consummate wisdom in their methods. Christianity is under no inherent compulsion to impose any special form of civilization on its adherents, else we should all be Judaised. It is certainly strange that we should take an Eastern religion, adapt it to Western needs, and then impose those Western adaptations on Eastern races. I can conceive no better way of swamping and stamping out all true individuality in our converts.⁴

In light of Edinburgh 1910's call for change, it only made sense that Mackenzie would want his own institution to take the lead in improving missionary training. And so it did.

Two German anthropologists, Paul Krusius and Hermann Kumm, taught ethnology first for one-year appointments at Hartford, but it was Agnes C. L. Donohugh (1876–1966) who kept the flame of anthropological education alive and burning at the Kennedy School for the next twenty-five years.⁵ No one influenced graduate anthropological training for missionaries in America during the interwar period as much as she did. A former missionary to India and a recent MA graduate in anthropology at Columbia University, Agnes C. L. Donohugh taught ethnology at the Kennedy School
from 1918–1944, first in the Africa Department and then in the Department of Sociology and Ethnology when it was established a few years later. She was called the "Apostle of Ethnology" by students and colleagues alike and taught at the Kennedy School far longer than her better-known British missionary anthropologist colleagues. William C. Willoughby served at the Kennedy School from 1919–1931, and Edwin W. Smith was there from 1939–1943.

Anthropology was still a young discipline in America when Donohugh started teaching at the Kennedy School in 1918; there were only nine anthropology or sociology-ethnology departments (undergraduate and graduate) in the nation. In missionary training the Kennedy School was at the anthropological forefront, and remained so for many years. No other seminary in America taught courses in ethnology until some years after the Kennedy School began to do so, and as late as 1955 the Kennedy School of Missions was the only missionary training institution in the world identified as having granted PhDs in anthropology in the preceding half century (Myklebust 1957: 52–94; Voegelin 1950: 351).

In spite of Donohugh's pioneering efforts in anthropology and in missionary training at this premier institution, however, the "Apostle of Ethnology" has been almost completely forgotten. There are several reasons for this. She published few articles and no books, she was a woman in a male-dominated field, and she lacked a PhD degree at a time when the discipline of anthropology was increasingly becoming more exclusive in admitting only PhD anthropologists into its ranks (Kuklick 1991: 10).

There are as many reasons for recovering Donohugh's story as there are reasons why she has been forgotten by anthropologists and missiologists. For the purposes of this volume, those reasons revolve around illustrating the processes, purposes, and impact Christian anthropologists may have in encouraging the integration of their faith with the value they place on the discipline. In the American context, Donohugh was the first Christian anthropologist to attempt this kind of integrative work. Donohugh's story can now be added to other biographical portraits of Christian anthropologists who have influenced the field of anthropology for reasons which both inspire and provide helpful methodological and theological insight (Clifford 1992; Fardon 1999). Biography has served a similar purpose among Christian historians who have sought to reflect in an integrative manner on their discipline. Interdisciplinary research with anthropology and history makes the insights of Christian historians germane to our goals in this volume as well.

Donohugh's career falls almost precisely halfway between two figures in Larsen's study; James George Frazer was twenty-three years Donohugh's senior and E. E. Evans-Pritchard was twenty-five years her junior. The profound theoretical distance between Frazer and Evans-Pritchard makes Donohugh's story a helpful vantage point to understand the radical changes taking place in anthropology — and indeed all the social sciences — during her lifetime.

Finally, Agnes Donohugh's story is instructive for the holistic way she contributed to both the field of anthropology and the Christian church's missionary training efforts. Donohugh made an impact in both arenas not only by applying anthropological ideas to missionary practice but also by making a constructive contribution to the field of anthropology through her own research, the PhD students she trained, and in the ways she influenced the field of anthropology to take religion more seriously. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a biographical portrait of Agnes Donohugh which highlights the different dimensions of her contributions to the field of anthropology, missionary training, mission thought, and even American foreign policy.

Early years and missionary service of Agnes Donohugh

A lifelong Methodist, Agnes Crawford Leaycraft was born in New York City in 1876 to financially prosperous parents who were active in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Her father ran a lucrative real estate firm in Manhattan (Bergen 1913: 642). Agnes attended Barnard College in New York City beginning in 1894 and graduated in 1901 with a course of study that included mostly English classes. She did, however, take one introductory anthropology course which was probably taught by either Franz Boas or Livingston Farrand. Women were not permitted to take advanced anthropology courses at Barnard or Columbia in the late 1890s in spite of the fact that Boas reported some years later that he found Barnard's female students more intellectually engaged than the undergraduate men of Columbia. While at Barnard Agnes was involved in a number of extra-curricular activities in addition to her coursework. She was the director of the Barnard Banjo Club (in which she played guitar), participated in several social clubs, a drama club, and the College Settlement Association, and she was business manager for the Barnard Glee Club. In 1899 she also became active in the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a foreshadowing of her life's work.

One searches in vain for details about Agnes's life in the few years immediately after graduating from Barnard in 1901. During these years Agnes met a Philadelphia Methodist attorney, Thomas S. Donohugh, who was discerning a call to missionary service. It is possible that Agnes met Thomas at a 1903 Silver Bay, New York conference sponsored by the YMCA (with significant Methodist participation) for young adults interested in missionary service.
By 1904 Thomas had applied for missionary service with the Methodist Episcopal Church and by 1905 he was in Meerut, India having the time of his life.

"The year or more has flown like the wind and it has been the happiest of my life. . . . The life has been full of joy, and the work a constant delight. I long to see it grow in power and believe that we are just on the verge of a new era; one we will all welcome most gladly."17

Someone was missing in Thomas's life, however, and after a year of service in India he returned to America. Thomas married Agnes in June of 1906.18 They had their first child (Agnes Carol) in New York late in 1907 before returning together to India around 1908 or early 1909 (Bergen 1913: 642).19 Agnes and Thomas Donohugh served in Meerut, India (seventy kilometers northeast of Delhi) where Thomas focused primarily on education and administrative oversight of Methodist work in the region. Agnes's father raised more than $2,000 shortly after they arrived in India for the construction of a boys' school they were running.20 One of the missionaries under Thomas Donohugh's oversight was the not-yet-famous E. Stanley Jones who had arrived in India in November of 1907.21 Three decades later Time magazine would describe Jones as "the world's greatest Christian missionary" (Graham 2005: 46).22 While we have some information on Thomas Donohugh's missionary work, the activities of Agnes Donohugh during this time is not well-documented in the Methodist archival record. Doubtless much of her energy was spent raising her two small children, Carol and Crawford, the latter of whom was born in India in December of 1910 (Bergen 1913: 642). But caring for her own children was far from all she did. Years later, after graduating from Columbia University, Agnes Donohugh reported to Franz Boas that she and her husband recognized during their service in India how valuable anthropological training was for their ministry.23

We were among the village people of Northern India, at Meerut, in the United Provinces, and we needed to know something of village organization of family and caste regulations, the great antiquity of certain customs, and the religious practices of the lower castes. It was slow work acquiring the knowledge first-hand when we did not know how much there was to find out. Since studying in the Anthropology Dept. I have made a beginning in such study and realize how much material there is in Provincial Reports, in Ethnological Reports in Anthropological Journals from different regions, available here, and not within one's reach out there except in certain centres, which would give just the insight into the life of the people as is most needed for sympathetic dealings with them.24

The cultural phenomenon which most interested Agnes and Thomas was the occurrence of "mass movements" or "caste movements" of Indians to the Christian faith. In 1913 Thomas Donohugh published one of the first articles on Christian "mass movements" which twenty years later was more thoroughly studied by Methodist missionary colleague J. Waskom Pickett in his 1933 text, Christian Mass Movements in India.25 Agnes's experience as an undergraduate student in just one anthropology course at Barnard College meant she had more training in anthropology to draw from in understanding these "caste movements" than perhaps any American missionary in the world. But as she relayed to Professor Boas years later, she wanted to know more.

Graduate school and scholarly contributions

Agnes and Thomas Donohugh returned to New York City in 1912, and Thomas began working with the Methodist Board of Missions in charge of missionary candidate recruitment while Agnes began graduate work at Columbia University.26 At the time that she began work toward her MA in anthropology she may have been one of just two women in the program; moreover, Laura Watson Benedict (1861–1932) and Agnes Donohugh were two of just a handful of graduate students with extensive overseas experience. The daughter of an Episcopal clergyman, Benedict was the first woman to receive a PhD in anthropology at Columbia in 1914 – at the age of 53.27 There is no evidence that Donohugh and Benedict knew one another, but in 1914, during Donohugh's second year at Columbia, there were fewer than twenty graduate students in the department which makes likely at least a passing acquaintance.28 Years after graduating from Columbia in 1916, Agnes Donohugh reported that she took "all the courses in anthropology which were offered" (The Harford Daily Courant 1944).29 Some of these courses were with Boas, but it appears that Dr. Alexander A. Goldenweiser was her primary advisor.30

In an April 1918 letter written to Boas, most likely to help him garner support for Goldenweiser against a university administration that wanted to fire him, Agnes described Goldenweiser as her director and praised him, Franz Boas, and the program more generally.31

For three years my work in the Graduate School of Columbia has been in the Anthropology Department – recognized as the strongest in the country – and much of the time under the direction of Dr. A. A. Goldenweiser. His lavish gift of time and interest to serious students are of the greatest help. His effort to enlarge the scope of scientific study so as to bring in new students; his insistence upon the fundamental character of anthropological data as related to History and Sociology; upon the contribution of research of the present day to the solving of problems of fact or of development, making anthropology a living, growing science, new and fresh in possibilities of discovery, – these create in his students an eagerness to add to the knowledge of primitive cultures through their
own original research. I count the Anthropology Department at Columbia one of the greatest departments of the University in all that it has done in the training of well-equipped anthropologists, and may yet do. With Yale strong in Archaeology, Harvard in undergraduate work in Anthropology, Columbia takes the lead in Graduate courses, in theoretical work, and in training for field work in Ethnology. I acknowledge my appreciation and indebtedness to Columbia, to Professor Boas, and to Dr. Goldenweiser. 32

What this letter and other correspondence demonstrate most clearly is that Donohugh made an important "relational contribution" to the field of anthropology even before she made scholarly or other professional contributions. Her ability to influence Boas, however, was not necessarily because of the strength of her relationship with him; in fact, the four letters which have been preserved between Donohugh and Boas after Donohugh graduated from Columbia suggests that her relationship with Professor Boas was cordial but not particularly close. Still, scholars have noted that Boas tended to have better relationships with female students than he had with male students (Lewis 2008: 189). Agnes Donohugh addressed one seven-page handwritten letter to Boas with the salutation, "My dear Prof. Boas," a rather warm and conventional greeting she used in corresponding with others as well. Boas, in turn, wrote back with a somewhat more formal salutation, "My dear Madam." Donohugh's long letter was an appeal to Boas to grant her permission to teach anthropology courses on Africa and China at Columbia University in the Department of Extension Teaching in 1918-1919.

Her long 1918 letter to Boas well illustrates the ways Donohugh sought to influence Boas by seeking to change how he thought about missionaries' contributions and her own ability to make a contribution as a woman in the field. In arguing for the significance of missionaries' contributions, she explained to Boas that there were twenty-six returned missionaries from China and that they should be taken seriously for the contribution they could make to anthropology.

Of course, the question of the preparation of missionaries is one which does not interest you, perhaps, especially in relation to Anthropology. There is this to consider in the matter: that the missionaries are being sent out steadily, year after year, the effort is being made by all the larger agencies to send out better prepared people in each year, and to that end time is being allowed them to get as much specific preparation as is available. This includes not only some theological study, and a study of educational methods, but the history of the people to whose land they go, and a study of the religions prevailing there. If to this were added, the anthropological study of the country so given that the newcomer would have an introduction to the manners and customs, the background of thinking, the traditions, which would indicate some of the things not to do, and also some of the lives for very profitable study while with the people, this would add to the equipment a valuable item.

This may not appeal to you, but since missions seem to be so an established feature, and modern civilization is making such inroads anyhow among primitive populations, I feel very keenly that science could use much which is easily accessible to the missionary on the field in the recording of rapidly disappearing beliefs and customs. But this will not always be done unless those going out know what to look for. We cannot hope [sic] these anthropologists as missionaries! But we can train some missionaries in Anthropology. The books of Roscoe and Junod, for instance, could be written for other regions also. 33

Boas was not the only anthropologist whom Donohugh sought to convince about the value of missionaries being more deeply engaged in anthropological study. At her retirement in 1944 Professor E. W. Capen notes that "[s]he was a persuasive advocate of missions among ethnologists." 34 Her involvement with the American Anthropological Association and other professional societies in which anthropologists participated would have given her a platform to influence other anthropologists in addition to that provided by her teaching role at the Kennedy School of Missions.

In Donohugh's letter to Boas she also pushed Franz Boas in his attitude toward women in the field of anthropology. In arguing that she should be permitted to teach the ethnology course on Africa and China at Columbia University in the Department of Extension Teaching in 1918-1919. Please do not misunderstand me, Prof. Boas, and think this a case of superlative Egotisms. I know that my preparation and qualifications are far from adequate in dealing with such scientific matters, and yet my three years of graduate work have inspired me with a real enthusiasm for the study of Anthropology and I should like to see the number of serious students greatly increased. My ambition to help in extending anthropological study. At her retirement in 1944 Professor E. W. Capen notes that "[s]he was a persuasive advocate of missions among ethnologists." 34 Her involvement with the American Anthropological Association and other professional societies in which anthropologists participated would have given her a platform to influence other anthropologists in addition to that provided by her teaching role at the Kennedy School of Missions.

In Donohugh's letter to Boas she also pushed Franz Boas in his attitude toward women in the field of anthropology. In arguing that she should be permitted to teach the ethnology course on Africa and China at Columbia University in the Department of Extension Teaching in 1918-1919. Please do not misunderstand me, Prof. Boas, and think this a case of superlative Egotisms. I know that my preparation and qualifications are far from adequate in dealing with such scientific matters, and yet my three years of graduate work have inspired me with a real enthusiasm for the study of Anthropology and I should like to see the number of serious students greatly increased. My ambition to help in extending anthropology even before she made scholarly or other professional contributions. Her ability to influence Boas, however, was not necessarily because of the strength of her relationship with him; in fact, the four letters which have been preserved between Donohugh and Boas after Donohugh graduated from Columbia suggests that her relationship with Professor Boas was cordial but not particularly close. Still, scholars have noted that Boas tended to have better relationships with female students than he had with male students (Lewis 2008: 189). Agnes Donohugh addressed one seven-page handwritten letter to Boas with the salutation, "My dear Prof. Boas," a rather warm and conventional greeting she used in corresponding with others as well. Boas, in turn, wrote back with a somewhat more formal salutation, "My dear Madam." Donohugh's long letter was an appeal to Boas to grant her permission to teach anthropology courses on Africa and China at Columbia University in the Department of Extension Teaching in 1918-1919.

Her long 1918 letter to Boas well illustrates the ways Donohugh sought to influence Boas by seeking to change how he thought about missionaries' contributions and her own ability to make a contribution as a woman in the field. In arguing for the significance of missionaries' contributions, she explained to Boas that there were twenty-six returned missionaries from China studying at Columbia University and that they should be taken seriously for the contribution they could make to anthropology.

Of course, the question of the preparation of missionaries is one which does not interest you, perhaps, especially in relation to Anthropology. There is this to consider in the matter: that the missionaries are being sent out steadily, year after year, the effort is being made by all the larger agencies to send out better prepared people in each year, and to that end time is being allowed them to get as much specific preparation as is available. This includes not only some theological study, and a study of educational methods, but the history of the people to whose land they go, and a study of the religions prevailing there. If to this were added, the anthropological study of the country so given that the newcomer would have an introduction to the manners and customs, the background of thinking, the traditions, which would indicate some of the things not to
This excerpt from Donohugh's letter to Boas notes her intention to obtain a PhD in anthropology – something which she never did even though she helped more than a dozen of her students write their own dissertations. Her concern to not popularize anthropology was something Boas may have discussed in courses Donohugh took with him. When Donohugh was a student at Columbia, Boas was waging a battle against popularizing anthropology with Columbia University's President Nicholas Butler who wanted to merge anthropology with sociology. Boas wrote that anthropology has been "struggling for years to get away from the amateurish work that has been the bane of anthropology for a long time."36 Donohugh strongly agreed with Boas on this point and appealed to his shared desire for academic rigor.

What should one make of Agnes Donohugh's appeal to Boas with regard to her qualifications as a female anthropologist? It is important to be careful here in determining the different reasons why Donohugh may have said what she did in her letter to Boas. By advocating for respect as a woman did she do so based on evidence that Boas was not of a similar mind? Or might these remarks betray instead a kind of excessively defensive posture toward Boas who, in later years at least, had a reputation for being rather welcoming toward women in the field of anthropology? Both are possible interpretations of this letter. In light of Agnes Donohugh's tendency to be quite direct and unapologetic in her correspondence, however, I find it unlikely that she was being excessively defensive in making her appeal to Boas.

Simply put, Agnes Donohugh was no timid wallflower, and she may have rightly discerned that Boas needed to be pushed. That nearly half of Boas's sixty PhD students he supervised by the end of his life would be women does not mean that he was already positively disposed toward women in anthropology in 1918 (Lewis 2008: 177). He was moving in that direction, however, even before Donohugh's letter. As we have seen, a few months before receiving Donohugh's letter Boas (in 1917) wrote to Columbia's president that he had found the women students at Barnard to be better students than the men at Columbia.37 He also had supervised Laura Benedict's dissertation a few years before Donohugh's letter. By 1920 he even remarked to an anthropologist colleague that he "had a rather curious experience in graduate work during the last few years. My best students are women."38 Since Boas had only encountered a few women graduate students by 1920 it may be that Agnes Donohugh was a person he had in mind when he made such a comment. Donohugh may very well have helped to prepare the way for the dozens of women anthropologists who studied with Boas after she did.39

It is doubtless true to both Goldenweiser's and Boas's influence at Columbia University that Donohugh chose to focus on the Salish Native Americans of British Columbia for her 1916 master's thesis entitled "Knowledge and Interpretation In Salish Culture: Illustrated from the Thompson River, Shuswap and Lillooet Tribes." Donohugh's thesis made at least two contributions to the discipline of anthropology. First, she called into question the general tendency to look down upon persons of other cultures "we are pleased to call primitive" and critiqued earlier anthropologists. "[I]t is clear that early writers on Anthropology, in so far as they dealt with the mental qualities of primitive man, were hampered by the scarcity of accurate information then available concerning the primitive cultures which they characterized." Unsurprisingly, as a student of Boas, Donohugh critiqued the work of anthropologists Spencer and Tylor specifically with regard to Spencer's low estimation of "primitive man's" reasoning abilities (Donohugh 1916: 1-2).40 As such, Donohugh's work added ammunition to the efforts of Boasian anthropology to overturn the racism and ethnocentrism rampant in both society and anthropology itself.

Second, Donohugh made significant contributions to anthropological epistemological theory in her thesis as well as in the dissertations which she supervised. This is especially pertinent for the epistemological concerns that are at the center of the book of which this chapter is a part. She critiques, for example, the tendency of scholars to focus excessively on the "peculiarities of magical interpretation of primitive man" instead of seeing such interpretations from "a common sense view" (1916: 30). She also questions previous portrayals of magic as exotic by pointing out Westerners' own unstated but nonetheless real magical inclinations.

Changes in weather caused by unusual happenings such as births, deaths, calamities; portents of death in dreams, in the cry of an owl at night, of a coyote near a dwelling, of a dog howling, of a cock crowing in the night, all these show the magical intrusion with which we in our own civilization are familiar. We are hardly in a position to use such evidence as proof of a lack of matter-of-fact knowledge and pervasive magic so long as our own nerves tingle almost involuntarily to similar fears or dreads [emphasis in the original].

(Donohugh 1916: 31)41

Moreover, throughout her career Donohugh supervised a number of PhD dissertations on issues related to magic and religious belief in other cultures. Indeed, during Donohugh's tenure at the Kennedy School of Missions the institution produced half the anthropology dissertations in America which focused on some dimension of magic or religion.42 The problem of anthropologists in the 1930s not analyzing religion adequately due to preconceived notions of what is real was mentioned by others at the time as well (Junod 1935: 226).

After finishing her master's thesis and graduating from Columbia University in 1916 Donohugh continued to make contributions to the field of anthropology through her participation in a number of professional societies. She was a fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute, the Royal...
Donohugh's correspondence with International Institute of African Languages and Cultures leaders in the participation of missionaries, anthropologists, and colonial agents (Kuklick 1991: 56). The Rockefeller Foundation provided a substantial part of its operations in 1926.

Donohugh occasionally presented anthropology papers at the professional societies to which she belonged, but by her own admission her publication record was not extensive. Donohugh reported at her retirement that she “never had time to write books. . . . There is a finality about printing that fills one with dismay.” One of her paper presentations was at the 1931 gathering of the British Association for the Advancement of Science where she detailed the research she did in the Belgian Congo in 1929 assisted by Methodist missionary Priscilla Berry (Donohugh and Berry 1932). She was the only American female scientist in attendance at that meeting. She attended another meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in Cape Town, South Africa during her 1929 African trip as well. Donohugh applied for (but did not receive) a Guggenheim Fellowship to help fund this anthropological research in the Belgian Congo.

After returning from the Congo, Donohugh also made an important contribution as an anthropologist in the related field of what is today called African American Studies. Donohugh participated in a lecture series at Columbia University’s Teacher College entitled “Lectures on Negro Education and Race Relations,” giving the first of the series’ ten lectures during the winter and spring of 1930. The topic of her lecture was “the African Background of American Negro Life,” a theme which another Boas student, Melville Herskovits, famously developed over a decade later in The Myth of the Negro Past.

Agnes Donohugh’s interest in teaching about African cultures and education in Africa put her in longstanding contact with the Phelps-Stokes Commission which had as its purpose the development of educational institutions on the continent of Africa and in the United States. It may have been the only major foundation in America that identified Africa as a focus of concern in its founding documents. One of the most anthropologically influential organizations which the commission supported was The International Institute for African Languages and Culture which was established in 1926.

The International African Institute – as it was later called – became the single greatest supporter of anthropological research and involved the participation of missionaries, anthropologists, and colonial agents (Kuklick 1991: 56). The Rockefeller Foundation provided a substantial part of its funding. Donohugh’s correspondence with International Institute of African Languages and Cultures leaders J. H. Oldham and Edwin W. Smith in the mid-1920s – before Smith became her colleague at the Kennedy School – suggests that she may have influenced the development of the Institute in informal but perhaps not inconsiderable ways. Unsurprisingly, both of Agnes Donohugh’s journal articles in the field of Anthropology were also published by the Institute’s journal, *Africa*.

In 1934 Donohugh became involved in her first book project which was also a work sponsored by the Phelps-Stokes Commission. W.E.B. Du Bois, one of the speakers in the 1930 lecture series in which Donohugh also participated, served as editor-in-chief of the *Encyclopedia of the Negro, Preparatory Volume*. Donohugh assisted in preparing the final manuscript for publication (Du Bois and Johnson 1945). It is important to not exaggerate the extent of Donohugh’s collaboration with Du Bois. Her involvement in the *Encyclopedia of the Negro* probably had more to do with her longstanding relationships with staff from the Phelps-Stokes Commission that financed the project than it did with her relationship to Du Bois. That she was brought on to help with the final preparation of the manuscript suggests as much. It is possible, however, that Boas’s relationship with Du Bois and other African American leaders may have also been a factor in prompting Donohugh’s involvement in the *Encyclopedia*. 52

**Teaching and missionary training**

Thus far, I have mostly discussed Agnes Donohugh’s educational experiences and her academic contributions to the discipline of anthropology; I turn now to focus on her teaching and her contributions to the field of missionary training. At the Kennedy School of Missions Donohugh taught a wide array of graduate courses beginning in 1918 and was named Associate Professor of Ethnology in 1926 and Full Professor in 1936. From the start Donohugh taught courses in General Ethnology, Ethnology of Africa, and Ethnology of India and Southern Asia. In later years she taught a two-semester course on “North American Indians”, and semester-long courses on the “Psychology of Primitive Peoples”, “Primitive Religion in Africa”, “African Social and Political Institutions”, and “Studies of Tribal Life.” Her course outlines understandably reflect a clear Boasian influence on her teaching in that she tended to focus a great deal of attention on historical anthropology.

Perhaps Agnes Donohugh’s most creative course and one which was likely not taught at Columbia University or perhaps at any other institution in her day was entitled simply “The Life of Women.” First taught in 1925 she described it as an “(a)analysis of problems of women at home and abroad. The art of living, in primitive and advanced society.” In proposing the course she mentioned that she had been “gathering material for years.” She was an avid supporter of missionary women and advocated for giving special concern to girls’ education in Africa. Two years before her retirement in 1944 she also tried to persuade Kennedy School Dean Malcolm Pitt to permanently hire another woman, Esther Strong, to teach courses related
to social psychology or "inter-cultural relations, reaction to change, questions of cultural survival, (and) new cultural forms." Strong taught for the Kennedy School between 1939-1941. Donohugh doubtless knew that she would not be teaching for much longer and may have seen Esther Strong as a possible successor, but Strong never taught at the Kennedy School after 1941.88

Donohugh’s course outlines at the Kennedy School do not give much of an indication about how she integrated Christian theological perspectives in her teaching, but an outline for an Africa Seminar in 1930 notes that she will cover "Points of Attachment for Truth."89 It is here where she likely discussed ways the Christian Gospel could be contextualized for Africa, thus infusing theological content into her teaching of anthropology. Donohugh could be quite adventurous in her reflections about contextualizing the Gospel in Africa.

It is even possible that in the African religious beliefs we might find that the divine attributes split up among a number of spirits or spiritual beings could be assembled under one expanded concept of a Supreme Being. So large a number of the elements already are present in African thought in many regions that transmutation or sublimation of much that is already there could effectively, easily, naturally evolve into a minimum Christian faith. The first thing to do is to recognize the claims, and their values, and then to devise means for using the native social machinery.

(Donohugh 1935: 338)\textsuperscript{60}

Donohugh’s argument here is intriguingly similar to one made by anthropologist Mary Douglas many years later, in 2001. In her essay, “Other Beings, Postcolonially Correct,” Douglas proposed that foreign gods may be helpfully considered as angelic beings alongside a strict monotheism.

Though it would bring a big shift in the attitude to foreign gods, and a big change in missionary practice, I suggest it need not be seen as a doctrinal change at all, only as a development of the ecumenical principle one which Vatican II has taken the initiative. The present proposal would assimilate the gods in the local pagan pantheon to the class of guardian spirits under the rule of the one God.

(Douglas 2012: 40)

Regardless of the theological merits of Donohugh’s (or Douglas’s) proposal, the resonance between the two is striking.

In spite of Donohugh’s considerable interest in African anthropology it is important to bear in mind that Agnes Donohugh did not spend very much time in Africa during her life — surely far less than a year. She may have benefited, however, from her husband’s knowledge of the African context which he gained as a mission board executive with oversight of African mission efforts of the Methodist Episcopal Church, a role in which he served his denomination beginning in the early 1920s.\textsuperscript{61} Donohugh’s colleague at the Kennedy School from 1919 to 1931, William C. Willoughby, may have also influenced Donohugh’s sympathetic views on African traditional religion.\textsuperscript{62}

The priority Donohugh placed on teaching, the crafting of a curriculum, and even the nurture of students outside the classroom was an important expression of her vocation. At the end of her career she wrote that mere “(d)ependence upon the giving of courses and the teaching of subjects is inadequate in sound missionary preparation. The individual person is the subject of education, and the objective is an integrated personality, with a well-rounded preparation.”\textsuperscript{63} Because Donohugh stayed at the Kennedy School during the week and only returned by train to New York on the weekends, it may be that she was especially well-suited to contribute to her students’ “well-rounded preparation.” She would have been able to share evening meals and have other informal interactions with students which she likely would not have been able to do as easily if she had gone home to her family each night.

Her presence on Hartford Seminary’s campus during the week may also have allowed her to strongly influence her students’ PhD dissertations. In fact, it may be that in Donohugh’s case her most significant academic contribution to the field of anthropology was through her students — especially PhD students — who went on to publish works in anthropology. Among the fifteen dissertations that were supervised at the Kennedy School of Missions between 1933 (when the first dissertation was completed which could be categorized as anthropological in nature) and 1946 (two years after Donohugh left) she is gratefully acknowledged in eight of them. William Willoughby influenced a few dissertations, but he left the Kennedy School in 1931 leaving Donohugh as the senior scholar of anthropology until Smith’s arrival in 1939.\textsuperscript{64} No other faculty member in these dissertations is mentioned even half as frequently or, it seems, with greater appreciation than Agnes Donohugh.\textsuperscript{65} This was clearly a reflection of Donohugh’s primary focus on being a teacher and her longstanding institutional commitment to the Kennedy School. The same could not be said for anthropologists William C. Willoughby or Edwin W. Smith. Willoughby and Smith both taught at the Kennedy School toward the end of their careers; they tended to be more focused on their research projects and on institutional commitments that they already had with missionary boards and institutions in Britain and Africa (Rutherford 2009: 221).

While most students went on to primarily affect their field of missionary service, a few made significant impacts on the field of anthropology. George W. Harley, for example, became an expert on African medicine and served as a fellow in the Department of Anthropology at Harvard University from 1932-1937. His 1938 Kennedy School dissertation was published by Harvard University Press in 1941. Donohugh was clearly proud of Harley’s
work, but in a letter to the Smithsonian Institution in 1943, she noted that her role as director for Harley’s dissertation was not acknowledged in the published volume. Donohugh was gratefully acknowledged in a published book by another student, Robert T. Parsons, whose work was entitled Religion in an African Society (Parsons 1964).

Donohugh’s concern at the Kennedy School for the curriculum, for students’ personal lives, and for rigorous anthropological research had ramifications for the wider world of Christian mission education. She was sought after for advice on this in several different ways. In her own denomination, the Methodist Episcopal Church, she was an outspoken advocate for anthropological education for missionaries. Her husband Thomas’s work with the Board of Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church helped her to develop relationships with mission boards, and he also helped to recruit Methodist missionary candidates to the Kennedy School. Between 1911–1936 Methodist students were by far the largest group of students at the School with a total of 206 students with connections to the Methodist Episcopal Board of Missions, the Woman’s Foreign Missionary Society, or the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. During her career she served as chairperson of candidate and personnel committees for missionaries serving overseas which gave her insight into their challenges of cultural adjustment as well. In 1922 Donohugh also wrote an article for the Methodist Review arguing for the importance of anthropological training for missionaries. Always interested in the promotion of her discipline, Donohugh pointed out in this article that not only would a multifaceted understanding of culture help the missionary and the people to whom he or she is sent but that sound anthropological training may help the missionary become for the wider field of anthropology “the best authority on his field” (Donohugh 1922: 258).

She sought to improve missionary preparedness outside of her own denomination as well. On at least one occasion, for example, J. H. Oldham and Edwin W. Smith invited her to teach at the Selly Oak Colleges, a British training center for missionaries. She also corresponded with the Secretaries of Foreign Mission Boards and posed a number of critical questions of them just a few months before the release of the Rockefeller-funded Laymen’s Foreign Missions Inquiry report, Rethinking Missions. The questions she posed to the mission secretaries were a kind of informal Laywoman’s foreign missions inquiry at a time when mission agency budgets were being lashed due to the Great Depression.

What changes in the status and function of the missionary are indicated in the changing situation abroad: – in administration? In direct evangelization? In education? In medical work? In agricultural and rural work? In industrial training? To what extent has the increasing participation of nationals closed these avenues of service to missionaries? How have Governmental attitudes and programs changed, taking over many of these activities, with the training for them? What bearing has the change in the temper of the Church at home upon Mission Board policies? To what degree will decreased income compel Boards to limit the numbers of new candidates? Can Boards undertake to allow a longer time for more careful preparation? One full academic year? Two years? Without support? Partial support?

These questions she asks illustrate both the depth of her knowledge about mission board administration and the scope of her interest well beyond that of anthropological education for missionaries.

She nonetheless did have an expansive vision for how anthropological training of missionaries might occur outside of formal educational institutions. After meeting fellow Methodist mission leader John R. Mott at a January 1936 Foreign Missions Conference, she wrote to him about funding what today might be called a distance education project in the study of anthropology for missionaries already in the field. Donohugh proposed that for her sabbatical the following year she would travel to a number of sites in Africa in order to give such training and that, if successful, this could be expanded to the Indian context. She made this request of Mott a few years after the well-funded Laymen’s Foreign Missions Inquiry and seems to be somewhat annoyed at its great expense when compared to her proposal.

As an extension of the work of commissions for survey, and deputations of experts for counsel, why not send at least one (qualified) person to one selected geographical area to spend an adequate – though short – amount of time with groups of missionaries and national workers, to point out ways in which a deeper knowledge of the life of the people – manners, customs, legal codes, folklore, religious attitudes and beliefs, etc., could be made to serve them in their development of Christian groups. Contacts are so intimate that the fullest equipment is essential for the Christian worker. Many missionaries have a wealth of experience of which they do not appreciate the value. . . . The need of such enlightenment does not require a further survey. The practical undertaking could be launched with little delay. No large group need be sent; one would do.

[emphasis in the original]

She further proposed that a syllabus could be generated from such a project “as no textbook exists which may be put into the hands of missionaries.” It was not the first time such “distance education” efforts for training missionaries in anthropology was proposed. Margaret Stevenson launched something similar fifteen years earlier in the International Review of Missions (Stevenson 1920).

Donohugh also attended a follow-up conference of mission leaders after the International Missionary Council’s gathering in Tambaram, India in 1939, and eagerly promoted this gathering. Held in March of 1939 in Hartford,
it focused on the training of missionaries in light of the conference in India. Frustrated by the seminary leadership's desire to postpone the conference, she struck an exasperated tone in her letter to her seminary's president. "We have altered very little of our system on our curriculum since Jerusalem (1928) and about all that we did in concession to that meeting was to add a "seminar" in Rural Reconstruction."72 One of the resolutions – there were only two – to be presented to the International Missionary Council from the March meeting in Hartford bore the clear mark of Donohugh's influence. It urged the IMC to develop a plan to encourage "new missionaries in understanding the mind, spirit and culture of the country" in which they serve.73 Though this admonition had been expressed in the 1910 Edinburgh Conference as well, Donohugh apparently saw there was still much room for improvement.

One of Agnes Donohugh's last publications was a study guide for Americans to reflect upon the continent of Africa in light of American and British foreign policy in the midst of World War II. Neither a work of anthropological scholarship nor a project exclusively aimed at missionary training, this work represents Donohugh's effort to influence American public policy through what has been called public diplomacy.74 Her sixteen-page study guide was intended to be read alongside a 164-page study by the Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims entitled The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint (Donohugh 1942). The Atlantic Charter was a set of "Eight Points" agreed upon by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill during their secret August 14, 1941 meeting on board the USS Augusta off the coast of Newfoundland. The agreement provided direction for the post-war "extension of the sovereignty, self-government and national life of the states and nations of Europe" (Donohugh 1942: 31). While the Charter was not originally intended to address the African context, it led to the organization of the Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims. This initiative under the initiative of the Phelps-Stokes Fund just a few weeks after Roosevelt and Churchill's meeting to expand its application to the African continent. As reviewed above, the Phelps-Stokes Fund had been focused on the concerns of Africa for decades, and they believed that Roosevelt and Churchill's "Eight Points" was a prime opportunity to make their case.

The Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims was strategically comprised to include a wide array of forty members which included missionary representatives Edwin W. Smith, Agnes's husband Thomas S. Donohugh, and J. H. Oldham, as well as African American intellectuals W.E.B. Du Bois, Ralph Johnson Bunche, and Charles S. Johnson. Prominent Africans currently residing in the United States were also asked to contribute to the committee's work. One of these persons was Lincoln University student and future first president of Ghana Kwame Francis Nkrumah. While it is difficult to know the impact of Agnes Donohugh's study guide, it nonetheless demonstrates the reach of her interests in foreign policy and her commitment to promoting a postcolonial future for African countries.

Conclusion

Agnes C. L. Donohugh's contributions to the field of anthropology, missionary training, mission thought, and American foreign policy are as extraordinary as is the extent to which she has been forgotten. She was not only one of the first female students of Franz Boas but was also his first exposure to a graduate student with significant missionary experience prior to beginning graduate studies with him. Her efforts to critique earlier anthropological theories in her master's thesis and faithful diligence in promoting excellence in her students' PhD dissertations are testimony to her commitment to the field. The projects which her PhD students took up in the study of magic and religion were contributions to the study of anthropology of religion in the 1930s even before the publication of E. E. Evans-Pritchard's Witchcraft, Oracles, and Magic among the Azande (1937).

Donohugh intentionally put ethnology into dynamic interaction with missionary training, and thereby advanced both anthropology and missionary practice in ways that helped to develop the field of the anthropology of religion. Her work was also a precursor to politically engaged scholarship in the American public square for Africans and African Americans. Her efforts to encourage anthropological awareness among non-anthropologists remind us of the need for anthropologists to make a robust case for the study of their discipline amidst declining university budgets for humanities and the social sciences. Thus, Donohugh's biography as an "apostle of ethnology" should serve as an inspiration for the potentially positive outcomes from a dialogue between theology and anthropology.

Notes

1 An earlier version of this chapter was published as "Apostle of Ethnology": Agnes C. L. Donohugh's Missiological Anthropology Between the World Wars" in April of 2016, in the International Bulletin of Mission Research 40(2): 106–118 (Sage Publications).
2 The 1913 proposal was for the Kennedy School to include "a study of primitive social organization and customs, to throw light upon survivals among more advanced peoples and to understand the social situation among backward tribes." Edward Warren Capen, "Remarks Made at the School of Missions Luncheon, May 22, 1944." Box 32 folder 469. Hartford Theological Seminary Library. Capen (1921: 3). Capen's original "Report of Commission V: Suggestions Re Findings" is in Edward Warren Capen papers, Box 298 folder 4189, Hartford Theological Seminary Library. A sociologist by training, Capen specifically mentions the value of teaching ethnology in this report.
3 Missionary candidates at Cambridge University attended lectures by anthropologist Alfred Cort Haddon (1855–1940). Haddon's series of lectures occurred just a few years after his Torres Strait Expedition that transformed the discipline of Anthropology in Britain. See Kuklick (1991: 187).
5 Both Krusius and Kumm had served with the Sudan United Mission. Krusius's 1915 lectures at Hartford included such topics as the "Psychological features
of the primitive Mind,” “Some concrete forms of the conception of the soul,” “Witchcraft and magic as based on soul conceptions; charms, amulets, talismans” and a number of sessions on African linguistics and “Hints on acquiring a native language.” Paul Krusius papers, Box 40 Folder 627, Hartford Theological Seminary Library, Hartford, CT; “Remarks made at the School of Missions Luncheon, May 22, 1944, by E. W. Capen.” Box 32 folder 469, Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

6 See “Remarks Made at the School of Missions Luncheon.” The Department of Sociology became the Department of Sociology and Ethnology in 1923. “To Memoriam: Agnes Crawford Leavcraft Bertholf (Mrs. J.R.)” (1876–1966) Box 32 folder 469, Hartford Theological Seminary Library. Toward the end of her life Agnes Donohugh and her husband divorced, and Agnes married J. R. Bertholf.


8 See also Lewis (2008: 177), and “Dissertations in Anthropology: Submitted to Educational Institutions of the World in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the PhD Degree or Equivalent,” Yearbook of Anthropology, 1955.

9 Reviews of the history of anthropology in missiological education(116,287),(780,764)

10 I was present for the celebratory sessions to honor professors George Marsden and Grant Wacker in recent years at two different American Society of Church History annual meetings. Their original reflections on how they have sought to “do history” and the reflections by their students were inspiring as well as instructive. It was clear to me at these events that for both of these Christian historians the fullness of their life narratives was rather more important for understanding how they did history than the particular historiographical insights to which they nonetheless sought to carefully adhere. Recently published autobiographical accounts by Christian historians concerning the ways they bring together faith and history include Bendroth (2012), Robert (2012), Salvatore (2007), and Shannon (2011).

11 For a helpful review of late nineteenth century social sciences in America and the place of anthropology in that see Stocking (1982: 234–307). Among missionary anthropologists, Agnes Donohugh’s birth year of 1876 is also identical to that of both her Kennedy School colleague Edwin W. Smith, who served as president of the Royal Anthropological Institute in 1934, and German missionary anthropologist Bruno Gutmann. For examinations of Edwin W. Smith and Bruno Gutmann see Young (2002). Also, Genschik (1982), Jaeschke (1985), Pierard (1986), Ustorf (2000), and Winter (1979). Agnes Donohugh was also just eight years older than Roman Catholic missionary anthropologist Wilhelm Schmidt. See Luzbetak (1994). Comparative analysis of different national traditions of anthropology has been done along similar lines in Barth et al. (2005).

2 Judging from her activities in Barnard College yearbooks it appears that she did not attend Barnard in 1896. See Barnard College yearbooks, Annual 1895, Annual 1897, Mortarboard 1898, Mortarboard 1899, Mortarboard 1900. Information about her Barnard academic transcript was obtained through personal e mail correspondence, Barnard College Registrar’s Office, 9 February 2015.

3 Letter to Nicholas Butler from Franz Boas, 26 November 1917, Columbia University Office of the President, Box 318, Columbia University Rare Books and Manuscripts Library. Unfortunately, Agnes Donohugh’s academic transcript at Barnard does not identify the precise dates when courses were taken making it impossible to determine who taught her anthropology. Livingston Farrand was more frequently identified as the instructor for this course between 1898–1901, although Franz Boas did teach it on at least one occasion. Boas more frequently taught advanced courses. On the prohibition of women from advanced anthropology courses see the Columbia University college catalog for the Division of Psychology and Philosophy and Education, Columbia University Rare Books and Manuscripts Library; I was not able to obtain the academic transcript of Donohugh at Barnard but was able to learn its basic content through email correspondence with the Barnard College Registrar’s Office, 9 February 2015.


15 Thomas S. Donohugh’s extensive application for missionary service which discusses his calls to mission service after starting work as an attorney are in the archives of the General Commission on Archives and History, Drew University, Madison, NJ. See T. S. Donohugh papers, N.W. India, 1903–1909, folder 1259–7–2–19.

16 There is only a record of Thomas Donohugh attending this conference, but it is not such a great speculative leap to imagine that Agnes may have attended this gathering as well. If they did not meet at Silver Bay in 1903 it seems likely that they may have met at a similar event to encourage mission engagement. The Silver Bay conference was surely a decisive event for Thomas in his decision to become a missionary. “Letter to A. B. Leonard from Thomas S. Donohugh,” 10 November 1903, Thomas S. Donohugh papers, folder 1259–7–2–19, General Commission on Archives and History, Drew University, Madison, NJ.

17 “Letter to A. B. Leonard from Thomas S. Donohugh,” March 1906. Thomas S. Donohugh papers, folder 1259–7–2–19, General Commission on Archives and History, Drew University, Madison, NJ.

18 Letter to A. B. Leonard from Thomas S. Donohugh,” March 1906.

19 The precise date of their arrival in India is not known, but there is correspondence from Thomas Donohugh in April of 1909 suggesting they arrived shortly before that. Thomas S. Donohugh papers, folder 1259–7–2–19, General Commission on Archives and History, Drew University, Madison, NJ.


21 Thomas Donohugh reports in an April 1909 letter to Methodist mission executive A. B. Leonard that Jones “has been a great help” and notes how he intends to utilize Jones in the coming months in “industrial training” efforts among Indians. Lewis (2008: 190). There is only a record of Thomas Donohugh attending this conference, but it is not such a great speculative leap to imagine that Agnes may have attended this gathering as well. If they did not meet at Silver Bay in 1903 it seems likely that they may have met at a similar event to encourage mission engagement. The Silver Bay conference was surely a decisive event for Thomas in his decision to become a missionary. “Letter to A. B. Leonard from Thomas S. Donohugh,” 10 November 1903, Thomas S. Donohugh papers, folder 1259–7–2–19, General Commission on Archives and History, Drew University, Madison, NJ.

22 See also, E. Stanley Jones Foundation, [http://www.estanleyjonesfoundation.com/stories/].

23 “Solved Way to Run Home with Career: Mrs. Donohugh, Retiring as Ethnology Professor at Seminary Recounts Her Pioneering,” The Hartford Daily Courant, 26 May 1944. Agnes C. L. Donohugh Papers, Box 32 folder 468, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

24 Letter from Agnes Donohugh to Franz Boas, 16 April 1918, Franz Boas Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

25 Donohugh (1913, 1914). For further background on Thomas Donohugh’s relationship to Pickett and others see McPhee (2001).

26 Letter to George Herbert Jones from Thomas Donohugh, 12 March 1913, T. S. Donohugh Missionary File Series of the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, 1912–1913, General Commission on Archives and History, Drew University.

27 During Donohugh’s years at Columbia there were very few students who had scholarly interests outside the United States (among PhD students this was
something only Laura Benedict and Fay-Cooper Cole apparently had – and both from work in the Philippines). This further increases the likelihood that Donohugh and Benedict knew each other. Donohugh's MA thesis was on Salish cultures in British Columbia, but her missionary service in India obviously gave her international interests as well. See Bernstein (1998: 184). Donohugh mentions her three years of work at Columbia in a letter to Franz Boas, 22 April 1918, Franz Boas Papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.

Letter from Franz Boas to Nicholas Butler, 11 February 1914, Box 318, Columbia University Office of the President, Central Files 1890–1984, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York.

"Solved Way to Run Home with Career: Mrs. Donohugh, Retiring as Ethnology Professor at Seminary Recounts Her Pioneering," The Hartford Daily Courant, 26 May 1944. Agnes C. L. Donohugh Papers, Box 32 folder 468, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

After repeated attempts, we were unable to obtain access to Agnes Donohugh's academic transcript for her graduate work at Columbia University. Columbia University's student privacy policy at present does not permit researchers to access student records.

Boas's correspondence at Columbia University also contains a letter written ten days before Donohugh's similarly praising the work of A. A. Goldenweiser to the president of Columbia University advocating for keeping him as a professor at the university. Letter to Nicholas Butler from Franz Boas, 12 April 1918, Box 318, Columbia University Office of the President, Central Files 1890–1984, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library, New York.

Letter from Agnes Donohugh to Franz Boas, 12 April 1918, Franz Boas Papers, American Philosophical Society.

Letter from Agnes Donohugh to Franz Boas, 18 April 1918, Franz Boas Papers, American Philosophical Society. Henri Junod had written a book about his work among the Thonga people, The Life of a South African Tribe that was published in 1913. John Roscoe published The Baganda: An Account of their Native Customs and Beliefs in 1911. Both positively reviewed texts by missionary authors, these examples doubtless helped buttress Donohugh's argument.

"Remarks Made at the School of Missions Luncheon, May 22, 1944."

Letter from Agnes Donohugh to Franz Boas, 18 April 1918, Franz Boas Papers, American Philosophical Society.

"Letter to Nicholas Butler from Franz Boas," 11 February 1914, Box 318, Columbia University Office of the President, Central Files 1890–1984, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

Letter to Nicholas Butler from Franz Boas, 26 November 1917, Box 318, Columbia University Office of the President, Central Files 1890–1984, Columbia University Rare Book and Manuscript Library.


There is evidence as well that she maintained a relationship with at least one faculty member at Columbia University for decades after finishing her masters degree there: Associate Professor of Rural Education in the Teachers College at Columbia Mabel Carney, who also taught a course at the Kennedy School. "The Kennedy School of Missions of the Hartford Seminary Foundation Announces: Backgrounds of American Indian Life," May, 1939. Box 32 Folder 469.

Sometimes in her master's thesis Donohugh places the term "primitive" in quotation marks and sometimes she does not.

With this insight she prefigured the insights of Horace Miner in his ironic examination of American culture in "Body Ritual among the Nacirema" (Miner, 1956).

I made this determination based on the analysis of dissertation titles and the use of key terms such as totemism, magic, religion, etc. among American institutions in "Dissertations in Anthropology: Submitted to Educational Institutions of the World in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for the Ph.D. Degree or Equivalent." Donohugh did not direct all dissertations at the Kennedy School but that she influenced all of those which related to anthropology to some degree is almost certain. The anthropological religion at the Kennedy School would have been strengthened by William C. Willoughby's research interests as well, but his departure in 1931, two years prior to the first anthropological dissertation at the Kennedy School lessened his impact for all but the first few dissertations produced. Dissertations at the Kennedy School at this time rarely contained something akin to an acknowledgments section as is customary today. Nor did they contain a signature page which clearly identifies who directed the dissertation.

"Solved Way to Run Home with Career..." 26 May 1944. Agnes C.L. Donohugh papers.

On Boas getting removed from the AAs governing council because he criticized anthropologists for their espionage activities during WW I, see Whitleft (2010). For the verbatim report of this censure and the votes for and against see Darnell (1969: 476–483).

This was reported by Elizabeth de W. Root, "In Memoriam: Agnes Crawford Leacyraft Bertholf (Mrs. J.R.) (1876–1966)," Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Box 32 folder 469, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

Edward Warren Capen, "Remarks Made at the School of Missions Luncheon, 22 May 1944," Box 32, folder 469, Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers; Letter to Edward Warren Capen from Agnes Donohugh, 14 September 1931(?), Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Box 32 folder 464, Hartford Theological Seminary Library. Her plan to do research with Priscilla Berry is discussed in a letter to Dr. W. Mackenzie, 2 March 1929, Box 32 folder 463, Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers.

Letter to Duncan Strong, 28 April 1943, Box 32 folder 468. Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

In 1928 Herskovits published The American Negro, challenging the concept of race (as Boas had done for some time) as a static category. Herskovits started his PhD studies with Boas in 1920, four years after Donohugh completed her graduate work at Columbia.

The Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims, The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint (New York City, 1942: vii)

Her relationship with Thomas Jesse Jones, Educational Director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund, was so significant that Jones wrote a letter to the President of Hartford Theological Seminary to encourage him to make sure that Agnes Donohugh could sign her retirement funds and to suggest that Mrs. Donohugh's scientific attainments may be recognized at the time of her retirement. Letter to R. W. Barstow from Thomas Jesse Jones, 23 February 1944, Agnes C. L. Donohugh's papers, Box 32 folder 468, Hartford Theological Seminary Library. For Donohugh's correspondence with Oldham and Smith see Letter to Edward Warren Capen, 30 August 1927, Box 32 folder 462, Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Hartford Theological Seminary Library. On Edwin W. Smith's and J. H. Oldham's leadership as well as Bronislaw Malinowski's in organizing the National Institute for African Languages and Cultures see Kuklick (1991: 207), Stocking (1995: 397–99), and Tilley (2011: 261–268). For more information about J. H. Oldham's work with the Institute see Clements (1999: 230).

Du Bois was never able to complete this project as funding fell short in future years. Du Bois wrote about the challenge of this project in his autobiography. See http://www.webdubois.org/wdb-ency.html. Accessed 15 January 2015. Henry Louis Gates took up the encyclopedia project in the late twentieth century and published The Encyclopaedia Africana in 1999.
In 1908 Franz Boas was approached to edit a similar volume, entitled the Encyclopedia of the Negro Race, but it too was never completed. On Du Bois's and Boas's relationship see Zumwalt and Willis (2008). For a discussion of Boas's involvement in American race relations see Whifford (2010: 434).

"In Memoriam: Agnes Crawford Leacyart Berthof (Mrs. J. R.)." 1876-1966," Papers of Donohugh, Agnes Crawford Leacyart (Mrs. Thomas S. Donohugh), Box 32 folder 469. Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

Donohugh's papers do give some brief outlines of her courses' content. She is clearly interested in teaching students about changes over time—especially with regard to the African and Native American contexts. See course outlines in Box 32 folder 469 and folder 461. Donohugh appears to have ascribed to Boas's ideas in this regard. "Historical particularism." Agnes Donohugh also briefly describes her teaching philosophy and methods in a brief article she wrote on the occasion of her retirement from the Kennedy School. See "Mrs. Donohugh Leaves Chair of Ethnology," Hartford Echoes, vol. 8, May 1944. Agnes Donohugh papers, Box 32 folder 469, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

List of Ethnology courses to be taught, Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Box 32 folder 467, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

Letter to Edward Warren Capen from Agnes Donohugh, June 1925, Box 32 folder 461, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

Donohugh's advocacy of girls' education in Africa is mentioned in "Africa Conference Held under the auspices of the Committee of Deference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America at Hartford, Conn, Oct. 30-Nov. 1, 1925" Edward Warren Capen papers, Box 298 folder 4186, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

Her effort to get Strong hired at the Kennedy School is mentioned in a letter to Malcolm Pitt from Agnes Donohugh, 12 July 1942, Box 32 folder 468, Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Hartford Theological Seminary Library. For Strong's years of teaching see the chart of Hartford Seminary professors and their years of teaching compiled by the archivist at Hartford Theological Seminary.

"Africa Seminar" Box 32 Folder 469.

For comments on evangelism in Africa see also a summary of her address at a 1925 "Africa Conference" held at Hartford Seminary and attended by 169 missionary, academic, and governmental leaders. "Africa Conference Held under the auspices of the Committee of Deference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America at Hartford, Conn, Oct. 30-Nov. 1, 1925" Edward Warren Capen papers, Box 298 folder 4186, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

The most revealing material about Thomas Donohugh's perceptions of Africa are in the many letters to Frank Mason North and other Methodist mission leaders during a six-month trip to the African continent in 1923. It does not appear as though Agnes Donohugh accompanied her husband on this trip. Thomas S. Donohugh correspondence, 1923, folder 2540-3-3:08, General Commission on Archives and History, Drew University.

For a particularly revealing example of Willoughby's sympathetic appreciation of African traditional religion see Rutherford (2009: 190). See also Willoughby (1926).

"An excerpt from Mrs. Donohugh's address at The Foundation Faculty Banquet," Hartford Echoes 8 no. 1, May 1944. Box 32 folder 469.

That dissertations were not produced until after Willoughby left suggests that perhaps Donohugh felt more strongly about producing PhD dissertations than the more practitioner-oriented Willoughby.

It is important to stress that in these dissertations gratitude to one's teachers is not always expressed explicitly. As stated previously, it seems to have not been a standard practice to include an acknowledgments section as it is today. During this span of time, two of the fifteen dissertations I have reported here as being anthropological in nature and identified as such in the 1955 Yearbook of Anthropology are, in my own review of them, questionably categorized as anthropology dissertations. The Yearbook of Anthropology did not identify MA theses, but there are three theses of an anthropological nature contained in the Hartford Theological Seminary collection during this time period which were likely influenced by Donohugh.

Letter to Dr. Duncan Strong from Agnes Donohugh, 28 April 1943. Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Box 32 folder 468, Hartford Theological Seminary Library. In this letter Donohugh offers her assistance to the US government during World War II. In this letter she also noted that she was doing some map work for Mr. Boggs, the Geographer in the State Department. She apparently was not as reticent to have anthropology be utilized as a tool by governments in a time of war as professor Franz Boas was during World War I. Agnes Donohugh's pride for her students' contributions is also mentioned in "An excerpt from Mrs. Donohugh's address at The Foundation Faculty Banquet," Hartford Echoes 8 no. 1, May 1944. Box 32 folder 469.

Free Methodists, Wesleyan Methodists, and the Primitive Methodist Church together contributed a small handful of students studying at the Kennedy School during these years as well (Capen 1921: 29).

"An excerpt from Mrs. Donohugh's address at The Foundation Faculty Banquet," Hartford Echoes 8 no. 1, May 1944. Box 32 folder 469.

Letter to Edward Warren Capen, August 30, 1927. Box 32 Folder 462. A January 24, 1931 letter to Edward Warren Capen also notes that an upcoming meeting with J. H. Oldham of the International African Institute is "developing some rather important phases" and notifies Capen that she will be attending it in lieu of her scheduled classes. The nature of this meeting is not clear from her correspondence. Oldham was a key figure in Christian mission circles during these years.


Letter to Rev. John R. Mott, 14 January 1936, Agnes C. L. Donohugh papers, Box 32 Folder 463, Hartford Theological Seminary Library.

Letter to Dr. Barston from Agnes Donohugh on 21 February 1939. Box 32 folder 466.

The Function and Training of Missionaries in the Light of the Madras Conference: A Summary of Discussions at Hartford March 31 and April 1, 1939 (Hartford, CT: 1939).

Her former professor, Franz Boas, was involved in similar efforts to influence American public policy in an anti-colonialist direction at this time as well (Whifford 2010: 434).

References


Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims. 1942 The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint: A Study. New York City.


Donohugh, Agnes C. L. 1941 "The Atlantic Charter and Africa from an American Standpoint: A Study Outline." Committee on Africa, the War, and Peace Aims.


Myklebust, Olav Guttorm. 1957 The Study of Missions in Theological Education: An Historical Inquiry into the Place of World Evangelisation in Western Protestant Ministerial Training with Particular Reference to Alexander Duff’s Chair of Evangelistic Theology. Vol. 2. Oslo: Forlaget Land Og Kirke.


Hartley


