History Compass 7/1 (2009): 306–328, 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00577.x

The Professional Worldview of the *Effendi* Historian

Yoav Di-Capua*
University of Texas, Austin

Abstract

This paper is part of a *History Compass* conference cluster tracing the formation of national culture in Egypt. Guest edited by Walter Armbrust, this cluster of articles was originally part of a conference in Oxford on January 12–13, 2007, organized by Walter Armbrust, Ronald Nettler, and Lucie Ryzova, and funded by the Middle East Centre (St. Antony's), The Faculty of Oriental Studies, The Khalid bin 'Abdullah Al-Sa'ud Professorship (Professor Clive Holes), and The Centre for Political Ideologies.

The cluster is made up of the following articles:

Guest Editor: Walter Armbrust

'The Formation of National Culture in Egypt in the Interwar Period: Cultural Trajectories', Walter Armbrust, *History Compass* 6 (2008), 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00571.x

'Repackaging the Egyptian Monarchy: Faruq in the Public Spotlight, 1936–1939', Matthew Ellis, *History Compass* 6 (2008), 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00572.x

'How *Zaynab* Became the First Arabic Novel', Elliott Colla, *History Compass* 6 (2008), 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00573.x

'Women in the Singing Business, Women in Songs', Frédéric Lagrange, *History Compass* 6 (2008), 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00574.x

'Long Live Patriarchy: Love in the Time of 'Abd al-Wahhab', Walter Armbrust, *History Compass* 6 (2008), 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00575.x

'Football as National Allegory: *Al-Ahram* and the Olympics in 1920s Egypt', Shaun Lopez, *History Compass* 6 (2008), 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00576.x

'The Professional Worldview of the *Effendi* Historian', Yoav Di-Capua, *History Compass* 6 (2008), 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00577.x

***

Who is the Egyptian professional historian? When did he (as initially all of these historians were men) first appear on Egypt's cultural scene? And what was so professional about him? By analyzing the professional ethos of Egyptian academic historians during the first four decades of the twentieth century this article accounts for the formation of modern Egyptian historical consciousness and the way in which it replaced Islamic historiography. It shows that for the new middle class (*effendi*) historian of

the 1930s professionalism meant mastery of a body of esoteric historical knowledge, full occupational autonomy, a drive toward monopoly on historical knowledge and the creation of an ideal service.

Introduction

Who is the Egyptian professional historian? When did he (as initially all of these historians were men) first appear on Egypt's cultural scene? And what was so professional about him? By analyzing the professional ethos of Egyptian academic historians, that is, by investigating in what terms *they* thought of their work, this article accounts for the process of formation and the structure of modern Egyptian historical consciousness. The emergence of the historical scholarly community during the 1930s is intimately related to the elusive character of the so-called 'middle class' *effendiyya* and to its commitment to nationalist thought. Thus far, several generations of students of Egyptian nationalism have noticed the close bond between the *effendiyya* and intellectualism (*thaqafat al-fikr*), defined as an attraction toward abstract thought. Indeed, it has become a truism that Egyptian and Arab thought between the two World Wars was intimately associated with the process through which the socio-cultural group of the *effendiyya* came into existence.

Yet, this nexus has often been dealt with in a rather holistic fashion that underlined the organic union between *effendis*, civil society and the various projects of state-building. Viewed from this perspective of nationalism as a cultural construction, scholarship of the past two decades has tended to treat *effendis* as generic intellectuals who were organized hierarchically (i.e., as first-class and second-class intellectuals). This pyramidal structure also assumed a certain unity of purpose and action as a group that seemingly toiled collaboratively on the grand project of state-building and identity formation. These pioneering studies 'discovered' the new *effendiyya* and successfully charted the major contours along which this new type of intellectual nationalized Middle Eastern societies.[1]

In doing so, the field of intellectual history paid much attention to the process of formation of these ideologies and, in more recent scholarship, to that of national narratives. This perspective came at the expense of understanding middle class intellectualism, since for the duration of the period in which intellectuals were actively engaged with the national project, it made little difference whether they were sociologists, historians, novelists, or literary critics.[2] Therefore, critical issues such as the actual formation and organization of specific communities of knowledge, their philosophical working assumptions, and the question of subjectivity in the context of colonial modernity remain to be studied. Put differently, the study of communal orientation, national politics and politics of identity (Pharaonic and Pan-Arab) benefited immensely from the study of nationalism but that of modernity as a form of existence benefited less.

Cognizant of past achievements and also of the shortcomings of existing literature, recent studies on Egypt, Lebanon, and Syria explored specific middle class experiences with modernity without using clear-cut socio-economic definitions of class. Thinking of the *effendiya* in more fluid terms, namely as a form of being in the context of colonial modernity, these studies are sensitive to the elaborate processes through which *effendis* acculturated new categories of knowledge and, in turn, were shaped by this disciplinary process. Thus, whether we examine the communities of sociologists, architects, lawyers, literary critics, or historians, we find that *effendi* intellectuals were struggling with a set of hitherto unnoticed paradoxes, dilemmas, and difficulties that conditioned their everyday life and even shaped public life for decades to come.[3]

And so, if we accept a more fluid definition of class and a weaker commitment to nationalism, just as we can speak about *effendi* technological mindedness, *effendi* entertainment, *effendi* masculinity, or even *effendi* criminality, we can clearly discern a distinctive form of *effendi* historical mindedness.[4] This new realm of thought was inhabited by all kinds of *effendis* who considered themselves historians including journalists, politicians, lawyers, and cultural critics. However, academics raised this realm of thought above all others to embody and codify the ideals of modern historicism and to forge around it a full-fledged professional ethos which was remarkably aggressive and competitive.

This article has two parts. Part I presents a cursory review of the local interest in modern historical thinking and the emergence of academic scholarship. It argues that this development occurred due to a fateful intellectual shift from the Islamic system of representation of the past to European historicist thinking, and ultimately, to a modern system of historical thought and practice. Ushered in by multiple indigenous and colonial competing forces, European historiographical ideals found their home in the royal archive/workshop of 'Abdin where all local and foreign historians who were interested in the history of modern Egypt worked. It is there that the very idea of what constituted modern Egypt was elaborated and established for generations to come.

Part II takes a closer look at the professional ideology of academics. From the 1920s onwards the cultural effort to think of one's past in entirely new philosophical terms became one of the most pressing intellectual projects of the first half of the twentieth century. Committed to this enterprise, academic historians developed a professional ideology that prided itself on new notions such as scientific objectivity and expert authority. Assisted by their positions in the university and their work in 'Abdin, these academic historians used their professional ideology to strengthen their public status, popularize their own vision of modern Egypt and undermine the legitimacy of their popular competitors. In the process of doing so the unexpected paradoxes of colonial modernity caught this community by surprise. One such

ironic outcome was the extent to which their preferred research methodologies, which were allegedly indigenous and patriotic, inevitably lead them toward an undesirable, and highly perplexing, colonial view of their societies.

Part I

THE LIMITATIONS OF NON HISTORICIST THINKING

The Arab Islamic chronicle, a genre that for hundreds of years accounted for the Islamic experience of all things past, died quietly. A short book replaced its voluminous and highly descriptive accounts. Its flowery language of rhymed prose (*saj'*), which spoke of style and aesthetic self-awareness, was traded for short telegraphic sentences. Its relaxed and synchronic sense of time and place was overtaken by the quest for progress and development. Though this process was anything but short, simple and straightforward, its final result was unmistakable: by 1920 the Arab Islamic chronicle and related historical genres such as the *khitat* perished.[5] With the death of these genres, the Arab world witnessed its own endemic system for producing historical meaning being replaced by the modern category of historical knowledge, which was also represented by a new type of historian.

The new mode of historical representation was based on a powerful tool of intelligibility – an outlook – which encapsulated everything modern, and thus, everything that Egypt's aspiring middle and upper classes hoped to become. Though at the time this new historical outlook was not given a proper Arabic name, in English it is commonly known as historicism. In the words of Maurice Mandelbaum:

> Historicism is the supposition that an adequate understanding of human reality can be gained only through considering it in terms of the place which it secured for itself, and the role which it played within a historical process of development.[6]

Technological advances and new forms of bureaucratic and economic organization ushered in a new sense of time (linearity), space (historical and well-bounded) and subjectivity (a unitary historical subject such as the 'nation'). These were to become the elementary particles of historicism. From a practical point of view, historicist thought prescribed the viewing of things in terms of their final outcome, encouraged searching for the roots of any given phenomenon and assumed that history is a changing stream governed by secular reason. Undoubtedly, the Arab experience of Darwinism was instrumental in popularizing historicist thinking.[7] More than anything else, however, historicism sought to understand the past from the point of view of the future, or put differently, from its final outcome of progress. As such, historicism was the only habit of mind that

could fully capture the actual experience of being modern. Ever afterward, the aspiration to modernize and the habit of historicism were inseparable and it became impossible to conceive of, and execute, modernity without historicism.

Experimenting with Historicism

History writing in late nineteenth-century Egypt was an avocation for former state officials, politically ambitious individuals, men of letters and amateurs from various walks of life. A biographical profile of these leisured historians shows a deep commitment to the cultural and mental world of the Ottoman Empire. Especially prolific were Mikha'il Sharubim, Isma'il Sarhank and Diyab Mahmud. These dignified writers were former state-officials who started writing upon retirement after a life-long effort to amass a private collection of documents and records. All such writers were men.[8] Through their networks and connections, they gained access to documents and private testimonies, relying as well on their own memories. Despite their strong commitment to history writing, the result of their effort was a series of extremely lengthy and hybrid compositions with multiple subjects that did not develop historically.[9] Since the logic of historicism was applied selectively, this form of history was removed from the intellectual, political, and ideological world of aspiring literate urban youth.

Following the momentum of the Lebanese *Nahda*, as historicism became a more common habit of mind, new literary genres such as the historical novel, the autobiography, the journalistic column and the modern history book made their appearance. These new genres were intimately associated with the urban atmosphere of turn of the century Cairo, Alexandria, Beirut, and similar cosmopolitan cities. By far, the person who did the most to popularize historicist thinking was Jurji Zaydan, whose twenty-two historical novels and history books taught a new stratum of literate city dwellers how to think with history.[10] As a result, senior Ottoman-Egyptian writers felt immense pressure to reconcile their indigenous tradition of the Islamic chronicle with historicism.

Indeed, in contrast with these Ottoman dignitaries, the next generation of history writers – young *effendi* politicians and journalists such as Mustafa Kamil and Muhammad Farid – progressed beyond the modified Islamic chronicle and attempts to revise and update it. They took the nation-state as the ultimate subject of history, bringing their burgeoning nationalist spirit to the fore. This proved to be a powerful cognitive tool, for historicism was organically designed to explain the developmental process of the nation. As one philosopher of history put it:

> In opposition to the atomistic view that conceives of societies as formed by originally free, autonomous, and equal individuals linked exclusively by contractual and willingly accepted ties, historicism imagines societies as organic

> wholes articulated by objective links independent of the will of their members and anterior to them.[11]

This, in a nutshell, was the difference between the struggling Islamic chronicle of the late nineteenth century and the exciting modern history book.

As historicism and nationalism acquired their distinctive Egyptian faces they were harnessed for the exclusive benefit of party-based politics. It was at this point that politics and history writing, in the context of building a modern national society, became inextricably intertwined.[12] More than any other piece of writing, it was Lord Cromer's *Modern Egypt* (1908) which set the standard for how to write the modern history of Egypt. With historicism, or what he called 'historical truth', at its core, his book claimed to be *the only method* that utilized the idea of progress as accumulative and irreversible linear change. As Cromer showed, modern history was committed to causality, was quantitative in essence, and developed progressive notions of time such as anachronism and periodization. Above all, however, his book made the case for the close affinity between the modern idea of history, the natural sciences and, especially, the notion of scientific objectivity. At the same time, it expressed antipathy toward mythical, literary, and poetic accounts of the past as reflected in the Islamic literary tradition.[13] The combined impact of Zaydan's earlier works and of Cromer's contribution illustrated the totality of this tradition which served as both a mode of being and as the object of a distinctive scholarly project.

Interestingly enough, though the modern idea of history immediately captured the fancy of the urban literate strata, not many books of history were written until the late 1920s. The reasons for this were the lack of historiographical infrastructure such as archives and libraries, and of solid educational programs in academic institutions. Between two philosophical regimes, this intellectual twilight zone prompted the last generation of chroniclers, those members of the shrinking Egyptian-Ottoman elite, to make their bid for new public histories. With a great deal of time, enough money and especially, the right network of connections, Amin Sami (1857–1941), Ahmad Shafiq (1860–1940), Prince 'Umar Tusun (1872–1944), and Fahmi Kallini (1860–1954) dedicated their final years to writing. Yet, despite a cultural will to revive the monumental Islamic chronicle and infuse it with statements about the scientific value of history and the desire to 'serve the beloved fatherland', the strength of such works was restricted to the realm of new facts.[14] These new 10,000-page histories had no evolving subject, no sense of accumulative progression, no 'lesson' and hence, no immediate relevance for Egypt's pressing nationalist concerns. And so, more than a decade before the graduation of the first students of a modern history program, Egypt's cultural arena was in need of something entirely different.

A NEW HISTORIOGRAPHICAL IDEAL

As in many other aspects of Egyptian life, in the realm of history writing too, the 1919 Revolution was a trigger for change. This change finally occurred when the burgeoning middle class *effendiyya* realized that it had become impossible to conceive of and execute modernity without historicist thought. Put differently, in sharp opposition to the old guard historians, members of this class instinctively understood that to have a past did not necessarily mean to have History. This was another striking difference between the Islamic chronicle and the modern history book. The most powerful manifestation of this realization was in the writing of the young student Muhammad Sabri, a staunch Wafdist and a true republican, whose new book on the 1919 Revolution, *La révolution égyptienne*, ignited the imagination of young nationalists and terrified the monarchy, which was entirely left out of the account.[15] It was partially in relation to this mode of writing and political action that King Fu'ad began paying historians, such as the Palestinian Ilyas al-Ayyubi, to write a properly historicized and nationalized version of the dynasty's history with an emphasis on its founder.[16]

Yet this was far from a satisfactory strategy. Literally pushed out of history, King Fu'ad responded by launching the most extensive historiographical project ever seen in the region. Beginning in 1920, the project spanned more than twenty-five years and involved dozens of foreign archivists, philologists and historians (among them: Eugenio Griffini, Jean Deny, Angelo Sammarco and Pierre Crabitès). Local editors and translators assisted them in creating what would become the first research archive, conveniently located in Fu'ad's own palace at 'Abdin. Overall, the project published close to eighty weighty tomes on modern Egyptian history covering the period from 1798 to the present.[17]

Undeniably colonial in essence, the royal project introduced three complementary elements to Egyptian historiography. First, it set the criteria for what constituted 'proper historical knowledge' with regard to modern Egypt. Then, it disseminated the assumption that both physically and epistemologically, there could be no valid historical evidence outside the archive (which systematically excluded both Ottoman and subaltern pasts). Finally, it introduced the concepts of 'scientific objectivity' and 'expert authority'. Although it claimed to be a public archive, in actuality it was a colonial workshop that was designed to mask the contradiction between the idea of the monarchy and that of the nation.[18] Despite this contradiction, 'Abdin introduced a powerful new ideal: methodologically controlled research makes objective knowledge possible. And so, in the late 1920s, it was now up to the more established new *effendiyya* to try and put this ideal to work, and thereby to translate the notion of objective/scientific knowledge into a form of cultural authority. While doing so, they were challenged to find a distinctive Egyptian voice.

Part II

THE EFFENDI HISTORIAN AT WORK

The idea that a methodologically controlled process is bound to yield objective scientific truth constituted the heart of the middle class's notion of professionalism. Indeed, the drive to professionalize, that is to actively and creatively join the march of the modern world, was a classic middle-class ambition. This was true for history writing as much as for the practice of law or any other systematically organized modern category of knowledge.[19] The fully functional university of the late 1920s was the place where Egyptian professionalism could be developed and practiced. In the field of history, the uncontested leader of professionalization was Muhammad Shafiq Ghurbal. He is famously known as the father of modern Egyptian historiography.[20]

Ghurbal was the archetypical *effendi*. He was born in 1894 to a Muslim family of merchants in the modern urban hub of Alexandria. His parents wanted him to be a lawyer or an engineer but, like so many young students of his generation, Ghurbal chose to enter the literary world of the *Nahda*. Surely, for members of an older generation like Ghurbal's parents, such an occupation would by no means suggest the stability and prestige of a modern profession. In 1915, after graduating from one of the most prominent Liberal Arts institutions in the country – the Liberal Arts Higher Teacher College (*Dar al-mu'alimin al-'ulya*) – he began his B.A. studies at the University of Liverpool.[21] The Egyptian government paid his tuition. After a short interval he continued his M.A. in the prestigious London University under the supervision of one of Britain's rising stars: the renowned historian Arnold Toynbee.

As a research student, Ghurbal visited as many as nine different archives, and, two years later, submitted an innovative and authoritative thesis: *The Beginnings of the Egyptian Question and the Rise of Mehmet Ali*. Toynbee admitted that he was quite ignorant of the political history of the early nineteenth century Ottoman Empire and that he learned from Ghurbal more than he could have taught him on that subject.[22] *The Beginnings of the Egyptian Question* set the standard for everything local professional historiography aspired to be. Being one of the only Egyptians with such scholarly achievements, he returned to Egypt in 1928 and began teaching at the History Department at Fu'ad University. Quite interestingly, Ghurbal, who would become the doyen of modern Egyptian historiography, never continued his official education beyond this point.

At the time, the Department of History at Fu'ad University was the only department in the country whose faculty was predominantly European. It was up to Ghurbal in history, along with members of numerous other departments, to Egyptianize the university. In the field of history, Egyptianization, or *tamsir*, meant to ensure that Egyptian history would be

written by Egyptians and for the sake of Egyptian nation building. Indeed, for Ahmad 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim, one of Ghurbal's most prominent students, and a future intellectual leader in his own right, *tamsir* was not merely studying Egyptian history in Arabic rather than in French or English. Much more than that, it was 'directing attention to the study of modern national history'.[23] As another former disciple observed:

> Ghurbal (was entrusted) with the mission of taking historical studies away from the monarchy and the foreigners. In more precise terms, he (was entrusted) with the mission of Egyptianizing (*tamsir*) history a quarter of a century before the idea of *tamsir* gained currency.[24]

Thus, especially following his appointment as Chair of the History Department in 1936, when he replaced the British historian Arthur J. Grant, and later as Dean of the Faculty of Arts, replacing Taha Husayn (1938–40), Ghurbal toiled to Egyptianize both faculty and students.[25]

To what degree was Ghurbal successful? Table 1 illustrates the historical horizons of the first generation of Ghurbal's students. These young scholars were the first generation of salaried Egyptian historians who were publicly, rather than privately, financed. Insofar as one can judge, most of them seem to have come from relatively humble social origins and went on to live an urban middle class life.[26] They were all men. Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, they would occupy and establish new programs of history such as the one in the University of Alexandria and, later, the important social history forum in 'Ayn Shams University. In terms of their scholarly interest, Ghurbal's advisees exclusively focused on Egyptian history from 1805 up to the 1882 British occupation. Conditioned by their work at 'Abdin, all of them examined various aspects of Muhammad 'Ali's contribution to the creation of the modern Egyptian nation-state. Accepting the universality of Europe's experience of nation-building, they sought to illustrate the many ways in which literary, economic, agricultural, commercial, educational, and military reforms during the nineteenth century pushed Egypt beyond the doorstep of the Ottoman world. After years of working in the 'Abdin archive, many of his students' works were eventually published either as books or articles. But what about their distinctive voice?

Indeed, from the inception there was a clear need to distinguish this new academic school from the dominant colonial scholarship of the 1930s. Deeply committed to this task, Ghurbal often reminded his students that 'foreign historians are interested in imperial aspects, and our mission is to focus on society'.[27] As 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim recalled:

> If the official school of British and French historians wrote the history of Muhammad 'Ali and Isma'il, Ghurbal directed the students of his school to study the history of the Egyptian nation and society. He directed them to study the history of education, industry, the printing–press, commerce, the Egyptian peasant, etc.[28]

Table 1. The First Generation of Academic History Students, 1934–1952.

Student	Year	Thesis Title	Degree	Notes
Ahmad Ahmad al-Hitta	1934	al-Fallah al-misri fi 'ahd Muhammad 'Ali	M.A.	
Radwan Abu al-Futuh*	1936	Tarikh matba'at bulaq	M.A.	Published as a book.
Ahmad 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim*	1938	Tarikh al-ta'lim fi 'asr Muhammad 'Ali	M.A.	Published as a book.
Iyad Hasanin Dus*	1939	al-Fath al-misri li-l-Sudan fi 'ahd Muhammad 'Ali	M.A.	
Ibrahim 'Abduh*	1940	Tarikh al-sahafa al-misriyya 1798–1882	M.A.	
Ahmad 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim*	1941	Tarikh al-ta'lim mundhu awakhir 'asr Muhammad 'Ali ila awa'il hukum Tawfiq	Ph.D.	Published in 1945 as two separate books.
'Abd al-Hamid Muhammad al-Batriq*	1943	al-hukum al-misri fi bilad al-'arab	M.A.	Completed his graduate work under Dodwell's supervision in London University.
Muhammad Muhammad Tawfiq*	1943	Mustalah watha'iq tarikh al-hukum al-'uthmani fi Misr	M.A.	Hired by the 'Abdin archive upon his graduation.
Ibrahim 'Abduh*	1943	Tatawwur al-sahafa al-misriyya wa athriha fi-l-nahdatayn al-fikriyya wal-ijtima'iyya	Ph.D.	
Muhammad Rif'at Ramadan*	1945	Thawrat 'Ali bik al-kabir 1768–1772	M.A.	
Jamal al-Din al-Shayyal	1945	Tarikh al-tarjama wal-haraka al-thaqafiyya fi 'asr Muhammad 'Ali	M.A. Alexa-ndria U.	Unofficial advisee of Ghurbal. Published as a book.
Amin Mustafa 'Abd Allah 'Afifi*	1946	Tijarat Misr fi 'ahd Muhammad 'Ali	Ph.D.	
Ahmad Ahmad al-Hitta*	1946	Tatawwur al-zir'aa al-misriyya f-l-nisf al-awwal min al-qarn al-tasi' 'ashar	Ph.D.	Published by EHS in 1950 under different title.
'Abd al-'Aziz Muhammad al-Shanawi*	1948	al-Sukhra fi hafr qanat al-Suwis	M.A.	Worked as an archivist in 'Abdin. His M.A. and Ph.D. were published as books.
Ahmad 'Abd al-Rahimm Mustafa*	1951	al-Khidiwi Isma'il wa 'alaqatihi bi-l-bab al-'Ali	M.A.	Joint advisee of 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim and Ghurbal. Published as a book.

Sources: Cairo University, *Dalil al-rasa'il al-jami'iyya* (Cairo: Kulliyat al-adab, 1996); *MTM* 13 (1967); *MTM* 16 (1969).
Note: *An advisee of Ghurbal.

History Compass 7/1 (2009): 306–328, 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00577.x

Notwithstanding such statements, as we shall now see, when comparing the intellectual working assumptions of both schools and their methods of work, the differences could at best be described as symbolic. For better or for worse, Ghurbal's school was the stepchild of the 'Abdin project.

THE PROFESSIONAL ETHOS OF THE *EFFENDI* HISTORIAN

Ghurbal's students went on to form a distinct school of history writing, which will be referred to here as 'the academic school'.[29] Side by side with its institutional development, the academic school developed a compatible professional ideology. Over the course of the 1930s, Ghurbal and his young colleagues forged a well-defined professional creed and wrapped it around the practice of archival work. Extensive experience at 'Abdin, the only research archive in Egypt, was considered the authoritative method for the finding of historical truth. Making the link between archival work and 'scientific history', Ghurbal articulated some of the elementary required conditions. First, there should be public acknowledgment of the right of historians to study the documents. Second, documents should be stored in a proper and safe place (Ghurbal was especially concerned about the traditional enemies of Egyptian state-documents, namely shredding, selling, fires, and mice).[30] They should be carefully classified, catalogued, and indexed. Third, historical scholarship demanded a capable, reliable and trustworthy historian who was trained to recover the 'truth' from the archive (*yastakhrij al-haqa'iq*).[31] Since the first two conditions were generally met, Ghurbal focused on cultivating new historians who would be trained in the archives:

> Ghurbal oriented his students to take interest in collecting original source material and his students were the first group of Egyptian research students to explore and 'dig out' the contents of the Egyptian archives. In doing so, they assisted in the organization, systematic arrangement and facilitation of the archives for other scholars. Through these activities Ghurbal and his students laid the foundations for the modern, national history of Egypt.[32]

Indeed, reiterating the myth of 'Abdin's scientific objectivity was a crucial aspect of university training. This was not because academics were mere parrots but because 'Abdin was the only place where modern methods of historical research could be practiced. Emphasis on archival work brought the first generation of historians to recount their pleasurable experiences in the archive, as though it were the ultimate academic rite of passage. The metaphors of the 'unveiling' (*Kashf al-niqab*) and 'uncovering' (*Kashf al-sitar*) of truth, became prevalent in describing the historian's task in the archive.[33] The celebration of source material resulted in a unique academic genre in which students published articles focusing exclusively on 'their sources'.[34] Years later, M.A. student 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Shinnawi complained that Ghurbal's pedantic insistence on the quality of archival work was extreme to the degree that it took him ten years to graduate.[35]

Much emphasis was put on proper footnoting as both the ultimate proof of working in the archive and as a sign of belonging to an exclusive band of professionals. And so Ghurbal's students adopted extensive footnoting as a form of official prose. This practice distinguished them from other, non-academic, writers. In this of course they followed European practice. As Anthony Grafton nicely put it:

> historians perform two complementary tasks. They must examine all the sources relevant to the solution of a problem and construct a new narrative or argument from them. The footnote proves that both tasks have been carried out . . . By doing so, moreover, it identifies the work of history in question as the creation of a professional.[36]

Beyond footnoting, the most authentic expression of the historians' professional creed was the series of manuals on 'how to write history'.[37] These publications were vivid manifestos of the emerging academic school in history. The first to be concerned with modern historical methodology in the Arab world was the Lebanese historian Asad Rustum who, in 1939, published his *Mustalah al- tarikh* (loosely translated as *The Practice of History*). Trained at the University of Chicago, he became familiar with the subject of 'methodology' and sought to apply and customize it to Arab historiography.[38] Rustum closely collaborated with the Royal historiographical project and hence was intimately familiar with the Egyptian academic scene. During his frequent visits to Cairo, he met not only with court officials and archivists, but also with professors and students with whom he shared similar views on how to think, talk and write about history.

For these reasons, and for the clarity of his writing, *Mustalah al-tarikh* enjoyed great popularity among Egyptian scholars who drew heavily on it, and at points entirely plagiarized it, in their new publications on methodology.[39] On a practical level, Rustum, who also believed in the accessibility and validity of 'historical truth', had written a guidebook for how to find it. Almost all of the book's chapters ended with a 'lesson'. The first chapter called for establishing the work on original source material.[40] The second chapter encouraged historians to master foreign languages and auxiliary sciences such as sociology so they could study the sources properly.[41] Rustum's third chapter argued that source material was often manipulated, and sometimes even entirely forged. Hence, a close analysis of the documents and their context was necessary for revealing historical truth.[42] Other chapters suggested that it was not enough to 'gather facts', and that historians should also pay attention to questions of organization and writing style, having in mind their future readership.[43] Most of Rustum's examples were based on his working experience in 'Abdin, a fact that further enhanced its popularity among Egyptian historians. Other parts of his book tackled the burdensome issue of the possible contribution of the Islamic historiographical tradition to modern historiography. This was, and remains to this day, a major philosophical challenge for the Egyptian historicist project.

Writing a series of articles in *al-Risala* throughout August to December 1941, Hasan 'Uthman, a former student of Ghurbal and an influential history professor in his own right, articulated the 'ten commandments' for the historian.[44] Drawing heavily on Rustum and others, 'Uthman repeated the conventional wisdom regarding the historian's task of uncovering 'historical truth' but added to it a new aspect.[45] For him 'historical truth', or historical objectivity, was not merely an ideal of service but a tool for the demarcation of the professional boundaries of academics, and for the exclusion of popular historians and historical novelists who, allegedly, could not tell reality from fiction. 'Uthman writes:

> Not everyone who writes history is a historian. A historian must have the necessary qualities of those who are working in science. He needs to love and be devoted to his work regardless of all the possible difficulties of research. The scarcity of sources should not discourage him. The obscurity and confusion of facts should not distract him. He should spend months and years and travel from country to country in pursuit of the truth. A historian should have a critical mind. He should not subscribe to any views or sources without first investigating them carefully. He should adopt only the just and the truthful and suggest nothing but that. He should be truthful, loyal and courageous. He should not lie. Nor should he be a hypocrite. He should not hide facts that others do not know . . . He should not be exhibitionist in his desire for fame. He should have a strong personality . . . should be sensitive, empathic, tolerant and with much imagination.[46]

Evidently, 'Uthman's text is designed to answer a crucial question: How do 'we', as professional historians, write history? 'Uthman conveys the sense that 'our' way, that of the true historian, is the only way to find objective 'truth' in history. Similar to other academic historians, 'Uthman reconfirms the premise that methodologically controlled research makes objective knowledge possible.

However, 'Uthman had a sense of the complexity of the issue of historical objectivity and of the fact that his community also used objectivity as a tool of exclusion. Thus, in sharp contrast with his high rhetoric of objectivity, he admitted that, philosophically speaking, it is impossible to grasp 'historical truth' in any categorical and objective fashion. All historians could do, he argued, was to present the results of their investigations as relatively truthful and reasonable (*natija ma'qula*).[47]

Allan Megill, a scholar of European historiography, has studied the way in which communities of scholars create a shared notion of objectivity. He defined this process as the creation of 'disciplinary objectivity'. Megill writes: 'defined institutionally, disciplinary objectivity refers to the claim by practitioners of a particular discipline to have authoritative jurisdiction over its area of competence'.[48] In other words, disciplinary objectivity serves as an important form of academic authority and a tool in asserting the academic monopoly over historical knowledge. Once this particular notion of objectivity was accepted by academic historians, they were

confident that they were the only ones capable of writing worthy history. Consequently, Egyptian academic historians were eager to persuade, and ready to impose, the validity of their professional authority on other writers.

In 1943, four years after the publication of Rustum's *Mustalah al-tarikh*, Hasan 'Uthman published the first book on historical methodology in Egypt, entitled *Manhaj al-bahth al-tarikhi*. *Manhaj* was the central keyword that governed 'Uthman's work. Narrowly defined, *manhaj* simply means methodology, and is still used in that sense today. However, it acquired an additional meaning which was incorporated into the jargon of professional historians which makes it pivotal for the understanding of their scholarly community. Beginning in the late 1930s, the concept of *manhaj* came to represent the claim of academic historians for professional authority.[49] Thus, *manhaj* was the vehicle through which professional historians presented their theoretical apparatus as scientific (*'ilmî*): that is, as empirical, objective, politically impartial, and disinterested knowledge:

> The time in which history was regarded as mere description of events, for the purpose of remembering, and for the glorification of key events in the life of individuals and nations, has passed. History is no longer regarded as part of culture in general, necessary for the training of individuals for political or military life. Nor is History regarded any longer as a branch of literature studied for the purpose of pleasure alone. Educated amateurs, on the one hand, and scholarly researchers, on the other, have up to now dealt with history, until scientists began to turn their attention toward the subject, at which point scientifically based historical research was established . . . scientific circles collected and published historical sources, wrote in all fields of history and studied historical methodology (*manhaj al-bahth al-tarikhi*). This methodology is one of the most important bases for the progression of historical studies.[50]

Simultaneously, as the *manhaj* incorporated the methodological assumptions of the community it also adopted the ethical code and, especially, the superior self-image, of the modern professional historian. Thus, the above quotations characterize the professional personality of the new historian as devoted, honest, careful, courageous, impartial, sensitive, empathic, tolerant, with a critical mind and much imagination.[51] Years later, when the first generation of professional historians began to pass away, the eulogies of their colleagues repeated, and thus perpetuated, these traits.[52]

By creating a professional ideology and forming a professional self-image, academic historians clearly distinguished themselves from 'other' historians. Indeed, by the 1930s historicism had already become a common urban habit of mind and there were many other history writers around in search of fame and influence. One such writer was the extremely popular nationalist historian 'Abd al-Rahman al-Rafi'i whose work was not footnoted.[53] His popularity and his alternative form of intellectual presence challenged the academic will to be the prime shaper of public opinion; itself a new middle class preoccupation. Again, it was Hasan 'Uthman who expressed the dominant mood among the so-called professionals:

> Many who write history do not understand history. They are not critical, and their writings are nothing but unorganized information. These books are not worthy of their titles, nor even of the paper on which they are printed.[54]

'Uthman's patronizing and dismissive attitude justified the tendency among academic historians not to read, nor even seriously take into consideration, any work that did not originate in their circles. This tendency put their school on a collision course with popular nationalist writers and positioned them in a defensive and vulnerable spot after the 1952 revolution. In addition, quite ironically, this approach was in opposition to the *manhaj*'s declared aim of bringing into account all possible sources. Although they produced the lion's share of published historical literature, academics did not review popular works they deemed partisan. Whereas academics left behind copious material concerning their institutions and ideology, and, in fact, provided us with a rather coherent sense of their intellectual community, they do not tell us much about the excluded 'amateurs'. Even from their own perspective, questions such as who the amateur historians were, what they wrote and how, if at all, they were organized, remain unanswered. The silence of the academic circles and their deliberate politics of exclusion are manifestations of this group quest for monopoly in the field of history writing.

In 1945 due to their apparent disappointment with the political academic culture of the university, Ghurbal and his colleagues decided to establish an independent administrative tool: The Royal Historical Society (*al-Jam'iyya al-malakiyya li-l-dirasat al-tarikhiyya*), the first historical association in the Arab world.[55] Financially and politically supported by the palace, the association followed the same model as the prestigious *Royal Geographical Society.* Consequently, Ghurbal's association became linked not only with royal historiography by way of methods and location of work, but also by way of its dependency upon the sponsors and promoters of the royal 'Abdin project.

Notwithstanding this 'dangerous liaison' and despite the limited autonomy and resources of the association, under Ghurbal's leadership it succeeded in consolidating and promoting its professional hegemony in the academic world. Indeed, through its journal *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya* and its conferences, the association promoted and enforced professional academic standards. Once Ghurbal's disciples were reasonably organized, anarchic criteria for writing were no longer acceptable. 'A'isha 'Abd al-Rahman (known also by her pen name *Bint al-Shati*), a student and a future influential scholar, remembered that her history professors, Ghurbal and Mustafa Ziyada, insisted that history writing requires specialization. It was clear, she recalled, that specialization leads to a monopoly in history writing (*ihtikar*) and that this monopoly is a necessary practice to ensure the quality of historical writing. Writing in 1961, she echoed the views of her professors, arguing that: 'the gate of writing in the sciences is locked and will open only to those who specialize'.[56] Ghurbal and his disciples had vouchsafed for themselves the task of gatekeepers, insuring that no despised amateur historian would ever inadvertently slip in.

Conclusion

Not only in Egypt but also elsewhere in the Middle East, historicism, and more broadly the professionalization of the modern idea of history with all of its attendant structures, institutions, and apparatuses, was an important element in the modern identity of the middle class.[57] But what did it mean to become a professional, or an *effendi* professional, in the Egyptian context of the time? As far as history writing was concerned, the first generation of academic historians promoted a vision which argued that being a professional historian meant to function within the convention of a scholarly discipline whose four elementary conditions were: (a) the development of a body of esoteric historical knowledge that the practitioners were required to master; (b) autonomy of the profession in controlling the work, its practitioners, and the relation between the two; (c) a bid for monopoly of historical knowledge; and (d) the creation of an ideal of service which was both a commitment and an ethical imperative that was external to the immediate interests of the discipline's practitioners.[58] Ghurbal was invested in all of these spheres and was thus the chief architect of the institutionalization of history writing. By this means he profoundly shaped the worldview of his colleagues and disciples.

Undoubtedly, the ability of the historical profession in Egypt to impose its intellectual program was, *inter alia*, the outcome of this institutionalization. However, what distinguished academic historians from other professions – for example, Egyptian blue-collar workers – and accorded them the authority by which they spoke, was the fact that academic history was a theory-driven practice. As such, it purports to account for unobservable phenomena and thus chart the path of future experiences. In order to justify their possession of such authority, academic historians developed the concept of objectivity, which allowed them to position themselves as disinterested viewers who, by means of this objective stance, could account for 'historical truth'. As Peter Novick illustrated, historians could not conceive of their practice without relating it to objectivity. Whether as a practical objective within reach, or only as an abstract ideal worth striving for, objectivity always functioned to justify the historians' claim to expert authority.[59]

From this new position, academics held that 'historical truth' was a matter of professional authorization, and that only Ghurbal and his circle could, and should, master and regulate this process. Only they could provide the scientific validation and the ability to enforce this truth. As expert historians, they purported to monopolize the ability to speak truth and to decide which statements were true or false. By regulating historical truth, they hoped to produce even more authority, in a cyclical process. Speaking with the authority of objective, empirical, and disinterested knowledge, exclusion of those who did not speak with such authority followed naturally.

Yet, as this Egyptian example shows, professionalism was not without its discontents. First, it created a distinction between the so-called 'amateurs' and 'professionals that would plague Egyptian historiography throughout the century'.[60] Second, because academic historiography was envisioned within the liberal politics of representation and thus had a close, and even dangerous, affinity with colonial knowledge, it was bound to be politically vulnerable in a post-independence era. Indeed, during the 1950s and 1960s Ghurbal's circle was repeatedly accused of being elitist, disconnected from the real concerns of the people and even, given the undeniable cooperation with the 'Abdin project, as colonial. A third implication, one that lies beyond the scope of our discussion and calls for additional research, was the fate of the Islamic historiographical tradition. Major figures such as Asad Rustum, Ghurbal, and 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim struggled with the fact that they had adopted a historiographical system that considered the philosophical contribution of Islamic historiography – with the possible exception of Ibn Khaldun – to be obsolete. Indeed, it was only in the 1980s that the judge and independent historian Tariq al-Bishri began to engage more systematically with this problem.[61]

For all these reasons, the academic school had trouble acquiring the status from which their expert authority would be widely acknowledged, especially by independent writers, partisan pundits, and, later on, by Islamists circles. Even as late as the 1990s, debates about the legacy of the academic school and the question of 'amateurism' were still raging.[62] Despite these challenges, as a growing number of politicized writers passed judgment about the past without ever studying it in depth, the methodological checks and balances of academia and its ethical commitment to a due historiographical process of investigation safeguarded historical writing from the dangers of metahistorical reasoning, hidden hand explanations and the ensuing detachment from historical reality. This remains the long-standing legacy of the professional *effendi* historian.

Short Biography

Yoav Di-Capua teaches Arab intellectual history at University of Texas at Austin. His book, *Gatekeepers of the Arab Past: Historians and History Writing in Twentieth Century Egypt*, is forthcoming with the University Press of California. He is currently writing a book on Arab thought in the shadow of the 1967 catastrophe. His latest publication is 'Common Skies Divided Horizons: Aviation, Class and Modernity in Early Twentieth Century Egypt', *Journal of Social History* (Summer, 2008).

Notes

* Correspondence address: Department of History, University of Texas at Austin, 1 University Station B7000, Austin, Texas, 78712-0220. Email: ydi@mail.utexas.edu.

[1] For a critical review of intellectual history of Egypt and the Middle East see: Israel Gershoni, 'The Theory of Crisis and the Crisis in a Theory: Intellectual History in Twentieth-Century Middle Eastern Studies', in Israel Gershoni, Amy Singer, and Y. Hakan Erdem (eds), *Middle East Historiographies: Narrating the Twentieth Century* (Seattle, WA: Washington University Press, 2006), 131–82.

[2] In *Redefining the Egyptian Nation, 1930–1945* Israel Gershoni and James Jankowski took issue with previous scholars of Egyptian nationalism whose rigid structuralism entirely blinded them to questions of class and thought. However, subsequent to this definitive study, the question of middle class intellectualism has also reached a certain deadlock.

[3] Akram Fouad Khater, *Inventing Home: Emigration, Gender, and the Middle Class in Lebanon, 1870–1920* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001); Keith Watenpaugh, *Being Modern in the Middle East: Revolution, Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Arab Middle Class* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006); Omnia El Shakry, *The Great Social Laboratory: Subjects of Knowledge in Colonial and Postcolonial Egypt* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007); Lucie Ryzova, 'Egyptianizing Modernity: The "New Effendiyya" Social and Cultural Constructions of the Middle Class in Egypt under the Monarchy', in Arthur Goldschmidt, Amy Johnson, and Barak Salmoni (eds), *Re-Envisioning the Egyptian Monarchy* (Cairo: AUC Press, 2005), 124–63.

[4] See for instance: Walter Armbrust, 'The Golden Age before the Golden Age: Commercial Egyptian Cinema Before the 1960s', in Walter Armbrust (ed.), *Mass Mediations: New Approaches to Popular Culture in the Middle East and Beyond* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Pres, 2000), 292–327; Wilson Jacob, 'Working out Egypt: Masculinity and Subject Formation between Colonial Modernity and Nationalism, 1870–1940', Unpublished diss. (New York University, 2005); Shaun Lopez, 'Madams, Murders and the Media: *Akhbar al-Hawadith* and the Emergence of a Mass Culture in 1920s Egypt', in Goldschmidt, Johnson, and Salmoni (eds), *Re-Envisioning the Egyptian Monarchy*, 371–97; Mumin Kamal al-Shafi'i, *al-Dawla wal-tabaqa al-wusta fi Misr* (Cairo: Dar qiba', 2000).

[5] By and large, scholarship on the subject measured local historiography in accordance with the standards of a pre-conceived static ladder of modern historiographical achievements: Jamal al-Din al-Shayyal, *al-Tarikh wal-mu'arikhin fi Misr fi-l-qarn al-tasi' 'ashar* (Cairo: Maktabat al-nahda al-misriyya, 1958); Jack Crabbs, *The Writing of History in Nineteenth-Century Egypt: A Study in National Transformation* (Cairo: AUC Press, 1984). A recent study noticed this flaw but did not do much to correct it. Anthony Gorman, *Historians, State and Politics in Twentieth Century Egypt: Contesting the Nation* (London/New York, NY: Routledge-Curzon, 2003).

[6] Maurice Mandelbaum, *History, Man, & Reason; A Study in Nineteenth-Century Thought* (Baltimore, MD/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971), 41.

[7] Darwinism and related ideas illustrated the potential of historicism for understanding the natural world in a rationally, that is, in opposition to biblical and Koranic accounts. For more on this issue see: Marwa Elshakry, 'Darwin's Legacy in the Arab East: Science, Religion and Politics, 1870–1914', Unpublished diss. (Princeton University, 2003).

[8] In 1894 feminist activist Zaynab Fawwaz declared: 'History, which is the best of all sciences, is largely dominated by men. Not a single one of those male historians has dedicated a single chapter in which to discuss women who represent half of human kind'. Quoted in Gorman, *Historians, State and Politics*, 104.

[9] In 1892 Diyab Mahmud, an official in the Ministry of Education, published his *Khulasat tarikh Misr al-qadim wal-Hadith*. Mahmud Fahmi who in 1894, while in exile with his fellow Urabists, wrote *al-Bahr al-zakhir fi tarikh al-'alam wa akhbar al-awa'il wal-awakhir*. In 1898 state official Mikha'il Sharubim published another inclusive chronicle: *al-Kafi fi tarikh Misr al-qadim wa-l-Hadith*. Isma'il Sarhank published *Haqaiqat al-akhbar 'an duwal al-bihar* in three volumes.

[10] For how Jurji Zaydan and other writers ushered in the historicist age see: Yoav Di-Capua, 'The Thought and Practice of Modern Egyptian Historiography, 1890–1970', Unpublished diss. (Princeton University, 2004), 1–66.

[11] Elías Palti, 'Historicisim as an *Idea* and as a *Language*', *History and Theory* 44 (October 2005): 431.

[12] Ghislaine Alleaume, 'L'Égypte et son histoire: Actualité et controversies. Première partie: La Presse et l'histoire', *Bulletin du CEDEJ* 20/2 (1986): 9–34.

[13] For Cromer's statement of purpose see: Evelyn Baring Cromer, *Modern Egypt* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1908), 1: 1–8.

[14] Amin Sami, *Taqwim al-Nil* (Cairo: Dar al-kutub, 1916–1936), vol. 1, Preface. Crabbs too considered Amin's statement of purpose highly sophisticated. Crabbs, *Writing of History*, 121.
[15] For Sabri's career see: Di-Capua, 'Thought and Practice', 62–4.
[16] Ilyas al-Ayyubi, *Muhammad 'Ali* (Cairo: Dar al-hilal, 1923).
[17] For a full account of this project see: Di-Capua, 'Thought and Practice', 67–110; Gorman, *Historians, State and Politics*, 15–23.
[18] The practices of this archive were a major reason for the proliferation of the myth that modern scholarship invented itself from nothing after 1798, as well as the fiction of a historiographical wasteland between 1516 and 1798.
[19] See for instance: Donald Reid, *Lawyers and Politics in the Arab World, 1880–1960* (Minneapolis, MN: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1981).
[20] Gorman, Piterberg, and Chouieri consider Ghurbal the father of modern Egyptian historiography because of his national narrative. In contrast with these scholars I argue that Ghurbal owes his title to his organizational skills as the builder of a modern community of knowledge. Gabriel Piterberg, 'The Tropes of Stagnation and Awakening in Nationalist Historical Consciousness', in James Jankowski and Israel Gershoni (eds), *Rethinking Nationalism in the Arab Middle East* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1998), 42–61; Gorman, *Historians, State and Politics*, 22–8; Youssef Choueiri, *Arab History and the Nation-State: A Study in Modern Arab Historiography 1820–1980* (London/New York, NY: Routledge, 1989), 77–124.
[21] While in Liverpool he met Muhammad Rif 'at; a close friend and a future historian who composed some of the most definitive nationalist textbooks of the era.
[22] Ahmad 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim, 'Kalimat ta'bin', *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya* (MTM), 11 (1963): 11.
[23] Ibid., 12.
[24] Muhammad Anis, 'Shafiq Ghurbal wa madrasat al-tarikh', *al-Majalla* (November 1961): 13.
[25] Arthur J. Grant (1862–1948) was the author of *Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. For *tamsir* in Fu'ad University See: Donald Reid, *Cairo University and the Making of Modern Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 99–102, 126, 162–64.
[26] For some biographies of historians see: Ibrahim 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Jumay'i, *Itijahat al-kitaba al-tarikhiyya fi tarikh Misr al-hadith wa-l-mu'asir* (Cairo: 'Ayn lil-dirasat wa al-buhuth al-insaniyya wal-ijtima'iyya, 1994), 157–230.
[27] Anonymous, 'Ta'bin Shafiq Ghurbal', *al-Majalla*, December 1961, p. 135.
[28] 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim, 'Kalimat ta'bin', *MTM*, 11 (1963): 13.
[29] Its important to note that Muhammad Husyan Haykal, Taha Husayn, and others also wrote history books. However, these were primarily books about history as opposed to the historical research which Ghurbal and his students practiced.
[30] Ahmad Izzat 'Abd al-Karim, *Tarikh al-ta'lim fi 'asr Muhammad Ali* (Cairo: Maktabat al-nahda al-misriyya, 1938), preface by Ghurbal, pp. i–v. Egyptian Historical Society, *Dhikra al-batal al-fatih Ibrahim Basha*, 2nd ed. (Cairo: Maktabat madbuli, 1990), preface, pp. i–ii. See also a rare interview with Ghurbal where he speaks about his work with archival documents: 'Abd al-Hayy 'Abd al-Tawwab, *'Asir hayati* (Cairo: al-Dar al-qawmiyya li-l-Tiba'a wa-l-nashr, 1966), 157.
[31] 'Abd al-Karim, *Tarikh al-ta'lim fi 'asr Muhammad 'Ali*, i–v.
[32] 'Abd al-Karim, 'Kalimat ta'bin', 13.
[33] 'Abd al-Karim, *Tarikh al-ta'lim fi 'asr Muhammad 'Ali*, i–ii.
[34] See: Ahmad Ahmad al-Hitta, 'Maraji' tarikh al-zira'a al-Misriyya: 'Ahd Muhammad 'Ali 1805–1848', *MTM*, 1 (1948): 239–54. See also: Ahmad 'Izzat 'Abd al-Karim, 'Tarikh al-ta'lim fi 'asr Muhammad 'Ali: masadiruhu wa watha'iquhu', op. cit., 255–76; Amin Mustafa 'Abd Ilah, 'Tarikh al-tijara fi 'asr Muhammad 'Ali: Masadiruhu wa watha'iquhu', op cit., 97–112.
[35] Indeed for his Ph.D. al-Shinawwi went to Alexandria University where he graduated in one year. Baha' al-Din 'Ulwan, *'Abd al-'Aziz al-Shinnawi mu'arikhan* (al-Mansura: Dar sanabil, 1999), 9–10.
[36] Anthony Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 4–5.
[37] Starting in the mid-1930s there seems to have been a growing concern with questions relating to the process of history writing in academic circles, as well as in the popular journals.

See for example an article by an Arab professor from Budapest who was hired as a visiting professor at Cairo University: 'Abd al-Karim Jarmanush, 'Kayfa yajibu an yuktab al-tarikh wa man huwa al-mu'arikh al-kamil?', *al-Hilal*, March 1935, pp. 201–4. Some writers sought to compare the European mode of history writing with the Islamic one: Anonymous, 'T'alif al-tarikh: Muqabalat al-turuq al-haditha bi-l-qadima', *al-Hilil*, April 1927, pp. 729–730.

[38] Ilyas al-Qattar et al. (eds), *Asad Rustum al-insan wal-mu'arikh 1897–1965* (Beirut: al-Maktaba al-bulisiyya, 1984), 19–26.

[39] See a series of articles by Muhammad Mustafa Ziyada, 'Sina'at al-tarikh fi Misr', *al-Thaqafa*, 97, 100, 105, 111 (November 1940–February 1941).

[40] Asad Rustum, *Mustalah al- tarikh* (Sidon: al-Matba'a al-'asriyya, 1955 [1939]), 1–3.

[41] Ibid., 5–9.

[42] Ibid., 10–28.

[43] Ibid., 124–6, 141.

[44] Hasan 'Uthman (1908–73) completed his Master's degree in Middle Eastern history and continued his doctoral studies in Italy where he specialized in Italian history. He was a prolific writer, who, among other things, translated Dante to Arabic. A member of the first generation of middle class professional historians, he was committed to the development of historical methodology. Muhammad Mahmud al-Saruji, 'Khitab t'abin', *MTM*, 21 (1974): 1–12.

[45] Hasan 'Uthman, 'Kayfa yuktab al-tarikh?', *al-Risala*, August 11, 1941, pp. 1000–2.

[46] Ibid., 1001.

[47] Ibid.

[48] Allan Megill, 'Four Senses of Objectivity', *Annals of Scholarship* 8/3–4 (1991): 305.

[49] For a similar process among the American historical community see: Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 50–2.

[50] 'Uthman hoped that Fu'ad University and Alexandria University would assign the book for history students. Hasan 'Uthman, *Manhaj al-bahth al-tarikhi*, 2nd ed. (Cairo: Dar al-ma'arif bi Misr, 1965), preface to the first 1943 edition, pp. 9–10.

[51] 'Uthman, 'Kayfa yuktab al-tarikh?', 1000–2.

[52] Sa'id 'Abd al-Fattah 'Ashur, 'Ustadh al-tarikh fi dhimat al-tarikh: al-Duktur Muhammad Mustafa Ziyada', *al-Majalla*, January 1969, pp. 31–7; Muhammad Mustafa Ziyada, 'Wafa' wa ratha'', *MTM*, 9–10 (1960–1962): i–ii. See also a special issue in memory of Ghurbal: Muhammad Rif'at, 'Kalimat ta'bin', *MTM*, 11 (1963): 7–9; Muhammad Farid Abu Hadid, 'Kalimat ta'bin', op. cit., 36–45.

[53] For al-Rafi'i's career and professional battles see: Yoav Di-Capua, 'Jabarti of the Twentieth Century: The National Epic of 'Abd al-Rahman Rafi'i and Other Egyptian Histories', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 36 (2004): 429–50.

[54] 'Uthman, 'Kayfa yuktab al- tarikh?', 1002.

[55] After 1952 the association's name was changed to 'Egyptian Historical Society' (*EHS*).

[56] 'A'isha 'Abd al-Rahman, 'al-Takhassus wal-ihtikar', *al-Ahram*, October 27, 1961, p. 12.

[57] For the case of Syria see Watenpaugh, *Being Modern in the Middle East*, 121–33.

[58] Thomas Broman, 'Rethinking Professionalization: Theory, Practice and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century German Medicine', *Journal of Modern History*, 67/4 (December 1995): 835; Jan Goldstein, 'Foucault among the Sociologists: The Disciplines and the History of Professions', *History and Theory*, 23/2 (1984): 175; Andrew Abbot, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor* (Chicago, IL/London: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 1–15.

[59] Novick, *That Noble Dream*.

[60] See various debates in the 1987 conference of objectivity in historical writing. Ahmad 'Abdallah (ed.), *Tarikh Misr bayna al-manhaj al-'ilmi wa-l-sira' al-hizbi* (Cairo: Dar shuhdi li-l-nashr, 1988).

[61] See his important introduction in Tariq al-Bishri, *al-Haraka al-siyasiya fi misr, 1945–1952*, 2nd ed. (Cairo: dar al-shuruq, 1983), 1–68.

[62] Ibrahim 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Jumay'i, 'al-Mu'arikhin al-hawah wa dawruhum fi kitabat tarikh misr al-hadith wa-l-mu'asir', in Muhammad 'Afifi (ed.) *al-Madrasa al-tarikhiya al-misriyya* (Cairo: Dar al-shuruq, 1997), 28–34. 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Jumay'i, *Itijahat al-kitaba*, 33–69.

Bibliography

ENGLISH/FRENCH SOURCES

Abbot, Andrew, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor* (Chicago, IL/London: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

Alleaume, Ghislaine, 'L'Égypte et son histoire: Actualité et controversies. Première partie: La Presse et l'histoire', *Bulletin du CEDEJ*, 20/2 (1986): 9–34.

Armbrust, Walter, 'The Golden Age before the Golden Age: Commercial Egyptian Cinema before the 1960s', in Armbrust, Walter (ed.), *Mass Mediations: New Approaches to Popular Culture in the Middle East and Beyond* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Pres, 2000), 292–327.

Broman, Thomas, 'Rethinking Professionalization: Theory, Practice and Professional Ideology in Eighteenth-Century German Medicine', *Journal of Modern History*, 67/4 (December 1995): 835–72.

Choueiri, Youssef, *Arab History and the Nation-State*: *A Study in Modern Arab Historiography 1820–1980* (London/New York/NY: Routledge, 1989).

Crabbs, Jack, *The Writing of History in Nineteenth-Century Egypt: A Study in National Transformation* (Cairo: American University of Cairo Press, 1984).

Cromer, Evelyn Baring, *Modern Egypt* (New York, NY: Macmillan, 1908).

Di-Capua, Yoav, 'Jabarti of the Twentieth Century: The National Epic of 'Abd al-Rahman Rafi'i and Other Egyptian Histories', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 36/3 (2004): 429–50.

Di-Capua, Yoav, 'The Thought and Practice of Modern Egyptian Historiography, 1890–1970', Unpublished diss. (Princeton University, 2004).

Elshakry, Marwa, 'Darwin's Legacy in the Arab East: Science, Religion and Politics, 1870–1914', Unpublished diss. (Princeton University, 2003).

Gershoni, Israel, 'The Theory of Crisis and the Crisis in a Theory: Intellectual History in Twentieth-Century Middle Eastern Studies', in Israel Gershoni, Amy Singer, and Y. Hakan Erdem (eds), *Middle East Historiographies: Narrating the Twentieth Century* (Seattle, WA: Washington University Press, 2006), 131–82.

Goldstein, Jan, 'Foucault among the Sociologists: The Disciplines and the History of Professions', *History and Theory*, 23/2 (1984): 175.

Gorman, Anthony, *Historians, State and Politics in Twentieth Century Egypt: Contesting the Nation* (London/New York, NY: Routledge-Curzon, 2003).

Grafton, Anthony, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

Jacob, Wilson, 'Working out Egypt: Masculinity and Subject Formation between Colonial Modernity and Nationalism, 1870–1940', Unpublished diss. (New York University, 2005).

Khater, Akram Fouad, *Inventing Home: Emigration, Gender, and the Middle Class in Lebanon, 1870–1920* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001).

Lopez, Shaun, 'Madams, Murders and the Media: *Akhbar al-Hawadith* and the Emergence of a Mass Culture in 1920s Egypt', in Arthur Goldschmidt et al. (eds), *Re-envisioning the Egyptian Monarchy* (Cairo: American University in Cairo Press, 2005), 371–97.

Mandelbaum, Maurice, *History, Man, & Reason; A Study in Nineteenth-Century Thought* (Baltimore, MD/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971).

Megill, Allan, 'Four Senses of Objectivity', *Annals of Scholarship*, 8/3–4 (1991): 301–20.

Novick, Peter, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Palti, Elías, 'Historicism as an *Idea* and as a *Language*', *History and Theory*, 44 (October 2005): 431–40.

Piterberg, Gabriel, 'The Tropes of Stagnation and Awakening in Nationalist Historical Consciousness', in James Jankowski and Israel Gershoni (eds), *Rethinking Nationalism in the Arab Middle East* (New York/NY: Columbia University Press, 1998), 42–61.

Reid, Donald, *Lawyers and Politics in the Arab World, 1880–1960* (Minneapolis, MN: Bibliotheca Islamica, 1981).

Reid, Donald, *Cairo University and the Making of Modern Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
Ryzova, Lucie, 'Egyptianizing Modernity: The "New Effendiyya" Social and Cultural Constructions of the Middle Class in Egypt under the Monarchy', in Arthur Goldschmidt, Amy Johnson, and Barak Salmoni (eds), *Re-envisioning the Egyptian Monarchy* (Cairo: AUC Press, 2005), 124–63.
Watenpaugh, Keith, *Being Modern in the Middle East: Revolution, Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Arab Middle Class* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006).

ARABIC SOURCES

'Abd al-Fattah 'Ashur, Sa'id, 'Ustadh al-tarikh fi dhimat al-tarikh: al-Duktur Muhammad Mustafa Ziyada', *al-Majalla*, (January 1969): 31–7.
'Abd Ilah, Amin Mustafa, 'Tarikh al-tijara fi 'asr Muhammad 'Ali: Masadiruhu wa watha'iquhu', *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya*, 1 (1948): 97–112.
'Abd al-Karim, Ahmad 'Izzat, *Tarikh al-ta'lim fi 'asr Muhammad Ali* (Cairo: Maktabat al-nahda al-misriyya, 1938).
'Abd al-Karim, Ahmad 'Izzat, 'Tarikh al-ta'lim fi 'asr Muhammad 'Ali: masadiruhu wa watha'iquhu', *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya*, 1 (1948): 255–76.
'Abd al-Karim, Ahmad 'Izzat, 'Kalimat ta'bin', *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya*, 11 (1963): 11.
'Abdallah, Ahmad (ed.), *Tarikh Misr bayna al-manhaj al-'ilmi wa-l-sira' al-hizbi* (Cairo: Dar shuhdi lil-nashr, 1988).
'Abd al-Mun'im al-Jumay'i, Ibrahim, *Itijahat al-kitaba al-tarikhiyya fi tarikh Misr al-hadith wal-mu'asir* (Cairo: 'Ayn lil-dirasat wa al-buhuth al-insaniyya wal-ijtima'iyya, 1994).
'Abd al-Mun'im al-Jumay'i, Ibrahim, 'al-Mu'arikhin al-hawah wa dawruhum fi kitabat tarikh misr al-hadith wal-mu'asir', in Muhammad 'Afifi (ed.), *al-Madrasa al-tarikhiya al-misriyya* (Cairo: Dar al-shuruq, 1997), 28–34.
'Abd al-Rahman, 'A'isha, 'al-Takhassus wa-l-ihtikar', *al-Ahram*, October 27, 1961.
'Abd al-Tawwab, 'Abd al-Hayy, *'Asir hayati* (Cairo: al-Dar al-qawmiyya li-l-Tiba'a wa-l-nashr, 1966).
Abu Hadid, Muhammad Farid, 'Kalimat ta'bin', *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya*, 11 (1963): 36–45.
Anonymous, 'T'alif al-tarikh: Muqabalat al-turuq al-haditha bi-l-qadima', *al-Hilal*, (April 1927): 729–30.
Anonymous, 'Ta'bin Shafiq Ghurbal', *al-Majalla*, December 1961.
al-Ayyubi, Ilyas, *Muhammad 'Ali* (Cairo: Dar al-hilal, 1923).
al-Bishri, Tariq, *al-Haraka al-siyasiya fi misr, 1945–1952* (Cairo: dar al-shuruq, second edition, 1983).
Cairo University, *Dalil al-rasa'il al-jami'iyya* (Cairo: Kulliyat al-adab, 1996).
Egyptian Historical Society, *Dhikra al-batal al-fatih Ibrahim Basha 1848–1948*, 2nd ed. (Cairo: maktabat madbuli, 1990).
al-Hitta, Ahmad Ahmad, 'Maraji' tarikh al-zira'a al-Misriyya: 'Ahd Muhammad 'Ali 1805–1848', *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya*, 1 (1948): 239–54.
Jarmanush, 'Abd al-Karim, 'Kayfa yajibu an yuktab al-tarikh wa man huwa al-mu'arikh al-kamil?', *al-Hilal*, March 1935, 201–4.
al-Qattar, Ilyas, et al. (eds), *Asad Rustum al-insan wal-mu'arikh 1897–1965* (Beirut: al-Maktaba al-bulisiyya, 1984).
Rif'at, Muhammad, 'Kalimat ta'bin', *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya*, 11 (1963): 7–9.
Rustum, Asad, *Mustalah al-tarikh* (Sidon, Lebanon: al-Matba'a al-'asriyya, 1955 [1939]).
Sami, Amin, *Taqwim al-Nil* (Cairo: Dar al-kutub, 1916–1936).
al-Saruji, Muhammad Mahmud, 'Khitab t'abin', *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya*, 21 (1974): 1–12.
al-Shafi'i, Mumin Kamal, *al-Dawla wa-l-tabaqa al-wusta fi Misr* (Cairo: Dar qiba', 2000).
El Shakry, Omnia, *The Great Social Laboratory: Subjects of Knowledge in Colonial and Postcolonial Egypt* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007).

al-Shayyal, Jamal al-Din, *al-Tarikh wa-l-mu'arikhin fi Misr fi al-qarn al-tasi' 'ashar* (Cairo: Maktabat al-nahda al-misriyya, 1958).
'Ulwan, Muhammad Baha' al-Din, *'Abd al-'Aziz al-Shinnawi mu'arikhan* (al-Mansura: Dar sanabil, 1999).
'Uthman, Hasan, 'Kayfa yuktab al-tarikh?', *al-Risala*, August 11, 1941, 1000–2.
'Uthman, Hasan, 'Kayfa yuktab al-tarikh?', *Manhaj al-bahth al-tarikhi*, 2nd ed. (Cairo: Dar al-ma'arif bi Misr, 1965).
Ziyada, Muhammad Mustafa, 'Sina'at al-tarikh fi Misr', *al-Thaqafa*, 97, 100, 105, 111 (November 1940–February 1941).
Ziyada, Muhammad Mustafa, 'Wafa' wa ratha", *al-Majalla al-tarikhiyya al-misriyya*, 9–10 (1960–1962): i–ii.