

WAITING AT NEMI: WELLHAUSEN, GUNKEL, AND THE WORLD BEHIND THEIR WORK

PAUL MICHAEL KURTZ, GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITÄT GÖTTINGEN¹

The times they are a-changin'.

—Bob Dylan

In the first edition of his now fabled *Golden Bough*, James George Frazer began with the tale of an unnamed priest-king waiting for his slayer and successor in the sacred grove at Nemi. “A candidate for the priesthood could only succeed to office by slaying the priest,” wrote the armchair anthropologist, “and having slain him he held office till he was himself slain by a stronger or a craftier.”² Scholars of Hebrew Bible have often cast their own history in these terms: if the established August Dillmann or Franz Delitzsch fell to a trailblazing Julius Wellhausen, Wellhausen himself succumbed to a pathfinding Hermann Gunkel.³ For the period after “the triumph of Wellhausen”—to use language from John Rogerson’s classic history—the scope then usually narrows, with Wellhausen and Gunkel forming legendary foils.⁴ Which of

-
1. This essay began as a paper delivered at the 2014 SBL Annual Meeting (San Diego), in the section titled Metacriticism of Biblical Scholarship. Thanks to a 2015 dissertation fellowship at the Leibniz Institute of European History, I was able to revise the presentation for its proper publication, while a writing stint at Ghent University—also conducted in 2015, under the auspices of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)/U4 Network—afforded me the opportunity to submit my work for additional feedback in the Department of Philosophy & Moral Sciences. Insightful comments on earlier drafts came from Walter Brueggemann, Reed Carlson, Malika Dekkiche, Susannah Heschel, Annelies Lannoy, Michael Legaspi, Nathan MacDonald, Dan Pioske, Danny Praet, Harald Samuel, Hermann Spieckermann, and TJ Thames, with Paul Allen and Cathy Bronson providing me with essential resources and an anonymous reviewer for *HTR* saving me from several solecisms: I am grateful to all of them. Responsibility is mine for all deficiency and error.
 2. James George Frazer, *Golden Bough: A Study in Comparative Religion* (2 vols.; 1st ed.; New York: Macmillan, 1890) I:2. For a penetrating study of this work, see Jonathan Z. Smith, “When the Bough Breaks” *HR* 12 (1973) 342–71, repr. in idem, *Map Is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 1978) 208–39 [repr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993]; cf. also his dissertation “The Glory, Jest and Riddle: James George Frazer and *The Golden Bough*” (PhD dissertation, Yale University, 1969).
 3. Such a characterization appeared early on: cf. Rudolf Kittel, “Die Zukunft der Alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft” *ZAW* 39 (1921) 84–99; cf. also, e.g., Walter Baumgartner, “Wellhausen und der heutige Stand der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft” *TRu* n.s. 2 (1930) 287–307; Rudolf Smend, “Richtungen. Ein Rückblick auf die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft im 20. Jahrhundert” *ZTK* 97 (2000) 259–75; Hugo Grefßmann, “Die Aufgaben der alttestamentlichen Forschung” *ZAW* 24 (1924) 1–33; cf. also Gunkel, “Die Richtungen der alttestamentlichen Forschung” *ChW* 36 (1922) 64–67; idem, “Was will die ‘religionsgeschichtliche’ Bewegung?” *Deutsch-Evangelisch. Monatsblätter für den gesamten deutschen Protestantismus* 5 (1914) 385–97 [ET: “The ‘Historical Movement’ in the Study of Religion,” *ExpTim* 38 (1926/27) 532–36]; see further Werner Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel. Zu seiner Theologie der Religionsgeschichte und zur Entstehung der formgeschichtlichen Methode* (FRLANT 100; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969) 157n.8; Konrad Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel. Eine Biographie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 321–22.
 4. John W. Rogerson, *Old Testament Criticism in the Nineteenth Century: England and Germany*

them, exactly, has rightful claim to the crown or represents the true hierarch of the Hebrew Bible muse depends upon the narrator's own disposition. Indeed, experts in biblical studies have long juxtaposed the two as intellectual opposites. In the process, they appear, oftentimes, as almost mythic figures, largely bereft of context—historical milieu otherwise being a crucial component of biblical scholarship for well over a century.

Scholars of Hebrew Bible ought to contextualize their discipline as much as they contextualize their own primary sources. Like the biblical texts themselves, now established methods were produced—and re-produced—in concrete time and place. They embraced, and embrace still, specific values, concerns, and premises potentially dismissed or eschewed today. Whether or the extent to which such procedures—embedded as they are—may simply be extracted from historical contingency and re-deployed apart from full consideration of the program they comprised merits studied rumination. Alongside these procedures, their protagonists need more cerebration, less celebration. Instead of some Manichean struggle in the air, debates on theory and method emanate from human agents, who themselves derive from distinct and local settings. Indeed, the Wellhausen–Gunkel contrast was rather symptomatic of far greater social shifts. Much more than warring minds, they were historical human beings: their divergence thus encompassed cultural, personal, and institutional elements. Furthermore, the dynamics of their disparity were neither exceptional nor extraordinary. As a brief foray into these savants' relations, this essay hopes to demonstrate the kind of insight won when a broader lens is used. Such a “non-cognitive” (or non-conceptual) perspective complements more conventional historiography composed by Bible scholars: in a sense, it foregrounds the background.⁵ In consequence, the enabling conditions crucial for academic products, trends, and triumphs can then come into view.

Be it Germanophone or Anglophone, whether Continental, British, or American, the standard historiography as told by Bible critics tends to characterize Gunkel and Wellhausen quite different in degree and even in kind at times.⁶ Echoing an ear-

([Philadelphia]: Fortress Press, 1985).

5. The language of cognitive and non-cognitive inquiries stems from Peter Novick's *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 9.
6. Cf. also, e.g., John Van Seters, *The Pentateuch: A Social-Science Commentary* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004) esp. 43–45; Eric Voegelin, *Israel and Revelation*, Vol 1 of *Order and History* (ed. Maurice P. Hogan; vol. 14 of *The Collected Works of Eric Voegelin*; Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2001) esp. 190–206; Douglas A. Knight, *Rediscovering the Traditions of Israel* (SBL Studies in Biblical Literature 16; Atlanta: SBL, 2006) 57–66; James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond"

lier essay by the Australian New Testament expert J.C. O'Neill, who long resided in Edinburgh, the Swiss(/German) specialist of Hebrew Bible Thomas Römer titles one section of a recent contribution "Gunkel versus Wellhausen, Tradition Criticism versus Redaction Criticism."⁷ Rudolf Smend sees a fork in the road as well. This Germanic doyen of biblical scholarship states, "Far beyond the lifetimes of their bearers, the names Wellhausen and Gunkel signify the [two] directions of critical work on the Old Testament—and actually also the New—for the course of the 20th century."⁸ Most palpably, perhaps, the American theologian Walter Brueggemann typifies such antithesis when he reasons,

The parameters for questions of interpretation were largely set by Wellhausen and Gunkel. Wellhausen's approach is scientific, Gunkel's artistic. Wellhausen is consistently analytical, Gunkel synthetic. Wellhausen aims for precision, Gunkel for suggestive nuance. Wellhausen speaks of documents whereas Gunkel treats of tradition. Wellhausen values discipline, Gunkel stresses imagination.⁹

In all these estimations, the contrast is largely intellectual, a difference of paradigm, procedure, or in the very least perspective. Yet this line of interpretation boasts an aged history. In fact, it traces back to the scholars themselves.

In a short, public, and mostly unilateral academic altercation, Gunkel reassured his readers, "The personal [dimension] is entirely irrelevant for me, as I believe it is also irrelevant for Wellhausen. The issue here is not a personal dispute but one of principle."¹⁰ As if to reinforce the point, his subtitle plainly read "Several Con-

JBL 88 (1969) 1–18; R.J. Thompson, *Moses and the Law in a Century of Criticism Since Graf* (VTSup 19; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 109–11; Clements, *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976) esp 14–15; Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments* (2nd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969) esp 341–42. For an investigation of a shared intellectual quandary, see Paul Michael Kurtz, "Axes of Inquiry: The Problem of Form and Time in Wellhausen and Gunkel" *SJOT* 29 (2015) 247–95. I would like to thank Werner Klatt for discussing the historical opposition of these two figures by scholars of Hebrew Bible, especially those who share in their intellectual and institutional heritage.

7. Thomas Römer, "Tracking Some 'Censored' Moses Traditions Inside and Outside the Hebrew Bible" *HeBAI* 1 (2012) 64–76, at 64; cf. J.C. O'Neill, "Gunkel Versus Wellhausen: The Unfinished Task of the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule" *Journal of Higher Criticism* 2 (1995) 115–21. On the often overlooked O'Neill, see his autobiographical passage in idem, "New Testament," in *Disruption to Diversity: Edinburgh Divinity, 1846–1996* (ed. David F. Wright and Gary D. Badcock; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996) 73–97, at 95; see his obituary in *The Scotsman*, April 17, 2003.
8. Rudolf Smend, "Gunkel und Wellhausen," in *Hermann Gunkel (1862–1932)* (ed. Ernst-Joachim Waschke; Biblisch-Theologische Studien 141; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2013) 21–40, at 22. Smend's essay marks the most focused discussion of their specific impact and exchange.
9. Walter Brueggemann and Hans Walter Wolff, *The Vitality of Old Testament Traditions* (2nd ed.; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982) 20. Brueggemann does caution against narratives of succession and supersession, however.
10. Hermann Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen. Einige principielle Erörterungen" *ZWT* 42 (1899) 581–611, at 611. For extended discussion of this exchange, see Henning Paulsen, "Traditionsgeschichtliche Methode und religionsgeschichtliche Schule," *ZTK* 75 (1978) 20–55, esp. 29–33; Werner Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, esp. 70–74; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*,

siderations of Principle." The source of debate was the question of sources. In 1895, Gunkel had published his *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12*.¹¹ Since confirmed by a letter to Adolf von Harnack, academic lore and family tradition have long preserved Wellhausen's own assessment: more chaos than creation.¹² He himself did not address the book, at least in any public forum, until 1899, when he issued his own essay on apocalyptic literature.¹³ Though he tempered his earlier albeit unexpressed appraisal, Wellhausen admitted that he must remain in protest.¹⁴ "The proton pseudos," he concluded, "is that [Gunkel] assigns great value to the question of origins in the first place. [...] Where this material originally comes from is methodologically irrelevant altogether."¹⁵ While the debate itself transpired beneath the banner of *Zeitgeschichte* and *Traditionsgeschichte*—i.e, contemporary history and that of tradition—the discussion actually encompassed three distinct dimensions: synchrony vs. diachrony, literacy vs. orality, and interiority vs. exteriority. Wellhausen had accused Gunkel of opposing investigations synchronic and diachronic, "as though they were mutually exclusive."¹⁶ Gunkel, in Wellhausen's judgment, sought all explanation in origins and placed the peripheral at centrum. More fundamentally, the dispute stemmed from priorities: first, whether immediate or distant past conveyed the most importance for

72–84; cf. also Hans-Peter Müller, "Hermann Gunkel (1862–1932)" in *Theologen des Protestantismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (2 vols.; ed. Martin Greschat; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978) 241–55, at 243–44; and already Carl Siegfried, "Literatur zum Alten Testament" *ThJber* 19 [enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1899] (1900) 1–104, at 72; Heinrich Holtzmann, "Literatur zum Neuen Testament" *ThJber* 19 [enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1899] (1900) 105–69, at 160.

11. While the title page lists 1895 as the years of publication, the foreword dates to October 1894. In fact, dissemination already began in 1894, as evident in Eduard Meyer's review (December 13, 1894), Wellhausen's letter to Harnack (December 21, 1894), and Gunkel's own letter to Zimmern (November 17, 1894): see Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 52n.9; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 60n.47, 76n.131; Wellhausen, *Briefe* (ed. Rudolf Smend; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013) 326, 715. Earlier that year, Gunkel had intended to title the book "Schöpfung und Chaos in AT und NT," and just before publication, he had decided to deviate from his initial plan and remove the potential series title "Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen," of which his *Schöpfung und Chaos* was to be the first (Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 52).
12. Cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 70n.2; Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 462; the letter first appeared in Christhard Hoffmann, *Juden und Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Leiden: Brill, 1988) 160n.40; cf. also Wellhausen's appraisal of a different essay in his letter to Adolf Harnack, December 13, 1910, in idem, *Briefe*, 587.
13. Wellhausen, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur" *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* 6 (1899) 215–49.
14. *Ibid.*, 225–26.
15. *Ibid.*, 233. The proton pseudos stems from Aristotle's *Prior Analytics* (Book II, Chapter 18), referring to a false conclusion reached by a fallacious premise. For a fine analysis of Wellhausen's own thinking in terms of method, see Peter Machinist, "The Road Not Taken: Wellhausen and Assyriology" in *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded* (ed. Gershon Galil, Mark Geller, and Alan Millard; VTSup 130; Leiden: Brill, 2009) 469–531.
16. Wellhausen, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur," 234.

textual explanation and, second, whether proper interpretation included materials transmitted not only across generations but also from other cultures. In the end, Wellhausen deemed such preoccupations perhaps of "antiquarian interest" but "not the task of the theologian and the exegete."¹⁷

Gunkel was incensed. He fumed over thirty pages in reply to the few from Wellhausen. In Gunkel's own perspective, Wellhausen may have offered some passing statements on the antiquity of certain material, but he finally failed to draw any methodological consequences from this concession of his.¹⁸ Gunkel stressed material while Wellhausen emphasized authors: trees were missed for forests; product eclipsed production. Consequently, an argument ensued over accent more than principle, but the root cause lay in virtue. Gunkel himself averred, "The real point of contention is therefore whether or not the question of the material's pre-history is of value to the theologian and exegete."¹⁹ His own answer being affirmative in the extreme, he declared the origin and meaning of inherited raw material a crucial component of the theological enterprise.²⁰ Indeed, he considered exploration of materials' prehistory "an interesting, important, and truly theological problem."²¹ He opined even further, "very often the most significant conclusions for religious history will result from such method when consistently applied."²² Such diffusionary inquiry was not an end in itself. For Gunkel, the question of origins could reveal the distinctiveness of ancient Judaism and, most importantly for him, that of Christianity as well.²³ In his judgment, Wellhausen not only disregarded this line of inquiry but even placed it out of bounds for others. Gunkel's most immediate concern may have been less interpretation than investigation, but he nonetheless wanted to understand the text.²⁴

Protestations notwithstanding, the conflict was also personal. His own reply betrayed a certain sensitivity. Beyond the tone itself, Gunkel expressed umbrage at being misunderstood at best and simply ignored at worst. He conveyed a readiness

17. Ibid.

18. Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen," 603–04, cf. 601–02; see also Wellhausen, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur," 233.

19. Ibid., 607.

20. Ibid., 607–08. Gunkel did assert, however, the value of such inquiry was by no means a priori.

21. Ibid., 604; cf. also idem, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testaments" repr. in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913) 11–29, at 24.

22. Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen," 604.

23. Ibid., 605, 608–09. Gunkel cites his forthcoming work on Genesis in the footnote, which would demonstrate the pursuit of distinctiveness all the more.

24. Ibid., 605

to heed the advice of such an eminent scholar but only after said savant had read him more than superficially. In Gunkel's estimation, not only did Wellhausen distort his work, but he also embellished the space between their positions.²⁵ Furthermore, when he did confess resemblance, Wellhausen argued the course was his alone, ostensibly taking pride in an autonomy from Gunkel.²⁶ In an undated letter to Harnack, probably from 1899, Gunkel lodged the same complaints.²⁷ Yet he would not leave the argument there. He alluded to Wellhausen's judgment, about half a decade later, in at least two other venues.²⁸ In the first volume of "Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments" (FRLANT), a series he founded with Wilhelm Bousset, Gunkel rehearsed the debate with Wellhausen and honed his own critique: "With such statements, Wellhausen falls into conflict with fundamental principles established everywhere in historical science and recognized and followed even by him in other spheres." He continued, "Our cardinal conviction of history is that we are not in the position to understand a person, a time, or a concept apart from their prehistory but that we can only speak of a true, living understanding once we know history in its formation."²⁹ Both here and in a review of Max Reischle's *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, Gunkel showed considerable indignation at construal of his work as only antiquarian in interest.³⁰ Accordingly, Werner Klatt concludes, "Gunkel is not affronted by Wellhausen's position of principle; rather, he is resigned that the scholar he so esteemed simply does not want to see the problems."³¹ If

-
25. Ibid., 594, 595, 596, 597, 602, 603, 605, 606, 610, 611; cf. idem, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments* (FRLANT 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903) 39–40n.1 [ET: "The Religio-Historical Interpretation of the New Testament" *The Monist* 13 (1903): 398–455].
26. Wellhausen, "Zur apokalyptischen Literatur," 216n.2, 226; Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen," 599, 605–06; cf. also Wellhausen to Adolf Harnack, December 13, 1910, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 567. Gunkel himself provided rather little documentation and downplayed the significance of others' contributions: see Martin Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context* (JSOTSup 274; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) 229n.67; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 240.
27. Hans Rollmann, "Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels an Adolf Jülicher zur religionsgeschichtlichen und formgeschichtlichen Methode" *ZTK* 78 (1981) 276–88, at 287.
28. Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 10–11; cf. also Gunkel to Adolf Jülicher, April 3, 1906, in Hans Rollmann, "Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels," 278–80.
29. Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis*, 10–11. On the history of FRLANT, see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, esp. 156–57, 378.
30. Gunkel, review of Max Reischle, *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte*, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 25/18 (1904) 1100–1110, at 1101.
31. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 72; cf. also Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen," 603, 609, 610. As Suzanne Marchand sees, "But on the whole, the liberals did not respond by checking these claims but by renouncing the line of inquiry as a whole, or in the case of claims made by classicists (like Norden and Reitzenstein), by insisting that only theologians had the right to pass judgment on religious texts" (idem, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*:

Gunkel requested his publisher, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, send *Schöpfung und Chaos* to Wellhausen, in 1894, no longer did his name stand on the list for free exemplars of his Genesis commentary, published two years post the skirmish, in anno 1901.³²

Gunkel admired Wellhausen. Not only did *Die Composition des Hexateuchs* represent the "standard-work" of literary criticism, but that "masterpiece" *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* turned the tides of Old Testament research, its description of the Priestly Source being Wellhausen's "immortal achievement."³³ In a programmatic essay, first published in 1904, he found Wellhausen's "particular greatness" "not only in the sharpness of his criticism but also in the positive, that is, in his splendid and persuasive total view and especially in his wondrous gift for tracking the earthy smell of portions of the Old Testament [*den Erdgeruch der alttestamentlichen Stücke aufzuspüren*]."³⁴ Gunkel even adored his mastery of language. Elsewhere, he lauded, "No modern—it would have to be Wellhausen, whom we have to thank for an extraordinary translation of the Minor Prophets—could hope to reach the power and warmth of Luther's locution."³⁵ If Wellhausen's likeness hung on his wall, his presence loomed all the larger in Gunkel's mind.³⁶ The necrology he wrote upon the

Religion, Race, and Scholarship [Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute, 2009] 289).

32. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 73.

33. Gunkel, *Genesis* (1st ed.; [Göttinger] Handkommentar zum Alten Testament I/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), lxxii ("Ausgewählte Literatur zur Genesis"); idem, *Genesis* (2nd ed.; [Göttinger] Handkommentar zum Alten Testament I/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902), lxxii (§5); idem, *Genesis* (1st ed.), lxiv–lxv (§6). Wellhausen's "most inspired work" hailed Gunkel the first volume of *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (1884), which contained "Geschichte Israels und Juda's im Umriss" (also titled "Abriss der Geschichte Israels und Juda's), a text that postdated the others: Gunkel, "Die 'Christliche Welt' und die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft" in *Vierzig Jahre 'Christliche Welt'. Festgabe für Martin Rade zum 70. Geburtstag 4. April 1927* (ed. Hermann Mulert; Gotha: Klotz, 1927) 151–56, at 152: see Rudolf Smend, "Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte. Zur Entstehung von Julius Wellhausens Buch," in *Geschichte–Tradition–Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag, Vol 1. Judentum* (ed. Peter Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) 35–42; idem, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Vol. III/1 *The Nineteenth Century–A Century of Modernism and Historicism* (ed. Magne Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013) 424–53, at 443–50.

34. Gunkel, "Ziele und Methoden der Erklärung des Alten Testaments" [originally "der alttestamentlichen Exegese"] repr. in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 11–29, at 22.

35. Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen* (1st ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911), vi; cf. also idem, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen," 582, 591–92; idem, *Die Psalmen* (4th ed.; Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament II/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929), 444; idem, review of Otto Zöckler, *Die Apokryphen des A.T.'s, nebst einem Anhang über die Pseudepigraphenlitteratur* [sic], *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 17/5 (1892) 126–30, at 129. Friedrich Baethgen had written the first through third editions: see Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 218–28; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 347–59.

36. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 230n.9. Gunkel's son also recalled the portraits of Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, David Friedrich Strauß, Paul de Lagarde, Ernest Renan, Adolf Lasson, Theodor Mommsen, Meyer, Harnack, and Stade and perhaps those of Leopold von Ranke and Albrecht Ritschl as well (ibid.).

death of Wellhausen Smend has rightly styled a “hymn.”³⁷ In the assessment of Klatt, again, Gunkel would have wanted for no further recognition had he known that it was Wellhausen who commended him as a substitute for Paul Hinneberg’s “Die Kultur der Gegenwart.”³⁸ Awareness of the endorsement penned by Karl Budde during his Gießen appointment proceedings would have boosted his confidence, too.³⁹ Notwithstanding his successes, a felt dearth of affirmation, let alone appreciation, inflamed his already trying personality and sizable insecurity for the duration of his life—qualities both manifest in and exacerbated by his early troubles in Göttingen, his publication conflicts with Martin Rade for *Die Christliche Welt*, and his own heavy redactional hand in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (both first and second editions) as well as “Schriften des Alten Testaments.”⁴⁰ Wellhausen’s own gruffness did not ease the situation. In the words of Konrad Hammann, “Given the dominant academic enterprise, always characterized by factional struggles and personal rivalries, his hope for universal approval of his merits amounted clearly to an illusion.”⁴¹ Yet the “principle” disputation even echoed once again, in the year 1906, though this time between Gunkel and Adolf Jülicher, New Testament professor and Wellhausen confidant.⁴² Almost two decennia after this recurrence, they finally made amends, and Gunkel confessed in a 1925 letter,

I was also so daunted by the i[n] p[art] fierce and entirely obstinate opposition of almost all the older generation that I preferred to restrain myself. For many, many years, I waited in vain for understanding and cooperation and then found [it] only among the younger generation. What profit I would have had then, if I had found an older friend to whom I could have brought my 1000 questions and who would have given me advice. Thus, for some time I had to go the difficult way alone. Perhaps I was also to blame for this loneliness, since I, in youthful exuberance, was probably too harsh in my battle against older opinions, although I always made sure not to bring the quarrel into the personal dimension.⁴³

Gunkel still denied any personal component. However, he did admit another: that of nascency and dotage.

37. Smend, “Gunkel und Wellhausen,” 28–29.

38. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 263n.7, cf. 167n.4; so also Smend, “Gunkel und Wellhausen,” 33.

39. See Smend, *Deutsche Alttestamentler in drei Jahrhunderten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 169–70. [ET: *From Astruc to Zimmerli: Old Testament Scholarship in three Centuries* (trans. Margaret Kohl; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007) 127–28].

40. Cf. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 32, 57, 157–60, 202, 209–14, 217–19, 222–23, 232, 252, 291–92, 341–36; Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism*, 218–19n.29; Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 51–52n.5. Buss provides one of the most insightful explorations into Gunkel’s academic undertakings, connecting them to contemporary human science more broadly.

41. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 324.

42. See Rollmann, “Zwei Briefe Hermann Gunkels an Adolf Jülicher.”

43. *Ibid.*, 281; cf. also the drafted letter to Budde (Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 179).

Beyond divergences in principle and person, Wellhausen and Gunkel showed a change in generation. While practitioners of Hebrew Bible often observe a difference in their age, rarely do they pursue the nature of this dimension: the new generation was no mere younger crop of the same variety.⁴⁴ The divide was patent even then. In his velitation with Wellhausen, Gunkel fulminated, "An older yet esteemed man, whose word counts for much, should first orient himself quite accurately as to whether he does injustice before ridiculing a younger one, who still seeks an established position."⁴⁵ Voicing disappointment in an "an older school" solely concerned with internal explorations of ancient Israelite history, Gunkel admitted utter surprise to hear such sentiment from "a visionary, whom we have admired as our pioneer and leader."⁴⁶ At the end of his rejoinder, Gunkel appealed to ultimate vindication, i.e., the "judgment of the future," and declared he could not remain in silence when such grave misunderstandings—advanced by no less an authority than Wellhausen himself—could "smother the young seed in embryo that only wants to grow."⁴⁷ Up until his death, almost three decennia later, Gunkel regarded Wellhausen along with Bernhard Stade as exemplars of a musty generation.⁴⁸ The passing of the old guard

-
44. E.g., Whybray, *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study* (JSOTSup 53; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 133–36; Peter Machinist, "Foreword" in Hermann Gunkel, *Creation and Chaos in the Primeval Era and the Eschaton* (trans. K. William Whitney, Jr.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006) xv–xx, at xix; Henning Graf Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation, Vol 4: From the Enlightenment to the Twentieth Century* (trans. Leo G. Perdue; SBLRBS 63; Atlanta: SBL, 2010) 340. Robert A. Oden, Jr., is exceptional in both denotations: idem, *The Bible Without Theology* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987) esp. 33–34; cf. also Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 209–62. Importantly, however, Marchand presses, "the scholars and intellectuals subsumed under this 'generation' still represented a very small slice of the male population of the Kaiserreich, the slice that attended elite schools, consumed large quantities of specialized literature (as well as, increasingly, modern art, philosophy, and literature) and sought academic jobs" (idem, *German Orientalism*, 213).
45. Gunkel, "Aus Wellhausen's neuesten apokalyptischen Forschungen," 597.
46. Ibid., 610–11; cf. 587–88, 600–01; see also Wellhausen to Adolf Harnack, May 21, 1891, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 267.
47. Ibid., 611.
48. Cf., e.g., Gunkel, "Bernhard Stade. Charakterbild eines modernen Theologen," repr. in idem, *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913) 1–10, at 9–10, cf. 2–3, 5; idem, "Stade, Bernhard," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol 5 (1st ed.; ed. Friedrich Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1913) 882–83, (2nd ed.; ed. Hermann Gunkel and Leopold Zscharnack; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1931) 744; idem, "The History of Religion and Old Testament Criticism," in *Fifth International Congress of Free Christianity and Religious Progress, Berlin, August 5–10, 1910* (ed. Charles W. Wendte; Berlin: Protestantischer Schriftenvertrieb, 1911) 114–25, at 115–16; idem, "Was will die 'religionsgeschichtliche' Bewegung?" 388–90; idem, *Genesis* (1st ed.), foreword; idem, *Genesis* (2nd ed.), foreword. In addition to Stade, Gunkel also numbered Duhm and Budde, inter alia, among the school of Wellhausen. In the second edition of his entry on Budde for *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Gunkel designated him as "one of the chief representatives of the old Wellhausian School" (idem, "Budde, Karl," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol 1 [2nd ed; ed. idem and Leopold Zscharnack; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1927] 1310). Although Duhm received less dubious designation in the second edition of Gunkel's RGG entry on him, he did name Duhm among the "old Wellhausians" in earlier correspondence with Martin Rade, on June 10, 1904,

prompted more than lamentation. When Gunkel eulogized Stade, his predecessor and onetime professor in Gießen, he could not refrain from affirming, "our science has entered a new epoch of transmutation."⁴⁹ Deservedly or not, Wellhausen—for Gunkel and many others (then and now alike)—personified Old Testament research toward the end of the nineteenth century. He embodied the way things had been, the way things were, but not necessarily the way things ought to be. Gunkel penned the entry on Wellhausen for *RGG*, in 1913 (revised for the second edition of 1931), listing several accusations: the Wellhausen School had ignored the ancient Near East, entrenched itself with literary criticism, launched a line of inquiry it then openly resisted, and grown old and unproductive in the end.⁵⁰ That same year, in a letter to Hugo Greßmann—who himself proceeded with far more polemical flare—Gunkel recalled that he had gone to Halle "still a Wellhausian on the whole"; however, Albert Eichhorn helped him to unloose himself from Wellhausen, as well as Albrecht Ritschl.⁵¹ At least some seven years later, he would draft a letter to Budde and confess his sincere hope that the future would one day deem him "a true Wellhausian, who brought critical Old Testament scholarship into a different period and thereby saved it from decay."⁵² As Hammann stresses, however, Gunkel did not see himself as any mere acolyte but rather the very Wellhausen to his own generation, hardly a modest ambition.⁵³

As for Wellhausen's own reflections, all too little features in his extant correspondence and his public declarations. Gunkel loomed much smaller in his world

during deliberations on article assignments for the first edition of *RGG* (in Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 209). On Gunkel's relationship with Duhm, see *ibid.*, 15, 25–26, 29–30, 38–39, cf. also 83.

49. Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze*, 9–10. A year after Wellhausen's quietus, Gunkel suggested the so-called Wellhausian School actually owed its success more to Stade than its eponym: see n. 65 below. On the relationship between Stade and Gunkel, see esp. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 18–20, 199–200, 204–06.
50. Gunkel, "Wellhausen," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (1st ed.; ed. Friedrich Michael Schiele and Leopold Zscharnack; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1913), V:1888–89; cf. also Gressmann, *Eichhorn*, 26: Wellhausen and Harnack "cannot deny paternity."
51. Werner Klatt, "Ein Brief von Hermann Gunkel über Albrecht Eichhorn an Hugo Greßmann" *ZTK* 66 (1969) 1–6 at 5; cf. Hugo Greßmann, *Albert Eichhorn und die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914) 5. For Greßmann's own sentiment, see, for instance, the correspondence published in Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 44, 73–74. Gunkel drew Greßmann away from Wellhausen (see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, esp. 169–70; cf. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments*, 352). Hammann further observes how Greßmann's appreciation of Gunkel, to put it mildly, fostered their close relationship (*idem*, *Hermann Gunkel*, esp. 292). I am grateful to Peter Machinist for guiding me to Greßmann.
52. In Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 179. Although the draft has no date listed, Gunkel penned it on the back of correspondence from Budde, which bore the date April 15, 1920 (cf. *ibid.*, 178).
53. The quote comes from Gunkel's own letter (*ibid.*); see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 81, cf. 323–34.

than the other way around, at least in the current record. His thoughts upon this clash remain allusive and hence elusive. A dispatch sent to Harnack, dated 1891, did critique the "dreadful bustle of children's work [*Kinderarbeit*]" with reference to pursuits of *Religionsgeschichte*. Though admitting the appeal was "understandable indeed," he lacked any sort of confidence in the haste of such endeavors: "reconstruction is fun, and you need not read or learn too much [to do it]; commentaries and concordances are everywhere."⁵⁴ Over two decennia later, in the year 1915, he would reckon Gunkel to the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, albeit beneath the dubious designation as a certain "Göttingen clique." "The gentlemen proceed with a predilection for the whole," he diagnosed to Enno Littmann, "One must let them play themselves out, the bubble will surely burst soon."⁵⁵ Similarly, he wrote Theodor Nöldeke, in 1905,

The honor of being condemned as entirely backwards in the areas of Old Test[ament] has befallen me, just like you, on more than one occasion, from the Assyriologists and from the general religion mashers, also from the metricists and from the Duhm enthusiasts. However, I am, of course, just as pachydermal as you. It does not occur to me to protest against it in detail; I only allow myself a small parenthetical detour from time to time. The young fellows are, of course, always right against the old; I am not much younger than you.⁵⁶

Most explicitly of all, he remarked—with no little irony—on an essay by "my friend Gunkel," in 1897, the article being an instance of "the rather windy scholarship" often seen in the *Preußische Jahrbücher*.⁵⁷ The same "harrumphing" figure merited comment somewhat later, owing to an essay written on the Odes of Solomon. Adapting an apothegm, the old guard Wellhausen averred, "Vanity always disfigures even the prettiest dame. In substance, I often agree with Gunkel, but I've never learned anything from him."⁵⁸ In yet another missive, from 1894, he alluded to the "Novissimus" of Harnack, Gunkel being slated for a new post in Berlin. He judged enthusiasm outweighed evidence in Gunkel's new *Schöpfung und Chaos*.⁵⁹ With epithets racial and other, he then scorned Eduard Meyer, who himself had granted Gunkel a rather positive review. In fact, Wellhausen's general disposition toward the younger generation is probably most embodied in his own exchange with Meyer, a dispute that proved far more heated—and certainly more bilateral—than what transpired with

54. Wellhausen to Harnack, May 21, 1891, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 267.

55. Wellhausen to Enno Littmann, December 21, 1915, in *ibid.*, 630.

56. Wellhausen to Theodor Nöldeke, October 18, 1905, in *ibid.*, 466–67.

57. Wellhausen to Helene Justi, May 15, 1897, in *ibid.*, 348–49.

58. Wellhausen to Harnack, December 13, 1910, in *ibid.*, 567.

59. Wellhausen to Harnack, December 21, 1894, in *ibid.*, 326; cf., as only one example, Wellhausen to Harnack, December 25, 1896, in *ibid.*, 346–47.

Gunkel.⁶⁰ As perhaps a foretaste of the venom yet to come, Wellhausen lambasted *Die Entstehung des Judenthums* two years before his public censure of Gunkel.⁶¹ Wellhausen's adverse assessments forged a kind of bond between the two. In 1901, the dust being settled more or less, Gunkel wrote to Meyer, "...I, too, have experienced that Wellhausen has no more desire to learn and that he sometimes reviews books he only reads very superficially."⁶² If scholars like Gunkel and Meyer suffered public censure from Wellhausen, others of the younger generation sustained it in private instead.⁶³ Such polemical exchanges only solidified the self-consciousness of the junior band of scholars.⁶⁴

The Wellhausen–Gunkel disparity featured also in institutions. Gunkel railed, in 1905, "The Wellhausian School, for instance, will never turn anyone into a full professor [*ordinarius*] who opposes Wellhausen."⁶⁵ He alluded to clannishness, *Cliquenwirtschaft*. In autumn of 1888, Gunkel had received his licentiate and habilitation in biblical theology along with exegesis.⁶⁶ Having long had problems in Göttingen, he requested, in 1889, that Halle permit him to teach Old and New Testament there.⁶⁷ Try though they might, Halle's faculty of theology could not refuse Friedrich Althoff,

60. On Meyer's relationship to universal history, on the one hand, and mid-century liberalism, on the other, see Suzanne Marchand, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism: Albrecht Dieterich, Richard Reitzenstein, and the Religious Turn in *Fin-De-Siècle* German Classical Studies" *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 46, Supplement 79: "Out of Arcadia" (2003) 129–60; cf. idem, *German Orientalism*, esp. 206–11.

61. See Reinhard Kratz, "Die Entstehung des Judentums. Zur Kontroverse zwischen E. Meyer und J. Wellhausen" *ZTK* 95 (1998) 167–84 [repr. in idem, *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* (FAT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004) 6–22]; idem, "Eyes and Spectacles: Wellhausen's Method of Higher Criticism" *JTS* n.s. 60 (2009) 381–402; Marchand, *German Orientalism*, 178–88, 206–11; cf. also Greßmann's unsigned, undated petition in Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 73–74; cf. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 80–81. Kratz's own preferences may emerge in his incisive portrayal, however, when he labels the disposition of Gunkel et al. as bias and offers no such evaluation for Wellhausen's approach (idem, "Eyes and Spectacles," 395).

62. Gunkel to Meyer, March 16, 1901, in Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 81.

63. See Johannes Schreiber, "Wellhausen und Wrede: Eine methodische Differenz" *ZNW* 80 (1989) 24–41; cf. also Hans Rollmann, "Paulus alienus: William Wrede on Comparing Jesus and Paul" in *From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare* (ed. Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd; Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984) 23–45. I would like to thank Hans Rollmann for providing me with bibliography on Wrede.

64. Cf. Paulsen, "Traditionsgeschichtliche Methode und religionsgeschichtliche Schule," 29n.37; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 82.

65. Wellhausen to Heinrich Weinel, October 10, 1905, in Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 103. In a 1919 memorandum, Gunkel declared the Wellhausen School "enjoyed a disproportionately long period in which it could develop its thoughts, establish an entire system and promote [it] in handbooks, train students, and place [them] in newly vacant positions" (see n. 71 below). Hammann rightly observes the myopia of this assertion, however, which neglected due consideration of government concerns.

66. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 30–40.

67. Ibid., 49–58.

a demigod in Prussia's Ministry of Culture, who intervened on his behalf. So it was that Gunkel went to Halle, as private lecturer.⁶⁸ Five years later, in 1894, he was promoted to associate professor [*extraordinarius*], but he occupied a comparable position in Berlin the following year, likely by dint of Harnack's intervention.⁶⁹ During his years in Berlin, misfortune befell him time and time again. Departmental politics precluded his promotion to full professor, in 1898, despite the apparent will of some faculty members. (Wolf Wilhelm Graf Baudissin assumed the post in 1900.) Two years later, he stood first on the list for a full position in Marburg, but the Prussian Ministry of Culture passed it to Budde instead—a turn of events Johannes Weiß, a onetime colleague of Gunkel's in Göttingen and a supporter of his in Marburg, read as Prussian attempts at atonement, since Budde's previous home lay in the Alsace city of Strasbourg. Nor did the year 1901 see a change in his tides of fortune. Ranking him only third, Jena chose to advance an internal nominee (Bruno Baentsch). Although Berlin weighed application, in 1906, to the Ministry of Culture for a second full position intended explicitly for Gunkel, the prospect never did come to fruition.

In 1907, he finally seized his ordinarius, as successor to Stade in Gießen at the age of 45.⁷⁰ Although the faculty had intended to seize a more prominent persona to replace the lauded Stade, the second round of the appointment process gave Gunkel a proper chance, and favorable assessments from Budde along with Carl Heinrich Cornill helped secure him *primo loco* and the position in the end. For nearly thirteen years, Gunkel resided there, though he did desire escape. The hope was to expand the sphere of his own influence. Indeed, he endured almost as much trouble securing an ordinarius as already full professor as he had had while still associate. Institutional obstacles continued to stand in his way. Heidelberg sought to appoint him, in the year 1909, in an attempt to raise its profile and become a second Marburg, but the government in Baden acquiesced to churchly pressures and opted for a conservative instead (Georg Beer). Only four years later, such politics would foil him once again. In 1913, Kiel placed Gunkel first; the Prussian Ministry, however, yielded to regional church demands and selected a different candidate (Ernst Sellin). The same year, Tübingen classed him second to Alfred Bertholet, who won the academic spoils. When Bertholet went on to Göttingen but only one year later, Gunkel found himself then standing atop the list: a government preference for locals seems to have

68. The faculty did avoid, however, appointing him associate professor at once (*ibid.*, 50–52).

69. *Ibid.*, 93–105.

70. *Ibid.*, 199–206, 309–21, cf. also 290–91.

dashed his hopes there, too. (It was Paul Volz who profited from such priorities.) After years of disappointment, he finally had an ally. His memorandum on the state of Old Testament scholarship within the bounds of Prussia found a sympathetic reader in Carl Heinrich Becker, who rose within the Ministry of Culture at the end of the Great War.⁷¹ Becker battled the local faculty and secured him the first vacant *professur* in Prussia, in Halle, in 1920.⁷² The Ministry's heavy hand in this particular appointment only fanned the flames already well ablaze in Protestant church politics, igniting debate across the churchly periodicals. Although some members of the Marburg faculty wanted Gunkel as Budde's replacement, to be filled the following year, his would-be predecessor objected with nothing less than fury—an (alleged) academic squabble having driven the two apart.⁷³ Thus, Gunkel stayed in Halle for the rest of his career, until 1932. The experience of Gunkel, a rather common story for the younger generation, provides a considerable contrast to the age of ascent for Stade, Harnack, and Wellhausen (27–28) as well as Meyer (30), Jülicher (32), and Budde (39), to name but only a few.⁷⁴ In the end, Gunkel fell victim—though not an innocent one—to academic feuding, ecclesiastical strife, and government concerns. To overcome these obstacles, he turned to other venues.

As a final field of contrast, Wellhausen and Gunkel conceptualized their efforts in radically different terms. The former's entire oeuvre may have its clearest expression in the name he chose for a personal series of studies: "Skizzen und Vorarbeiten," i.e., sketches and spadework.⁷⁵ With a resolved dedication to more technical

71. This 1919 statement, entitled "Über die gegenwärtige Lage der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft in Preußen," was never published, however: see Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 312–14. I owe thanks to Konrad Hammann for kindly offering access to this missive. With respect to Becker's role in promoting cultural history, see Marchand, *German Orientalism*, 361–67.

72. Greßmann benefited from Becker's efforts the following year, receiving an open post in Berlin: cf. Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 223–26. According to the plan, however, Greßmann was to go to Halle and Gunkel to Berlin—"to be rewarded for his merits. It was supposed to make atonement for his poor treatment earlier" (*ibid.*, 224).

73. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 288, 323–24. On Gunkel's relationship with Budde, see also *ibid.*, 173–74, 196–97.

74. Although Wellhausen did abandon Greifswald's theology faculty and assumed a position of lower rank on Halle's philosophical faculty, the initiative was his own. On greater structural shifts, see, inter alia, Christian von Ferber, *Die Entwicklung des Lehrkörpers der deutschen Universitäten und Hochschulen, 1864–1914* (Untersuchungen zur Lage der Deutschen Hochschullehrer III; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956); Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany, 1700–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980) esp. 288–321; and Konrad H. Jarausch, "Universität und Hochschule," in *Handbuch der deutschen Bildungsgeschichte*, Vol 4: 1870–1918: *Von der Reichsgründung bis zum Ende des Ersten Weltkriegs* (ed. Christa Berg; Munich: Beck, 1991) 313–45, which provides substantial bibliography.

75. Cf. Wellhausen to Reimer, February 4, 1884, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 140–41. In an earlier letter to Smith, he had considered the title "Beiträge zur Erforschung der Geschichte und Literatur der Hebraeer und Araber" (February 6, 1883, in *ibid.*, 117–18).

endeavors, Wellhausen closed his *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams* with the simple declaration, “I hope to have hammered home that historiography floats in the air without such prolegomena.”⁷⁶ True, he would later serve as advisor for “Quellen der Religionsgeschichte”—a project commissioned by the Königliche Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen and published jointly by J.C. Hinrichs and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht—but this particular series centered on printing the sources themselves, and he himself only counseled for the section on Islam.⁷⁷ Wellhausen fully endorsed the analytical enterprise, manifest in his full support of lexica and the like, yet he firmly believed synthetic ventures were far too premature. Furthermore, he abhorred more popular work. Hans Liebeschütz thus describes his “almost ascetic conception of scholarship.”⁷⁸ He declined Hans Delbrück's request to contribute, on occasion, to the *Preußische Jahrbücher*, in 1886. “I have absolutely no desire to let my *practical* thoughts be published,” he confessed to his publisher, Ernst Reimer. “I have already enough to do with the publication of the theoretical.”⁷⁹ As another example of many, Wellhausen rebuffed participation at the founding of Althoff's *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik*, in the year 1907. “I cannot popularize,” he wrote Harnack of the affair.⁸⁰ Wellhausen also had little need to avail himself of these organs, for he was established early on. Even more, no matter how much he might have downplayed his position, he enjoyed a privileged status within the upper echelons of the academy as well as the Prussian regime.⁸¹ He died a mid-century liberal devoted to empirical research and averse to any (overt) speculation, theorization, or generalization.

76. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur ältesten Geschichte des Islams* (Skizzen und Vorarbeiten 6; Berlin: Reimer, 1899), 146.

77. Program of “Quellen der Religionsgeschichte,” July 1, 1913, in Archiv der Göttinger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Unternehmungen der Akademie Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Herausgabe der “Quellen der Religionsgeschichte,” 1913–21 (Sign. Scient 167, Vol 1); see also Roland Deines, *Die Pharisäer: ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz* (WUNT 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) 406n.5; cf. also Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 837. Kind thanks go to Peter Porzig for granting me access to this program. For fuller discussion on how Wellhausen conceived of his own endeavors, see Paul Michael Kurtz, “Kaiser, Christ, and Canaan: The Religion of Israel in Wilhelmine Germany, 1871–1918” (PhD dissertation, University of Göttingen, forthcoming).

78. Hans Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber* (SchrLBI 17; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1967) 250.

79. Wellhausen to Ernst Reimer, ca. January 1886, in idem, *Briefe*, 190–91.

80. Wellhausen to Harnack, May 26, 1907, in Wellhausen, *Briefe*, 517–18. He also disliked the colleagues.

81. On Wellhausen's position within the circles of power, see Paul Michael Kurtz, “The Way of War: Wellhausen, Israel, and Bellicose *Reiche*” *ZAW* 127 (2015): 1–19.

Gunkel spent substantial time and effort in promoting his own work—as with that of his contingent.⁸² Apart from academic journals, he distributed his diverse material in churchly periodicals, culture magazines, and even daily papers—albeit with varying regularity—from *Die Christliche Welt*, *Kirchliche Gegenwart*, and *Deutsch-evangelisch. Monatsblätter für den gesamten deutschen Protestantismus* through *Preußische Jahrbücher*, *Internationale Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst und Technik*, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, and *Deutsche Literaturzeitung für Kritik der Internationalen Wissenschaft* to *Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Deutsche Rundschau*, and *Tägliche Rundschau*, to enumerate some but not all.⁸³ Such attempts to popularize proceeded from at least three basic causes, all closely interwoven.

First, he needed the funds. Coinciding with his years spent in Berlin, much of this engagement came before his *ordinarius*. Gunkel's correspondence, especially with his publisher, reveals his (in the very least perceived as) dire circumstances even after his full position. Reprints and revisions had pecuniary force.⁸⁴ Reciprocally, he avoided certain organs with low honoraria. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* hence hosted few essays of his. He once reflected to Harnack, "Certainly, I could have accomplished more by far if a German government had given me an adequate salary and I did not have to work my whole life for daily bread."⁸⁵ Yet beyond the stick of funding, Gunkel also had some carrots: namely, influence and effect.

Second, Gunkel and his cohort sought to maximize their impact. Some entrepreneurial publishers proved quite happy to oblige. In fact, many channels for the

82. On this aspect of his undertakings, see, specifically, Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, esp. 81–90; Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, esp. 148–61; more generally, see Marchand, *German Orientalism*, 259–67; Nittert Janssen, *Theologie fürs Volk: Der Einfluß der Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule auf die Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Studien und Texte zur Religionsgeschichtlichen Schule 4; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1999); idem, "Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung. Breitenwirkung durch Vorträge und 'gemeinverständliche' Veröffentlichungen," in *Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule in Göttingen: Eine Dokumentation* (ed. Gerd Lüdemann and Martin Schröder; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987) 109–36; for a particularly rich investigation, see Ruth Conrad, *Lexikonpolitik: Die erste Auflage der RGG im Horizont protestantischer Lexikographie* (AKG 97; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); cf. also Matthias Wolfes, *Protestantische Theologie und Moderne Welt: Studien zur Geschichte der liberalen Theologie nach 1918* (TBT 102; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999) 29–71. The consumption history of such theological/biblical literature merits far more attention, from price points and print runs through intended and actual audiences to advertisements featured on publications and distribution locations.

83. See Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 100–01, 151, cf. 394–99.

84. Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 150–51. Throughout his private correspondence, Wellhausen persistently bemoaned his own income, as well. His contributions to *Encyclopedia Britannica* had financial motives, too: see, e.g., Wellhausen to Charlotte Limpricht, January 12, 1883, in idem, *Briefe*, 113–14; Wellhausen to Theodor Mommsen, January 12, 1881, in *ibid.*, 80.

85. Gunkel to Harnack, May 17, 1917, in Hammann, *Hermann Gunkel*, 150.

popular work of Gunkel had not been open long. Previously called *Evangelisch-Lutherisches Gemeindeblatt für die gebildeten Glieder der evangelischen Kirche* (1886), *Die Christliche Welt* changed its name in 1888, the organ assumed by Mohr in 1897, which would reestablish a residence in Tübingen in 1899.⁸⁶ Side by side with Mohr, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht was an early advocate of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, and both profited quite handsomely from their interest and investment.⁸⁷ Thus, Mohr launched the journal *Theologische Rundschau* (1897), issued the sequence “Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte” (1896), and secured the series “Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher für die deutsche christliche Gegenwart” (1906)—previously published by Gebauer-Schwetschke (1904), which Bousset’s brother had helmed as general manager—to say nothing of RGG (1908). Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht started the circular *Monatsblätter für den Evangelischen Religionsunterricht* (1908) and printed the series “FRLANT,” (1903), “Schriften des Neuen Testaments” (1904), and “Schriften des Alten Testaments” (1911), too. Gunkel’s work appeared in many of these channels, which flowed to students, women, school teachers, and the *moyenne bourgeoisie* more broadly. Not only academic slight but also positive ambition drove Gunkel to these outlets: he was convinced he had something to say the public sorely needed to hear.

Third, popularization came with the theological territory, at least in the eyes of Gunkel and his ilk. “This activity I consider part of my occupation,” he penned Ruprecht in 1910.⁸⁸ When engaging Gunkel’s writings, many a Bible scholar ignores his audience and aim, a public and objective shown in publication choices. Whether RGG (for which he served as editor and author), “Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher” (which held *Das Märchen im Alten Testament*), or “SAT”—aka, tellingly, “Gegenwartsbibel,” “Göttinger Bibel,” “Laienbibel,” or “Lehrerbibel”—(in which *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen [Das erste Buch Mosis]* materialized and several studies of his introduced Hans Schmidt’s *Die großen Propheten*), much of his work aspired to a wider reading public. Initially, *Ausgewählte Psalmen* came in mainstream papers,

86. The journal altered its name on numerous occasions: see Johanna Jantsch, ed., *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Adolf von Harnack und Martin Rade: Theologie auf dem öffentlichen Markt* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996) 21–26; Wolfes, *Protestantische Theologie und Moderne Welt*, 51–56; see further Johannes Rathje, *Die Welt des freien Protestantismus: Ein Beitrag zur deutsch-evangelischen Geistesgeschichte dargestellt an Leben und Werk von Martin Rade* (Stuttgart: Klotz, 1952) esp. 96–97; Oskar Rühle, *Der theologische Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): Rückblicke und Ausblicke* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1926) 48–50, 73.

87. Though sharing editors and authors, these publishers—and others—often worked in competition rather than in tandem: see Conrad, *Lexikonpolitik*, esp. 213n.124, 224–28, cf. subsequent dynamics at 436–43; see also Janssen, “Popularisierung der theologischen Forschung,” 125.

88. Gunkel to Ruprecht, April 15, 1910, in Klatt, *Hermann Gunkel*, 84. The quote continued, “for one may not, of course, leave the field alone to charlatans.”

too. All these media aimed at a general yet very specific public: namely, *Bildungsbürgertum*, the educated middle classes. They bloomed from an overt theological project rooted in *Kulturprotestantismus*, especially in its manifestation at the end of the long 19th century.⁸⁹ Gunkel began a book on Genesis—and thus the series “SAT”—with the following panegyric:

Bible, wonderful Bible, Teacher of humanity, Bedrock of our spiritual being! You are like that glorified city divine upon the towering world mountain, which lies near to the heavens! The nations behold you and drink from the living water of your streams! Entire generations may turn away from you and disdain you because they do not know you; time and again humanity comes back to you.⁹⁰

Beyond bringing biblical scholarship to the broader public, he wanted to recalibrate such scholarship to the very nature of religion. As but one example of many, Gunkel once declared, “Our people thirst for your words about *religion* and its *history*! Do not be so timid and do not believe that you must conceal from the laity what you have discerned! How do you expect to have trust when you avoid the ultimate question? Now there is still time. Soon it will be too late. But if you keep silent, then the blatherers will speak.”⁹¹ This “outcry” for religious restoration was only one of myriad tokens of the larger sense of crisis that pervaded the professorate towards the end of the 19th century.

Apart from any individual, intellectual, or institutional opposition—and most importantly of all—the Wellhausen–Gunkel variance involved much broader social forces. The tremors quaking biblical research accorded with the powerful earthquake rocking society in general and humanities in particular at the *fin de siècle*. Indeed, cultural historians have long recognized the 1880s generation, a phenomenon Suzanne Marchand has explored in rather dazzling detail.⁹² As she herself contends, “these

89. The *locus classicus* is Gangolf Hübinger, *Kulturprotestantismus und Politik: Zum Verhältnis von Liberalismus und Protestantismus im wilhelminischen Deutschland* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1994); see also Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, “Protestantische Theologie in der Gesellschaft des Kaiserreichs,” in *Profile des neuzeitlichen Protestantismus II/1: Kaiserreich* (ed. idem; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1992) 12–117.

90. Gunkel, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen (Das erste Book Mosis)* (SAT I/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911) v, cf. esp. vii.

91. Gunkel, “Ein Notschrei aus Anlaß des Buches: Himmelsbild und Weltanschauung im Wandel der Zeiten. Von Troels-Lund, Leipzig, Teubner 1899” *ChW* 14 (1900) 58–61, at 60; see also Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, “Rettung der Persönlichkeit,” in *Kultur und Kulturwissenschaften um 1900: Krise der Moderne und Glaube an die Wissenschaft* (ed. Rüdiger vom Bruch, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, and Gangolf Hübinger; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1989) 103–31.

92. See Suzanne Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, esp. 212–51; idem, “Philhellenism and the *Furor Orientalis*” *MIH* 1 (2004) 331–58; idem, “From Liberalism to Neoromanticism”; cf. also idem, “Popularizing the Orient in *Fin De Siècle* Germany” *IHR*, Special Issue: “An Empire of Vision: German Art and Visual Culture, 1848–1919” 17 (2007): 175–202; idem “German Orientalism and the Decline of the West” *PAPS* 145 (2001): 465–73. Marchand provides the clearest lens for understanding any Wellhausen–Gunkel dichotomy.

clashes were neither simply personal, nor exclusively ideological, but were also the product of the rapidly changing public sphere and scholarly scene of the 1880s to 1920s."⁹³ In terms of academia, texts were pouring in from the East and being deciphered back at home. Within the public province, these rumblings thundered all the more. This rather boisterous timeframe witnessed urban centers bustle and industry loudly boomed. It saw social democrats rise in politics while women and workers and Catholics and Jews all entered the public arena. It watched churches lose their influence and schools sustain reform. It observed an outbreak of über-nationalism and then gaped as war demolished Europe. Amidst the blur of bicycles, the swell of coffeehouses, and the wave of periodicals, German mandarins saw their once tight grip on culture quickly slip between their fingers. Thus came the cries for renewal resounding throughout academia's halls—with jeremiads against the sins of a previous epoch. Regardless of their accuracy, accusations of positivism and materialism lambasted the efforts of mid-century research. Fathoming these deeply troubled waters, Fritz K. Ringer writes, "In history as in other disciplines, the widespread sense of social and cultural crisis produced a reorientation in the methods and purposes of learning. Thus from 1890 on, the substantive concerns of German scholarship were inextricably intertwined with the mandarins' passionate interest in a revival of 'Idealism.'"⁹⁴ The Wellhausen–Gunkel antithesis was therefore symptomatic of an endemic diagnosed in German culture at the end of the 19th century—only one of many manifestations across the human sciences. Accordingly, their friction corresponded to the broader shift from liberalism to neo-romanticism and all that this upheaval brought with it.

Rather than train their focus upon royal-priestly scholars waging war with mental blades, practitioners of Hebrew Bible would do well to compose their histories with an eye on the grove itself. For the long 19th century in Germanophone lands, specifically, such a setting would include, in the very least, shifts in academic culture, effects of professional politics, affairs of appointment procedures, policies of administrative structures (stately and churchly alike), impacts of personal rivalries,

93. Idem, "From Liberalism to Neoromanticism," 130.

94. Fritz K. Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890–1933* (repr. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1990) 304. Elsewhere in this radiant volume, Ringer writes, "...the mandarins were never content to cultivate their own gardens. They thought of themselves as a priestly caste, and they meant to legislate ultimate values to a peasant population. That was their model; it has to be assumed, if any of their *fin de siècle* anxieties are to be understood" (ibid., 268); cf. Graf, "Rettung der Persönlichkeit"; see also Georg G. Iggers' classic *The German Conception of History: The National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present* (rev. ed.; Middleton: Wesleyan University Press, 1983).

choices in publication, and—to move from the non-cognitive to the externalist, more properly—changes in theory and method across the human sciences. The same skills Bible scholars hone to read their texts in context should also be applied to write the history of their field. As with the scholars themselves, the problems they saw and methods they used were shaped in time and space, with interests and assumptions built into their very core: protagonists, priorities, and projects were not detached from circumstance. Scrutinizing historiographic discord, Robert Oden apprehends the cardinal conviction of Gunkel: “[the] failure to go backward far enough behind the historical sources meant that Wellhausen was, in the end, *not* a true historian.”⁹⁵ Debate over proper method ultimately expressed a time-bound discrepancy in historical understanding, from object to objective—a perceived disparity at minimum. Methodological selection still implies such premises. Semblance notwithstanding, the world of *modus operandi* is not one “in which grins [hang] about without the cat.”⁹⁶ Beyond the pursuits of modern history—and apart from any antiquarian interest—critical interrogation of foundational research exposes why biblical scholars do what they do in the manner they do and which presumptions may remain inbuilt. This line of inquiry moves from descriptive questions of who, what, when, and where to analytical assessments of the more difficult how and why: how and why, for instance, theories, methods, and figures attained the dominance they now enjoy. Like the biblical texts themselves, any academic orthodoxy did not arise from nowhere. Production, from this perspective, is even more important than product, “principle” but one of many dimensions.

95. Oden, *The Bible Without Theology*, 33–34; cf. Buss, *Biblical Form Criticism in Its Context*, 210n.6.

96. Michel Foucault, *Herculine Barbin: Being the Recently Discovered Memoirs of a Nineteenth-Century Hermaphrodite* (trans. Richard McDougall; New York: Pantheon, 1980) xiii.