

Disappearing Jews: National Consciousness & the Peripheralization of Judaism by Ancient Historians in 19th-Century Germania¹

Paul Michael Kurtz, University of Cambridge & Queens' College

Faculty of Divinity, West Road, Cambridge, CB3 9BS, UK

pmk43@cam.ac.uk

+44 (0)1223 763 858

Keywords

Ancient Judaism | Classics | Historiography | Nationalism | Scholarship | Germany

Abstract

This essay considers why Jewish antiquity largely fell outside the purview of ancient historians in the Germanies for nearly half a century, between 1820 and 1880, and examines the nature of those portraits that did, in fact, arise. It seeks to understand the discussions of Jewish antiquity in this half century against the background of those cultural values that were consolidating across the German states. Firstly, the analysis considers those reasons why so little attention was granted to Jewish history by ancient historians in the first place, as opposed to its relative prominence before ca. 1820. Second, the essay examines representations of ancient Judaism as fashioned by those historians who did consider the subject in this period. Surveying works composed not only for the upper echelons of scholarship but also for adolescents, women, and the laity, it scrutinizes a series of arguments advanced and assumptions embedded in universal histories, histories of the ancient world, textbooks of history, and dedicated histories to either Greece or Rome. In fine, the paper asserts the Jewish past did not conform to the values of cultural ascendancy, political autonomy, national identity, and religious liberty increasingly hallowed across the Germanies of the 19th century, on the one hand, and inscribed into the very enterprise of historiography, on the other. The perceived national and political failures of ancient Jews – alongside the ethnic or religious ones discerned by others – thus made antique Judaism an unattractive object of study in this period.

Total word count

12,698

1. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 749628. I am grateful to Nathan MacDonald, the Faculty of Divinity, and the University of Cambridge for supporting my work in an ideal setting. My gratitude further extends to the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) for appointing me a Postdoctoral Fellow and to Ghent University, especially Danny Praet and the Department of Philosophy & Moral Sciences, for sponsoring that rôle. Earlier versions of this essay were presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and the American Academy of Religion (2017), in the Old Testament Senior Seminar of the Cambridge Faculty of Divinity (2018), and in the Modern Religious History Seminar of the Oxford Faculty of History (2018). For their incisive and meticulous feedback on the paper, I must express deep thanks to Annelies Lannoy and Rebecca Van Hove.

Disappearing Jews: National Consciousness & the Peripheralization of Judaism by Ancient Historians in 19th-Century Germania

Keywords

Ancient Judaism | Classics | Historiography | Nationalism | Scholarship | Germany

Abstract

This essay considers why Jewish antiquity largely fell outside the purview of ancient historians in the Germanies for nearly half a century, between 1820 and 1880, and examines the nature of those portraits that did, in fact, arise. It seeks to understand the discussions of Jewish antiquity in this half century against the background of those cultural values that were consolidating across the German states. Firstly, the analysis considers those reasons why so little attention was granted to Jewish history by ancient historians in the first place, as opposed to its relative prominence before ca. 1820. Second, the essay examines representations of ancient Judaism as fashioned by those historians who did consider the subject in this period. Surveying works composed not only for the upper echelons of scholarship but also for adolescents, women, and the laity, it scrutinizes a series of arguments advanced and assumptions embedded in universal histories, histories of the ancient world, textbooks of history, and dedicated histories to either Greece or Rome. In fine, the paper asserts the Jewish past did not conform to the values of cultural ascendancy, political autonomy, national identity, and religious liberty increasingly hallowed across the Germanies of the 19th century, on the one hand, and inscribed into the very enterprise of historiography, on the other. The perceived national and political failures of ancient Jews – alongside the ethnic or religious ones discerned by others – thus made antique Judaism an unattractive object of study in this period.

Introduction

The markets of intellectual capital seemed shaky in the mid 19th century for those with a stock of expertise in ancient Israel and Judaism. A defensive note was struck when, in 1850, Protestant biblical scholar Andreas Gottlieb Hoffmann (1796–1864) felt compelled to preserve the importance of this people in an article composed for the *General Encyclopedia of Sciences and Arts*: “Although the Hebrews have not at any time showcased episodes of universal history in their political relationships,” he wrote, “their history nonetheless reliably belongs to the most remarkable and most interesting parties of ancient history.” Hoffmann offered a theory as to why this “Hebrew-Jewish history” – i.e., the continuous past of a single people, whose nominal division reflected only one of chronology – had been neglected by other experts in the study of antiquity: “And it would therefore be very much astonishing that the historians in the discipline [of ancient history] have treated it so much like Cinderella or altogether left it aside, if we did not know that the distinctive difficulties it has may well have scared the majority away from

it.”² Clashing with the classicists, the semitist asserted the prominence this ancient nation merited in any history of the world. Consent though Hoffmann might that the Hebrews boasted neither earth-shattering wars, artistic culture, scientific achievement, practical discoveries, nor far-reaching trade, he claimed, like so many others, that Israel was to religion what Greece and Rome had been to *Bildung*. If indeed the modern age still betrayed this intellectual patrimony, as affirmed by Hoffmann, writings on antiquity appeared to indicate Hebrew-Jewish history was being undervalued.

This essay considers why Jewish antiquity largely fell outside the purview of ancient historians in the Germanies for nearly half a century, between 1820 and 1880, and examines the nature of those portraits that did, in fact, arise. Certainly, no few studies have scrutinized the writing of Jewish history in scholarship on the Bible, the Orient, and Judaica throughout the 19th century by Protestant academics in particular.³ Such inquiries have, *inter alia*, detected real animosity toward Judaism – religious, ethnic, cultural – and further discerned a connection between anti-Judaism and Christian anti-clericalism. Yet constructions of the Jewish past by historians of classical antiquity have seen far less inspection. This want may well reflect the data, given the widening division of academic labor in the specialization, institutionalization, and professionalization of

2. Andreas Gottlieb Hoffmann, “Hebräer,” in *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste in alphabetischer Folge von genannten Schriftstellern bearbeitet*, Vol. 2.3, *H-N: Harrich-Hebung* (Leipzig: Gleditsch, 1828), 307–29, at 309; see, too, this article’s extensive counterpart, written by Selig Cassel, who soon after publication converted to Christianity, changed his name to Paulus, and became a missionary to the Jews: Cassel, “Juden (Geschichte),” in *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste in alphabetischer Folge von genannten Schriftstellern bearbeitet*, Vol. 2.27, *H-N: Juden-Jüdische Literatur* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1850), 1–238. Hoffmann was not the first to make this claim: cf. review of *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes von Abraham an bis auf Jerusalems Zerstörung, für denkende Leser der Bibel*, by [Christian Gottlieb Kühnöl], *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 2, no. 114 (1792): 227–29, at 227–28 – a work also translated into Dutch as *Geschiedenis des Joodschen Volks, (voor denkende Leezers van den Bijbel)* (Dordrecht: de Leeuw and Krap, 1792).

3. So, *inter alia*, Yaacov Shavit and Mordechai Eran, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn: From Holy Scripture to the Book of Books, A History of Biblical Culture and the Battles over the Bible in Modern Judaism*, trans. Chaya Naor (Studia Judaica 38; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007); Christian Wiese, *Challenging Colonial Discourse: Jewish Studies and Protestant Theology in Wilhelmine Germany*, trans. idem and Barbara Harschav (Studies in European Judaism 10; Leiden: Brill, 2005); Susannah Heschel, *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus* (Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1998); Roland Deines, *Die Pharisäer. Ihr Verständnis im Spiegel der christlichen und jüdischen Forschung seit Wellhausen und Graetz* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 101; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

disciplines in the period. Still, these figures do supply considerable leverage on the values, the stakes, the concerns, and the anxieties of their age, for they – as opposed to, say, specialists in the Old or New Testament and scholars in the history of theology or the church – not only had little empirical or disciplinary necessity to consider Jewish history, whether to engage or to dismiss it, but also enjoyed increasing clout in the cultural and educational institutions across the consolidating German lands. These classicists both structured and themselves were structured by distinctive conceptions of the past. Furthermore, by focusing on the history of Judaism between the Achaemenid and Roman empires specifically, this investigation gains two important points of purchase on such historiography: first, these historians were less compelled to have a favorable disposition towards these periods insofar as the Protestant tradition had less at stake after the fall of the ancient Israel (whereby Catholics maintained 1 and 2 Maccabees, for instance, as part of their own canon); secondly, the contrast between these periods of autonomy and dependence opened a space for more overt reflection on the political dimensions of Judaism. These constructions of ancient Judaism thus betrayed a nationalist as well as Protestant inflection of historiography itself.

The standard works on the topic, written several decades ago by Hans Liebeschütz and Christhard Hoffmann, prove indispensable to the task insofar as they deliver richly detailed portraits of major writers on Jewish antiquity and afford a nuanced analysis of their writings.⁴ True to his title, *Judaism in the German View of History from Hegel to Max Weber*, Liebeschütz inspects the subject of Judaism in conceptions of history among German intellectuals ranging from Hegel to Weber and centers his study on the modern concerns that impacted the portrayal of the ancient past. Hoffmann includes several of these luminaries but encompasses still others, including Jewish scholars, as he expands the scope into the Second World War. In the process, though, such a focus on figures – for all its interpretive power – tends to blur the larger questions that were defining cultural history, on the one hand, and animating the human sciences more broadly, on the other, beyond contemporaneous debates specifically on Jews and Judaism

4. Hans Liebeschütz, *Das Judentum im deutschen Geschichtsbild von Hegel bis Max Weber* (Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 17; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1967); Christhard Hoffmann, *Juden und das Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Studies in Judaism in Modern Times 9; Leiden: Brill, 1988); idem, “Ancient Jewry—Modern Questions: German Historians of Antiquity on the Jewish Diaspora,” *Illinois Classical Studies* 20 (1995): 191–207.

in the 19th century. The structure of a portrait gallery also overshadows those historiographic trends at times recorded by Hoffmann and Liebeschütz yet frequently eclipsed by intellectual biography. Moreover, their strong analytical focus on those at the top of the ivory tower does limit a sense of just how deep the foundation of historiography truly ran, of how fundamental specific questions and concerns, particular preferences and perspectives were in mainstream understandings of the past. This study's inclusion of secondary, now forgotten figures and of histories that targeted the broader educated bourgeoisie expands the scope of sources for work on ancient Judaism – already in somewhat short supply for the period – and thereby reveals the prevalence of values built into writings on the past.⁵

The essay at hand therefore seeks to understand the – albeit relatively small and tangential – discussions of Jewish antiquity in this half century, between 1820 and 1880, against the background of those cultural values that were consolidating across the German states. Firstly, the analysis considers those reasons why so little attention was granted to Jewish history by ancient historians in the first place, as opposed to its relative prominence before ca. 1820. Without suggesting any mono- (or rather dual) causality, the paper contends the rise of nationalist consciousness in the wake of Napoleon, on the one hand, and the history of disciplinary divisions in the Germanies, on the other, became two major factors in the treatment – or non-treatment – of antique Judaism. The question of non-treatment ultimately converges with more recent theorizations of space and silence not as neutral, apolitical, or absence but rather social constructions implicated in social sanctioning as well as reflections on the transfer and nontransfer of knowledge between colony and metropole, which interrogate the implications of suppression and not-knowing.⁶ Second, the essay examines representations of ancient Judaism as

5. Several other avenues also lie at the ready. Comparing portraits of Hebrews, Israelites, and Jews with those of Greeks or Romans would surely yield a real contrast in many respects, but another analytical move would have to connect the historiography of these ancient pasts to the German present. Alternatively, juxtaposing scholars' statements in their academic writings with those in other venues – whether private correspondence, reviews, or opinion pieces – could potentially suggest a resonance between views on past and present, although such an operation would still demand great interpretive care to assess audience, aim, and any performativity and thus avoid any mere projection of present values onto the ancient past, an all-too-simple one-to-one correspondence.

6. Cf., e.g., Jay Winter, "Thinking about silence," in *Shadows of War: A Social History of Silence in the Twentieth Century*, ed. idem, Efrat Ben-Ze'ev, and Ruth Ginio (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

fashioned by those historians who did consider the subject in this period. Surveying works composed not only for the upper echelons of scholarship but also for adolescents, women, and the laity, it scrutinizes a series of arguments advanced and assumptions embedded in universal histories, histories of the ancient world, textbooks of history, and dedicated histories to either Greece or Rome. In fine, the paper asserts the Jewish past did not conform to the values of cultural ascendancy, political autonomy, national identity, and religious liberty increasingly hallowed across the Germanies of the 19th century, on the one hand, and inscribed into the very enterprise of historiography, on the other. The perceived national and political failures of ancient Jews – alongside the ethnic or religious ones discerned by others – thus made antique Judaism an unattractive object of study in this period, thereby turning it, as Hoffmann said, into a Cinderella among classicists.

Minding the gap

Though the encyclopedia article by Andreas Gottlieb Hoffmann reckoned the harvest of Jewish history ripe and the laborers few, the field had, in fact, long been well cultivated. As the 18th century had become the 19th one, any number of theologians and historians, semitists and biblicists did continue to write on Jewish antiquity. After all, these were the days of Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752–1827), and Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette (1780–1849): figures who did much to set the intellectual trajectory for at least Germanophone scholarship on ancient Judaism into the 20th century – and arguably even unto the present day. Of course, the boundaries between such provinces of knowledge – between past and present, between theology and history, between language, literature, culture – were anything but impenetrable at the time. Both the Johann Gottfrieds personified the sort of polymathy so characteristic of Enlightenment intellectuals. With equal comfort Eichhorn could compose, inter alia, *General History of the Culture and Literature of Modern Europe* (1796–1799), *The French Revolution in Historical Overview* (1797), and *The Hebrew Prophets* (1816–1819), whilst the list of topics Herder did not address would likely be shorter than that of those he did.⁷ It was

2010), 3–31; Rebekka Habermas, “Lost in Translation: Transfer and Nontransfer in the Atakpame Colonial Scandal,” *The Journal of Modern History* 86 (2014): 47–80.

7. Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Cultur und Litteratur des neuen Europa*, 2 vols. (Geschichte der Künste und Wissenschaften seit der Wiederherstellung derselben bis an das Ende des

indeed an enlightening era for the study of ancient Judaism, one that helped to build the rocks of prior learning into a foundation for the modern scientification of erudition.

At the turn of the 19th century, no few writers on the ancient world had even dedicated volumes to specifically Jewish history. So historian Theodor Jakob Ditmar (1734–1791) published *History of the Israelites* in 1788; rhetorician and theologian Christian Gottlieb Kühnöl (1768–1841) issued *History of the Jewish People from Abraham onwards until the Destruction of Jerusalem* in 1791; and ethicist and biblicist Georg Lorenz Bauer (1755–1806) printed *Handbook of the History of the Hebrew Nation* between 1800 and 1804.⁸ The object of inquiry itself was something of a moving target. As these titles suggest, the terminology of Hebrew, Israelite, and Jew was not yet strictly periodized – a distinction ultimately sharpened with de Wette’s critical separation of “Hebraism” and “Judaism.”⁹ In like manner, the chronological limits of ancient Judaism – i.e., what did and did not count as “Jewish” history – ranged quite wildly as well. If such historiography could begin with Moses, Abraham, or even the creation of the world, it ended anywhere

achtzehnten Jahrhunderts; Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1796/1799); idem, *Die französische Revolution, in einer historischen Uebersicht*, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1797); idem, *Die hebräischen Propheten*, 3 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1816/1819). The fullest edition of Herder’s works came under the title *Johann Gottfried von Herders Sämmtliche Werke*, ed. Bernhard Suphan, 33 vols. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1877–1913).

8. Theodor Jakob Ditmar, *Geschichte der Israeliten bis auf den Cyrus, zur Ehre und Vertheidigung der Bibel und zur Berechtigung des Wolfenbüttelschen Fragmentisten, nebst einem Anhang, der die Alte Geschichte der Assyrer, Meder, Babylonier, Perser, Lydier, Phrygier, Hellenen, Pelasger und des Osiris enthält* (Berlin: Maurer, 1788); Christian Gottlieb Kühnöl, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes von Abraham an bis auf Jerusalems Zerstörung für denkende Leser der Bibel* (Leipzig: Junius, 1791); Georg Lorenz Bauer, *Handbuch der Geschichte der hebräischen Nation von ihrer Entstehung bis zur Zerstörung ihres Staats*, 2 vols. (Nürnberg: Monath & Kußler, 1800–1804). Kühnöl’s work was, in fact, published anonymously, and A.G. Hoffmann reported the rumor of its author being the Halle Pietist Georg Christian Knapp (1753–1825). Other works include the following: Wilhelm Scherer, *Die Geschichte der Israeliten vor Jesus, nach ihren heiligen Büchern für die Bedürfnisse unsrer Zeit*, 2 Vols (Zerbst: Füchsel, 1803–1804); Johann Jakob Heß, *Geschichte der Israeliten vor den Zeiten Jesu*, 12 vols. (Zurich: Orell, Geßner, and Fießli, 1776–88); Johannes Remond, *Versuch einer Geschichte der Ausbreitung des Judenthums von Cyrus bis auf den gänzlichen Untergang des Jüdischen Staats* (Leipzig: Crusius, 1789).

9. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht de Wette, *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmatik in ihrer historischen Entwicklung dargestellt*, Vol. 1, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments. Oder kritische Darstellung der Religionslehre des Hebraismus, des Judenthums und Urchristenthums. Zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen* (Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung, 1813). However, see already Heinrich Ehrenfried Warknekros, *Entwurf der hebräischen Altertümer, zum Gebrauch akademischer Vorlesungen* (Weimar: Hofmann, 1782), foreword.

from the fall of Judah (586 BCE), through the First Jewish–Roman War (73 CE) or – though perhaps less often – up to the Bar-Kokhba Revolt (132 CE). Whatever the center assigned, ancient Jewish history occupied many writers into the early 19th century. Beyond these works composed in German, translated ones – from Danish and American – generated enough interest to circulate on the book market as well.¹⁰

Besides such focused historiography, Judaism featured in volumes of a grander scope. Eichhorn himself produced not only histories expressly concerned with the Jewish past – as in his introductions to the Old and New Testaments – but he also included antique Judaism in his history of literature and in his history of the world.¹¹ Friedrich Schlegel (1772–1829) considered the subject with *On the Language and Wisdom of the Indians*.¹² Indeed, the Jews of antiquity traversed any number of inquiries into the past, motivated by a diversity of interests. They appeared in the history of the world composed by Friedrich Christoph Schlosser (1776–1861), in the historical geography of Greece and Rome by Konrad Mannert (1756–1834), and in the histories of ancient states and peoples composed by Johann Georg August Galletti (1750–1828) and by

10. From Danish, Ludvig Holberg, *Jüdische Geschichte, von Erschaffung der Welt bis auf gegenwärtige Zeiten*, 2 vols., trans. Georg August Detharding (Altona: Korte Brothers, 1747); Christian Bastholm, *Geschichte der Juden, von der Schöpfung der Welt an bis auf jezige Zeiten*, 2 vols., trans. Johann Friedrich Marcus (Leipzig: Beer, 1786). From American, Hannah Adams, *Die Geschichte der Juden, von der Zerstörung Jerusalems an bis auf die gegenwärtigen Zeiten*, 2 vols., trans. N.N. (Leipzig: Baumgartner, 1819–20). For further bibliography, cf. Ulrich Wyrwa, “Die europäischen Seiten der jüdischen Geschichtsschreibung: Eine Einführung,” in *Judentum und Historismus. Zur Entstehung der jüdischen Geschichtswissenschaft in Europa*, ed. Ulrich Wyrwa (Frankfurt: Campus, 2003), 9–36.

11. Cf. Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*; idem, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*; idem, *Weltgeschichte*, Vol. 1, *welcher die alte Geschichte von ihrem Anfang bis auf die Völkerwanderung enthält*, (Göttingen: Rosenbusch, 1799); idem, *Geschichte der Litteratur von ihrem Anfang bis auf die neuesten Zeiten*, Vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1805), published in the second edition as *Handbuch der Litteraturgeschichte des Alterthums und des Mittelalters* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1828).

12. Friedrich Schlegel, *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier. Ein Beitrag zur Begründung der Alterthumskunde, Nebst metrischen Uebersetzungen indischer Gedichte* (Heidelberg: Mohr und Zimmer, 1808), 196–219.

Heinrich Luden (1778–1847).¹³ As different facets of antiquity were written into books, they oft incorporated Jews and Judaism.

Between 1820 and 1880, however, this Jewish past was upstaged, if not set in the wings entirely, by classical historians – classical in both senses of the adjective: i.e., specialized in antique Greek and Latin culture and aligned, traditionally, with the discipline of history in the faculty of arts, as opposed to that of theology. Not until the *fin de siècle* did Judaism in its manifestations between the Achaemenid dynasty of Persia and Theodosian dynasty of Rome once again rise to anything approaching prominence – and even then, oft a dubious one – in the historiography composed by ancient historians. Perhaps the greatest example comes with Eduard Meyer’s (1855–1930) 1896 *The Genesis of Judaism* (and the subsequent debate that unfolded with orientalist Julius Wellhausen on the subject).¹⁴ When Hellenists Richard Reitzenstein (1861–1931) and Albrecht Dieterich (1866–1908) turned their attention to religion, they, too, focused on the history of Judaism, and the famed philologist Eduard Schwartz (1858–1940) also disentangled the divergent calculations of Easter among Jews and Christians.¹⁵ Yet like their Protestant

13. Friedrich Christoph Schlosser, *Universalhistorische Uebersicht der Geschichte der alten Welt und ihrer Cultur*, 9 vols. (Frankfurt am Main: Varrentrapp, 1826–1834); idem, *Weltgeschichte in zusammenhängender Erzählung*, Vol. 1, *Alte Geschichte bis zum Untergang des Weströmischen Reichs* (Frankfurt am Main: Varrentrapp, 1815), 25–44; Konrad Mannert, *Geographie der Griechen und Römer*, Vol. 6.1, *Arabien, Palästina, Phönicien, Syrien, Cypren* (Nürnberg: Grattenauer, 1799), esp. 205–53; Johann Georg August Galletti, *Geschichte der Staaten und Völker der alten Welt*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: Hartmann, 1822–23), esp. 1:60–123; Heinrich Luden, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Völker und Staaten*, Vol. 1, *Geschichte der Völker und Staaten des Alterthumes*, 2nd ed. (Jena: Frommann, 1819), esp. 58–80, 96–105.

14. So, inter alia, Eduard Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Eine historische Untersuchung* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1896); idem, *Julius Wellhausen und meine Schrift Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Eine Erwiderung* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1897); cf. also idem, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 5 vols. (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1884–1902); idem, *Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine. Dokumente einer jüdischen Gemeinde aus der Perserzeit und das älteste erhaltene Buch der Weltliteratur* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912).

15. See Suzanne Marchand, “From Liberalism to Neoromanticism: Albrecht Dieterich, Richard Reitzenstein, and the Religious Turn in *Fin-de-Siècle* German Classical Studies,” in *Out of Arcadia: Classics and Politics in Germany in the Age of Burckhardt, Nietzsche and Wilamowitz*, ed. Martin Ruehl and Ingo Gildenhard (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies Supplement 79; London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Studies, University of London, 2003), 129–60; Arnaldo Momigliano, “Religious History Without Frontiers: J. Wellhausen, U. Wilamowitz, and E. Schwartz,” *History and Theory* 21, no. 4, Beiheft 21: *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1982): 49–62. The work by Schwartz was *Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln* (Abhandlungen der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu

counterparts in studies theological, biblical, and oriental, even those academics in the classical kind who did explore Jewish antiquity oft betrayed a certain aversion to it, particularly Hellenistic Judaism.

One ought not claim, of course, that Jewish history went unwritten in this period. Indeed, research on ancient Judaism (including its relationship to Israel and Christianity) streamed from the quills of especially Protestant biblical and orientalist scholars before the 1880s. Witness the 1843 *History of the People of Israel until Christ* by Heinrich Ewald (1803–1875) or the 1869 *History of the People of Israel from the Beginning until the Conquest of Masada in the Year 72 After Christ* by Ferdinand Hitzig (1807–1875).¹⁶ So, too, Jewish scholars – many associated with the so-called *Wissenschaft des Judentums* and most relegated to positions outside the academy – pressed forth with a rigorous study of antique Judaism. One need only look at Isaak Markus Jost’s (1793–1860) nine-volume *History of the Israelites from the Time of the Maccabees up until our Days* or Heinrich Graetz’s (1817–1891) eleven-volume *History of the Jews: From the Most Ancient Times until the Present*.¹⁷ Part of this story, then, is that longer one of modern disciplines carving up which pieces of the past belonged to which bodies in which chairs of which departments – and which of those many pieces deserved any study at all.

If, as Christhard Hoffmann has observed, historians of classical antiquity hardly ever ruminated on the Jewish past in droves, some of them fed upon it nonetheless, yet

Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, n.s. 8.6; Berlin: Weidmann, 1905).

16. Heinrich Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus, in drei Bänden* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1843–59); Ferdinand Hitzig, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel von Anbeginn bis zur Eroberung Masada’s im Jahre 72 nach Christus, in zwei Theilen* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1869). Despite the subtitle, Ewald’s work expanded into multiple volumes even with the first edition. The work was also translated into English.

17. Isaak Markus Jost, *Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsre Tage*, 9 vols. (Berlin: Schlesinger, 1820–28), whereby he added further volumes later (Berlin: Schlesinger, 1846–47); Heinrich Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, 1st ed., 11 vols. (Leipzig: Leiner: 1853–74), which saw a rather complicated publication history in editions and translations, including abridgment as *Volkstümliche Geschichte der Juden*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: Leiner, 1888). Both authors wrote many other works on Jewish history, which went into various translations. As Ismar Schorsch remarks, “Not only was Jost the first Jew since Josephus to write a comprehensive history of his people, but more important, he was also among the first since Azariah de Rossi to risk using Josephus for the study of Jewish history” (Schorsch, “From Wolfenbüttel to Wissenschaft: The Divergent Paths of Isaak Markus Jost and Leopold Zunz,” *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 22, no. 1 (1977): 109–28, at 111).

they did so at certain points more than others.¹⁸ By and large, between 1820 and 1880 the field of Jewish antiquity saw relatively little cultivation by historians laboring in the past. The question, then, is not only where and when but also why and how that past was seized upon or not. In this way, the written and the unwritten pasts – or the pasts that ceased to be written – can illuminate the enterprise of writing history.

Nations of antiquity

It was, indeed, a truth self-evident among historians that not all ancient peoples were created equal. Through the late Enlightenment, the histories of ancient Greece and Rome – or, more precisely, select places, persons, and periods in those pasts – had gained significance across the upper and middle classes, and by the early 19th century they offered a powerful complex of alternative social, cultural, and political values. So Suzanne Marchand writes, “the Germans wished to see themselves as rediscoverers of a lost Arcadia and pioneers of a new kind of pedagogy. And the development of Germany’s national self-identification with the Greeks, precisely in its explicit rejection of the culture of ‘Augustan’ neoclassicism, did create a new complex of ideas and ambitions.”¹⁹ With Europe left shattered by the Napoleonic Wars, liberal and progressive movements once restricted by the church and crown now seized this very space – physical and intellectual alike – to source new foundations for reconstructing meaning and identity. What would become “classical” antiquity supplied these intellectuals and nationalists with alternative materials to build a cultural history for Europe distinct from the Pope and *ancien régimes* and to present their opponents as defenders of a feeble old world. This new ancient past therefore seemed to furnish a sound basis for the German nation, in contrast to the one that had just crumbled and that destabilized powers were seeking to reassemble. The 19th century was an era of new establishments and ones especially designed for revitalizing culture and reorganizing knowledge, as with the founding of the University of Berlin, in 1810. Through state engineering, a massive influx of money, and educational reforms, the ideals of *Bildung* were wed to powerful institutions

18. Cf. Hoffmann, *Juden und das Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, 40. Hoffmann defined the chronological scope of his inquiry based upon this very sparseness (*ibid.*, 6).

19. Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 4; cf. *idem*, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Publications of the German Historical Institute; Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute / Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

in a conscious attempt – as Alexander von Humboldt wrote – to “inoculate the Germans with the Greek spirit.”²⁰

As theological and humanistic learning continued to nourish bourgeois culture in the Germanies, one of these streams began to flow less forcefully and dry. Any number of studies have shown just how deeply together these two traditions of erudition truly ran in the early modern period, with biblical and classical learning cascaded into that enterprise which is modern philology.²¹ Friedrich August Wolf (1759–1824) modeled his *Prolegomena to Homer* on *Einleitung ins Alte Testament* by Eichhorn, who himself had studied with classicist Christian Gottlob Heyne (1729–1812) and orientalist Johann David Michaelis (1717–1791) in Göttingen.²² In fact, the pollination between biblical and classical erudition was of the cross variety still at the end of the 19th century, as demonstrated by figures like Julius Wellhausen, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and Eduard Schwartz, and continued well into the 20th one, with, for instance, Martin Noth’s use of the Greek amphictyony to explain the confederation of the tribes of Israel.²³ Nevertheless, although historically classical philology – housed in the so-called “lower faculty” (that is, of arts or philosophy) – long operated as the handmaiden to that queen science which was theology, by 1810 a change had occurred: classicists were the model for scientific and cultural ideals, and by 1830 classics had won dominance within the philosophical faculty. Guiseppe Veltri thus describes the former humanistic ideal of a *homo trilinguis* – a master of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin – narrowing into a new focus on the Greeks.²⁴ Notwithstanding, the legacy of *philologia sacra*, “philologist” unqualified sug-

20. Cited in James J. Sheehan, *German History, 1770–1866* (Oxford History of Modern Europe; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 365.

21. So, e.g., Anthony Grafton and Joanna Weinberg, *“I have always loved the Holy Tongue”: Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011); Dirk van Miert, Henk Nellen, Piet Steenbakkens, and Jetze Touber, eds., *Scriptural Authority and Biblical Criticism in the Dutch Golden Age: God’s Word Questioned* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

22. Anthony Grafton, “Introduction,” in F.A. Wolf, *Prolegomena to Homer, 1795*, ed. and trans. Anthony Grafton, Glenn W. Most, and James E.G. Zetzel (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), 3–35.

23. Cf. Arnaldo Momigliano, “Religious History Without Frontiers: J. Wellhausen, U. Wilamowitz, and E. Schwartz,” *History and Theory* 21, no. 4, Beiheft 21: *New Paths of Classicism in the Nineteenth Century* (1982): 49–62.

24. Giuseppe Veltri, “Altertumswissenschaft und Wissenschaft des Judentums: Leopold Zunz und seine Lehrer F.A. Wolf und A. Böckh,” in *Friedrich August Wolf: Studien, Dokumente, Bibliographie*, ed. Reinhard

gested more and more an expert in Greek or Latin language and literature – as opposed to Hebrew, Arabic, or Sanskrit – while *Altertumswissenschaft* (i.e., “the science of antiquity”) described the study of the same. So it was that “classical” antiquity came to evoke the Tiber not the Jordan, Olympus instead of Sinai, and fire stolen from the gods rather than a bush aflame.

As ancient Greece became a wellspring for nourishing a German nation-state, the study of antiquity gained in prestige and, increasingly, sought to purge religion from the study of the past. In fact, the field of classical antiquity was demarcated specifically to exclude the usual occupations of religious history. In 1801, Wolf had placed Jewish history specifically beyond the bounds of antiquity as a discipline. This circumscription came on any number of grounds:

One would very much like to encompass all such peoples into One study; however multiple reasons make a distinction here necessary and do not allow us to place *Egyptians, Hebrews, Persians* and other nations of the orient on One level with the *Greeks* and the *Romans*. One of the most important differences between these and those nations is the following: that the first did not raise themselves at all or only a few steps above the kind of cultivation which one should call *civil policing* or *civilization*, as opposed to *higher, true culture of the spirit*.²⁵

So, too, in a series of lectures on philology delivered over 26 semesters between 1809 and 1865 to a total registered audience of 1,696, August Boeckh (1785–1867) argued against the existence of any single character of antiquity given the existence of diverse nationalities. Yet this distinction among nations of the past not only allowed but even called for a concentration on the Greeks – and to a lesser extent the Romans – since they embodied ancient culture in its highest form.²⁶ In this way, the higher culture of the Hellenes, not the religion of the Hebrews or other civilizations of the Orient, were to stand at the center of the ancient world. As Ismar Schorsch has written, “Overall, how-

Markner and Giuseppe Veltri (*Palingenesia* 67; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999), 32–47, at 32.

25. Friedrich August Wolf, “Darstellung der *Alterthums-Wissenschaft*,” *Museum der Alterthums-Wissenschaft* 1 (1807): 1–145, at 16; repr. in S.F.W. Hoffmann, ed., *Fr. Aug. Wolf’s Darstellung der Alterthumswissenschaft, nebst einer Auswahl seiner kleinen Schriften; und litterarischen Zugaben zu dessen Vorlesungen über die Alterthumswissenschaft* (Leipzig: Lehnhold, 1833); cf. also *Friedrich August Wolf’s Encyclopädie der Philologie. Nach dessen Vorlesungen im Winterhalbjahre 1798–1799*, ed. S.M. Stockmann, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: Serig, 1845), 8–9.

26. August Boeckh, *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften*, ed. Ernst Bratuscheck (Leipzig: Teubner, 1877), 264–65, cf. 6.

ever, there was no room for the study of the Jews of antiquity in the vaunted field of *Altertumswissenschaft* propagated by Wolf and Boeckh.”²⁷ Of course, many trained ancient historians were more than capable of working on the Jewish past of classical Athens or Imperial Rome. One need only mention Jacob Bernays (1824–1881) and Leopold Zunz (1794–1886), both of whom had deep classical training, in fact from the founders themselves. But as Jews they were hindered if not barred from the institutional centers of prestige and resources.

In addition to this disciplinary parting of the ways, historical writing itself reoriented itself between 1820 and 1880. Historiography all across Europe was shifting from the focus on universal history to one on the national kind.²⁸ As a romantic generation powered by universalist and diffusionary interest gave way to a post-romantic one driven by particularist and empirical concerns. Playing a major role in this shift was the so-called Creuzer Affair, which centered on iconoclast Friedrich Creuzer’s (1771–1858) *Symbolism and Mythology of the Ancient Peoples*, published between 1810 and 1812.²⁹ With a stress on universals, diffusion, and religion, Creuzer looked to the Orient (primarily Egypt) to understand the Greeks, and even then those Greeks he lauded were not those of fifth-century Athens but of the Roman period. In the process, he defied the strict scientific philology advanced by Wolf and the separation of Greek and Egyptian cultures outlined by Winckelmann. Karl Otfried Müller (1797–1840) especially fought against comparativism and promoted a more white-gloves type of textual study, which joined the narrowing forces of Karl Lachmann’s (1793–1851) textual criticism and Leopold von Ranke’s (1795–1886) concern with historical sources – all of which established language and text at the center of inquiry.³⁰ So it was this period became an age of a philo-

27. Ismar Schorsch, *Leopold Zunz: Creativity in Adversity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017), 21.

28. Cf. Stefan Berger, “The Invention of European National Traditions in European Romanticism,” in *The Oxford History of Historical Writing*, Vol. 4, 1800–1945, ed. Stuart Macintyre, Juan Maignushca, and Attilio Pók (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 19–40.

29. George S. Williamson, *Longing for Myth Germany: Religion and Aesthetic Culture from Romanticism to Nietzsche* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004), 121–50; Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*, 66–71.

30. Just as he had sought to free the Greeks from any dependence on the Egyptians, so also he sought to put distance between the Greeks and Jews (Müller, *A History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, 3:333). On the shifting historiographic values in this regard, see Brian Vick, “Greek Origins and Organic Metaphors:

logical positivism, one that marched to the drum of political, not cultural, history and the national, not universal, kind.³¹

If neo-humanism had elevated Greeks and Romans above the Jews, the secularizing program drafted by the liberal architects of *Bildung* and new educational and cultural institutions largely swept them aside. As Anthony Grafton has observed, “Jews and Judaism were far less attractive in Restoration Germany than they had been in the late Enlightenment.”³² Alongside a clear and rising anti-Semitism and a purist, anti-comparative philology, however, yet another factor impacted the general silence on Judaism in the study of antiquity, on the one hand, and the kind of assessments that did emerge, on the other: namely, its national and political past.

The Jewish past in a German present

The history of classical scholarship thus reflected a turn from universal to national history, a shift from the religious to the political past, and a change in concentration to Greek and Roman history specifically. These forces do much to explain how the Jewish past was pressed to the periphery of classical studies. However, yet another dimension accounts for such relative silence: Jewish antiquity did not conform to the national and political values whose currency only went up in the course of the 19th century. This central issue emerges on four related yet analytically separable fronts in the historiography composed by ancient historians: the disintegration of a strong national identity; the failure to offer contributions to art and science; the loss of political autonomy; and the ele-

Ideals of Cultural Autonomy in Neohumanist Germany from Winckelmann to Curtius,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 63, no. 3 (2002): 483–500.

31. See John Edward Toews, *Becoming Historical: Cultural Reformation and Public Memory in Early Nineteenth-Century Berlin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). One recent study has noted the importance of media in circulating ideas about the past – more specifically, the interaction between historicism and visual popular culture: Kathrin Maurer, *Visualizing the Past: The Power of the Image in German Historicism* (Berlin: de Gruyter 2013).

32. Grafton, “Prolegomena to Friedrich August Wolf,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 44 (1981): 101–29, at 128–29. Grafton later modified his position on Wolf’s own contribution to the separation of Judaism from the study of antiquity more broadly: cf. idem, “Juden und Griechen bei Friedrich August Wolf,” in *Friedrich August Wolf: Studien, Dokumente, Bibliographie*, ed. Reinhard Markner and Giuseppe Veltri (Palingenesia 62; Stuttgart: Steiner, 1999), 9–31.

vation of religious institutions. Furthermore, these same values account, at least in part, for negative portrayals of ancient Judaism by historians.

First of all, a consciousness of German identity had emerged by the end of the 18th century and gradually merged with attempts to delineate both the features and the boundaries of this felt nation and to consider its political implications for states and territories in central Europe. The qualities of Germanness were elusive at the start and, in fact, remained so even after unification of (some) primarily germanophone states into the German Empire, in 1871.³³ Writers and intellectuals experimented with all sorts of emotive glue to bind a perceived people together: whether this German people was constituted by a shared language or collective literature, an imagined space or shared experience in time. In the first decade of the 19th century alone, Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814) considered the very essence of Germanness in his *Addresses to the German Nation*; Clemens Brentano (1778–1842) and Achim von Arnim (1781–1831) published “old German songs”; Joseph Görres (1776–1848) issued German chapbooks; and the Grimm Brothers assembled folktales, legends, and myths before proceeding to construct a grammar and dictionary of the German language. Whatever it meant to be German, the stakes were high that being part of the German people actually meant something. Throughout this century (and beyond), the question of national identity was answered differently, even discordantly, but it was indeed a pressing one. Wherever the substance of this Germanness resided – in tongue or blood, in heart or mind – it demanded not only cultivation but also preservation.

Against this backdrop of discussions on what constitutes the German people, ancient historians reflected upon the nature of Jewish identity. The relationship between Israelites and Jews, the classification of Judaism as a religion or ethnicity, and the extent of Jewish integration into ancient empires formed a conceptual matrix that informed their writings on the past. Anomalous not only for writing on Jewish history at length but also for focusing on its politics rather than religion, Heinrich Leo produced, in 1828, his *Lectures on the History of the Jewish State* along philosophical lines.³⁴ In his pursuit of an ele-

33. See Hagen Schulze, *The course of German nationalism: From Frederick the Great to Bismarck, 1763–1867*, trans. Sarah Hanbury-Tenison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); for questions of national identity in the German Empire, see Helmut Walser Smith, *German nationalism and religious conflict: Culture, ideology, politics, 1870–1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

34. Heinrich Leo, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte des Jüdischen Staates* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1828);

mental cause to explain all of Jewish history, he argued a basic “national character” had become manifest in its political formations and epitomized in “hierarchy” or “theocracy,” that is, rule by priests. Leo extrapolated from the particular to the universal, believing the course of Jewish history ultimately supplied an object lesson on how not to organize, politically, a people. Drawing lessons from the past, he explained his study:

If, then, it offers, on the one hand, no small interest to follow and to learn about this single people, the Jews, in its distinctiveness, it must, on the other hand, be of a still much more general and greater interest to see most clearly predetermined in the Jewish state the character, the main features, the development, and the ultimate demise of all hierarchies and, if one wishes to consider history the teacher of politics, to take from this people’s hardness of heart an example of how no other people should live.³⁵

Historian Georg Weber, director of the höhere Bürgerschule in Heidelberg, whose *History of the World in Clear Presentation* underwent twenty editions between 1851 and 1889, claimed Hellenism had, in fact, dissolved much of Jewish identity: “Many Jews settled in Alexandria,” he maintained, “where they came into wealth and power but gradually lost the customs, language and faith of their fatherland or mixed them with Greek character (*Wesen*).”³⁶ By contrast, Weber seemed to suggest those who remained in the homeland

idem, *Lehrbuch der Universalgeschichte zum Gebrauche in höheren Unterrichtsanstalten*, Vol. 1, *Die Einleitung und die alte Geschichte* (Halle: Anton, 1835), 561–600. Christhard Hoffmann offers a full discussion of Leo, including the religious transformation towards a pietism that ultimately led him to criticize his earlier, rationalist work: idem, *Juden und das Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, 42–73. Notably, Andreas Gottlieb Hoffmann clearly conceived his article as part political, part cultural history. Suggesting a division of the Jewish past into five different phases – tribe and family until Moses, a “republican constitution” until the monarchy, from the monarchy to exile, bondage till the Maccabees, and freedom together with its gradual limitation up to the demise of the state – he contrasted this periodization with de Wette’s trifold one, which ran from the mythology of Abraham to Saul, the kingdom from Saul to exile, and the exile to the destruction of Jerusalem by Rome, as well as that of Leo, which traced a purely Oriental period giving way to a Greek-Oriental period followed by a Roman-Oriental one (Hoffmann, “Hebräer,” 311).

35. Leo, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte des Jüdischen Staates*, 4.

36. Georg Weber, *Die Weltgeschichte in übersichtlicher Darstellung. Ein Lehrbuch für mittlere Gymnasialklassen; für höhere Bürger- und Realschulen; für Töchterschulen und Privatanstalten* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1851), 57 [English Translation: *Outlines of Universal History, from the Creation of the World to the Present Time*, trans. M. Behr, 1st ed. (London: Whittaker & Co., 1851)], an abbreviated version of his *Lehrbuch der Weltgeschichte* (cf. n.45 below). The problem of “Hellenism” would become a chief concern in the study of Jewish identity, especially

maintained this identity when he asserted the Jews, following the destruction of Jerusalem, had scattered across the globe yet still maintained the character.³⁷ (Hoffmann imagined the same phenomena during the exile, when “many gradually disowned their fatherland, made themselves comfortable with the pagan cultus, and became the same as the Babylonians; but others remained true to the customs and religion of the fatherland and were strengthened and preserved by the prophets in this effort.”³⁸) A deep ambivalence emerged in such historiography as to whether the Jews – especially Samaritans and Alexandrians and, for that matter, even modern, European ones – had retained their ancient character given their supposed self-exclusion or had, rather, lost it owing to their embeddedness amongst other peoples. For all the praise of their ethics and monotheism, which did set them above a “natural” or otherwise “oriental” religion, critique often fell upon the Jews for their relations with other peoples. In a section devoted to the Asiatic peoples of antiquity, Luden questioned whether – notwithstanding the law and the divine – Judaism’s fate resulted from a neglect of the human sphere, a jealous disposition, a focus not on a people but a tribe, a self-exclusion from other peoples, a myopic cultivation – in short by a lack of orientation towards humanity.³⁹

Secondly, aspirations and achievements in the sciences and arts, in education and cultivation helped to galvanize a sense of German identity and became a real preoccupation of the German states as they consolidated into a nation-state. Romantic nationalists established through language and literature the boundaries of Germanness. This choice in criteria should perhaps occasion no surprise. After all, these cartographers of a national identity as well as a national past were members of the literate bourgeoisie, ones facilitated by superior means to articulate their ideas, to disseminate their labors, and to move their bodies by travel.⁴⁰ Furthermore, the sciences – human and natural

after Alexander and in Alexandria. Seeing the Graeco (pagan) world as a thesis to the antithesis of Judaism, Johann Gustav Droysen (1808–1884) understood Christianity as synthesis of the two: see further Arnaldo Momigliano, “J.G. Droysen between Greeks and Jews,” *History and Theory* 9, no. 2 (1970): 139–53; Hoffmann, *Juden und das Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, 74–86.

37. Weber, *Die Weltgeschichte in übersichtlicher Darstellung*, 108; cf. also Leo, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte des Jüdischen Staates*, 184.

38. Hoffmann, “Hebräer,” 316.

39. Luden, *Geschichte der Völker und Staaten des Alterthumes*, 59, see further 63–64, where Luden discusses the conditions and contingencies necessary to consider for a proper accounting of this people’s history.

40. Though few in number, limited in socio-economic power, and based in urban areas, these romantic

alike – gained a national aura, which shone all the brighter thanks to increasingly centralized and well-funded state institutions. Unsurprisingly, the university fanned a national pride in science. Exploring the formation of a *Wissenschaftsideologie* in the *Vormärz* period, R. Steven Turner indicated some time ago how “[t]his radically new concept of the universities’ essence and mission allied the new, reformed universities not only to German patriotic sentiment but also to German philosophic and scholarly thought,” while Thomas Howard has since examined “the emergence of a new conception of the state as a tutelary agent in religious and cultural matters (i.e. *Erziehungsstaat* or *Kulturstaat*).”⁴¹ Music, too, galvanized a sense of nationhood, though, unlike literature, those who actually produced it – be they musicians or composers – engaged much less often in overt attempts to consolidate a national identity.⁴² Likewise, art and architecture became important for imagining such a community. The *Allgemeine Deutsche Kunstgenossenschaft*, founded in 1856, the 1858 Munich Exhibition, and the German National Art Gallery, established in 1861, all bound together artistic and nationalist identities. As Robin Lenman writes, “. . . by the 1850s German artists’ status owed less to royal favour than to their constant self-identification with national destiny.”⁴³ Conse-

nationalists of mostly Protestant heritage and of the literate bourgeoisie enjoyed a disproportionately loud voice in the public square as they putatively spoke for an entire people: cf. Matthew Levinger, *Enlightened Nationalism: The Transformation of Prussian Political Culture, 1806–1848* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 99–101.

41. R. Steven Turner, “The Growth of Professional Research in Prussia, 1818–1848—Causes and Context,” *Historical Studies in the Physical Sciences* 3 (1971): 137–82, at 142; Thomas Albert Howard, *Protestant Theology and the Making of the Modern German University* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2006), 213; cf., most recently, Zachary Purvis, *Theology and the University in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

42. See Celia Applegate and Pamela Potter, “Germans as the ‘People of Music’: Genealogy of an Identity,” in *Music and German National Identity*, ed. Celia Applegate and Pamela Potter (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 1–35. Ryan Minor has examined choral singing and public culture in forging national identity: idem, *Choral Fantasies: Music, Festivity, and Nationhood in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). Similarly, Brent Orlyn Peterson has examined nationalism in the framework of literacy in popular culture: idem, *History, Fiction, and Germany: Writing the Nineteenth-Century Nation* (German Literary Theory and Cultural Studies; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2005).

43. Robin Lenman, *Artists and society in Germany, 1850–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 43.

quently, such cultural productions of art and erudition both constructed and were constructed by a perceived German identity.

Set before this backcloth of the premiums placed on intellectual, or spiritual, accomplishments, historiographers of ancient Judaism leveled a critique against its cultural developments, or rather its lack therefore. An Enlightenment appreciation for ethics or monotheism – what one writer called the Jews’ “national science” – surely did remain, especially among defenders of antique Judaism’s importance for the present, but even then, some argued this heritage had proved detrimental.⁴⁴ Weber’s textbook on universal history, which focused on culture, religion, and literature and also went through twenty editions, between 1846 and 1888, explained, “In sciences and arts, the Jews have achieved little; their nature was inartistic, and the strict monotheism hampered the cultivation of sculpture and painting.”⁴⁵ Carl August Theodor Wernicke (1813–1872) agreed. This professor at the prestigious Royal Elisabeth School in Berlin asserted all developments in art among the Hebrews – as with every other people of antiquity – had derived from their religion. Accordingly, their prohibition against images accounted for a shortfall in the visual arts; their one lone sanctuary, in contrast to the many temples built by other nations, answered for a deficit in any distinctive architecture; their concern with Yahweh gave reason for their lack of occupation with merely temporal events in drama; and their integration of god and history supplied a justification for a lack of epic.⁴⁶ Yet Wernicke lauded their lyric – or rather its manifestation before the exile, after

44. Adolf Holm, *Griechische Geschichte von ihrem Ursprunge bis zum Untergange der Selbstständigkeit des griechischen Volkes*, Vol. 4, *Die griechisch-makedonische Zeit, die Zeit der Könige und der Bünde, vom Tode Alexanders bis zur Einverleibung der letzten makedonischen Monarchie in das römische Reich* (Calvary’s Philologische und archäologische Bibliothek, 107–114, 1; Berlin: Calvary & Co., 1894), 562 [English Translation: *The History of Greece from its Commencement to the Close of the Independence of the Greek Nation*, Vol. 4, *The Graeco-Macedonian Age, the Period of the Kings and the League, from the Death of Alexander down to the last Macedonian Monarchy in the Roman Empire*, trans. Frederick Clarke (London: Macmillan and Co., 1898)].

45. Georg Weber, *Lehrbuch der Weltgeschichte mit Rücksicht auf Cultur, Literatur und Religionswesen, und einem Abriß der deutschen Literaturgeschichte als Anhang, für höhere Schulanstalten und zur Selbstbelehrung*, 4th ed., 2 vols., (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1850), 1:54.

46. Carl Wernicke, *Die Geschichte der Welt*, Vol. 1, *Die Geschichte des Alterthums*, 4th ed. (Berlin: Duncker, 1870), 92–93; cf. also the work by Magdeburg architect Carl Albert Rosenthal (1801–1879), *Vollständige Uebersicht der Geschichte der Baukunst, von ihrem Ursprunge an bis auf die neueste Zeit, im organischen Zusammenhange in sich und mit der allgemeinen Culturgeschichte; für Geschichtsforscher, Baumeister und überhaupt für denkende und gebildete Leser*, Vol. 1, *Die ältesten Völker bis einschliesslich die Aegypter* (Berlin: Reimer, 1841), 97–98, which first

which he saw substantial decline. Here, he echoed Herder, who had breathed new spirit into the study of Hebrew poetry.⁴⁷ So did Wilhelm Wachsmuth (1784–1866), a professional historian who argued the Hebrews had not only preserved authentic historical traditions and produced coherent works of history but also ones of universal perspective, and yet he still confessed they had bequeathed no grand monuments of literature.⁴⁸ Wolf, by contrast, denied the Jews any proper historiography and opined – unsurprisingly – they could hardly compare with the Greeks in the development of distinct genres.⁴⁹ Juxtaposing the Hebrew people with the Etruscans, he declared they had no true literature: “A nation that does not extend beyond poesy cannot be considered a nation of learned writing.”⁵⁰ Whatever the assessment of earlier periods and apart from contributions to religion, the standard evaluation of Judaism in things art and science was not, by any means, enthusiastic. Representatively, one prolific historian blankly stated, “The further course of Jewish history during Persian hegemony features nothing else noteworthy,” before describing subsequent literary or intellectual activity of the Jews as fundamentally bound to the service of scribal study and legal interpretation and claiming any literature of note – that is, demonstrative of “a free, independent spiritual life” – had ultimately come not from Judea or Samaria but the diaspora.⁵¹ Working with such an anthropolo-

appeared as a series of articles in *Journal für die Baukunst*.

47. Johann Gottfried Herder, *Vom Geist der Ebräischen Poesie. Eine Anleitung für die Liebhaber derselben, und der ältesten Geschichte des menschlichen Geistes*, 2 vols. (Dessau: Buchhandlung der Gelehrten, 1782–83) [English Translation: *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, trans. James Marsh, 2 vols. (Burlington: Smith, 1833)].

48. Cf. Wilhelm Wachsmuth, *Grundriß der allgemeinen Geschichte der Völker und Staaten* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1826), 16; idem, *Allgemeine Culturgeschichte*, Vol. 1, *Der heidnische Orient, das klassische Alterthum, das Christenthum und das christliche Römerreich, der Islam* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1850), 104.

49. Johann Daniel Gürtler, ed., *Fr. Aug. Wolf's Vorlesungen über die Alterthumswissenschaft*, Vol. 2, *Fr. Aug. Wolf's Vorlesung über die Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur* (Leipzig: Lehnhold, 1831), 3, cf. 164–65. Completing an unfinished work by Karl Otfried Müller, English classicist John William Donaldson was generally unimpressed with the apparent knowledge not only of Greek but even of Hebrew evident in the Septuagint: cf. Karl Otfried Müller, *History of the Literature of Ancient Greece*, Vol. 2 (London: Parker & Son, 1858), 490–94.

50. Johann Daniel Gürtler, ed., *Fr. Aug. Wolf's Vorlesungen über die Alterthumswissenschaft*, Vol. 3, *Fr. Aug. Wolf's Vorlesung über die Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* (Leipzig: Lehnhold, 1832), 37–38.

51. Georg Weber, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und der Entstehung des Christenthums*, Vol. 1, *Das Volk Israel in der alttestamentlichen Zeit* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1867), 404–05. Heinrich Holtzmann, Weber's son-in-law, wrote the companion volume, entitled *Judenthum und Christenthum im Zeitalter der apokryphischen und neutestamentlichen Literatur* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1867), although he expressed a certain reluctance to do so, being a biblical

gy, historians conceptualized a deep connection between the very essence of a people and their accomplishments in art and science and thus employed the one to explain the other.

Third, a deep concern with political autonomy resonated across the Germanies. The wedding of a German nation-state and classical antiquity came amidst considerable tumult: from the political upheavals of the French Revolution through the turmoil of the wars that followed to the uncertainty of the Restoration thereafter. In the wake of Napoleon, there was a conservative backlash marked by the Holy Alliance of 1815 and Klemens von Metternich's attempts at reestablishing order, including the Carlsbad Decrees of 1819, which aimed to secure monarchical structures and suppress national and liberal movements through the censorship of periodicals, intervention in university administration, disbandment of student clubs, and centralized investigation into revolutionary activities. The 1830s then saw revolutionary outbreaks across Europe: the secession of provinces from the United Kingdom of the Netherlands to form the Kingdom of Belgium, the July Revolution in France, the Polish November Uprising, the Swiss *Ustertag*, as well as unrest in the Italian states and Portugal. If that unrest were not enough, the Revolutions of 1848 then followed, which entangled the political makeups of now Italy, France, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Poland, Belgium, and Ireland. Closer to home, in the Germanies of this period, political conflicts and skirmishes continued unabated, in the Schleswig Wars, the Austro-Prussian War, the annexation of the Kingdom of Hannover, alongside any number of other growing pains leading up – or, depending on the perspective, dying gasps leading down – to the unification of Germany, in 1871.

In this framework of political recomposition and independence movements, historians of classical antiquity placed an accent on autonomy and evaluated Judaism based on such criteria. As with cultural achievements, many explained the political course of Jewish history through religion. Writing after the unification of Germany on the wars of King David abroad and insurrection at home, von Ranke argued, “Never was a nation worse adapted than the Jewish nation to create an empire by conquest,” a claim he saw substantiated in the opposition of tribes to the monarchy and in a monolatry that hindered any governance of other nations with other deities.⁵² Likewise, Weber

exegete rather than an historian (cf. *ibid.*, foreword).

52. Leopold von Ranke, *Universal History: The Oldest Historical Group of Nations and the Greeks*, ed. George

held sectarianism had weakened the Jewish people and thus bore responsibility for their fall to the Roman Empire.⁵³ With this thesis, he echoed the position of his teacher, the decorated Heidelberg historian Friedrich Christoph Schlosser (1776–1861). The latter’s *Ancient History* insisted it was not the enemy without but “the death of Hebrew patriotism” within – together with the demise of its religious inspiration in the Mosaic law, sacred poetry, and prophetic institution – that had destroyed the “Jewish” (i.e. Judahite) kingdom under Nebuchadnezzar.⁵⁴ Indeed, internal strife attracted much attention from historians. Wachsmuth, an accomplished historian and university administrator, dedicated considerable space to the topic in his *History of Political Factions in Ancient and Modern Times*.⁵⁵ Alongside this lack of unity, criticism could target the scarcity of military prowess among the Jews.⁵⁶ One writer went so far as to suggest autonomy was “in point of fact unnatural” for the Jewish people.⁵⁷ Viewed within this constellation of critiques, descriptions of the Jews owing their self-determination to the Persians then gains a different tone.⁵⁸ Rather than win autonomy for themselves, they had been dependent on external forces. In fact, many writers agreed with Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776–1831) in declaring the Jews ceased to be a proper nation (*Nation*) after the fall of their kingdom, becoming, instead, a mere “community.”⁵⁹ In this way, Jewish history had become de-

Walter Prothero (New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1884), 50–51 [German Original: *Weltgeschichte*, Vol. 1, *Die älteste historische Völkergruppe und die Griechen* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1881)].

53. Weber, *Die Weltgeschichte in übersichtlicher Darstellung*, 57; cf. also Hoffmann, “Hebräer,” 321, 329.

54. Friedrich Christoph Schlosser, *Universalhistorische Uebersicht der Geschichte der alten Welt und ihrer Cultur*, Vol. 1.1 (Frankfurt: Varrentrapp, 1826), 232.

55. Wilhelm Wachsmuth, *Geschichte der politischen Parteien alter und neuer Zeit*, Vol. 1, *Geschichte der politischen Parteien des Alterthums* (Braunschweig: Schwetschke and Son, 1853), 42–60.

56. So, e.g., Hoffmann, “Hebräer,” 326. Galletti wrote of Apollonius’ assault on Jerusalem, “The Jews preferred to die than to fight on a sabbath” (*Geschichte der Staaten und Völker der alten Welt*, 2:239); cf. also Weber, *Die Weltgeschichte in übersichtlicher Darstellung*, 92. See further Paul Michael Kurtz, “The Way of War: Wellhausen, Israel, and Bellicose Reiche,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 127, no. 1 (2015): 1–19, at 14–18.

57. Luden, *Geschichte der Völker und Staaten des Alterthumes*, 542–43. By contrast, Cassel argued, writing on the Roman empire, “The Jews could not forget that they had lost their independence as a nation. No true nationality can do so, even if the condition of bondage would be more fortunate than that of freedom” (idem, “Juden [Geschichte],” 12).

58. Cf. Wernicke, *Die Geschichte des Alterthums*, 342.

59. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, *Vorträge über alte Geschichte, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten*, Vol. 3, *Die*

pendent on that of other peoples. As one commentator wrote, “Since the end of the autonomy of a Jewish state, the history of the Jews intertwines itself with the Roman one.”⁶⁰ In an age where the subject of history was the past of Greece and Rome and the object of history was increasingly national consciousness, state construction, political savvy, and military might, historians mostly focused on the political fortunes of ancient Judaism. Wherever the story of Jewish political autonomy ended – with Persians, Greeks, or Romans – this historiography could even bridge the past and present and claim the contemporaneous Jews were essentially the same as those of old.

Finally, religious confrontation – albeit less violent in nature – continued unabated throughout the 19th century. The relationship between church and state remained, indeed, a fierce concern across religious confessions and created a deep anxiety in an era of political uncertainty. Perhaps most obviously, this was the age of what Michael Gross has called a “war against Catholicism,” which included the well-known *Kulturkampf* – a social and political struggle between secular and religious authorities. But unrest also took place within Protestantism itself. Although the year 1817 did see the consolidation of both Reformed and Lutheran churches in Prussia into the Church Union, a single Protestant church, even this unity was met with disintegrating forces, such as the rise of the Old Lutherans, who resisted confessional unification. Hard, unsure, and gradual, Jewish emancipation was also realized in the 19th century’s first half, albeit at different times in different states, from the Kingdom of Prussia in 1812 to the Kingdom of Hanover in 1842. So, too, secularist movements – dubbed the “fourth confession” by Todd Weir – conquered more and more space in the public square, even if the fighters were few and the space restricted. It was, indeed, an age of renegotiation for ecclesiastical and political authority, one further vexed by liberal and nationalist crusades.

Viewed against this background of confessional confrontation, the comments by ancient historians that emerged considered the implications a weak state had for the people: namely, priests had come to overrule the population. The portrait (or panning) of hierarchy – what Josephus himself had called theocracy – surfaced time and again, especially from the time of Cyrus onwards. Although he understood “democracy,” “aris-

makedonischen Reiche, Hellenisierung des Orients, Untergang des alten Griechenlands, die römische Weltherrschaft, ed. M. Niebuhr (Historische und philologische Vorträge, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten, Part 2, Alte Geschichte nach Justins Folge mit Ausschluß der römischen Geschichte; Berlin: Reimer, 1851), 543.

60. Wilhelm Wachsmuth, *Allgemeine Culturgeschichte*, Vol. 1, 114, cf. 433–39.

tocracy,” and “monarchy” equally compatible with “theocracy” in Jewish antiquity, Wernicke maintained the Mosaic Law and, even more so, prophecy had once restrained priestly power, with prophets having to read priests the riot act – or, to borrow the German idiom, to read them the Levites.⁶¹ Indeed, the complex of religion and politics in Judaism drew much comment and critique. Berlin historian Ferdinand Heinrich Müller (1805–1886) judged the two inseparable: “The Jewish state is only of significance with respect to religion, the political is only a pretense of the religious element; its entire existence is determined by religion, and the collapse of the state comes with the collapse and the destruction of religion”⁶² Yet Leo was the most devoted analyst of Jewish politics. As he examined political history through the lens of “national character,” Leo believed the very nature of this people accounted for their ultimate rule by priests. Betraying a certain inconsistency between the general, typological and the specific, historical, he colored the ancient past with explicit – and contrast – of Protestantism and Catholicism.⁶³ So, too, Theodor Mommsen (1817–1903) regarded national character as almost determinative for the fortunes of a people, although he considered the Jewish national character significant for the fate of the entire world. Despite the negative features on display in his portrayal of ancient Jews, especially their relationship to the state, he did see antique Judaism playing a crucial role in the history of Rome. Along the philosophical – i.e., dialectical – arc of his *Roman History*, which devoted a chapter to “Judaea and the Jews,” Mommsen believed ancient Jews had served as agents of the World Spirit by decomposing different ethnicities and transforming the national cultures of Greece and Rome into a global, cosmopolitan one.⁶⁴ Furthermore, Mommsen viewed the Jewish–Roman War as strife between church and state: “The question concerned was one not of faith but of power; the Jewish church-state, as head of the Diaspora, was not compatible with the absoluteness of the secular great-state. From the general rule of toleration the government did not even in this case depart; it waged war not against Judaism but against the high priest and the Synhedrion.”⁶⁵ In these accounts of Jewish his-

61. Wernicke, *Die Geschichte des Alterthums*, 90.

62. Ferdinand Müller, *Ueber den Organismus und den Entwicklungsgang der politischen Idee im Alterthum oder die alte Geschichte vom Standpunkte der Philosophie* (Berlin: Lüderitz, 1839), 60.

63. Cf. Hoffmann, *Juden und Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, 57.

64. See Hoffmann, “Ancient Jewry – Modern Questions,” 195–201.

65. Theodor Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire from Caesar to Diocletian*, 2 vols., trans. William P. Dickson (London: Bentley & Son, 1886), 2:220 [German Original: *Römische Geschichte*, Vol. 5, *Die Provinzen*

tory, as in so many others, opposition to clerics and Catholics converged with that to Judaism. It seemed only a secular state – or rather a liberal Protestant one masked as the secular – could restrain the dominance of religious authorities.

The attention granted to Jewish history by ancient historians was selective. Unsurprisingly given the movements in the institutionalization of *Bildung*, in the history of classics as a discipline, and in the nature of historiography more broadly, discussions centered on contact with the Persians, Greeks, or Romans, which often meant times of conflict, whether the Maccabean Revolt, the Herodian dynasty, or the Jewish–Romans wars. Yet the Maccabees and Hasmonean dynasty earned ancient Jews an uptick in positive assessments rendered by historians, when rekindled patriotism, valorous resistance, and military might fanned new life into the dreams of a return to political autonomy.⁶⁶ Leo called it “the best period of Jewish history.”⁶⁷ In fact, such appreciation for political liberation and national awakening extended beyond the realm of historiography by professional academics between 1820 and 1880. Several works of poetry and drama – written, republished, and translated – recounted the Jewish uprisings as well.⁶⁸ These moments in Jewish history, it seemed, were worth remembering, rewriting, and reclaiming. This political past of ancient Judaism appeared to speak to the German present.

Conclusion

von Caesar bis Diocletian (Berlin: Weidmann, 1885)].

66. E.g., Leopold von Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, Vol. 2, *Die römische Republik und ihre Weltherrschaft*, Part 2, *Bürgerkriege, Entstehung des römischen Reiches* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1882), 154–73; Luden, *Geschichte der Völker und Staaten des Alterthumes*, 440; Adolf Schmidt, *Karl Friedrich Becker's Weltgeschichte*, 8th ed., ed. Eduard Arnd, Vol. 2, *Alte Geschichte 2* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1860), 397–98. Becker's work, first published in 1801, initially bore the subtitle *für Kinder und Kinderlehrer*, removed by the editors of later editions.

67. Leo, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte des jüdischen Staates*, 199.

68. Friedrich Ludwig Zacharias Werner, *Die Mutter der Makkabäer. Tragödie in fünf Acten* (Vienna: Wallishauser, 1820); Otto Ludwig, *Die Makkabäer. Trauerspiel in fünf Akten* (Leipzig: Weber, 1854); Karl von Heigel, *Bar-Cochba, der letzte Judenkönig* (Hanover: Rümpler, 1857); so also the translation of Thomas Morell's 1747 libretto for *Judas Maccabaeus* by Georg Friedrich Händel, printed as *Judas der Makkabäer. Oratorium in drei Abtheilungen* (Stuttgart: Eichele, [ca. 1830]) and *Judas Maccabäus. Oratorium* (Karlsruhe: Müller, 1847); Theodor Hell [pseudonym of Karl Gottfried Theodor Winkler], *Die Makkabäer. Drama in vier Aufzügen. Nach dem französischen Original in Prosa metrisch bearbeitet* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1818).

A multiplicity of analytical knives served to sever the Jewish past into different kinds of histories portrayed in different contexts. The division of Israelite and Jewish history, the separation of diasporic Jews from those back in the homeland, and the contrast between Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism all bore implications for the selection of sources, the structure of books, the telling of narratives, and the understanding of history itself. This assembling, this organizing, this assessing of antiquity was physically written into all sorts of histories of the ancient world, which then circulated in multiple forms across the educated middle classes. Indeed, much of this writing on the ancient world targeted not academics who stood behind the lectern but bourgeois readers who sat beside the hearth. The subtitle to Georg Weber's histories announced his intended audience specifically as schoolchildren, while Wernicke's specified his as women.⁶⁹

However, these concerns and categories, preferences and priorities operative in the historiography of antique Judaism were not specific to the subject. Peoples and periods alike were placed upon a scale more generally. Archaeologists of the 19th century may have seen material progression in the ages they labeled stone, bronze, and iron, but philologists tended to agree with the kind of degeneration suggested by Hesiod's *Work and Days*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, or even Daniel's dream, with their eras labelled golden, silver, bronze, heroic, or iron. Though less common for Greek than Latin literature, the basic division of gold and silver surely suggested a material significance in description of the past.

Whatever their celebrated status, not all the Greeks of antiquity were created equal, either. Indeed, the assessments reached by classicists themselves transmuted over time. Already in 1905, one review of literature noticed a major change in the political judgments delivered on Greek history but correlated the change to scholars' own political sensibilities. Where an older generation of historians, men like George Grote (1794–1871), Ernst Curtius (1814–1896), and Max Duncker (1811–1886), had been rooted in the liberalism of the *Vormärz* period and praised the democracy of classical Athens, a younger one – which came of age amidst unification, as Bismarck fought the liberals, squashed revolutionaries, and curbed international politics – conceptualized Greek his-

69. Carl Wernicke, *Die Geschichte der Welt, zunächst für das weibliche Geschlecht*, 1st ed., 3 vols. (Berlin: Duncker, 1853–57). Already by volume three – and for subsequent editions of the work as a whole – the audience indicator disappeared.

tory so differently that it “sprang into sight on almost every page.”⁷⁰ Here, the glory years were Demosthenes’ no longer but rather those of Philip. Similarly, after the Great War, anglophone commentators discerned an historiographical trend towards a celebration of the imperial among 19th-century Germans. A different writer analyzed how “Hegelian speculation and Prussian aspiration” colored German representations of that same conflict between Macedon and Athens.⁷¹ So, too, Charles Darwin Adams noted, “If a Grote and a [Henry Lord] Brougham [1778–1868] saw in Demosthenes the champion of their own ideal democracy, certainly men who were enjoying the marvelous prosperity of imperial Germany could not fail to see in a Frederick the Great or a Wilhelm I another Philip of Macedon, and in opposition to the Macedonian Empire they saw only a suicidal attempt to maintain the system of petty states” – a statement that resonates with Arnaldo Momigliano’s re-description of “Macedon being the Prussia of antiquity.”⁷² A rupture had opened in writings on Greek antiquity across the long 19th century, separated by seismic shifts in the political ideals of historians themselves. The Jewish past was not along in finding itself the subject of modish values and criteria.

This essay has sought to tell a different chapter in the story of 19th-century constructions of Jewish antiquity – one recounted far less often than those of specifically theological, cultural, or even ethnic representations: namely, the national and political concerns that structured narratives and judgments of the past. Through specializing, institutionalizing, and disciplining forces of academic inquiry, ancient Judaism was increasingly bracketed by historians in the Germanies for nearly half a century, between 1820 and 1880. Not only did Jewish history from the Achaemenid to the Roman empires bear too close a connection to the objects and the province of theology, but it also

70. Theodor Lenschau, “Griechische Geschichte,” in *Die Altertumswissenschaft im letzten Vierteljahrhundert. Eine Übersicht über ihre Entwicklung in der Zeit von 1875–1900 im Verein mit mehreren Fachgenossen*, ed. Wilhelm Kroll (Leipzig: Reiland, 1905), 154–92; see also Robert Pöhlmann, *Griechische Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert. Festrede gehalten in der öffentlichen Sitzung der k. b. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München zur Feier ihres 143. Stiftungstages am 13. März 1902* (Munich: Royal Bavarian Academy, 1902).

71. John R Knipfing, “German Historians and Macedonian Imperialism,” *American Historical Review* 26, no. 4 (1921): 657–71.

72. Charles Darwin Adams, *Demosthenes and His Influence* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927), 151; Arnaldo Momigliano, “J.G. Droysen Between Greeks and Jews,” repr. in idem, *Studies on Modern Scholarship*, ed. G.W. Bowersock and T.J. Cornell (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994 [1970]), 147–61, at 151.

offered few exemplars to burning questions of the age – an era marked by a consciousness of the nation, realignment of political structures, and fracture of religious authority. Even further, critical portraits in this period of ancient Jewish history stemmed, at least in part, from a perceived failure by the Jews to preserve a national identity (apart from religion alone), to create artistic and scientific achievements, to secure a political independence, and to prevent a rule by clerics. At base, Jewish antiquity did not conform to those grand ideals of national-political autonomy revered more and more in the uncertain world of post-Napoleonic Central Europe.

Distinguishing between the approaches of theology and philology in a programmatic statement, Niebuhr once criticized the “theological disposition” as follows: “The history of the other peoples are only narrated insofar as they come into contact with the Jewish one and are always treated as dependent upon it.”⁷³ In the end, however, classicists had come to consider Jewish history in much the same way: analyzing ancient Judaism only insofar as it met the Greek or Roman past. Andreas Gottlieb Hoffmann may well have defended the Jewish past as a subject of study worthy – nay essential – in its own right and assigned such a neglect to the more technical dimensions of research, but other factors surely structured this non-treatment, from the hardening borders of disciplines to an outright aversion towards Judaism. When the silence of ancient historians broke, their word on the matter was often negative, indeed. Yet the judgments they formed were guided, in no small part, by political and national values consolidating in their present – criteria that did not conform to Jewish antiquity. Although Jewish antiquity now undergoes much study in its own right, just how much of these national and political concerns structure contemporary historiography is a question for another essay.

73. Barthold Georg Niebuhr, *Vorträge über alte Geschichte, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten*, Vol. 1, *Der Orient bis zur Schlacht von Salamis, Griechenland bis auf Perikles*, ed. M. Niebuhr (Historische und philologische Vorträge, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten, Part 2, *Alte Geschichte nach Justins Folge mit Ausschluß der römischen Geschichte*; Berlin: Reimer, 1847), 5; cf. idem, Vol. 3, *Die makedonischen Reiche, Hellenisierung des Orients, Untergang des alten Griechenlands, die römische Weltherrschaft*, 540–41. See Hoffmann, *Juden und Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, 40–41.