

Excavating Imperial Fantasies: The German Oriental Society, 1898–1914

Kristen E. Twardowski

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of History.

Chapel Hill
2015

Approved by:

Karen Hagemann

Konrad H. Jarausch

Daniel J. Sherman

© 2015
Kristen E. Twardowski
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Kristen E. Twardowski: Excavating Imperial Fantasies:
The German Oriental Society, 1898--1914
(Under the direction of Karen Hagemann)

Though established near the end of the age of exploration and empire, after its formation in 1898, the *Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft* (the German Oriental Society or DOG) quickly became a leading international archaeological society. This thesis explores this period of growth during the DOG's founding years in the 1890s until the First World War. It examines the motives that led to the DOG's inception, the structure and composition of this organization, and the ways in which the DOG used its publications to present itself to the public. Though members of the society held diverse professions, religions, and perspectives, they shared two aims: to extend Germany's international influence using archaeology and to solidify a respected place within the male elite of the German Empire. Unlike the rich literature on French and British Orientalism, studies on German Orientalism have only recently emerged. This thesis hopes to contribute to this developing scholarship.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Historiography, Methodology, and Sources.....	4
CHAPTER 1: Founding the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft.....	11
German Orientalism before 1898.....	11
The Founding of the DOG and its Goals.....	15
CHAPTER 2: The Organization of the DOG and Its Activities.....	22
The Members of the DOG.....	22
The Organization of the DOG and its Power Structures.....	34
The Member-Oriented Activities and Initiatives of the DOG.....	40
The Publications of the DOG.....	43
CHAPTER 3: Gaining Support for Near Eastern Projects.....	51
DOG Funded Excavations and Imperial Competition.....	52
Public Campaigns and German Identity.....	57
Institutionalizing Imperial Fantasies.....	63
CONCLUSION: Near Eastern Archaeology as a New Imperial Fantasy.....	68
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	71
Primary Documents.....	71
Secondary Documents.....	73

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - Major DOG Excavations, 1898-1914.....	54
--	----

INTRODUCTION

In a lecture given on January 13, 1902 to the members of the German Oriental Society (*Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft* or DOG), the leading Near Eastern¹ archaeological society of Wilhelmine Germany, Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch (1850–1922)² asked his peers,

What is the purpose of going to such great expense to ransack through mounds that are many centuries old, digging all the way to the water table, all the while knowing there is no gold or silver to be found? Why this *rivalry among the nations*, in order to secure the greatest possible number of desolate tells for excavation? (Emphasis in the original)³

The rivalry Delitzsch alluded to was the competition between Great Britain, France, and Germany to secure archaeological sites. Ultimately, Germany participated in this international struggle both to gain knowledge of the ancient Christian past and also “*for Germany's honor and for Germany's science.*”⁴ The members of the DOG considered their projects to be vital to the development of Germany’s sense of nationhood and significance in the international sphere.

Despite its claim of importance, the society had only been established in 1898, four years prior to Delitzsch's lecture. The society had, however, already gained a substantial following

1 Though in the nineteenth-century the Near East was a very broad term that could refer to the lands from North Africa to India, members of the DOG typically used it to refer to the lands held by the Ottoman Empire. I have adopted their understanding of the term.

2 Enno Littmann, “Delitzsch, Friedrich Conrad Gerhard” *Neue Deutsche Biographie (NDB)* 3 (1957): 582; Hermann Klüger, *Friedrich Delitzsch, der Apostel der neubabylonischen Religion; ein Mahnruf an das deutsche Volk* (Leipzig: Krüger, 1912); and Reinhard G. Lehmann, *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1994).

3 Here, “tells” refer to the earthen mounds of ancient settlements. Tells are created through the rebuilding on a single location. Thus, when DOG members excavated these tells, they were digging through many generations of buildings that had been constructed on top of one another. Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel: Ein Vortrag* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902), 4.

4 Emphasis in the original. Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel: Ein Vortrag* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902), 51.

among the educated and elite members of German society and experienced increasing support abroad. By 1902, membership had climbed to 656 and included participants from as far afield as Cairo, Constantinople, London, New York, Paris, and St. Petersburg. Among these members were prominent figures in German society such as Arthur von Gwinner (1856–1931), the director of the Deutschen Bank in Berlin,⁵ Friedrich Alfred Krupp (1854–1922), head of the steel manufacturing company Krupp,⁶ and Kaiser Wilhelm II (1859–1941), the leader of the German nation.⁷ Over the next decade and a half, the society led heralded excavations that included the survey of Babylon directed by internationally acclaimed archaeologist Robert Koldewey (1855–1925);⁸ the explorations in Egypt led by Ludwig Borchardt (1863–1938), German privy councilor and founder of the German Archaeological Institute in Cairo;⁹ and the surveys of Assyria managed by Walter Andrae (1875–1956), the famed archaeologist who would become curator of the Near East Museum (*Vorderasiatisches Museum*) in Berlin.¹⁰ Through these projects,

5 Wolfgang Arendt, “Gwinner, Arthur Philipp Friedrich Wilhelm von,” *NDB* 7 (1966): 361.

6 Renate Köhne-Lindenlaub, “Krupp, Friedrich Alfred,” *NDB* 13 (1982): 135–138.

7 DOG “Mitgliederverzeichnis,” *Jahresbericht* 4 (1903): 10–21. For more on Kaiser Wilhelm II, see Christopher M. Clark, *Kaiser Wilhelm II* (Harlow: Longman, 2000); Benjamin Hasselhorn, *Politische Theologie Wilhelms II* (Berlin: Dunker & Humblot, 2012); Wolfgang J. Mommsen, “Kaiser Wilhelm II and German Politics,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 25 (1990): 289–316; James Retallack, *Germany in the Age of Kaiser Wilhelm II* (Basingstoke: St. Martin’s Press, 1996); John C. G. Röhl, *Kaiser, Hof und Staat. Wilhelm II. und die deutsche Politik* (München: C.H. Beck, 1988); John C. G. Röhl, *Der Aufbau der Persönlichen Monarchie, 1888–1900* (München: C.H. Beck, 2001); and John C. G. Röhl, *Der Weg in den Abgrund, 1900–1941* (München: C.H. Beck, 2008).

8 Barthel Hrouda, “Koldewey, Robert,” *NDB* 12 (1980): 459–460; C.W. Ceram, *Gods, Graves, and Scholars* (New York: Knopf, 1951); and Ralf B. Wartke, *Auf dem Weg nach Babylon: Robert Koldewey, ein Archäologenleben* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2008).

9 Herbert Ricke, “Borchardt, Ludwig,” *NDB* 2 (1955), 455; Ludwig Borchardt, Daniel Wuensch, and Klaus P. Sommer, *Ludwig Borchardt: Die altägyptische Zeitmessung* (Göttingen: Termessos, 2013); Susanne Voss, “Ludwig Borchadts recherche zur herkunft des Ebers,” *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 65 (2009): 373–376.

10 Walter Andrae, *Lebenserinnerungen eines Ausgräbers* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961); Jürgen Bär, “Walter Andrae, ein Wegbereiter der modernen Archäologie,” in *Wiedererstehendes Assur. 100 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen in Assyrien*, ed. Joachim Marzahn and Beate Salje (Mainz, 2003), 45–52; and J.M. Cordoba, *Walter Andrae und die Wiederentdeckung Assurs das abenteuer der architektonischen zeichnung innerhalb der*

the DOG sought to achieve its goals of the study of oriental antiquity, further the acquisition of oriental artifacts for the Royal Museums and public collections, and propagate interest in the oldest human cultures.¹¹

As the society's agenda suggests, the group's participation in international imperial rivalries did not include a militaristic or expansionist approach. Unlike groups such as the German Eastern Marches Society (*Deutscher Ostmarkenverein* or DO) and the German Colonial Society (*Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft* or DK), the DOG did not seek to establish more German colonies in Eastern Europe or Africa.¹² Rather, the DOG's vision of Imperial Germany relied on the collection and presentation of Near Eastern cultural artifacts as a form of international cultural competition. Members of the society participated in this contest for three principal reasons: they sought to extend Germany's international cultural influence using archaeology; they considered the Near East to be the origin of Western Civilization and, more importantly, of Christianity; and they hoped to solidify a respected position for themselves within the male elite of the German Empire.¹³

My MA Thesis explores the rise of the DOG in 1898 until the disruption of the society by First World War in 1914. I identify the motives that led to the society's inception, the structure and composition of its mostly male, affluent and highly educated membership, and the ways in

archäologie des alten orientis (Madrid: University of Madrid, 2003).

11 "Die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft," *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung* 1.2 (1898): 36–37.

12 For more on the DO, see Adam Galos, *Die Hakatisten. Die deutsche Ostmarkenverein. Ein Beitrag der Geschichte der Ostpolitik des deutschen Imperialismus* (Berlin: Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1966); and Jens Oldenburg, *Der Deutsche Ostmarkenverein, 1894–1934* (Berlin: Logos, 2002). For more on the DK, see Imre Joef Demhardt, *Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft 1888–1918. Ein Beitrag zur Organisationsgeschichte der deutschen Kolonialbewegung* (Wiesbaden: Selbstverlag, 2002); and Franz Göttlicher, *Koloniale Gesellschaften und Verbände* (Bremerhaven: Wirtschaftsverlag, 2004).

13 For more the imagined German empire, see Susanne Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family & Nation in Precolonial Germany* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press 1997); and Birthe Kundrus, ed., *Phantasiereiche. Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus* (Frankfurt/Main: Campus Verlag, 2003).

which the society used its own publications to present itself to the public in order to gain support for its agenda. With my research project, I contribute to the growing field of literature on imperial fantasies, defined here as the articulation of desires and goals as framed through the abstract role of imperialism in forming and reshaping the metropole.¹⁴ The DOG presents a compelling subject of study not only because a global community of scholars quickly recognized it as a major organization but also because the society's leading members transcended scholars of the field to include internationally well-connected individuals who represented broad circles of the educated and wealthy male elite in Wilhelmine Germany. Within Germany, the members of the society used Near East archaeology to develop imperial fantasies among elite and popular circles in order to strengthen both their own as well as their nation's position in the imperial contest.

Historiography, Methodology and Sources

Because the DOG influenced and directed German imperial fantasies, this project draws on the historiography of both topics. Despite the society's relevance to Imperial Germany, no contemporary study of its history and political, social and cultural context exists. Current scholarship on the DOG focuses primarily on the mechanisms of the society or on the contributions of individual members. Several studies produced by the DOG itself, particularly those written by Gernot Wilhelm, once the chairman of the society, provide a wealth of knowledge about the group's history but do not interrogate its place in Wilhelmine society.¹⁵

14 For the role of imperialism in shaping the metropole, see Michael Dodson, *Orientalism, Empire and National Culture: India, 1770–1880* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); John M. Mackenzie, *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995); Alexander L. Macfie, *Orientalism: A Reader* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Books, 1978); Bryan S. Turner, *Orientalism: Postmodernism and Globalism* (London: Routledge, 1994). For a more explicit discussion of the historical role of fantasy, see Joan W. Scott, "Fantasy Echo: History and the Construction of Identity," *Critical Inquiry* 27.2 (2001): 284–304.

15 DOG, ed. *Deutsche Orientgesellschaft Seit 1898 im Dienste der Forschung* (Berlin, 1981); and Gernot Wilhelm,

However, in biographies of James Simon (1851–1932),¹⁶ the leading patron of the society, a more nuanced exploration of the DOG's role emerges. Historians Olaf Matthes and Bernd Schultz each hint at the cultural and social dynamics that shaped the group.¹⁷ Because they focus on Simon, they are not interested in interpreting the group's motives as a whole.

Scholarship on imperial fantasies has made much more thorough attempts to address important aspects of German society. As a result of discussions on Orientalism¹⁸ as well as work on “imagined communities”, scholars have begun to assess the role of the “imagined empire” and “imperial fantasies” in German history.¹⁹ In particular, Birthe Kundrus and Susanne Zantop have argued that though Germany's period as a colonial power was brief, the idea of Germany as an empire heavily influenced the development of the state.²⁰ These colonial or imperial fantasies

Zwischen Tigris und Nil. 100 Jahre Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Vorderasien und Ägypten (Mainz, 1998).

16 Olaf Matthes, “Simon, Henri James,” *NDB* 24 (2010): 436-438

17 Olaf Matthes, *James Simon: Mäzen im wilhelminischen Zeitalter* (Berlin: Bostelmann & Siebenharr, 2000); Olaf Matthes, *James Simon: die Kunst des sinnvollen Gebens* (Berlin: Hentrich & Hentrich; Centrum Judaicum, 2011); and Bernd Schultz, *James Simon: Philanthrop und Kunstmäzen* (Berlin; New York; München: Presetel, 2007).

18 For the German context, see Nina Berman, *Orientalismus, Kolonialismus und Moderne: um Bild des Orients in der deutschsprachigen Kultur um 1900* (Stuttgart: M und P, 1997); Frederick N. Bohrer, *Orientalism and Visual Culture: Imagining Mesopotamia in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Sabine Mangold, *“Eine weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft”: Deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004); Todd Kontje, *German Orientalisms* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press 2004); Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race and Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); and Andrea Polaschegg, *Der andere Orientalismus. Regeln deutsch-morgenländischer Imagination im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005).

19 The phrase “imagined communities” was popularized by Benedict Anderson in order to describe how individuals can consider themselves members of a group despite the absence of face-to-face daily interactions. Though Anderson considered these groups to be largely political, the term has been expanded by other scholars to include other categories. See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); and Jacqueline Rose, *States of Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

20 Birthe Kundrus, ed., *Phantasiereiche. Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2003); and Susanne Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770–1870* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997).

occupied Germans over a hundred years before any state-sponsored colonial activities, and they involved not only the possibility of German but also the constant presence of international competitions. Though these fantasies encompassed many motivations, scholars such as Isabel V. Hull have viewed them primarily in reference to what followed: namely, attempts at expanding eastward, the First World War, and the coming of the Third Reich.²¹ In contrast to these works, I explore the conflicting nature of these imperial narratives within their contemporary context in order to highlight the social and political tensions of the period.

Throughout this essay, the concepts of “fantasy” and “cultural capital” are integral to my understanding of why the members of the DOG expressed such profound interest in Near Eastern excavations and artifacts. Because members of the society used imagined visions of the Near East to frame their own desires and identities as German citizens, “fantasy” as a cultural construct plays an important role in this study. I combine literature scholar Jacqueline Rose's argument that “there is no way of understanding political identities and destinies without letting fantasy into the frame” with historian Joan W. Scott's understanding of “fantasy” as a particular desire's representation, “which at once reproduces and masks conflict, antagonism, or contradiction” while constructing a coherent narrative.²²

Because members of the society used these fantasies in order to increase their social, political, and professional status, the concept of “cultural capital” similarly is vital to

21 See Eric Ames, Marcia Klotz, and Lora Wildenthal, eds., *Germany's Colonial Pasts* (Trenton: University of Nebraska Press, 2005); Nina Berman, *Orientalismus, Kolonialismus und Moderne: Zum Bild des Orients in der deutschsprachigen Kultur um 1900* (Stuttgart: M and P, Verlag für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 1996); Sara Friedrichsmeyer, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop, eds., *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998); Isabel V. Hull, *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005); and Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

22 Jacqueline Rose, *States of Fantasy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 4; and Joan W. Scott, “Fantasy Echo: History and the Construction of Identity,” *Critical Inquiry* 27.2 (2001), 288–289.

understanding their motivations. I draw from sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's three-pronged approach to understanding of cultural capital as embodied through knowledge, skills acquired through education; objectified in physical items such as images, books, or, in the case of the DOG, ancient artifacts; and institutionalized through the state, seen here in the partnership between the DOG, the Kaiser, and the German state museums.²³

In addition to these concepts the theories of Orientalism and professionalization form the backbone of this work. As a result of the DOG's excursions into the Near East as well as the use of the Near East and its artifacts as a symbol, underlying this study is the theory of Orientalism. Though the work has been much maligned since its original publication, Edward Said's seminal text *Orientalism* still forms the backbone of my own understanding of the topic. Which is to say that Orientalism “is a style of thought based upon ontological and epistemological distinction between “the Orient” and (most of the time) “The Occident””²⁴ and that these distinctions become “an integral part of European material civilization and culture.”²⁵ Though numerous, well-founded critiques of Said's work, especially his omission of the German case have emerged, Said's fundamental theory, particularly the notion that Western nations projected their own hopes and goals onto their understanding of the East, remains useful.²⁶ Because Said minimizes German Orientalism, historians of Germany Suzanne Marchand and Ursula Woköck supplement my definition. Marchand shows that Germany created a vibrant form of Orientalism that

23 Pierre Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital,” in *Cultural Theory: An Anthology*, eds., Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 82.

24 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Books, 1978), 5.

25 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Books, 1978), 1–2.

26 For these critiques and reinterpretations, see Ziad Elmarsafy, ed., *Debating Orientalism* (Hondmills; Basingstoke; Hamshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Robert Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and Their Enemies* (London: Allen Lane, 2006); Chandreyee Niyogi, *Reorienting Orientalism* (New Delhi; Thousand Oaks, CA; London: SAGE Publications, 2006); Daniel Martin Varisco, *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2007); Ibn Warraq, *Defending the West: A Critique of Edward Said's Orientalism* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2007).

depended little on colonial politics, which is particularly pertinent to the DOG, since the society neither sought nor interfered with German colonial projects.²⁷ Because many of the group's projects revolved around scholarship, Woköck's assertion that the narratives of Orientalists must be understood "by contextualizing the stories of individual scholars in Middle East studies in terms of the development of the profession at the university" plays another vital role in my project.²⁸ Orientalism emerged in the DOG through the group's projected fantasies, its avoidance of colonial politics, and its relationship to the professional study of the ancient Near East.

Because one major aim of the DOG was to build an influential professional organization for scholars of the Near East, another vital approach for the study is the history of professions and professionalization.²⁹ Beginning in the 1950s and 1970s, political scientists and sociologists asserted that the construction of a profession relied on claims that an occupation required specialized education, the appearance of social responsibility, and the presence of a unified group identity.³⁰ Because of the importance of class to the DOG, I combine this definition with sociologist Keith M. Macdonald's assertion that class constrained what groups could professionalize because "gentlemen wished to have their money, their property, their bodies, and

27 Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 19.

28 Ursula Woköck, *German Orientalism: The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945* (London: Routledge, 2009), 79.

29 Jeff Hearn, "Notes on Patriarchy, Professionalization and the Semi-Professions." *Sociology* 16.2 (1982): 184–202; Konrad H. Jarausch, "Introduction." In *German Professions, 1800–1950*, ed. Konrad H. Jarausch and Geoffrey Cocks (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Magali Sarfatti Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley; London; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977); and Maria Malatesta, *Professional Men, Professional Women: The European Professions from the 19th Century until Today*, trans., Adrian Belton (London; New Delhi; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2011).

30 In particular, see Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957). This monograph asserts that professions must have three attributes: expertise, responsibility, and corporateness. Huntington's analysis is constrained by the subject of the study, namely the professionalization of the military, which makes it difficult to ascertain the extent to which these attributes can be generalized.

their souls dealt with by gentlemen, and ordinary people followed their example if they could afford to.”³¹ By applying these definitions to German structures of professionalization, I ascertain how and why Near Eastern-related professions gained prominence through the DOG.³²

The primary sources of this study are the main publications of the DOG, in particular the editions of the journal *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* and the annual *Jahresbericht* and *Mitglieder-Verzeichnisse* published between 1898 and 1915.³³ In these publications, the society’s members portrayed the DOG and its activities as vital to the perpetuation of national and imperial identity for upper class German men. To supplement this material, I investigate other publications written by leading DOG members who sought to define and propagate the agenda of the DOG.³⁴ These additional sources provide insight into the unofficial narratives constructed around the DOG. They show not only how DOG leadership presented the society but also what political, economic, and social factors that motivated them.

The study is divided in three chapters. The first explores the motivations for founding the *Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft* in Wilhelmine Germany and contextualizes the DOG historically as well as internationally. The second chapter delves into the membership of the society and its

31 Keith M. Macdonald, *The Sociology of the Professions* (London: Sage Publications Ltd, 1995), 31.

32 A wealth of German scholarship on the subject has been produced. In particular, the following titles inform my approach. Lothar Burchardt, “Professionalisierung oder Berufskonstruktion?” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 6 (1980): 326; Claudia Huerkamp, *Der Aufstieg der Ärzte im 19. Jahrhundert. Vom gelehrten Stand zum professionellen Experten* (Göttingen, 1986); Charles E. McClelland, “Zur Professionalisierung der akademischen Berufe in Deutschland,” in Werner Conze and Jürgen Kocka, eds., *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1985); Konrad H. Jarausch, “Introduction,” in *German Professions, 1800–1950*, edited by Konrad H. Jarausch and Geoffrey Cocks (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

33 DOG, *Jahresbericht* (Berlin: DOG, 1899–1915); DOG, *Mitglieder Verzeichnis* (Berlin: DOG, 1899–1915); DOG, *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient Gesellschaft* 1–54 (1898–1914); DOG, *Sendschriften* 1–15 (1898–1914).

34 Examples of these publications include public and published lectures such as Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1903); and Friedrich Delitzsch, *Zweiter Vortrag über Babel und Bibel* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1903); and monographs such as Walter Andrae, *Lebenserinnerungen eines Ausgräbers* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961); Robert Koldewey and Karl Schuchardt, *Heitere und ernste: Briefe aus einem deutschen Archäologeleben* (Berlin: Grote, 1925); and Robert Koldewey *Das wieder erstehende Babylon, die bisherigen Ergebnisse der deutschen Ausgrabungen* (Leipzig, J.C. Hinrichs, 1913).

composition. It examines how the mostly affluent, highly educated members of the DOG were differentiated by social status, religion and gender. The last chapter explores the ways in which the DOG used its excavations and publications to present itself to the public and to gain support for its agenda. The conclusion discusses the aims that the DOG members shared. In particular, it investigates how these men used Near Eastern Archaeology as a symbol of Imperial Germany in order to extend Germany's international cultural and political influence and to distinguish and solidify their own positions within the German Empire.

CHAPTER 1: FOUNDING THE DEUTSCHE ORIENT-GESELLSCHAFT

German Orientalism before 1898

Despite the fanfare surrounding the founding of the *Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft*, interest in the Near East was not new; fascination with the region had been rising for a century both outside and within Germany. Though private cabinets of curiosities (*Kunstkabinett* or Cabinets of Wonder), rooms in which aristocrats displayed their collection of rare objects, had included artifacts from the Near East since the Renaissance, broad, systematic, and public-oriented interest in the region did not emerge until the nineteenth-century.³⁵ Following Napoleon's Egyptian Campaign (1798–1801), Western interest in the region rose.³⁶ In Great Britain and France, systematic excavations of the Near East reached an apex in the 1840s and resulted in the creation of extensive Near Eastern collections in state museums. The two leading archaeologists during this period were French archaeologist Paul-Émile Botta (1802–1870), who discovered the ruins of Khorsabad and an extensive collection of Assyrian sculptures and works

35 Ken Arnold, *Cabinets for the Curious: Looking Back at Early English Museums* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2006); Horst Bredekamp, *Antikensehnsucht und Maschinenglauben. Die Geschichte der Kustkammer und die Zukunft der Kunstgeschichte* (Berlin: Wagenbach, 1993); and Oliver Impey and Arthur MacGregor, eds., *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001).

36 For the ways Napoleon's Egyptian Campaign influenced Europe, see Marie-Cécile Thoral, "Napoleon's Egyptian Campaign and Nineteenth Century Orientalism: Perception and Memory in Autobiographical Accounts and Novels," in *War Memories: The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in Modern European Culture*, eds. Alan Forrest, Étienne François, and Karen Hagemann, 114–136 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

of cuneiform³⁷ and British archaeologist Austen Henry Layard (1817–1894), who investigated the ruins of Babylon and Nineveh and located similar artifacts.³⁸

With these finds, state involvement in Near Eastern archaeology grew. The Assyrian artifacts discovered by Botta and Layard were quickly integrated into the collections of the Louvre and the British Museum respectively. Exhibits in the Louvre displayed items like the massive lamassu, statues of protective deities with a bearded human head, wings, and a bull or a lion's body, on view for the general public.³⁹ The collection at the British Museum was similarly impressive as a result of Layard's hope of "the saving the Monuments of the distant past in ancient Assyria from destruction and bringing them out of their present concealment to the illustration which European knowledge may be able to throw upon their meaning and history."⁴⁰

In addition to the seemingly altruistic goal of increasing scholarship, these excavations and the study of Assyrian artifacts offered men the opportunity to gain social and professional status. Botta suggested that if an ambitious civil servant was "determined to return Eastward and to seek a consulate, you may depend upon it that your name be brought before the public

37 See Charles Levavasseur, "Notice sur Paul-Émile Botta," in *Relation d'un Voyage Dans L'Yémen* (Paris: Benjamin Duprat, 1880), by Paul-Émile Botta 1–34; Paul-Émile Botta, *M. Botta's Letters on the Discoveries at Nineveh*, trans. C.T. (London: Longman, Brown, Grown, and Longmans 1850); Seton Lloyd, *Foundations in the Dust* (London: Penguin Books, 1980); Julian Reade, *Assyrian Sculpture* (London: British Museum Press, 1983), 5–12.

38 Mogens Trolle Larsen, *The Conquest of Assyria: Excavations in an Antique Land 1840–1860* (London; New York: Routledge, 1996); Austen Henry Layard, *Nineveh and its Remains: A Narrative Expedition to Assyria during the Years 1845, 1846, & 1847* (London: John Murray, 1891); and Shawn Malley, *From Archaeology to Spectacle in Victorian Britain: The Case of Assyria, 1845–1854* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012).

39 Francis H. McGovern and John N. McGovern, "BA' Portrait: Paul Émile Botta" *The Biblical Archaeologist* 49.2 (1986): 111.

40 In addition to Layard's own works, see H.W.F. Saggs, "Introduction," in *Nineveh and its Remains* by Austen Henry Layard (New York: Routledge & K. Paul, 1970), 1–64. For the British Museum's collections, see Edward Miller, *That Noble Cabinet: A History of the British Museum* (London, 1973), 191–223. The first systematic listing of the British Museum's Assyrian artifacts was published in 1848. *Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum* 53rd edition (London, 1848) in Frederick N. Bohrer, "The Times and Spaces of History: Representation, Assyria, and the British Museum," in *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourse, Spectacles*, edited by Daniel J. Sherman and Irit Rogoff (University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 203–204.

connected with fresh discoveries at Nimrud and [this] would be of considerable service [to the state].⁴¹ He spoke from personal experience; starting in 1840, Botta served as a French consul in the city of Mosul. It was during this position that he received encouragement from Julius Mohl, the secretary of the Asiatic Society of Paris (*Société Asiatique de Paris* or SA) to seek sites of ancient ruins along the banks of the Tigris.⁴²

The role of the *Société Asiatique* was not entirely unique; French and British academic societies interested in the Near East had advocated for increased study of the region since the 1820s. The SA along with its main periodical, the *Journal Asiatique*, were both created in 1822 in order to develop and spread knowledge about the region from North Africa to the Far East.⁴³ The creation of a similar society in Great Britain quickly followed. In 1823, a series of British academics founded The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (RAS) so that “an association of intelligent persons might encourage research, extend intercourse between Europe and Asia, and lead to results reciprocally beneficial.”⁴⁴ Like the *Société Asiatique*, the RAS soon created its own scholarly publication, *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (formerly the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*), first published in 1834.⁴⁵ As

41 BL, Add. MS 38941, fo. 36, quoted in Paul-Émile Botta, quoted in Holger Hoock, *Empires of the Imagination: Politics, War, and the Arts in the British World, 1750–1850* (London: Profile Books, Ltd, 2010).

42 Francis H. McGovern and John N. McGovern, “BA' Portrait: Paul Émile Botta” *The Biblical Archaeologist* 49.2 (1986), 111.

43 Robert Fox, “Scientific Enterprise and the Patronage of Research in France.” *Minerva* 11 (1973) 442–444; Alain Schnapp, “French Archaeology: Between National and Cultural Identity.” In *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, edited by Margarita Diaz-Andreu and Timothy Chapon, 48–67 (London: Univeristy College London Press, 1996); and Société Asiatique, *Le Livre du Centenaire (1822–1922) de la Société Asiatique* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1922).

44 Frederick Eden Pargiter, ed. *Centenary Volume of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland 1823–1923* (London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1923), vii.

45 For more on the RAS, see Frederick N. Bohrer, “Inventing Assyria: Exoticism and Reception in Nineteenth-Century England and France,” *Art Bulletin* 80 (1998): 336–356; John E. Curtis and Julian E. Reade, eds., *Art and Empire: Treasures from Assyria in the British Museum* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1995); Stuart Simmonds and Simon Digby, eds., *The Royal Asiatic Society: Its History and Treasures* (Leiden: E.J. Brill,

Botta's anecdote suggests, these societies encouraged not merely a scholarly interest in the Near East but also the excavation of ancient ruins and the retrieval of ancient artifacts.

In contrast to the broader interests of individuals in Britain and France, specialists of the Near East in Germany remained focused on academic scholarship, mainly in the fields of religion, culture, language, literature, and art. This emphasis was encouraged by the German Eastern Society (*Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft* or DMG), founded in 1845. Leaders of this Leipzig-based group included primarily scholars such as Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801–1888),⁴⁶ a leading Orientalist and Professor of Oriental Languages at Leipzig University, and Georg Heinrich August Ewald (1803–1875),⁴⁷ an Orientalist and Professor of Theology first at the University of Göttingen and later at the University of Tübingen.⁴⁸ Unlike the SA or RAS, the leaders of the DMG did not seek to conduct adventurous excavations in the Near East or reclaim artifacts for the increasing number of museums found in the states of the German Confederation. The DMG instead focused on promoting the study of Eastern languages, religions, and cultures within Germany, which circumvented the need for resources and political support necessary to perform excavations.⁴⁹ To further its goals, the society created two academic journals, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen* (*ZDMG*) in 1847 and

1979).

46 Lutz Bellmann, *Der Orientalist Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801–1888) als Leipziger Hochschullehrer von internationalem Rang* (Leipzig: Diplomarbeit, 1986); G. Höpp, “Hinrich Leberecht Fleischer und die Arabische Aufklärung” in *Orientalistische Philologie und arabische Linguistik*, edited by W. Reuschel, 7–12 (1990).

47 Thomas Witton Davies, *Heinrich Ewald Orientalist and Theologian 1803–1903 A Centenary Appreciation* (London: 1903); Lothar Perlitt, “Heinrich Ewald. Der Gelehrte in der Politik,” in *Theologie in Göttingen: eine Vorlesungsreihe*, ed. Bernd Müller, 157–212 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987).

48 Holger Preissler, “Die Anfänge der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (*ZDMG*) 145.2 (1995): 247.

49 Holger Preissler, “Die Anfänge der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (*ZDMG*) 145.2 (1995): 260.

Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes (AKM) a decade later in 1857.

The Founding of the DOG and its Goals

After the founding of the German Empire in 1871, Germany began to participate more in the international arena. By the 1880s, a segment of the German population supported a growing Imperialist movement as well as Germany's participation in the “Scramble for Africa”. This scramble involved a new wave of invasion, occupation, colonization, and annexation of African territory by European powers.⁵⁰ In this political context, individuals also became interested in imperialist contest of a less militaristic and economic kind, namely the excavation of ruins and the retrieval of artifacts from the Near East and other parts of the globe for German state museums, particularly for the museums in Berlin that were funded by the federal government. To facilitate excavations, the German government and scholars of the region supported the foundation of multiple organizations including the *Orient-Comité* “behufs Erforschung der Trümmerstätten des Alten Orients” (Committee for the Study of the Ruins of the Ancient Orient), in 1887 and the *Deutscher Verein zur Erforschung Palästinas* (German Association for the Study of Palestine) founded in 1881.⁵¹

This shift in Near Eastern activities was reinforced, in part, by the new international and domestic policies enacted under Emperor Wilhelm II's (r. 1888–1918) leadership. Unlike German chancellor Otto von Bismarck, who put forth relatively neutral international trade policies between 1871 and 1890, Wilhelm II endorsed more aggressively imperial strategies. After he

50 Muriel Evelyn Chamberlain, *The Scramble for Africa* (London: Routledge, 2014); Dirk van Laak, *Über alles in der Welt: deutscher Imperialismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (München: C.H. Beck, 2005); John M. Mackenzie, *The Partition of Africa, 1880–1900, and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century* (New York; London: Methuen, 2005); and Helmut Stoecker, *German Imperialism in Africa: From the Beginnings until the Second World War* (London: Hurst & Co., 1986).

51 Suzanne Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 192–193.

dismissed Bismarck as chancellor in 1890, Wilhelm began to support expansionist policies, backed by nationalist elites, in hopes of constructing an empire equal to those of France and Great Britain. In addition to building their own imperial connections, Germany policies attempted to disrupt French and British colonial powers. In an attempt to gain more control over North Africa, Germany supported Morocco's quest for independence from France, which led to the first Moroccan crisis in 1905–1906.⁵² The conflict was a military and diplomatic disaster for Germany. Moroccan nationalists failed spectacularly to extricate their country from French control, and France and Britain instated political and economic sanctions on Germany to punish the European power's interference.

Though this shift in policies included the German military, and interests in Africa and Asia, the German government strongly courted the Ottoman Empire.⁵³ Creating personal ties between Germany and the Ottoman Empire seemed particularly important to the facilitation of good relations between the two nations. In order to foster German-Ottoman “friendship”, Wilhelm II first visited the head of the empire, Sultan Abdül Hamid II (r. 1876–1909) in Constantinople in 1889.⁵⁴ This meeting resulted in a strong economic and political partnership and led to a major trade agreement between the two nations. In 1898, Wilhelm II continued this pattern of German-Ottoman friendship and made a second visit to the Near East. Such interactions facilitated the concession between the German Bank and the Ottoman Empire stating

52 Eugene Newton Anderson, *The First Moroccan Crisis, 1904–1906* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1966); and Gregory D. Miller, *The Shadow of the Past: Reputation and Military Alliances before the First World War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).

53 Gregor Schöllgen, ed., *Escape into War? The Foreign Policy of Imperial Germany* (Oxford: Berg, 1990).

54 Doğan Gürpınar, *Ottoman Imperial Diplomacy: A Political, Social and Cultural History* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014); Reşat Kasaba, *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy: The Nineteenth Century* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988); Donald Quataert, *The Ottoman Empire, 1700–1922* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); and Naci Yorulmaz, *Arming the Sultan: German Arms Trade and Personal Diplomacy in the Ottoman Empire before World War I* (London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2014).

that a railroad could be built from Berlin to Baghdad.⁵⁵

In addition to these social and political changes, which fostered the public interest in the territories of the Near East, the study of the history, language, and culture of this region also began to flourish. Beginning in the 1870s, universities contributed more of their funding to the development of departments dedicated to the study of the Near East. Vital to this shift in academic politics was Friedrich Delitzsch (1850–1922), the first scholar to earn a *Habilitation*, the highest academic qualification possible in Germany, in Assyriology at the University of Leipzig in 1874.⁵⁶ Delitzsch, along with Eberhard Schrader (1836–1908), the chair for Oriental languages at the Friedrich-Wilhelm-University of Berlin starting in 1875, became the backbone for scholarly research on the Near East.⁵⁷ Their success occurred in tandem with the creation of several new publications focused on the Near East. These included *The Journal of Cuneiform Research* (*Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung*), established in 1884, and *The Orientalist Literature Journal: Monthly Journal of the Science of the Entire Orient and its Relationship to Adjacent Cultures* (*Orientalistische Litteraturzeitung. Monatsschrift für die Wissenschaft vom ganzen Orient und seinen Beziehung zu den angrenzenden Kulturkreisen*), established in 1898.⁵⁸

Despite increased political and academic interest in the Near East, societies like the Orient-Comité struggled to gain enough monetary support to fund excavations; individuals interested in gaining artifacts decided to intercede. (Henri) James Simon (1851–1932), partner in

55 Ludmila Hanisch, *Die Nachfolger der Exegeten: deutschsprachige Erforschung des Vorderen Orients in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 29–32.

56 Johann Fück, *Die Arabischen Studien in Europa: bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1955), 287.

57 Ursula Woköck, *German Orientalism: The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945* (London; New York: Routledge, 2009), 146.

58 Ursula Woköck, *German Orientalism: The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945* (London; New York: Routledge, 2009), 147.

the Simon Brothers' cotton conglomerate proved crucial to this intervention.⁵⁹ Simon had first become interested in the arts during the 1880s when he became acquainted with German art historian and future director of the state museums Wilhelm von Bode (1845–1929). Though Simon met with the founders of the Orient-Comité and supported their quest to finance Near Eastern excavations for the state museums, he quickly became frustrated the group's failure to gain adequate monies. As a result, Simon sought alternative funding routes and ultimately founded a society of his own: the DOG.⁶⁰

Though the source record on this period is erratic, it is obvious that at some point during the late 1880s, Simon began to gather support for this new society from elite members of German society as well as Near Eastern scholars. Simon had experience founding other successful societies such as the Protection Agency against Child Abuse and Exploitation (*Verein zum Schutz der Kinder Mißhandlung und Ausnutzung*), the Society for Public Entertainment (*Verein für Volksunterhaltungen*), and the Aid Association of German Jews (*Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden*), so it is likely that he knew how to quickly gain public support and monetary assistance from his peers for his newest project. His connections in court circles also undoubtedly aided this endeavor.

Regardless of the intricacies of the founding process of the DOG the establishment of the society was well under way by November of 1897. During this month, archaeologist Robert Koldewey (1855–1925) wrote to his friend and colleague classical archaeologist Otto Puchstein (1856–1911) about a preparatory trip to Mesopotamia.⁶¹ Though Koldewey does not explicitly

59 Olaf Matthes, “Simon, Henri James,” *NDB* 24 (2010): 436–438; Bernd Schultz, *James Simon: Philanthrop und Kunstmäzen* (Berlin; New York; München: Prestel, 2007).

60 Bernd Schultz, *James Simon: Philanthrop und Kunstmäzen* (Berlin; London; New York; München: Prestel, 2007), 14–16.

61 Robert Koldewey to Otto Puchstein, November 16, 1897, in Robert Koldewey, *Heitere und ernste Briefe aus einem*

state that the excavation for which he is prepping is at the behest of the DOG, it is likely that he was preparing for the DOG sponsored excavations that began in January of 1898. This timeline indicates that the founding members of the DOG believed that enough funds would be available for such an endeavor. Indeed, the DOG's first annual report indicates that it remunerated Robert Koldewey and Gorlitz 1,200 RM for unspecified work in October and November, likely the work Koldewey had written about previously.⁶²

Simon and Koldewey's interest in the Near East culminated shortly after two o'clock on January 24, 1898 with the official founding of the DOG. Unlike the Orient-Comité, Simon had managed to gather support for Near Eastern excavations. Under the soaring cupola in the Egyptian wing of the *Neues Museum* in Berlin, Prince Heinrich von Schoenaich-Carolath (1852–1920) addressed almost 60 gentlemen of high society who had gathered there.⁶³ As a member of both the Reichstag and the Prussian House of Lords (*Herrenhaus*), Schoenaich-Carolath's role indicated that the DOG would not simply be a group of elite men or scholars interested in the Near East but that this society and its projects would be tied to the German state.⁶⁴ Referencing beloved German writer Johann von Goethe, Schoenaich-Carolath reaffirmed this connection between the Near East and Germany by proclaiming “Gottes ist der Orient, Gottes ist der Okzident.”⁶⁵

deutschen Archäologenleben, ed. Carl Schuchardt (Berlin: G. Grot'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1925), 121.

62 DOG, “Kassenbericht”, *Jahresbericht* 1 (1899), 10.

63 On Schoenaich-Carolath, see “Schoenaich-Carolath, Heinrich Prinz von,” *Deutsche Biographie*, accessed November 22, 2014, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz115135.html>. The most thorough description of the event it found in “Die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft,” *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung* 1.2 (1898): 33.

64 See Werner Herzog, *Prince Henry of Schoenaich-Carolath 1852–1920. Freimaurer und Politiker im deutschen Kaiserreich* (Schwerin: Stock & Stein, 1999); and Ludwig Maenner, *Prinz Heinrich zu Schoenaich-Carolath. Ein parlamentarisches Leben zur wilhelminischen Zeit (1852-1920)* (Berlin; Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1931).

65 “Die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft,” *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung* 1.2 (1898): 34. Goethe uses the phrases

During this first meeting, the founding members of the DOG asserted that the society would undertake three primary objectives:

1. the advancement of the study of Oriental antiquity in general and in particular, the advancement of the study of the ancient monuments in Assyria, Babylon, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the other countries of Western Asia;
2. furthering the acquisition of Oriental Antiquities, art monuments, and the general cultural aspirations of the Royal Museum in Berlin as well as other public collections in the German Empire;
3. and the dissemination of the results of research on Oriental antiquity in an appropriate manner and the propagation of interest in the oldest human cultures.⁶⁶

Though these goals would ostensibly guide the society's projects the interests and needs of its members unofficially influenced the development as well. The leaders of the DOG as well as the relationships between members steered the projects and focal points of the society.

The society's aims resulted from the immense social and political changes that Germany had experienced over the past decade. For archaeologists and scholars such as Koldewey and Delitzsch, the appearance of the state interest in the Near East provided the opportunity to advance their professional positions within the university and gain funding for their projects. In a similar manner, men like Bode, Simon, and even the Kaiser saw acquisitions from that region as an opportunity to cultivate German museum collections. This quest for artifacts did not simply stem from a love of ancient art but was seen as a representation of the emergence of a German

in his 1819 collection of poetry, *West-östlicher Diwan*. The complete stanza reads, "Gottes ist der Orient! Gottes ist der Okzident! Nord- und südliches Gelände/ Ruht im Frieden seiner Hände". Scholars differ on the precise interpretation of the terms. Edward Said's *Orientalism* famously presents the work as a romantic vision of the East that ignores the history of the land. However as Daniel Marin Varisco notes in *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid*, Goethe was quoting a translated version of the Quran. See Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Books, 1978); and Daniel Martin Varisco, *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2007).

66 "Die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft," *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung* 1.2 (1898): 36–37.

Empire that could be competitive with the empires of Great Britain and France. The desire to propagate interest in the Near East that is described in the final goal, therefore, expresses other, unwritten hopes of DOG members.

The following chapter will explore how the members of the DOG used the society in order to realize their diverse imperial fantasies. It will begin with an assessment of the DOG membership and explore what types of people sought a position in the archaeological society as well as what they hoped to gain from their membership. Next, the chapter will evaluate how the society was organized, who held power within the group, and how these hierarchies helped give voice to some types of these fantasies while silencing others. These dynamics emerged in the member-oriented activities and initiatives of the DOG. During these social and often academic events, society members had the opportunity to forge social and political connections to benefit themselves rather than simply to further DOG goals. Lastly, the chapter will turn to the publications of the DOG in order to appraise how the group represented itself and what type of imperial fantasy emerged as the dominant narrative in these publications.

CHAPTER 2: THE ORGANIZATION OF THE DOG AND ITS ACTIVITIES

The Members of the DOG

Art historian Bernd Schultz has described patron James Simon as a “Pied Piper” who drew wealthy and well-positioned men to the cause of German museum creation.⁶⁷ The DOG proved to be one such avenue through which Simon and other men operated. Though the membership in the DOG was, ostensibly, accessible to anyone, its members were almost without exception educated middle- or upper-class individuals. In part, the DOG restricted its membership through the price of its dues. At a minimum, members paid 10 RM for an annual subscription, which would have been prohibitively expensive for most Germans.⁶⁸ For civil servants, however, the price was reasonable. A typical lecturer councillor (*Vortragender Rat*) earned around 10,000 RM annually, which was more than enough to purchase a membership.⁶⁹ The cost of the joining the society was such that by the end of its first year the DOG had already grown to over 500 members, predominately men, who came from three distinct groups: the court and the aristocratic elite, scholars from different disciplines interested in the Near East, and men

67 Bernd Schultz, *James Simon: Philanthrop und Kunstmäzen* (Berlin; New York; München: Presetel, 2007), 14.

68 DOG, *Jahresbericht* 1 (1899). For comparison, a single issue of the *Berliner Illustrirte Zeitung* cost 10 pfennig, and workers could purchase individual issues rather than a subscription. Corey Ross, *Media and the Making of Modern German: Mass Communications, Society, and Politics from the Empire to the Third Reich* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 30; see also Werner Faulstich, *Medienwandel im Industrie- und Massenzeitalter (1830–1900)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

69 John C.G. Röhl, *The Kaiser and His Court: Wilhelm II and the Government of Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 141.

from the *Bürgertum*, the urban bourgeoisie.⁷¹

Analyzing the motives of the society members first requires understanding what type of people participated in the DOG. Membership grew throughout the founding period. Despite this growth, the majority of members were always educated, wealthy men. By the end of its first year, the society had 533 members.⁷³ The greatest portion of these members, 32 percent, lived in the city of Berlin, and the vast majority of the group had a German nationality.⁷⁴ Despite the alleged openness of the society's membership, 34 percent of the members either were elites from the highest political and social echelons of Wilhelmine Society or were scholars of the Near East, and 66 percent were members of the *Bürgertum*.⁷⁵ Despite minor fluctuations, the proportions of elites, scholars, and *Bürgertum* remained consistent between 1898 and 1914.

What changed over the next decade and a half, however, was the size of the organization, the number of members from abroad, and the number of *Bürgertum*. By 1914, the DOG had grown to 1,510 members.⁷⁶ Though the group was much larger than the numerous local voluntary associations that included everything from gymnastics clubs to women's relief societies, the DOG remained much smaller than politicized imperial associations such as the German Eastern Marches Society (*Deutscher Ostmarkenverein Förderung des Deutschtums in*

71 DOG, *Jahresbericht* 1 (1899): 6. Though the *Bürgertum* typically includes academics and scholars, I have removed these men from the category in order to better differentiate the motives of men who produced and published scholarship on the Near East from those who consumed that scholarship.

73 DOG, "Mitglieder-Verzeichniss," *Jahresbericht* 1 (1899), 12–20.

74 DOG, "Mitglieder-Verzeichniss," *Jahresbericht* 1 (1899), 13–14. 172 members in total have Berlin listed as their primary residence in the journal.

75 DOG, "Mitglieder-Verzeichniss," *Jahresbericht* 1 (1899), 12–20. This is a conservative estimate. Examining the *NDB* shows that at least 183 of these men held positions that would bring them in the contact with the royal court or other elite circles. When I could not find definitive information about an individual, I assumed they were not part of this elite group.

76 DOG, *Jahresbericht* 16 (1914), 13.

den Ostmarken or DOFDO), which had 48,000 members by 1913.⁷⁷ Unlike the DOFDO, the DOG never sought to reach vast portions of the population and instead focused on cultivating bourgeois membership. Despite the growth of the society's international membership, the group's center remained in Berlin; 37 percent of the members were from the city. With the growth of the DOG, the number of international members increased and more men from outside the elite circles became members.⁷⁸

Though many voluntary organizations prohibited the membership of women, the DOG welcomed them. However, women always remained a small percentage of the group's overall membership. In 1914, a typical year, only 6 percent of members were women.⁷⁹ Women participated in the society for two primary reasons: their social standing or their professional advancement. The majority of female members took part in the DOG because of their social position and the social position of their their male relatives.⁸⁰ Being a DOG member allowed these women to participate in Wilhelmine high society and constituted a part of their cultural capital. This capital was both individual in the sense that allowed women to assert their own cultivation and a household resource in the sense that it elevated the families of these women.⁸¹

77 David Blackbourn, *History of Germany, 1780–1918: The Long Nineteenth Century* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub., 2003), 324.

78 DOG, *Jahresbericht* 16 (1914): 22–28. 556 members listed Berlin addresses.

79 DOG, *Jahresbericht* 16 (1914): 21–42. Only 83 of the 1510 members are identified as women.

80 For example, both Dr. Max Reichenheim of Berlin and his wife are listed as members of the society. However, he is listed under his full name (Herr Reichenheim, Dr. Max) whereas she is identified only as his wife (Frau Reichenheim, Dr. Max). Anna Zanders is identified as Frau Anna Zanders, geb. (born) v. Siemens. DOG, *Jahresbericht* 16 (1914): 26. There is, however, a great deal of inconsistency in the identification of women. Some women are with their full name as well as with their husband or father's title and others are simply listed under their own name. Members determine how they wish to be identified both on their membership card and in the DOG's membership lists. The identification is patterned according to how these women and or their families wish to present themselves to the public; women who study the Ancient Near East or are affiliated with the field in some way are much more likely to be listed under their own name than their husbands. Professional advancement likely influenced their decision.

81 For a more extensive discussion of the difference between individual and group cultural capital, see Elizabeth B.

For women who were identified in relation to their male relatives, in particular, this membership was used to convey the high-ranking status of the entire family unit and not simply the position of an individual.

Despite this trend, some women did participate in the society as a part of their own professional advancement. Two typical female professional members of the DOG were Caroline L. Ransom and Hedwig Schäfer. Caroline L. Ransom (1872–1952), was one of the first women with a doctoral degree in Egyptology and served as assistant curator of Egyptian Antiquities for the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York,⁸² and Hedwig Schäfer was a librarian in Berlin who researched economic issues related to colonies.⁸³ Both of these women were about 20 years younger than leading DOG members such as Robert Koldewey and Friedrich Delitzsch who were born in 1855 and 1850 respectively. Female professional contemporaries of Koldewey and Delitzsch were much rarer, likely because of cultural and social restrictions. Women were

Silva, "Gender, Home and Family in Cultural Capital Theory," *The British Journal of Sociology* 56.1 (2005): 100.

82 Though it was rare for women to hold scholarly positions at this time, it was not completely unheard of. Not to be confused with the artist from Ohio, Caroline L. Ransom graduated from Bryn Mawr College with a degree in art and archaeology in 1905. In addition to her role as assistant curator, Ransom worked as a Professor at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and published her own studies on museums and the ancient past including Caroline L. Ransom, "The Value of Photographs and Transparencies as Adjuncts to Museum Exhibits," *Proceedings of the American Association of Museums* 6 (1912): 42–46. In addition to printing Ransom's paper, this article includes a transcript of the discussion following Ransom's presentation. This discussion indicates that Ransom played an active role in shaping discourse surrounding museums and ancient acquisitions. Participating in groups like the DOG allowed her to access to the latest research on Near Eastern antiquities, which she could apply to her own professional advancement. See J. R. Wheeler and William N. Bates, "Twenty-Fifth Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens," *American Journal of Archaeology* 10 (1906): 8–17; The University of Chicago, "The Association of Doctors of Philosophy," *The University Record* 12 (1908): 41.

83 Schaefer's precise birth and death dates are unknown. However judging from her publications as well as her years of membership in the DOG, she was likely born between 1870 and 1890. Schaefer wrote Hedwig Schäfer, *Die Produktion von Kapok und dessen Stellung in der Weltwirtschaft* (Berlin: Kolonial-Wirtschaftliches Komitee (or KWK), 1925). The KWK, the group that sponsored this particular work, sought to expand German trade internationally, promote German settlement abroad, expand commodity production in the colonies, and increase the sale of domestic goods within the colonies. For Schaefer, the economic issues of the KWK are connected to the culture capital produced by the DOG. See Kolonial-Wirtschaftliches Komitee and Geo A. Schmidt, *Das Kolonial-Wirtschaftliche Komitee: ein Rückblick auf seine Entstehung und Seine Arbeiten aus Anlass des Gedenkjahres 50-jähriger deutscher Koloniarbeit* (Berlin: Kolonial-Wirtschaftliches Komitee, 1934).

explicitly banned from German universities in the 1860s and 1870s, for example, and were not readmitted until 1900 when Baden once again allowed female applicants.⁸⁴ Participating in the DOG as well as holding professional rolls separated Ransom and Schäfer from previous generations of women who were not allowed to hold such roles. Having membership in the DOG, therefore, connected both of these women to an international community of scholars and allowed them to keep abreast of current topical research, just as their male colleagues did and also allowed these women to assert that they belonged in the academic world.

Despite their participation in the group, women did not greatly influence the aims or development of the society. During its founding period, no woman every served on its executive board, nor did a woman ever write an article published in its main journals. The society remained male-dominated as well as predominately German and as such primarily reflected the goals and beliefs of German men.

These male members of the society can broadly be divided into three already mentioned three groups: aristocratic elites, scholars of the Near East, and the *Bürgertum*. Though members of the elite class composed the smallest portion of DOG membership, they, along with academic scholars, were the most influential members and formed the core of the society. Throughout the society's founding period, the elite members of the DOG were among the wealthiest, most politically and socially powerful men in Germany. To name just a few, they included the director of the *Deutsche Bank*, (Johann) Georg von Siemens (1839–1901) whose major professional goals included financing international railroad systems, including the Baghdad Railroad;⁸⁶ the

84 Patricia Mazón, *Gender and the Modern Research University: The Admission of Women to German Higher Education, 1865-1914* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003), 8 – 10.

86 Martin L. Müller, “Siemens, Johann Georg von,” *NDB* 24 (2010): 375–376.

head of the Krupp German steel manufacturer, Friedrich Arthur Krupp (1854–1902);⁸⁸ Lord Mayor Franz Adickes (1846–1915) who helped found the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University;⁹⁰ and Lord Mayor and director of the *Nationalbank für Deutschland* Richard Witting (1856–1923).⁹¹ Because of their social, economic, and political positions, these men travelled among the highest echelons of Wilhelmine society.

Through their affiliation with the society, these men reaffirmed their position as the most socially and politically powerful men in Wilhelmine Germany. Associations like the DOG enabled men to maintain personal and professional relationships and to further their political platforms.⁹² For German-Jewish men like James Simon, a great patron of public education and the arts who aimed for an increase of the German Empire's cultural influence, this political program included the DOG's ability to educate the Germans on the ancient Near Eastern past and the joint roots of Western civilization and Jewish and Christian religions. He fought for a decrease German military spending, because he believed that Germany's future lay in cultural, not military, dominance. For men like the Kaiser, however, archaeological excursions into the Near East mirrored both his desire to cultivate diplomatic and economic relations with the Ottoman Empire and also his hope for finally gaining cultural superiority in the international race

88 DOG, *Jahresberichte* 1–16 (1899–1915); Viktor Schützenhofer, “Krupp, Arthur,” *NDB* 13 (1982): 146. Krupp worked to diversify the Krupp business and extended Krupp Works to include other enterprises. He also served on the Reichstag from 1893–1898. The most contested aspect of Krupp's life was his sexuality. In 1902, a Social Democratic magazine (*Vorwärts*) asserted that Krupp was a homosexual. These claims resulted in Krupp's suicide and inspired a furious rebuttal by Kaiser Wilhelm II. See Bernd-Ulrich Hergemöller, *Mann für Mann, Biographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte von Freundschaft und männlicher Sexualität im deutschen Sprachraum* (Hamburg: Männerschwarm Skript-Verlag, 1998), 449; and Julius Meisbach, *Friedrich Alfred Krupp – wie er lebte und starb* (Köln: Verlag K.A. Stauff & Cie., 1903).

90 Hermann Meinert, “Adickes, Franz,” *NDB* 1 (1953): 67.

91 The most thorough biography of Witting appears to be Arthur Kronthal, *Ryszard Witting: szkis biograficzny* (Poznan: s.n., 1931). After WWI, Witting published his own account of the diplomatic and political reasons the war occurred. See Richard Witting, *Auswärtige Politik und Diplomatenkunst, Kriegsmoralität, Lehmann und Krause* (Berlin: Kronen-Verlag, 1917).

92 Nancy Ruth Reagin, *A German Women's Movement*, 18.

of cultural imperialism. Though the members of the society did not always agree on political issues, their interest in the Near East united them.

In addition to these elites, the DOG also featured a large contingent of scholars. This group included primarily men who had undergone university training in disciplines such as archaeology, art history, religious studies, or the study of the languages and literatures of the Ancient Near East and, most importantly, produced scholarship on these subjects. One especially influential group was formed here by the leaders of German public museums, especially the Berlin State Museums. This group often straddled the line between elite and scholarly membership. Scholar and art specialist Wilhelm von Bode (1845–1929) were one of the central players of these museum elite-scholars.⁹³ He focused on collecting items for the Berlin State Museums, advised the Kaiser on tasteful art acquisition, and went to social events with the leaders of the Berlin secession.⁹⁴ Because Bode was considered an arbiter of “socially acceptable art,” his support of the DOG encouraged conservative Germans to act as patrons of the society even if they would normally have considered Near Eastern artifacts to be “too primitive.” In addition to Bode, General Director of the German State Museums Richard Schöne (1840–1922), participated in the society.⁹⁵ Schöne had long been active in the renovation of the royal museums and had worked to make the State Museums equal in quality to the British museums, especially

93 Ludwig Justi, “Bode, Arnold Wilhelm von,” *NDB* 2 (1955): 347.

94 The Berlin Secession (*Berliner Secession*) was founded in 1898 as an art association for Berlin artists who sought to work outside of the state-run Association of Berlin Artists. Notable members included the Secession's President, Max Liebermann, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Edvard Munch, Emil Nolde, and numerous others interested in modern art. On the Berlin Secession, see Werner Doede, *Die Berliner Secession* (Ullstein Verlag, 1977); Peter Paret, *The Berlin Secession. Modernism and Its Enemies in Imperial Germany* (Harvard University Press, 1980). For more on Bode, see Karsten Borgmann, “‘The Glue of Civil Society’: A Comparative Approach to Art Museum Philanthropy at the Turn of the Twentieth Century.” In *Philanthropy, Patronage, and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America*, edited by Thomas Adam, 34–55 (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004), 44.

95 Gertrud Platz-Horster, “Schöne, Richard Curt Theophilus” *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 23 (2007): 403–404.

in the categories of acquisitions, collections, and publications.⁹⁶ Together representatives of the State Museums helped guide the projects and funding distribution of the DOG.

These men's motivation for supporting the DOG's archaeological projects was clear; ancient Near Eastern artifacts could make Berlin's museums as grand as those found in Great Britain and France, and their positions within German academia and society as well as in the international community of museum directors and curators would rise as a result. Artifacts from Ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome had either already been claimed by other nations or were difficult to access politically.⁹⁷ Because Kaiser Wilhelm II had fostered diplomatic ties with the Ottoman Empire that Britain and France lacked, the Near East provided these scholars with the perfect landscape from which to glean artifacts and create new museum collections. The growing collections, consequently, provided men like Bode with the reasons to seek expanded funding from the state; with so many new objects, the museums needed larger and grander spaces in which to exhibit them. All of this further reinforced the ability of the German state museums to compete with other art museums internationally.

The majority of the academic members of the DOG were formed by less patently political

96 Schöne was also the first commoner and first archaeologist to hold such a high position in the State Museums. See Gertrud Platz-Horster, "Schöne, Richard Curt Theophilus" *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 23 (2007): 403–404; and Claudia Bohm, "Richard Schöne" In *Archäologenbildnisse. Porträts und Kurzbiographien von Klassischen Archäologen deutscher Sprache*, edited by Reinhard Lullies and Wolfgang Schiering (Mainz, 1988); and Ludwig Pallat, *Richard Schöne – Generaldirektor der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der preußischen Kunstverwaltung 1872–1905* (Berlin, 1959).

97 Germany did, however, manage to support several major archaeological projects focused on these civilizations. Heinrich Schliemann, for example, led a series of four excavations to uncover the Grecian city-state of Troy between 1871 and 1890. Schliemann uncovered extraordinary golden artifacts including what he called Priam's Treasure and the Mask of Agamemnon. These excavations, however, occurred in Ottoman territory and, thus, avoided overt conflicts with British and French interests. See Donald F. Easton, "Heinrich Schliemann: Hero or Fraud?" *The Classical World* 91.5 (1998): 335; and David A. Traill, *Schliemann of Troy: Treasure and Deceit* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995). The DOG also led its own excavations into Tell el-Amarna, Egypt. This project, however, did not receive the full support of the society, many of whom doubted they would discover anything of value. As a result, philanthropist James Simon provided nearly all of the funding for the project himself. See Ludwig Borchardt, *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Sahura* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910); and Bernd Schultz, *James Simon*, 17.

scholars who were affiliated with German universities or made a living as independent scholars and archaeologists. Three of the most prominent scholars in the DOG were Robert Koldewey,⁹⁸ Ludwig Borchardt⁹⁹ and Walter Andrae.¹⁰⁰ As a result of their DOG sponsored projects, these men published dozens of academic papers on topics related to the study of the Ancient Near East.¹⁰¹ The flourishing of their publications indicates that these scholars were largely interested in the DOG because the society had the potential to advance them professionally and help them to get the public support, funding and recognition for their excavations and their related research.

These scholars joined the DOG mainly because they hoped a membership would strengthen their status as academic professionals. Though German scholars had studied the languages and religions of the Near East throughout the 1800s, German universities still lacked vital departments or professorial positions on those topics. As such, scholars had to reinforce

98 Barthel Hrouda, "Koldewey, Robert," *NDB* 12 (1980): 459–460; C.W. Ceram, *Gods, Graves, and Scholars* (New York: Knopf, 1951); and Ralf B. Wartke, *Auf dem Weg nach Babylon: Robert Koldewey, ein Archäologenleben* (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2008).

99 See Herbert Ricke, "Borchardt, Ludwig," *NDB* 2 (1955), 455; Ludwig Borchardt, Daniel Wuensch, and Klaus P. Sommer, *Ludwig Borchardt: Die altägyptische Zeitmessung* (Göttingen: Termessos, 2013); S. Voss, "Ludwig Borchardts recherche zur herkunft des Ebers" *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 65 (2009): 373–376.

100 On Walter Andrae (1875–1956), see Walter Andrae, *Lebenserinnerungen eines Ausgräbers* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961); Jürgen Bär, "Walter Andrae, ein Wegbereiter der modernen Archäologie," in *Wiedererstehendes Assur. 100 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen in Assyrien*, ed. Joachim Marzahn and Beate Salje (Mainz, 2003), 45–52; and J.M. Cordoba, *Walter Andrae und die Wiederentdeckung Assurs das abenteuerer der architektonischen zeichnung innerhalb der archäologie des alten orientis* (Madrid: University of Madrid, 2003).

101 Some of the most well known of these publications are Walter Andrae, *Allgemeine Beschreibung der Ruinen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908); Walter Andrae, *Die Festungswerke von Assur* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913); Walter Andrae, *Einzelbeschreibung der Ruinen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912); Ludwig Borchardt and Heinrich Schäfer, *Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen bei Abusir. 1. Im Winter 1898–99* (Berlin: Reichsdr., 1902); Ludwig Borchardt, *Kunstwerke aus dem aegyptischen Museum zu Cairo, mit Erläuterungen* (Cairo: F. Diemer Nachf., 1908); Friedrich Delitzsch, 'Ex oriente lux'. *Ein Wort zur Förderung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1898); Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babylon, mit einem plan des ruinenfeldes* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899); Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel: Ein Vortrag* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902); Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel: Zweiter Vortrag* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903); Robert Koldewey, *Die Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa, nach den ausgrabungen durch die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911); and Robert Koldewey, *Das wieder erstehende Babylon, die bisherigen ergebnisse der deutschen ausgrabungen* (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1913).

their value to the academic community in order to gain new positions. These men joined the DOG because the society offered them a venue to study and publish on the ancient past, which reinforced their worth to the German academia and society at large. Membership in the DOG also allowed these scholars to make connections to the elite members of the society who could influence universities and grant allotment through their role as patrons.¹⁰² Taking part in the DOG was vital to building an academic career for these men.

The third group of DOG members was the *Bürgertum*, i.e. bourgeois individuals who did not belong to the highest echelons of society. These individuals typically lacked noble blood, and though they did not belong to the wealthiest, well-connected elite group of the bourgeoisie either, but they hoped to belong to this group in the near future. Unlike the scholarly members of the society, who also mainly came from middle class families, the members of the DOG who belonged to the *Bürgertum*, were usually academically educated too. But they had chosen a different career path. Many had earned their wealth during Germany's period of rapid industrialization in the latter half of the nineteenth-century. They strove to rise politically and socially and hoped to join the ranks of the male elite of the Wilhelmine Empire.¹⁰³ This majority of the society's male members consumed DOG publications and had the option of attending its events. The high percentage of members from the *Bürgertum* indicates that, for them, being

102 The Kaiser, for example, created the Kaiser Wilhelm Society (*Kaiser-Wilhelm Gesellschaft*) in 1911 in order to provide funding to scholars in multiple fields. Günter Wendel, *Die Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft 1911–1914. Zur Anatomie einer imperialistischen Forschungsgesellschaft* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975).

103 Because they did not belong to the highest echelons of German society, less information is readily available about these men and women than previous categories. Explorations of local German archives may allow for further analysis of this group to be done. See David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans, *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991); Heiner Karuscheit, *Deutschland 1914: vom Klassenkompromiss zum Krieg* (Hamburg: VSA, 2014); Carolyn Helen Kay, *Art and the German Bourgeoisie: Alfred Lichtwark and Modern Painting in Hamburg, 1886–1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002); Maiken Umbach, *German Cities and Bourgeois Modernism, 1890–1924* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

listed as a member of the DOG, receiving its publications, and participating in its social, cultural and academic events provided interesting benefits. Most likely the cultural capital granted by membership in the group motivated men of the *Bürgertum* to join the DOG. With their membership, they hoped to signal to the public that they belonged to the educated and wealthy elite of the *Kaiserreich*. The DOG offered them a stage on which they could represent their (aimed for) status and make connections to peers and superiors. Cultural capital, social and economic factors intertwined here, and forming personal connections allowed the *Bürgertum* to profit both in terms of cultural capital as well as in terms of their business relationships.

Though members from each of the categories had distinct reasons for joining the society, their education, upbringing, and understanding of themselves as German men united them and motivated their DOG membership. Academic education, a strong believe in the superiority of German *Bildung* and a shared understanding of Western civilization united this men and formed their collective male identity.

Men from wealthy noble and well-off middle-class families shared an experience going through the German University system. In addition to providing these men with a “classical” education, potentially sparking an interest or at least working knowledge of the ancient era, this system also reinforced how this male elite should act and view themselves. As historian Lisa Fetheringill Zwicker shows, the increasingly democratized nature of German politics and economics did not prevent university graduates from maintaining their special place in German society because of their relationship to *Bildung*. Indeed, a male university graduates “could hope to go on to become a substantial presence in his community, and a gulf divided those who had experienced *Bildung* from those who had not.”¹⁰⁴ The members of the DOG had experienced this

104 Lisa Fetheringill Zwicker, *Dueling Students: Conflict, Masculinity, and Politics in German Universities, 1890–1914* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2011), 7.

process and imagined themselves as the leading class of Germany.

Their belief in *Bildung* and their sense of self-cultivation bound the male DOG-members as did their shared interest in public education and the arts. This included the aim of enriching the museum collections of the German state, and these museums represented the superiority of the German culture domestically and internationally. For many elite men, thus membership in the DOG indicated their belonging to the small social circle of German society that was able to patronize the arts. These men included James Simon and coal and steel baron Oscar Huldshinsky (1846–1931) among others.¹⁰⁵ Like Simon, Huldshinsky was a generous patron of the arts; both men were founding members of the Kaiser Friedrich Museum Association (*Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Verein* or KFMV)¹⁰⁶ in addition to a member of the DOG and patron of the Berlin state museums.¹⁰⁷ Artistic patronage composed an essential part of the identity of these elite men, and they felt it was their duty to shape and enlighten the lower echelons of German society. They intended for the collection and public display of art to enhance all of

105 Wilhelm von Bode, ed., *Die Sammlung Oscar Huldshinsky* (Berlin: Cassirer, 1928).

106 The KFMV was founded the year before the DOG in 1897. The association was created at the behest of Wilhelm von Bode in order to promote the art gallery and sculpture collections of the Berlin State Museums. In particular the association sought to acquire paintings from the fifth- to eighteenth-centuries, to organize exhibits and public events, and to promote academic lectures on art. The founding members of the society, many of whom were also members and sometimes founding members of the DOG included Kaiser Wilhelm II, Wilhelm von Bode, Rechtsanwalt Dr. Paul Herrmann, Oscar Huldshinsky, Friedrich Alfred Krupp, Franz von Mendelssohn, Georg Meyer, Paul Schwabach, James Simon, and numerous other high ranking Germans. Unlike the DOG, however, official interactions between members of the association were not encouraged; the bulk of their communications was limited to annual reports or missives from Bode to the other members. For a more extensive exploration of the KFMV's history, see Eva Giloi, *Monarchy, Myth, and Material Culture in Germany 1750–1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Bettina Held, *Kaiser-Friedrich-Museums-Verein: Tradition, Leidenschaft, Kunstverstand* (Berlin: Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Verein, 2006); Kaiser-Friedrich-Museums-Verein, *Statut des Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Vereins in Berlin* (Berlin: Kaiser-Friedrich-Museums-Verein, 1897); Sven Kuhrau, *Der Kunstsammler im Kaiserreich: Repräsentation in der Berliner Privatsammlerkultur* (Kiel: Verlag Ludwig, 2005); and Ralf Roth, “German Urban Elites in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.” In *Who Ran the Cities?: City Elites and Urban Power Structures in Europe and North America, 1750–1940*, edited by Robert Beachy and Ralf Roth, 127–160 (Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2007).

107 “Gründungsmitglieder,” Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Verein, accessed October 20, 2014, http://www.kaiserfriedrich-museums-verein.de/cms/front_content.php?idcat=33.

Germany and with this present the cultural dominance of the empire internationally.

Another shared belief of the male members was their appreciation of Western civilization, rooted in ancient antiquity. Here, religion, particularly the search for the origins of Judaism and Christianity, played a significant role in a German interest in the Near East. Though there was a large Jewish minority in the DOG, the society's members were overwhelming Protestant. Members of both religions sought greater knowledge of Biblical history, and this knowledge could only come from the excavation and study of the ancient Near East. This religious interest was not merely personal but also was tied to Germany identity. Though secular intellectual culture flourished throughout the nineteenth-century, Christianity retained a prominent position in German society. Even as late as the 1890s, the Kaiser advocated for the presence of Protestant education in public schools.¹⁰⁸ According to the dominant cultural narrative of the period, participating fully in German society mean participating in Protestantism.

Because of all these reasons, the DOG became not simply an archaeological but also a cultural and in the broadest sense political society that participated in the project of constructing a collective Wilhelmine identity. This project both sought to affirm German greatness during a time when German industries and the economy were thriving while simultaneously binding the nation to an ancient Biblical past centered in the Near East. Membership in the society was personal as well as highly political.

The Organization of the DOG and its Power Structures

Despite the society's ostensible openness in terms of participation, the organizational system of and hierarchies in the DOG reflected the inequalities present in broader structures of Wilhelmine society. The society was predominately led by its elite members who received input

¹⁰⁸ Todd H. Weir, *Secularism and Religion in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Rise of the Fourth Confession* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 254.

from leading scholars. The majority of middle-class members, in spite of their large numbers, had little direct input into the management and funding of the DOG. Despite the seeming cohesion of the elite male members of the society, religious distinctions between Judaism and Protestantism divided even the highest ranking members. Though powerful German Jews like Simon led the society, the DOG's public persona remained bound to the Protestant perspective that dominated Wilhelmine Germany.

The DOG easily fit into Germany's established legal and social structures. Though the association's legal status was in flux for the first several years of its existence, by 1902 it was officially a registered association (*eingetragener Verein* or e.V.) in the association register for Royal District Court 1 (*Königlichen Amtsgerichts I*) in Berlin.¹⁰⁹ After this time, the society began to label itself as an “*eingetragener Verein*” in its publications as well.¹¹⁰ As a registered association, the DOG asserted that it was not a group intended for commercial purposes and counted as a legal entity that could enter contracts, own property, and incur debt. However, the association's new status also meant that it was obligated to pay taxes.¹¹¹ Adopting this new status allowed the DOG to more adeptly manage monies and fund its projects.

The DOG's aims and projects were influenced most heavily by its executive board. Its members were confirmed by the society's annual meeting. The executive board directed all major decisions of the DOG including where it would fund excavations, who would lead these projects,

109 DOG, “Satzung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft,” *DOG*, accessed December 10, 2014, <http://www.orient-gesellschaft.de/satzung.html>.

110 DOG, *MDOG* 16 (1902–1903): 1.

111 Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, Jürgen Kocka, and Arnd Bauerkämper, eds., *Geselligkeit und Demokratie, Vereine und zivile Gesellschaft im transnationalen Vergleich 1750–1914* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2003); and Klaus Nathaus, *Organisierte Geselligkeit. Deutsche und britische Vereine im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2009).

and how resources would be distributed.¹¹² The executive board also oversaw the management of DOG publications and meted out funds for public lectures, DOG meetings, as well as the publication of articles, directories, brochures, and membership cards.¹¹³ The board solely consisted of men who either belonged to the aristocratic male elites or were well-known scholars of the Near East.¹¹⁴ Prior to 1914, these men consistently included DOG founders James Simon, Wilhelm von Bode, and Friedrich Delitzsch as well as the politician Prinze Heinrich zu Schoenach-Carolath. Though scholars like archaeologist Alexander Conze (1831–1914) were occasionally elected to the board, the bulk of its members belonged to the aristocratic elite. Scholars seem to have played a secondary role.¹¹⁵

Because of this composition, any decisions made by the DOG's executive board primarily reflected the goals of these men. However, the board members were not complete autocrats. Their presence on the board relied on elections held during the DOG's meetings, so they needed to retain enough broad support from the society's members in order to retain power. The executive board decisions stemmed from the tension that often existed between the aims of the board members and the aims of the lay members.

In addition to these members, Kaiser Wilhelm II himself influenced the directives of the society. On March 20, 1901, the Kaiser took on the DOG as a protectorate.¹¹⁶ Though the precise

112 DOG, *Jahresbericht* 1 (1899), 3.

113 DOG, *Jahresbericht* 1 (1899) 10.

114 Men consistently on the executive board included James Simon, Heinrich Schoenach-Carolath, Wilhelm von Bode, Friedrich Delitzsch, and the Kaiser to name but a few. Though scholars were on the board, the bulk of board members were from the elite group; scholars seem to have played a secondary role. See DOG, *Jahresberichte* 1–16 (1898–1915).

115 Friedrich Goethert, "Conze, Alexander Christian Leopold," *NDB* 3 (1957): 348.

116 *MDOG* 7 (1901): 1. The DOG used the term "Protectorat" here rather than "Schutzgebiet". Schutzgebiet was used to indicate Germany's colonies and protected areas at the end of the nineteenth-century. See works such as Hans Weicker, *Kiatschou: das deutsche Schutzgebiet in Ostasien* (Jiaozhou: A Schall, 1908); Deutsche

details of this relationship remain somewhat obscured—the Kaiser seems to overstate his role in his autobiography—several facets emerge.¹¹⁷ The DOG presented its new relationship with the Kaiser with obvious pride. Rather than feature the usual, staid cover for the March 1901 issue of MDOG, this issue featured a prominent image of the imperial crown below which, in a font larger than the title of the journal, were the words “His Majesty the Emperor and King had the grace to take over the German Oriental Society as a protectorate by a resolution on March 20th of this year.”¹¹⁸ This appreciation for the Kaiser likely results from his ability to provide money for the group; in 1901, the Kaiser donated 15,000 RM and gave 40,000 RM from the Royal Disposition funds as late as 1914. WWI, however, ultimately redirected the Kaiser's financial priorities, and he stopped providing monetary support by 1915.¹¹⁹ Despite the presence of the Kaiser, DOG board members retained overall control over the excavations performed and the distribution of funds. When archaeologist Robert Koldewey described seeking additional funding, he mentioned speaking with Schöne and Simon, but did not describe any royal input.¹²⁰

Though Wilhelm II did not closely manage the society, he maintained an interest in its activities. In his memoirs, he claimed,

I accepted with pleasure the offer of the presidency of the German Oriental Society and devoted myself to the study of its work, which I promoted to the best of my ability, never missing one of its public lectures on the result of its explorations. I had much to do with those at the head of it and caused detailed

Kolonialblatt, *Mitteilungen aus den Deutschen Schutzgebieten* (1889).

117 DOG archives may hold missives or internal documents that provide more details.

118 DOG, *MDOG* 7 (1901): 1.

119 DOG, *Jahresberichte* 1–16 (1899–1915).

120 Robert Koldewey, “Zusammenkunft: Briefe zu Otto Puchstein, August 25, 1898,” in *Heitere und ernste Briefe aus einem deutschen Archäologenleben*, edited by Carl Schuchardt (Berlin: G. Grot'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1925), 130.

reports to be made to me of the excavations at Nineveh, Assur, and Babylon, in Egypt and in Syria, the protection and facilitation of which I often personally brought influence to bear on the Turkish government.¹²¹

Robert Koldewey's letters from his excavation at Babek affirms that the Kaiser sought these reports.¹²² The Kaiser frames his interest in the DOG as a largely academic and religious affair. In his memoirs, he claims that Assyriology appealed to him because it could bring to bear “an elucidation and vitalizing of the Old Testament, and, hence, of the Holy Scriptures.”¹²³ The Kaiser's religious and academic interests and his monetary and political support likely influenced the society but did not direct it. But his interests were mirrored by the motives of other aristocratic men in the executive board. Despite the presence of scholars on the board, academic experts of the Near East clearly had less influence on its decisions and with it the development of the society.

The ability of individuals to influence the politics of the DOG depended not only on descent, social status, and wealth but also, in part, on religion. Despite the many similarities among the most powerful men of the DOG, religion was an important marker of difference. The leaders of the association were typically either Jewish such as James Simon and Georg Siemens or Protestant such as Friedrich Krupp and the Kaiser. For some of the Jewish members, interest in Near Eastern excavations stemmed from an interest in Jewish history. Noted Zionist J. Ginsberg, likely a pseudonym, was one such member of the DOG; his concern for the Jewish past and Near Eastern archaeology was directly related to his involvement in crafting a future for

121 Wilhelm II, Emperor of Germany, *The Kaiser's Memoirs*, trans. Thomas R. Ybarra (London; New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1922), 203.

122 Robert Koldewey, “Babek: Briefe zu Otto Puchstein, Janaury 5 or 6, 1899,” in *Heitere und ernste Briefe aus einem deutschen Archäologenleben*, edited by Carl Schuchardt (Berlin: G. Grot'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1925), 135.

123 Wilhelm II, Emperor of Germany. *The Kaiser's Memoirs*. Translated by Thomas R. Ybarra (London; New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1922), 203.

the Jewish people.¹²⁴

Despite the presence of illustrious Jewish members, the society avoided emphasizing the role of Jewish “influence” in the public and its publications. The society's prominent authors and archaeologists were Christian, and then often framed their work as exploring Christianity's biblical history rather than including the history of Judaism. Important Jewish members like Simon tried to avoid fostering the Anti-Semitism that existed among the Protestant elites. The Kaiser, in particular, was often vehemently opposed to Judaism and did not wish to connect it with German Protestantism in any way. Wilhelm II hoped that excavations into the Biblical past would prevent the growth of religious dogmatism and allow for a more thoroughly academically based differentiation between the two religions. In a letter to the philosopher Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855–1927),¹²⁵ the Kaiser wrote, “The Jews are *not our religious predecessors*” but rather Aryans are.¹²⁶ Prejudices like these prevented Jews from having careers in the army or in high-ranking diplomatic positions in Germany.¹²⁷ However, the DOG provided Jewish men like James Simon to participate in a German identity project and, consequently, assert their own German-Jewish identity.

124 Under this name, Ginsberg published in J. Ginsberg, “Das Deutsche Bureau der Alliance Israélite Universelle,” *Ost und West: Illustrierte Monatsschrift für das Gesamte Judentum* 14.1 (1914): 9. It is possible that this was a pseudonym for Ascher Ginsberg, noted Zionist, as his pen and Hebrew name Ahad Ha'am also appears in this article. The evidence indicating this is, however, circumstantial.

125 Chamberlain is perhaps best known for his work Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1899). This text ranked the contributions of European “races” and concluded that Teutonic peoples had influenced the development of Western civilization the most. The text was often used by supporters of the pan-Germanic movement and supporters of Nazi racial policies. For further reading, see Geoffrey G. Field, *Evangelist of Race: The Germanic Vision of Houston Stewart Chamberlain* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1981); Jean Real, “The Religious Conception of Race: Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Germanic Christianity,” in *The Third Reich: Essays on the National-Socialist Movement in Germany*, edited by Edmond Vermeil, 243–286 (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1955); and Otto Graf zu Stolberg-Wernigerode, “Chamberlain, Houston Stewart,” *NDB* 3 (1957): 187–190.

126 As quoted in Lamar Cecil, *Wilhelm II: Emperor and Exile, 1900–1941* (Chapel Hill, NC; London: The North Carolina University Press, 1996), 318.

127 Lamar Cecil, *Wilhelm II: Emperor and Exile, 1900–1941* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 57.

Despite the presence of powerful members of the Jewish community on the DOG's executive board, the society typically presented itself as having a Christian-oriented perspective. Power remained in the hands of elites, and the society's goals reflected the desires and goals of these elites. Though the DOG's publications adopted portrayed the group as good Christian Germans, the society provided a unique opportunity for its Jewish members. The society allowed these men to both support the study of the ancient Jewish homeland in a socially acceptable way as well as provided them with access to political and personal echelons of society in which German Jews were often prohibited from participating.

The Member-Oriented Activities and Initiatives of the DOG

The ability of DOG members to make and maintain personal relationships with one another relied on member-focused events and special projects. By attending these events, members had the ability to interact with well-off and educated men of different social circles who shared beliefs in *Bildung* and the German *Kulturmission*. The relationships they developed during these events then bolstered the personal projects of the members involved.

The collective identity of members as highly educated and influential male elites within the Wilhelmine Empire was a primary impetus to join the association. The society systematically maintained and developed this identity through its member-oriented activities and initiatives. These events included club meetings, lectures, celebrations, and social events during which members had the opportunity to talk with one another and make social connections that could aid in their personal and professional goals. In addition to board meetings, the DOG held annual general assemblies in such elegant places like the *Konferenzsaal des Bankhauses S. Bleichröder* zu Berlin. These general assemblies typically followed the same pattern. Prince Heinrich von Schoenaich-Carolath oversaw the proceedings, James Simon discussed the finances and future funding opportunities, and scholars such as Leopold Messerschmidt (1870–1911), the curator of

the Near Eastern Department of the Royal Museums in Berlin,¹²⁸ discussed the excavations and results of expeditions.¹²⁹

Regularly organized academic lectures provided another venue in which members could gather and form connections. Three examples, are the lectures on October 28, 1902 that Ludwig Borchardt presented on “New Research on Pyramids,”¹³⁰ and on January 21 and 25, 1904 by Hermann Thiersch (1874–1939), an art historian, and Gustav Hölscher (1877–1955), a theologian and Orientalist, gave two lectures on the DOG's research trip to Syria and Palestine.¹³³ Several of these lectures were attended by Kaiser Wilhelm II and his entourage and, as such, provided a perfect opportunity for DOG members to form relationships with other men of the German elite in Berlin.¹³⁴ Events like this were held in grand spaces in Berlin such as the *Singakademie* and the *Theatersaal der Königlichen Hochschule für Musik* (Auditorium of the Royal Academy of Music). These locations provided the events with the aspired grandeur and reinforced their cultural capital. These events furthermore contributed to the image of Berlin as the center of German culture.

Social events provided another form of important activities for the society. The society celebrated the contributions of its members by regularly holding grand feasts, which they in turn used for the fundraising. On October 11, 1904, for example, the society held one such gathering

128 “Messerschmidt, Leopold,” *Deutsche Biographie*, accessed November 12, 2014, http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz103_00739_1.html.

129 DOG, “Vereinsnachrichten” *MDOG* 27 (1905): 1.

130 DOG, “Vereinsnachrichten” *MDOG* 15 (1902): 3.

133 See “Thiersch, Hermann,” *Deutsche Biographie*, accessed November 12, 2014, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz116873.html>; and “Hölscher, Gustav” *Deutsche Biographie*, accessed November 12, 2013, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz32839.html>.

134 DOG, “Vereinsnachrichten” *MDOG* 21 (1904): 2.

at the Hôtel Bristol a grand hotel built in 1891 in the center of Berlin on *Unter den Linden*.¹³⁵ Though few details of these events emerge in descriptions of them, it is likely that they were similar to other banquets of the sort. In particular, the men came together in lavish dinners and celebrated themselves and their accomplishments, renewed their connections, and made new ones. The society held another celebration at Hotel Bristol on January 26, 1908 to celebrate the tenth anniversary of the founding of the DOG. Members of the society as well as their guests were invited to the event.¹³⁶ Members of the society also represented the group at the feast held on the occasion of the Kaiser and Kaiserin's twenty-fifth wedding anniversary in 1906 and the society gave to the pair a golden medallion crafted with the image of an Assyrian lion as well as phrases written in hieroglyphs, Hebrew, and Babylonian. Members of the society could order bronze replicas of the medallion in order to commemorate the event for 10 RM.¹³⁷

These occasions allowed scholars and the elite of the rising bourgeoisie to meet and mingle with the most powerful men in the nation. Here, people could make professional ties, conduct business arrangements, and build individual relationships. These opportunities explain the presence of publishing and manufacturing firms among the DOG's members. Publishers and scholars could connect to discuss new academic writings, and manufacturers could meet with politicians and wealthy patrons to discuss future economic opportunities. The same processes occurred among the *Bürgertum* and explain the growing presence of the group among the society's membership. Though archaeology, scholarship, and museum creation formed the impetus for the society, the DOG's ability to connect disparate members allowed for it to grow and flourish.

135 DOG, "Vereinsnachrichten" *MDOG* 25 (1904): 1–2.

136 DOG, "Vereinsnachrichten" *MDOG* 36 (1908): 1.

137 DOG, "Vereinsnachrichten" *MDOG* 31 (1906): 1–3.

The Publications of the DOG

The DOG's success also depended on the diversity and readership of its publications. Through its official publications, the DOG communicated with its members and sought their continued support. In addition to these journals, however, scholars published articles about the society's projects in both academic as well as more general publications. These articles allowed scholars to strengthen their professional position within the academic community and also enabled the DOG to seek support from the broader public. Together these publications increased the society's membership and funding and communicated its mission.

The DOG's Annual Report (*Jahresbericht*) reached only a small audience interested in the management and development of the society, mainly its members. These reports were typically published in May following the annual meeting of the Executive Board. They were divided into three sections: the annual report, the financial report, and the membership list. The annual report included discussions of the DOG excavation projects, mentioned if any members had published on related subject, and described the society's goals for the coming year. The financial report listed the group's expenditures and income. In this section, members could see precisely how much money the society gained from membership dues, individual donations, and gifts from the state and Kaiser as well as how the society spent that money. The membership list existed in myriad formats that varied by year; typically, these included lists of lifetime members, of members with a yearly subscription, and, occasionally, of sponsors of the society and deaths of members.

The *Jahresbericht* communicated the status of the DOG as well as decisions made at the annual meeting to the society's members. For members who lacked the opportunity to attend the annual meeting, this offered them the opportunity to remain informed about the group's activities, and, because the *Jahresbericht* listed all members, allowed these men to have the

impression that were truly integrated in to the society. Through its publication, the *Jahresbericht* encouraged the belief that even for ordinary members, participating in the society was worth paying an annual fee and that the DOG was successfully fulfilling its goals.

In addition to its annual report, the society published three journals, which were all intended for a larger readership beyond the society's members, including scholars interested in the fields of archaeology, the Near East, or Semitic religions, The journals were the *Communications of the German Oriental Society (Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* or *MDOG*), the *Dispatched Writings of the German Oriental Society (Sendschriften der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* or *SDOG*), and the the *Scholarly Publications of the German Oriental Society (Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* or *WDOG*).

The most prolific of these publications was the *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*. The DOG began publication of this journal a mere five months after the group's founding; the first issue came out in May of 1898.¹³⁸ Though only one issue of the journal was published that first year, the publication schedule soon increased: two issues were published in 1899, and the DOG adopted a quarterly publication schedule that they more or less maintained until the start of the First World War.¹³⁹ *MDOG* contained several types of articles. It published club news, lists of new members, reports and letters from men on DOG excavations, and scholarly analyses of retrieved artifacts. The authors of these pieces included a relatively small number of men, most of whom did not hold the power within the society. Rather, these were academic writings written for members interested in archaeological finds and scholarship.

138 DOG, *MDOG* 1 (1898).

139 The publication schedule was often sporadic. Issues commonly ranged between 3 and 5 per year.

Frequently, well-known scholars like Robert Koldwey, Walter Andrae, and Ludwig Borchardt published in it.

Each member of the DOG received a subscription to *MDOG*, and as a result, the periodical sought to entice all society members regardless of their social or religious background. Primary to these concerns was showing the scholarly and material value of the society: what contributions could the DOG make to academia and, more importantly, what physical artifacts did the DOG bring to the State Museums. The majority of the articles describes these findings or scientifically analyzes them.¹⁴⁰ This publication also provided entertainment value for its readers. The periodical frequently published letters describing travels throughout the Near East. These articles included highly descriptive, narrative prose and were written primarily by the excavators and archaeologist working in the field.¹⁴¹ Without archival access, it is difficult to determine precisely why *MDOG* included these letters and tales of travel. However, it is possible to make several educated guesses. First, it is likely that not all members or potential members of the society were interested in the minutia of excavations and the stories of Salmanassars II, but they may have been interested in the Near East itself.¹⁴² Travelogues to the region remained popular

140 These articles often look at specific ruins or artifacts that the DOG has unearthed. Often these explorations are not written by excavators but rather are written by university professors or academic specialists. Several examples of these writings are Friedrich Delitzsch, "Das 'Neujahrfesthaus' von Assur," *MDOG* 33 (1907): 34–40; Julius Jordan, "Aus den Berichten aus Assur. Von April bis Oktober 1908," *MDOG* 38 (1908): 44–49; Franz Sellin, "Vorläufige Nachrichten über die Ausgrabung in Jericho im Frühjahr 1909. Nebst einem Anhand. Die Krugstempel," *MDOG* 41 (1909): 26–29; and Friedrich Wachtsmuth, "Bericht über die Grabungen an und auf der Prozessionsstraße und in der Hauptburg des Kasr," *MDOG* 51 (1913): 22–23.

141 There is, of course, some overlap in the travel and academic articles. However, it is possible to differentiate the two categories. Travel writings often use the term "*Reise*" or trip. The articles published as "*Briefen*" or letters share the narrative and descriptive qualities of travel writings. For a sampling of these articles, see Walter Andrae, "Reise von Damaskus nach Mosul," *MDOG* 20 (1903): 9–11; Robert Koldwey, "Aus acht Briefen Dr. Koldwey's," *MDOG* 8 (1901): 2–8; Robert Koldwey, "Reise von Babylon nach Mosul, 3.–18. August 1903," *MDOG* 20 (1903): 12–16; and A. Nöldeke, "Aus zwölf Briefen von A. Nöldeke aus Babylon," *MDOG* 25 (1904): 3–15.

142 Salmanassar II (860–824) was the son of Assyrian King Assurnasirpal and ruled after his father. Karl Woermann, *Geschichte der Kunst aller Zeiten und Völker: Bd. Die Kunst der vor- und ausserchristlichen Völker* (Berlin: Bibliographisches Institut, 1900), 168–169. DOG member Walter Andrae published an academic

in Germany throughout the late nineteenth-and early twentieth-century. These stories included descriptions of the Kaiser's journey to the Ottoman Empire in 1898 as well as travel reports by less elite figures.¹⁴³ The members of the DOG could have been using these travel articles to attract readers and new members.

On a more practical level, the editors of *MDOG* also used these travel articles to show that the society was producing some results. The bulk of these articles were published in the early years of the society before excavations had begun to extract exciting artifacts.¹⁴⁴ Though DOG members had yet to produce ancient objects, they must have felt the need to show their subscribers that excavators were working and projects were proceeding. These travel writings and published letters may have merely updated patrons and sought their continued financial support.

The *Sendschriften der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* and the *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* appealed to a more scientifically minded audience than the *MDOG*. People wishing to read either of these journals, even members of the society, had to pay a separate subscription fee. *SDOG* was irregularly published until 1914. The journal produced scientific articles about the Near East and Oriental Studies that were easily

exploration of a statue of Salmanassars II in a 1904 edition of *MDOG*. The language used in the article is highly scientific rather than narrative. Walter Andrae, "Das Basaltstandbild Salmanassars II (860–824), gefundenes am 18. Dezember 1903 östlich der Zikkurat von Assur," *MDOG* 21 (1904): 39–42.

143 For a description of Kaiser Wilhelm II's 1898 trip to the Ottoman Empire, see Felix Mühlmann, *Das deutsche Kaiserpaar im Heiligen Lande im Herbst 1898. Mit Allerhöchster Ermächtigung seiner Majestät des Kaisers und Königs bearbeitet nach authentischen Berichten und Akten* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler, 1899). For more general travelogues, see Hans Barth, *Unter südlichen Himmel. Bilder aus dem Orient und Italien* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893); Friedrich Dernburg, *Auf deutscher Bahn in Kleinasien. Eine Herbstfahrt* (Berlin: J. Springer 1892); Paul Lindenberg, *Auf deutschen Pfaden im Orient* (Berlin: Dümmler, 1902); Gotthold Schulz-Labischin, *Die Sängerreise der Berliner Liedertafel nach dem Orient* (Berlin: Berliner Liedertafel, 1908); and Friedrich Adolf Strauss, *Sinai und Golgatha: Reise in das Morgenland* (Berlin: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1865).

144 Most of these travel writings can be found in *MDOG* issues published between 1898 and 1906. After this period, only two such articles appear between 1907 and 1914.

accessible to a broad rather than strictly academic audience. In *SDOG* articles, authors such as archaeologist Otto Puchstein (1856–1911) frequently connected their studies of the Near East to other studies of classical Roman and Greek archaeology with which their audience was familiar.¹⁴⁵ Unlike *MDOG*, nearly every page of *SDOG* featured an illustration of some variety. The 43 page article “Die ionische Säule: als klassisches Bauglied orientalistischer Herkunft,” for example, included 63 separate images,¹⁴⁶ and the 41 page article, “Aegypten zur Zeit der Pyramidenerbauer” featured 33 images.¹⁴⁷ These images included sketches of flora and architecture as well as photographs of reliefs and sculptures, and all of the images had succinct captions that described what item was pictured, where it was located, and, if possible, when it was created. The presence of so many images made *SDOG* approachable for educated people with an interest in the Near East even if they had little direct experience with the subject. Thus, the society used *SDOG* to help achieve its goal of spreading knowledge about and interest in the Near East and unofficially increased the *Bildung* of German society.

WDOG featured articles intended for a much smaller readership of professional scholars. It included results from *DOG* sponsored excavations and research activities. The journals articles and images discussed in precise detail the measurement, layout, and location of ancient remnants. When discussing the findings from the Babylon expeditions, for example, archaeologist Oskar Reuther (1880–1954)¹⁴⁸ spent four pages carefully enumerating the length,

145 Volker Kästner, “Puchstein, Otto,” *NDB* 20 (2001): 756–757.

146 Otto Puchstein, “Die ionische Säule: als klassisches Bauglied orientalistischer Herkunft,” *SDOG* 4 (1907): 5–47.

147 Eduard Meyer, “Aegypten zur Zeit der Pyramidenerbauer,” *SDOG* 5 (1908): 3–43.

148 “Reuther, Oscar,” *Deutsche Biographie*, accessed November 23, 2014, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfzR3264.html>.

width, and depth of walls found in various locations around the ancient city.¹⁴⁹ Though *WDOG* also featured many images, these too differed from the pictures found in *SDOG*. In addition to photographs of the ruins, *WDOG* include the floor plan of buildings found on excavated sites. In the instance of the palace uncovered at the expedition site, the floor plan was reproduced to scale and included room measurements as well as descriptions of the rooms when possible.¹⁵⁰ Such particulars primarily interested individuals with an academic or professional involvement in the Near East. As such, *WDOG* provided a platform for the society's professional scholars to discuss and produce research that could further their careers and fully legitimate the study of the Near East in Germany.

In addition to articles curated by the society, DOG members produced texts that were published outside of the society's official publications. These works included articles both for popular magazines and also for academic journals. To increase popular interest in their projects, members of the DOG published reports about their expeditions in the Near East in popular magazines. Because these articles were intended for a broader audience than texts written for *MDOG*, the writing within in them used more narrative and descriptive phrases rather than strictly academic prose. They often included illustrations or photographs that inspired emotional connections to these Near Eastern projects. Though individual responses to these articles are unclear, on a whole, learned men seem to have embraced them. Periodicals such as *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift (BPW)* and *Deutsche Literaturzeitung (DL)* reported on these articles as well as the expeditions and events that surrounded them.¹⁵¹

149 Oskar Reuther, "Ocheïdir nach aufnahmen von Mitgliedern der Babylon-Expedition der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft," *WDOG* 20 (1912): 9–12.

150 Oskar Reuther, "Ocheïdir nach aufnahmen von Mitgliedern der Babylon-Expedition der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft," *WDOG* 20 (1912): Tafel 3.

151 These periodicals as well as larger publications such as newspapers regularly reported on the DOG and its

Though each of these publications played a different role, all of them helped make the DOG a diverse society that included elites, scholarly professionals, and the broader public. Journals such as *MDOG* connected and entertained society members while *WDOG* and other academic journals assisted the careers of professional scholars. Despite the insular nature of these publications, the society reached the broader public as well through accessible publications like *SDOG* and publication of articles in newspapers and popular magazines. The DOG had multiple intertwined goals of building the society, strengthening the academic field of the Near East, and spreading interest in the Orient to educated German culture, and its publications reflected these aims.

The society's membership as well as the way that the DOG represented itself in its publications indicates that contested imperial fantasies were at play. Though *Bürgertum* within the group produced their own fantasy, the primary tension within the society was between the academics and elites, and among the elites themselves. Scholars like Koldewey sought to produce quality research that could provide them with domestic and international renown in their field. However, they relied on the funding from elite members such as Simon, Bode, and the Kaiser who while interested in the academic nature of artifacts, considered them to be auxiliary to the primary focus on the retrieval of artifacts. Though elites agreed that the DOG's purpose was to gain these ancient objects for the state museums, they disagreed about the function of

activities. These two publications, however, seem to be representative of the types of items about which periodicals often reported. The following articles from May of 1900 illustrate discussions of the DOG well. The article in *BPW* divides its focus between the DOG's projects and the contributions of individual members. To this end, it describes the locations of excavations as well as the artifacts found there and mentions the "interesting" works found in the *MDOG*. It then names how Koldewey, Andrae, Delitzsch and several other members have contributed to the society, including their roles in excavations, their publications, etc. "Mitteilungen. Aus dem zweiten Jahresbericht der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft zu Berlin," *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 20 (19 May 1900): 635–637. In the May 12, 1900 edition, the *DL* described the DOG's excavations and discoveries from the past year. The bulk of the article is given to describing the vast number and type of sculptures, reliefs, inscriptions, and ruins that the DOG discovered. The article also observes that the society's membership has grown from 489 members to 537 in the past year. "Abteilung: Mitteilungen," *Deutsche Literaturzeitung: für Kritik der internationalen Wissenschaft* 20 (12 May 1900): 1345–1346. An examination of archives in Berlin should provide a better impression of what more general periodicals reported about the DOG.

these new collections. For liberal elites like Simon, these museum displays participated in the construction of a relatively peaceful imperial fantasy. Housing colossal statues of Assyrian Gods in Berlin museums would allow Germany to compete with the Empires of Great Britain and France without creating armed conflict between the two. For the elites who shared the Kaiser's focus, however, these objects acted as part of a more encompassing imperial fantasy. In this vision of the nation, the artifacts may have allowed Germany to compete with the other empire, but they also represented Germany expansion in economics, the military, and international politics.

The next section of the essay delves into an analysis of how the DOG attempted to gain support for its projects and, subsequently, for its versions of German imperial fantasies. The section begins with an exploration of the DOG funded excavations in the Near East in order to determine what locations were considered the most archaeologically important and why. From here, the text focuses on the DOG's public funding campaigns, how the society attempted to gain broad support and to what extent it was successful. Lastly, the chapter explores the relationship between the German state and its museums. This section will elaborate on what aspects of the DOG's imperial fantasies were most widely displayed and institutionalized.

CHAPTER 3: GAINING SUPPORT FOR NEAR EASTERN PROJECTS

On January 19, 1898, Assyriologist and co-founder of the DOG Professor Friedrich Delitzsch¹⁵² published a passionate defense of the founding of the society in the *National-Zeitung*, a popular daily newspaper in Berlin.¹⁵³ He wrote that the lack of German excavations in the Near East “stands in sharpest contrast to the intensive and successful research in philology, general history and cultural history we [Germans] have conducted in precisely this area,” and elaborated that “this inferior position affects not only our museum collections, but also is reflected in the public's prevailing view [of the ancient Near East].”¹⁵⁴ These sentiments indicate that since its initiation, the society considered Near Eastern excavations, German museum collections, and public opinion vital to the Germany's international and domestic standing and that only the DOG could make Germany competitive.

This chapter explores how the DOG sought to gather public and governmental support for the projects associated with this rivalry. The society's excavations provided the foundation for its museum displays and international exhibits, and understanding them requires knowing which locations were considered the most important and why. The society's public campaigns

152 See Enno Littmann, “Delitzsch, Friedrich Conrad Gerhard,” *NDB* 3 (1957): 582; Hermann Klüger, *Friedrich Delitzsch, der Apostel der Neubabylonischen Religion; ein Mahnruf an das deutsche Volk* (Leipzig: Krüger, 1912); and Reinhard G. Lehmann, *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1994).

153 The *National-Zeitung* was a daily newspaper printed in Berlin from 1848–1938. The paper typically adopted a liberal position and had one of the largest circulations in the city. See Ernst Gerhard Friehe, “Die Geschichte der Berliner ‘National-Zeitung’ in den Jahren 1848 bis 1878,” (Phd diss., University of Leipzig, 1933); and Jürgen Kahl, “National-Zeitung (1848–1939),” in *Deutsche Zeitungen des 17. bis 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Heinz-Deitrich Fischer, 177–189 (Munich: Pullach, 1972).

154 Friedrich Delitzsch, “Eine Deutsche Orient Gesellschaft” *National-Zeitung* 19 January 1898, quoted in Suzanne Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 197.

subsequently built on these archaeological projects. These campaigns highlight what goals the DOG found most important. The most powerful manifestations of these ambitions emerged in the relationship between the society and the German state and its museums. Through this partnership, the society and the state institutionalized and displayed imperial fantasies that framed Germany as a Christian nation equal to the empires of Great Britain and France.

DOG Funded Excavations and Imperial Competition

The DOG's success at advocating for its aims hinged on its excavations. In order to gain support for the society, the group framed its forays into the Near East around two foci: the retrieval of artifacts for the state museums and the ability to learn more about the ancient Biblical past. By fulfilling these objectives, the society received continued support for its projects from the State Museums as well from the broader public.

Between 1898 and 1914, the DOG conducted 14 major excavations in addition to exploratory trips to the Near East (Fig. 1).¹⁵⁵ Because the DOG received funding from the museums as well as had members of the museums on its board, the society sought to justify its excavations to museum leaders. On October 10, 1904, for example, archaeologist Robert Koldewey appeared at the General Assembly of the State Museums in Berlin in order to discuss his research and work with the expeditions.¹⁵⁶ Typical digs lasted one or two years though lengths did vary from several months, in the case of Borsippa, to 19 years, in the case of Babylon

155 These sites include Babylon, Abusir, Tell el-Amarna, Assur, Borsippa, Hatra, Jericho, Uruk, and numerous others. For a complete list of the major excavations, see figure 1. The start of WWI disrupted most of the DOG's projects. The only major excavation to continue after 1914, however, was Koldewey's work in Babylon. Koldewey and his workers continued their project until 1917 when Allied Troops approached the region. The disarray of war resulted in the theft of numerous objects uncovered by the DOG's excavations. The location of most of these items is currently unknown. The Iraq and Berlin Museums divided any remaining artifacts in 1926. See Olof Pedersen, "Excavated and Unexcavated Libraries in Babylon," in *Babylon: Wissenskultur in Orient und Okzident*, ed. Eva Christiane Cancik-Kirschbaum, Margarete van Ess, and Joachim Marzahn, 17–70 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 48–49; and Bernard Lewis, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

156 DOG, "Vereinsnachrichten" *MDOG* 25 (1905): 1.

(Fig. 1).

The DOG considered its excavations successful if they re-discovered ancient locations or if they uncovered ancient artifacts. The DOG's excavation at Babylon, directed by Assyriologist Robert Koldewey from 1899–1917, retrieved the most finds. During these digs, Koldewey and his fellow workers uncovered the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, the Palaces of Nebuchadnezzar; artifacts from which would be displayed in the State Museums in Berlin.¹⁵⁷ Though other excavations were not as extended, they too resulted in many discoveries. From 1906–1911, Orientalist Hugo Winckler excavated in Turkey and uncovered the capital of the Hittite Empire.¹⁵⁸ Egyptologist Ludwig Borchardt's expedition into the Ancient Egyptian necropolis Abusir lasted from 1911–1914, and also resulted in the discovery of lauded artifacts including the bust of Nefertiti and other sculptures produced by Egyptian artist Thutmose.¹⁵⁹

Figure 1: Major DOG Excavation, 1898–1914¹⁶⁰

157 Peter A. Clayton and Martin J. Price, ed. *The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World* (London; New York: Routledge, 1988); Robert Koldewey, *Das wieder erstehende Babylon, die bisherigen ergebnisse der deutschen Ausgrabungen* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1913); and Robert Koldewey, *Das Ishtar-tor in Babylon, nach den Ausgrabungen durch die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1918). For more on the State Museum Collections, see Can Bilsel, *Antiquity on Display: Regimes of the Authentic in Berlin's Pergamon Museum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); and Max Kunze, *Short Guide, Pergamon Museum: Collection of Classical Antiquities, Museum of Western Asiatic Antiquity* (Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin; Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 1992).

158 Unlike the fabulous sculptures uncovered by Koldewey, Winckler's findings were better suited for language analyses; he located thousands of tablets written in Akkadian, and philologists greatly benefited from them. The presence of these tablets in Berlin made Germany into a center of Hittitology. See Horst Klengel, "Hugo Wincklers Tagebücher," *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 43 (1993): 511–516; and Kaspar K. Riemschneider, "Fünfzig Jahre Hethitologie," *Das Altertum* 12 (1966): 174–187.

159 Ludwig Borchardt, *Excavations at Tell el-Amarna, Egypt, in 1913–1914* (Washington, D.C.: G.P.P., 1921); Ludwig Borchardt and Herbert Ricke, *Ägypten: Landschaft, Volksleben, Baukunst* (Berlin: E. Wasmuth, 1929). Controversy has emerged over the ownership of the bust because, in part, of rumors that Borchardt concealed the objects value when bringing it out of Egypt. The Egyptian government has sought to repatriate the bust since it was first publicly displayed in 1924. For more on the controversy, see Claudia Berger, "The 'Berlin' Nefertiti Bust," in *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500–2000*, ed. Regina Schulte (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006); and Kurt G. Siehr, "The Beautiful One has Come – to Return," in *Imperialism Art and Restitution*, ed. John Henry Merryman (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

160 Source: DOG Jahresbericht 1–15 (1899–1915)

Major DOG Excavations , 1898-1914

Fig. 1

Excavation	Region	Years
Babili (Babylon)	Ottoman Empire	1898–1917
Birs Nimrud (Borsippa)	Ottoman Empire	1902
Abu Hatab (Kisurra)	Ottoman Empire	1902–1903
Fara (Schuruppak)	Ottoman Empire	1902–1903
Abusir	Egypt	1902–1908
Qal'at al-Scherqat (Assur)	Ottoman Empire	1902–1913
Tell el-Mutesellim (Megiddo)	Ottoman Empire	1903–1905
Abusir el-Meleq	Egypt	1905–1906
Bogazkköy (Hattuscha)	Ottoman Empire	1906–1911
El Hadr (Hatra)	Ottoman Empire	1907–1911
Tell es-Sultan (Jericho)	Ottoman Empire	1907–1909
Tell el-Amarna (Achet-Aton)	Egypt	1911–1914
Warka (Uruk)	Ottoman Empire	1912–1913
Tulu 'Aqir (Kar-Tukulti-Ninurta)	Ottoman Empire	1913–1914

Data taken from DOG, *Jahresbericht* 1-15 (1899-1915).

Though DOG excavations acted as attempts to stabilize religious hegemony within Germany, they were used to increase Germany's competitiveness among imperial nations internationally. In an article published for the *Leipzig Illustrierte Zeitung* on the DOG's expedition to Babylon, for example, Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch wrote, “Nineveh, the palace of Sardanapalus— – England's fame is forever entwined with these names. Babylon, the royal city of Nebuchadnezzar—could it be a mission worthy of Germany to be associated with these names?”¹⁶⁴ Delitzsch explicitly connects England's renown with the nation's successful archaeological projects in the Near East; Delitzsch argues that Germany can achieve similar

164 Friedrich Delitzsch, “Die deutsche Expedition nach Babylon,” *Leipzig Illustrierte Zeitung*, October 19, 1899, 541–543.

celebrity through its own archaeological projects. It was no accident that the Babylonian excavations were the DOG's longest running expeditions during the society's founding period. Babylon, with its Biblical connections and its potential to house numerous exquisite ruins, was one of the few remaining ancient sites that German could use to compete with Britain and France. The fate of Germany's international position was bound to its successful excavation of ancient Near Eastern sites.

The belief that these excavations were important to the status of German did not remain restricted to members of the society but permeated educated German culture. Journals such as *Berlin's Philological Weekly* (*Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* or *BPW*) and the *German Literature Newspaper* (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung* or *DL*), both intended for the educated members of Germany, provided frequent reports on the progress of the DOG's expeditions.¹⁶⁵

This sense of competition with other imperial nations further emerged in criticisms of the society. As late as 1912 in a review written for the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, Assyriologist and DOG member Bruno Meissner (1869–1947) commented on the society's failure to retrieve artifacts from Babylon and Borsippa.¹⁶⁶ He claimed that “most German Assyriologists” were concerned that the excavations would not justify their expenses and

¹⁶⁵ These periodicals as well as larger publications such as newspapers regularly reported on the DOG and its activities. These two publications, however, seem to be representative of the types of items about which periodicals often reported. The following articles from May of 1900 illustrate discussions of the DOG well. The article in *BPW* divides its focus between the DOG's projects and the contributions of individual members. To this end, it describes the locations of excavations as well as the artifacts found there and mentions the “interesting” works found in the *MDOG*. It then names how Koldewey, Andrae, Delitzsch and several other members have contributed to the society, including their roles in excavations, their publications, etc. “Mitteilungen. Aus dem zweiten Jahresbericht der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft zu Berlin,” *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 20 (1900): 635–637. In the May 12, 1900 edition, the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* described the DOG's excavations and discoveries from the past year. The bulk of the article is given to describing the vast number and type of sculptures, reliefs, inscriptions, and ruins that the DOG discovered. The article also observes that the societies membership has grown from 489 members to 537 in the past year. “Abtheilung: Mittheilungen,” *Deutsche Literaturzeitung: für Kritik der internationalen Wissenschaft* 20 (1900): 1345–1346. An examination of archives in Berlin should provide a better impression of what more general periodicals reported about the DOG.

¹⁶⁶ Hartmut Kühne, “Meissner, Bruno,” *NDB* 16 (1990): 697.

asserted that “as regards literary and archaeological data, the results are quite moderate.”¹⁶⁷ He continued his dismissal of the group's work by writing that “in any case, there are a number of interesting inscriptions from Borsippa in the British Museum.”¹⁶⁸ To Meissner, the society was not discovering finds important enough to elevate Germany's Near Eastern programs to the level of Britain.

Meissner's assessment indicates that comparisons between Germany and Britain did not depend simply on rhetoric used by Delitzsch and other members of the DOG but also relied on the society's archaeological results. Finding artifacts, researching them, displaying them, and publishing on them all played major roles in attaining cultural capital for Germany. Bolstering Germany's Near Eastern museum collections acted as a physical manifestation of Germany's parity with other imperial nations.

Though diplomatic relations influenced the selection of the DOG's excavation sites, the significance of these locations to the Biblical past played as well as the possibility of finding artifacts in these locations played a greater role in those decisions. Nineveh, Babylon, and other ancient cities were mentioned in Christian as well as Jewish religious texts, and members of the society sought to uncover more of their religious past. Their interest was not, however, simply personal. For the large contingent of Jewish members, this information tied in to debates within the German-Jewish community about Zionism, modern Judaism, and the place of the Jewish people in modern Germany. For the Christian members of the DOG, these discussions reinforced rhetoric of Germany's heritage as a Christian nation. These excavations and publications discussing them reaffirmed that the dominant culture in German was a protestant Christian one.

167 Bruno Meissner, Review of Robert Koldewey, *Die Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa nach den Ausgrabungen durch die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft*. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 15.9 (1912): 416.

168 Bruno Meissner, Review of Robert Koldewey, *Die Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa nach den Ausgrabungen durch die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft*. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 15.9 (1912), 418.

This rhetoric, however, depended on the ability of these excavations to discover and retrieve ancient artifacts worthy of study. The DOG's excavations allowed the educated members of German society to articulate the rivalry between Germany and the great empires of Europe. Archaeology provided Germans an avenue through which they could compete outside of traditional military and economic endeavors. Here, imperial contests emerged in museums and scholarly articles rather than in colonies.

Public Campaigns and German Identity

The public perception of the DOG and its excavations was vital to the success of the society and enabled the group to participate in broad discourse on German cultural superiority. The DOG sought to bolster the image of Germany as an imperial Christian nation not only for society members but also for the broader public. To this end, the society hosted numerous public lectures at which educated Germans could hear about the group's excavations and research. During these meetings, the society reinforced Germany's status as a Christian, economically and culturally competitive nation.

This non-secular interest in the Near East related to the religious makeup of Wilhelmine Germany. As historian Harry Liebersohn has shown, Protestant traditions dominated upper-class Prussian culture and constituted the politically dominant majority.¹⁶⁹ This group composed the largest portion of the educated middle class, had an intimate relationship with the state, and considered itself to be superior to other denominations.

This position sharply contrasted with that of Catholics and Jews in Germany. Following German unification and the *Kulturkampf*¹⁷⁰, political Catholicism emerged. Catholics advocated

169 Harry Liebersohn, "Religion and Industrial Society: The Protestant Social Congress in Wilhelmine, Germany," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 76.6 (1986), 3.

170 *Kulturkampf* references the policies enacted by Otto von Bismarck between 1871 and 1878, which aimed to

for their interests through political parties such as the German Centre Party (*Deutsche Zentrumspartei* or *Zentrum*) as well as large organizations such as the People's Association for a Catholic Germany (*Volksverein für das katholische Deutschland*), which had 800,000 members at its peak.¹⁷¹ German Jews similarly became more politically active during this period though unlike German Catholics, German Jews were typically prohibited from public service. Though German-Jewish Zionism emerged during this period, groups like the Central Association of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith (*Centralverein deutscher Staatsbürger jüdischen Glaubens* or *Central Verein*), which was founded in 1893 and had over 100,000 members at its peak, predominated the era.¹⁷² This association did not seek to remove Jews from Germany but rather struggled against anti-Semitism and sought to better integrate Jews into German Society. The conflicts between Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism led to increasingly public divisions based on religion.

Despite its religiously diverse membership, the DOG leadership participated in these religious debates with the aim of reinforcing the perspective of the Protestant majority. In *MDOG* editions, the society frequently referred to the excavations in reference to the Bible. The society highlighted its exploration of Tell Ta'annek, which it described as the ancient Canaanite

reduce the influence of the Catholic Church, especially in Prussia. The policies included the restriction of the freedom of speech of Catholic spiritual leaders, removed many religious protections and included the Germanization of the Polish population in Germany's eastern territories. See Christopher Clark and Wolfram Kaiser, eds., *Kulturkampf in Europa im 19. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Leipziger Universität-Verlag, 2003).

171 Volker Rolf Berghahn, *Imperial Germany, 1871–1918: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 218. See also Margaret Lavinia Anderson, *Practicing Democracy: Elections and Political Culture in Imperial Germany* (2000); Rebecca Ayako Bennette, *Fighting for the Soul of Germany: The Catholic Struggle for Inclusion after Unification* (Harvard University Press, 2012); David Blackbourn, “The Political Alignment of the Centre Party in Wilhelmine Germany: A Study of the Party's Emergence in Nineteenth-Century Württemberg,” *Historical Journal* 18.4 (1975): 821–850; and Wilhelm Loth, *Katholiken im Kaiserreich. Der politische Katholizismus in der Krise des wilhelminischen Deutschland* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1984).

172 Volker Rolf Berghahn, *Imperial Germany, 1871–1918: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005), 219.

city, Ta'anâk described in Joshua 12.21 of the Bible,¹⁷³ and having identified artifacts from Pharaoh Scheschonk I's time, related the discovery to the story of Issac from the Bible.¹⁷⁴ Though these references could, ostensibly, include the Catholic and Hebrew Bibles the society presented these references from a Protestant perspective. In contrast to some Catholic and Jewish teaching, society members such as Friedrich Delitzsch and the Kaiser criticized scriptural interpretations. Even the Kaiser who was a highly pious Protestant, agreed that “the Old Testament contains many sections which are of a purely human and historical nature” and in fact, “are *not* God's revealed word.”¹⁷⁵

Despite the personal beliefs of its individual members, the DOG did not officially seek to address these controversies. Rather, the society sought to present itself as collegial and open-minded. This persona often emerged in public lectures; these events rarely caused any large conflict. Whatever hopes the society had of maintaining a friendly and unifying public identity were disrupted by a series of public lectures given by Assyriologist Friedrich Delitzsch. In 1902 and 1903, Delitzsch gave a series of lectures on “Babel und Bibel” that unleashed the Babylon and Bibel Controversy (*Babel-Bibel-Streit*). These lectures did not, however, prove immediately divisive. The first lecture, given on January 13, 1902, occurred without instance; important society members attended, and the Kaiser was so impressed by the commentary that he requested Delitzsch repeat the performance on February 1, 1902 so that members of his court and his wife

173 Hans Stumme, “Über die gemeinsamen Ausgrabungen des Deutschen Vereins zur Erforschung Palästinas und der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in der Ebene Jezreel im Frühjahr 1903,” *MDOG* 20 (1903), 3.

174 Ludwig Borchardt, “Ausgrabungen bei Abusîr. Januar bis Juni 1907,” *MDOG* 34 (1907), 45.

175 As quoted in Paul Carus, “Higher Criticism and the Emperor” in *Babel and Bible: Two Lectures on the Significance of Assyriological Research for Religion, Embodying the Most Important Criticisms and the Author's Replies* by Friedrich Delitzsch, 139–144 (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company, 1903), 139.

could hear it.¹⁷⁸ The lecture was subsequently published, and as a result, even the most far-flung members of the DOG had the opportunity to have a common point of knowledge.¹⁷⁹

The second lecture in the series, however, resulted in conflict both within Germany and abroad. This lecture, given in January of 1903, was also presented to members of the DOG, wealthy patrons, and the Kaiser and Kaiserin.¹⁸⁰ During this lecture, Delitzsch asserted that the Hebrew Bible was not the result of a revelation from God, and to replace it, the German people should learn from their own history.¹⁸¹ These assertions infuriated the German public. Leaders of Catholic, Jewish, and even conservative Protestant groups attacked Delitzsch's findings as anti-religious and overly nationalistic. The debate quickly moved from academic journals into the popular press both internationally as well as within Germany.¹⁸² Within Germany, 60,000 copies of the first lecture had been sold by 1905, and 1,650 articles and 28 pamphlets had been written on the subject.¹⁸³ Delitzsch as well as the society had become infamous.

Though the DOG had hoped to gain renown for its projects, this response threatened to humiliate and undermine the group. As a result, members tried to minimize the controversy.

178 DOG, "Vereinsnachrichten" *MDOG* 11 (1902): 2.

179 DOG, "Vereinsnachrichten" *MDOG* 11 (1902): 2.

180 Reinhard G. Lehmann, *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1994), 173.

181 Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel: ein Vortrag* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902); Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, edited by C.H.W. Johns (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1903; London: Williams and Norgate, 1903); Reinhard G. Lehmann, *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).

182 For the debates in Germany, see: Karl Budde, *Das Alte Testament und die Ausgrabungen. Ein Beitrag zum Streit um Babel und Bibel*, 2nd edition. (Giessen: Ricker, 1903); P. Jensen, "Babel und Bibel in der 'Christlichen Welt'" (1902); S. Oettli, *Der Kampf um Bibel und Babel*; C.H. Cornill *Babel und Bibel in der Deutschen Litteratur Zeitung* (1902). For international commentary, see J. Dyneley Prince "Review of *Babel und Bibel* by Friedrich Delitzsch" *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 21.3 (1905): 190–192; Alfred Loisy, "Review of *Babel und Bibel* by F. Delitzsch" *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 45 (1902): 440.

183 Reinhard G. Lehmann, *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ru recht, 1994, 50; and Can Bilsel, *Antiquity on Display: Regimes of the Authentic in Berlin's Pergamon Museum* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 161.

When publishing his second lecture, Delitzsch distanced himself from the DOG and was careful to assert that “*the German Oriental Society has not the least concern with my personal religious views, although it should have been obvious, has been emphasized* (italics in the original).”¹⁸⁴ Delitzsch then attempted to confront the critics who claimed that these lectures were both anti-Semitic and anti-Christian.¹⁸⁵ To quell these debates, Delitzsch clearly states that he hopes that his research will no longer “be considered injurious or even insulting to Judaism, least of all to the modern Jewish faith.”¹⁸⁶

The elite members of the society, and the Kaiser in particular, also sought to lessen the crisis. The Kaiser dismissed criticisms as the result of “a public as yet to ignorant and unprepared” to understand the knowledge to be gained from the Near East. To reeducate them in the matter, the Kaiser partnered with the DOG to sponsor the play “Assurbanipal”, a retelling of the life of an Assyrian king. The Kaiser used his personal connections to ensure his “trusted friend and brilliant theater director, Count [Georg von] Hülsen-Haeseler,” would produce it.¹⁸⁷ To show his continuing support for Delitzsch and the society, during the opening night of the production, the Kaiser presented Delitzsch with the Prussian Order of the Red Eagle.¹⁸⁸ Despite

184 Italics in the original. Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, edited by C.H.W. Johns (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1903; London: Williams and Norgate, 1903), 213.

185 Bill T. Arnold and David B. Weisberg, “A Centennial Review of Friedrich Delitzsch's “Babel und Bibel Lectures” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121.3 (2002), 454.

186 Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible*, edited by C.H.W. Johns (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1903; London: Williams and Norgate, 1903), 213. For the debates in Germany, see: Karl Budde, *Das Alte Testament und die Ausgrabungen. Ein Beitrag zum Streit um Babel und Bibel*, 2nd edition. (Giessen: Ricker, 1903); P. Jensen, “Babel und Bibel in der “Christlichen Welt” (1902); S. Oettli. *Der Kampf um Bibel und Babel*; C.H. Cornill *Babel und Bibel in der Deutschen Litteratur Zeitung* (1902). For international commentary, see J. Dyneley Prince “Review of *Babel und Bibel* by Friedrich Delitzsch” *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 21.3 (1905): 190–192; and Alfred Loisy, “Review of *Babel und Bibel* by F. Delitzsch” *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 45 (1902): 440.

187 Hans Knudson, “Hülsen, Georg Graf von” *NDB* 9 (1972): 738. Kaiser Wilhelm II, 204.

188 These awards came in several varieties including First Class, Second Class, Third Class, Fourth Class, and the Badge of Honor. Though Order of the Red Eagle awards were typically given to high-ranking military officers or

the care given to the display, critics did not appreciate the production; the morning after its inaugural show, the *Vossische Zeitung*, a Berlin newspaper, asserted that “the Assyrian Ballet “Sardanapal” is so boring that anyone who lasts to the end receives the Order of the Crown, third class.”¹⁸⁹

The tumult that occurred as a result of Delitzsch's lectures indicates that despite support from the Kaiser, a very vocal group of Germans did not agree with the depiction of Germany presented by the society. Artifacts and studies that did not directly confront religious interpretations went largely unnoticed by the German public. However, once Delitzsch and, by association, the society proposed new readings of Christian and Jewish texts, a national uproar started at the margins of society: Catholicism, orthodox Judaism and Protestantism. This religious debates reflected the larger national conflicts occurring within Germany as Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant groups attempted to find a place for themselves within the state. Rejections of more conservative religions fed into the more general dismissal of these groups from German political and social contexts. Despite the large number of Jewish elites within the DOG, the society itself presented Germany as a Protestant nation and did not attempt to appease the myriad perspectives found within the nation.

Institutionalizing Imperial Fantasies

members of the nobility, some, especially the Fourth Class and Badge of Honor awards, were granted to public servants and private individuals. It is likely that Delitzsch's award fell into one of these latter categories. In light of the comment from the *Vossische Zeitung*, the Order of the Red Eagle, Third Class is the most likely candidate. See D.E. Barclay, “Ritual, Ceremonial, and the “Invention” of a Monarchical Tradition in Nineteenth-Century Prussia” in *European Monarchy: Its Evolution and Practice from Roman Antiquity to Modern Times*, edited by Heinz Duchhardt, Richard A. Jackson, and David J. Sturdy, 207–220 (Franz Steiner Verlag, 1992), 212–213; *Vossische Zeitung* (September 2, 1908) As quoted in Can Bilsel, *Antiquity on Display: Regimes of the Authentic in Berlin's Pergamon Museum* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 176.

¹⁸⁹ *Vossische Zeitung* (September 2, 1908) As quoted in Can Bilsel, *Antiquity on Display: Regimes of the Authentic in Berlin's Pergamon Museum* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 176. There are conflicting titles used for the play in part. DOG materials indicate the appropriate title is “Assurbanipal”.

To minimize these conflicts of German identity, the DOG and the state partnered in order to institutionalize a sense of German cultural superiority based on imperial archaeological projects. Together, they affirmed Germany's position through the State Museums and international exhibitions. Through these means, the state and the DOG asserted that Germany could compete on an international stage.

Paramount to this project was the display of retrieved Near Eastern artifacts in the State Museums. As historian James J. Sheehan has shown, during the nineteenth-century, German rulers, the government, and the public “came to regard art museums as indispensable sources of prestige and essential instruments for the spread of culture and enlightenment.”¹⁹⁰ Art museums provided one facet of unifying identity for the upper-class members of German society because they were vital to “both individual *Bildung* and social cohesion.”¹⁹¹

Though the German State's Near Eastern collections did not truly blossom until 1930 when the Pergamon Museum was completed, the state began to display finds from DOG excavations as early as 1899. By enriching the museums, the DOG participated in the older pattern of museums working to connect art with the *Bürgertum*. The Near Eastern Section of these museums was founded in 1899, one year after the creation of the DOG. The society worked to quickly place its ancient finds in galleries; by 1902, items from the DOG's excavations were already on display in the Berlin museums. In particular, artifacts from the excavations at Abusir including the Timotheus-Papyrus were placed on display in the Egyptian Wing of the Royal Museum on October 20, 1902.¹⁹² In the early days of the collection, the Near Eastern section was

190 James J. Sheehan, *Museums in the German Art World: From the End of the Old Regime to the Rise of Modernism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 84.

191 James J. Sheehan, *Museums in the German Art World: From the End of the Old Regime to the Rise of Modernism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 177.

192 DOG, “Vereinsnachrichten” *MDOG* 15 (1902): 2–3.

both relatively empty and had highly restricted access; unlike other collections in the Royal Museums, the Near East section required an appointment for viewing.¹⁹³ As the collection grew and as the Pergamon Museum was established, viewing these artifacts became more open. The society's publications repeatedly mention that how excavations were performed “for the Berlin Museums.”¹⁹⁴ In the founding years of the society, these displays remained rather uninspiring.

The DOG and the state ensured that the society had a much more impressive international presence, however, as exemplified through the 1904 St. Louis World's Fair.¹⁹⁵ The St. Louis World's Fair was not the first exposition of its kind; international exhibitions had been held since 1851 with the Great Exhibition held in London.¹⁹⁶ Like its predecessors, this exposition was a lush affair. Exhibiting nations sponsored the construction of expensive and exquisite buildings, created displays that showed advancements in technology, agriculture, the arts, and education, and organized meetings for fraternal societies so that “all inquiring minds may note the progress

193 Ludwig Pallat, *Richard Schöne, Generaldirektor der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der preussischen Kunstverwaltung 1872–1905* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 279–280.

194 DOG, *MDOG* 14 (1902): 4.

195 Notably, Kaiser Wilhelm II refused host any such exhibition in Berlin because he felt that his city was not yet impressive enough to compete with on an international stage in that way. He stated, “Berlin is not Paris, Paris is the great whorehouse of the world; therein lies its attraction independent of any exhibition. There is nothing in Berlin that can captivate the foreigner, except a few museums, castles and soldiers.” Curating exhibits to be presented in other host cities, however, was something that the nation was more than capable of doing. For a larger discussion, see Alexander C.T. Geppert, *Fleeting Cities: Imperial Expositions in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 34. Under Wilhelm II, Berlin did, however, host smaller events such as the 1896 Great Industrial Exposition of Berlin (*Große Berliner Gewerbeausstellung*) and the 1896 Colonial Exposition in Berlin. See Alexander C.T. Geppert, “Weltstadt für einen Sommer: Die Berliner Gewerbeausstellung 1896 im europäischen Kontext.” *Mitteilungen des Vereins für die Geschichte Berlins* 103.1 (2007): 434–448; and Norbert Schmidt, *Kolonialmetropole Berlin. Zur Funktion der Völkerschau im Rahmen der ersten deutschen Kolonialausstellung in Berlin 1896* (München: GRIN Verlag, 2005).

196 Jeffrey A. Auerbach, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999); Alexander C. T. Geppert, *Fleeting Cities. Imperial Expositions in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); and Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851–1939* (Manchester University Press, 1988).

of the world in these first years of the twentieth century.”¹⁹⁷ Though over fifty governments made elaborate displays at the fair, Germany made one of the greatest monetary and material commitments to the event.¹⁹⁸ Like France, Germany spent over \$1,000,000 on the fair; the next closest nation was Brazil with \$600,000 and Great Britain with \$500,000.¹⁹⁹

The DOG participated in several exhibits at the World's Fair. These exhibits intermingled with displays about the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences, German possession in the Pacific, German East Africa, systematic zoology, German technical colleges, and a bust of Wilhelm II in the German Educational Exhibition. In a guide to this exhibition, Delitzsch and Borchardt wrote on the DOG's work in Babylon and Abusir respectively. From Babylon, the exhibited copies of flagstone pictures of magnificent lions, dragons from the Ishtar Gate, and an ornament from the fortress of Kasr.²⁰⁰ The excavations at Abusir exhibited the ground plan for the dig site as well as a model of the field of pyramids in the area.²⁰¹ The official description of these exhibitions explicitly and repeatedly mentions the role of the society. The Babylon works occurred, for example “at the instance of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft (German Orient Association) in cooperation of with the General Administration of the [German] Royal Museums,”²⁰² and in the

197 “Royal Guide to Saint Louis and the World’s Fair: A Complete Director and Map of St. Louis and the World’s Fair.” St. Louis: O.P. Hedges & Co., 1904).

198 “Royal Guide to Saint Louis and the World’s Fair: A Complete Director and Map of St. Louis and the World’s Fair.” St. Louis: O.P. Hedges & Co., 1904),16.

199 “Royal Guide to Saint Louis and the World’s Fair: A Complete Director and Map of St. Louis and the World’s Fair.” (St. Louis: O.P. Hedges & Co., 1904), 6; and Ludwig Borchardt, “Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft bei Abusir im Winter 1903/4” *MDOG*, 24 (1904): 5, 16.

200 Friedrich Deltizsch, “Babylon,” in *German Educational Exhibition, World’s Fair, St. Louis* ed. W. Büxenstein (St. Louis: O.P. Hedges & Co.1904), 35.

201 Ludwig Borchardt. “The Excavations of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft at Abusir” in *German Educational Exhibition, World’s Fair, St. Louis*, ed. W. Büxenstein, (St. Louis: O.P. Hedges & Co.1904), 38.

202 Friedrich Deltizsch, “Babylon,” in *German Educational Exhibition, World’s Fair, St. Louis* ed. W. Büxenstein (St. Louis: O.P. Hedges & Co.1904), 33.

case of Abusir, the reference is immediately visible in the exhibit title, “The Excavations of the Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft at Abusir.”²⁰³ The society published reproductions of portions of their display in *MDOG*, and as a result, members could see how the society displayed itself to a broad international public.

These exhibits participated in an impressive narrative of German growth and advancement. Writing for *The Cosmopolitan*, American automobile entrepreneur and publisher John Brisben Walker exclaimed, “The German exhibit, as a whole, is the most superb that has ever been made at any exhibition.”²⁰⁴ The German Educational Exhibition in which the DOG housed its displays was particularly impressive. Walker notes that “elaborate exhibits are made through interesting photographs of plans of the work of excavation which the Orient Society of Germany is doing at Abusir”²⁰⁵ and describes that in the educational exhibit “the reason for her [Germany's] progress as a nation is made manifest.”²⁰⁶ The German government's \$1,000,000 investment in the St. Louis appeared to have paid off; Walker proclaimed to over 150,000 of the magazine's subscribers that Germany along with Japan “are the nations which are to-day leading the world.”²⁰⁷

203 Friedrich Deltizsch, “Babylon,” in *German Educational Exhibition, World's Fair, St. Louis* ed. W. Büxenstein (St. Louis: O.P. Hedges & Co.1904), 36.

204 John Brisben Walker. “XIX. Foreign Nations at the Fair: What They are Teaching the People of the United States” *The Cosmopolitan: The World's Fair* (September 1904): 598.

205 John Brisben Walker. “The Education of the World as Shown in the Exhibits of Many Peoples. The Immense Importance of this Part of the Exposition—How Every Problem of Government, Art, Mechanism and Material Prosperity is Shown as Centered Around That of the World's Education” *The Cosmopolitan: The World's Fair* (September 1904), 508–509

206 John Brisben Walker, “The Education of the World as Shown in the Exhibits of Many Peoples. The Immense Importance of this Part of the Exposition - How Every Problem of Government, Art, Mechanism and Material Prosperity is Shown as Centered Around That of the World's Education” *The Cosmopolitan: The World's Fair* (September 1904), 506.

207 Walker, John Brisben Walker, “XIX. Foreign Nations at the Fair: What They are Teaching the People of the United States.” *The Cosmopolitan: The World's Fair* (September 1904), 597.

These international events along with museums exhibits, public lectures and excavations formed the core of DOG's self-representation. Through these avenues, the society presented itself as fundamental to the domestic and international success of Imperial Germany. Not only could the society enlighten its nation through the collection, study, and display of ancient artifacts, but it could also use these same objects to compete with nations on both sides of the Atlantic. The DOG sought to prove that not only did individual members profit from the society but the German nation and German people benefited as well.

CONCLUSION: NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY AS A NEW IMPERIAL FANTASY

In his memoirs, archaeologist Walter Andrae reflected on the excavations he led in Turkey and mused,

In those days, the vision of the future filled our fantasies. We saw the barren country change and prosper because once it came creeping our way, we intended for this steely strand of land to be exclusively a bearer of blessings.²⁰⁸

These imperial fantasies contributed to German interest in the Near East as well as motivated the DOG to become a leading archaeological society internationally.

Through its partnership with German state, the DOG used its cultural capital to compete with other global empires. The society sought to create art museums filled with ancient wonders so that Germany's cultural holdings matched its industrial and economic development. In turn, these museums vied for respect internationally just as Great Britain and France had done. The DOG and the artifacts the society uncovered became representations of German intellectual, diplomatic, and artistic prowess. Despite the increases in cultural capital the society's finds offered, group members worried that the DOG was not finding artifacts that were impressive enough to truly represent the increasingly powerful nature of the German nation.

This concern regarding the German identity emerged more fully in the domestic context. Individual members used the DOG to gain cultural capital and to benefit on a personal level. Elite members used it to reaffirm their social and class connections through meetings, social events, commonly shared points of reference, and contributions to the construction of the empire.

208 Walter Andrae, *Lebenserinnerungen eines Ausgräbers*, 171.

In contrast, the DOG's excavations allowed scholars of the Near East to assert their intellectual and professional value and helped them to institutionalize the study of the Near East in the German University system. For the *Bürgertum*, the society provided an opportunity to make social and political connections, to potentially rise in power within the German state.

These men could, however, gain many of the same benefits from other volunteer societies; the success of the DOG stemmed from the connection between the Near East, imperial fantasies, and the conflicting interpretations of German national identity. The DOG's power structure and official publications simultaneously replicated the social and economic structures of Wilhelmine society and highlighted the conflicts of that same society. Protestantism was the hegemonic religion during that period, and Protestant leaders sponsored the DOG's Near Eastern excavations in order to retain power by better integrating German and Biblical pasts. Though the society officially supported a Protestant perspective, it also exposed debates on the role of Protestantism, Judaism, and Catholicism in Germany. Conflicts regarding the society-sanctioned research such as Friedrich Delitzsch's "Babel und Bibel" lectures showed that in spite of the Protestant majority, the Jewish and Catholic communities also struggled to assert a place for themselves in the German nation. Jewish members also subverted the dominant narrative by using the society to learn about the own religious past and to shape imperial fantasies when participation in many civic structures was forbidden for them.

Ultimately, the success of the society shows that educated German's agreed with Friedrich Delitzsch's assessment that Germany needed the DOG "*for Germany's honor and for Germany's science.*"²⁰⁹ The society's members, and Germans more generally, differed in their understanding of what that honor and science entailed. During the Wilhelmine era, Germany grappled with the future of the nation. Who could truly be considered German? What groups would wield political

209 Italics in the original. Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel und Bibel: Ein Vortrag* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902), 51.

and social power in Germany? Germany had become economically competitive with world powers; could it become culturally competitive as well? Through conflicting imperial fantasies, the DOG crystallized the possible resolutions to these questions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Journals

Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft (DOG). *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* (MDOG), 1–54 (1898–1914).

DOG. *Sendschriften der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 1–15 (1899–1914).

DOG. *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 1–17 (1900–1914).

Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1–17 (1898–1914).

Newspapers

Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung Berlin: Ullstein Verlag (1898–1914).

Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger Berlin: August Sverl Verlag (1898–1914).

Berliner Morgenpost Berlin: Ullstein Verlag (1898–1914).

Kreuzzeitung Berlin: Berliner Zentraldruckerei G.m.b.H. (1898–1914).

Other Published Works

Andrae, Walter. *Allgemeine Beschreibung der Ruinen*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908.

Andrae, Walter. *Die Festungswerke von Assur*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913.

Andrae, Walter. *Einzelbeschreibung der Ruinen*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912.

Andrae, Walter. *Lebenserinnerungen eines Ausgräbers*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961.

Barth, Hans. *Unter südlichen Himmel. Bilder aus dem Orient und Italien*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1893.

Borchardt, Ludwig and Heinrich Schäfer, *Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen bei Abusir. 1. Im Winter 1898–99*. Berlin: Reichsdr., 1902.

Borchardt, Ludwig. *Das Grabdenkmal des Königs Sahura*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1910.

Borchardt, Ludwig *Kunstwerke aus dem aegyptischen Museum zu Cairo, mit Erläuterungen*. Cairo: F. Diemer Nachf., 1908.

- Botta, Paul-Émile. *M. Botta's Letters on the Discoveries at Nineveh*. Translated by C.T. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans 1850.
- Carus, Paul. "Higher Criticism and the Emperor." In *Babel and Bible: Two Lectures on the Significance of Assyriological Research for Religion, Embodying the Most Important Criticisms and the Author's Replies*. By Friedrich Delitzsch, 139–144. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company, 1903.
- Chamberlain, Houston Stewart. *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Munich: F. Bruckmann, 1899.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *'Ex oriente lux'. Ein Wort zur Förderung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1898.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Babel und Bibel: Ein Vortrag*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Babylon, mit einem plan des ruinenfeldes*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1899.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Zweiter Vortrag über Babel und Bibel*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1903.
- Dernburg, Friedrich. *Auf deutscher Bahn in Kleinasien. Eine Herbstfahrt*. Berlin: J. Springer, 1892.
- Ginsberg, J. "Das Deutsche Bureau der Alliance Israélite Universelle," *Ost und West: Illustrierte Monatsschrift für das Gesamte Judentum* 14.1 (1914): 9
- Koldewey, Robert and Karl Schuchardt, *Heitere und ernste: Briefe aus einern deutschen Archäologeleben*. Berlin: Grote, 1925.
- Koldewey, Robert. *Das wieder erstehende Babylon, die bisherigen Ergebnisse der deutschen Ausgrabungen*. Leipzig, J.C. Hinrichs, 1913.
- Koldewey, Robert. *Die Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa, nach den Ausgrabungen durch die Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911.
- Layard, Austen Henry. *Nineveh and its Remains: A Narrative Expedition to Assyria during the Years 1845, 1846, & 1847*. London: John Murray, 1891.
- Levavasseur, Charles. "Notice sur Paul-Émile Botta." In *Relation d'un Voyage Dans L'Yémen*. Paris: Benjamin Duprat, 1880.
- Lindenberg, Paul. *Auf deutschen Pfaden im Orient*. Berlin: Dümmler, 1902).
- Mühlmann, Felix. *Das deutsche Kaiserpaar im Heiligen Lande im Herbst 1898. Mit Allerhöchster Ermächtigung seiner Majestät des Kaisers Königs bearbeitet nach*

- authentischen Berichten und Akten*. Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler, 1899.
- Ransom, Caroline L. "The Value of Photographs and Transparencies as Adjuncts to Museum Exhibits." *Proceedings of the American Association of Museums* 6 (2012): 42–46.
- Schaefer, Hedwig. *Die Produktion von Kapok und dessen Stellung in der Weltwirtschaft*. Berlin: Kolonial-Wirtschaftliches Komitee, 1925.
- Schulz-Labischin, Gotthold. *Die Sängerreise der Berliner Liedertafel nach dem Orient*. Berlin: Berliner Liedertafel, 1908.
- Strauss, Friedrich Adolf. *Sinai und Golgatha: Reise in das Morgenland*. Berlin: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1865.
- University of Chicago. "The Association of Doctors of Philosophy." *The University Record* 12 (1908): 41.
- Wheeler, J.R. And William N. Bates. "Twenty-Fifth Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens." *American Journal of Archaeology* 10 (1906): 8–17.
- Wilhelm II, Emperor of Germany. *The Kaiser's Memoirs*, trans. Thomas R. Ybarra. London; New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1922.
- Witting, Richard. *Auswärtige Politik und Diplomatenkunst, Kriegsmentalität, Lehmann und Krause*. Berlin: Kronen-Verlag, 1917.
- Woermann, Karl. *Geschichte der Kunst aller Zeiten und Völker: Bd. die Kunst der vor- und ausserchristlichen Völker*. Berlin: Bibliographisches Institut, 1900.

Secondary Sources

- "Gründungsmitglieder." *Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Verein*. Accessed October 20, 2014. http://www.kaiserfriedrich-museums-verein.de/cms/front_content.php?idcat=33.
- "Hölscher, Gustav" *Deutsche Biographie*, accessed November 12, 2013, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz32839.html>.
- "Messerschmidt, Leopold." *Deutsche Biographie*. November 12, 2014. http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz103_00739_1.html.
- "Thiersch, Hermann," *Deutsche Biographie*, accessed November 12, 2014, <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/sfz116873.html>.
- Allen, A.T. "Sex and Satire in Wilhelmine Germany: "*Simplicissimus*" Looks at Family Life."

- Journal of European Studies* 7.25 (1977).
- Ames, Eric Marcia Klotz, and Lora Wildenthal, eds., *Germany's Colonial Pasts*. Trenton: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Anderson, Eugene Newton. *The First Moroccan Crisis, 1904–1906*. Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1966.
- Arendt, Wolfgang. “Gwinner, Arthur Philipp Friedrich Wilhelm von,” *NDB* 7 (1966): 361.
- Arnold, Bill T. and David B. Weisberg, “A Centennial Review of Friedrich Delitzsch's “Babel und Bibel Lectures” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 121.3 (2002).
- Arnold, Ken. *Cabinets for the Curious: Looking Back at Early English Museums*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2006.
- Bär, Jürgen. “Walter Andrae, ein Wegbereiter der modernen Archäologie.” In *Wiedererstehendes Assur. 100 Jahre deutsche Ausgrabungen in Assyrien*, edited by Joachim Marzahn and Beate Salje (Mainz, 2003), 45–52.
- Barker, Graeme ed., *Companion Encyclopedia of Archaeology*. London; New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Bellmann, Lutz. “Der Orientalist Heinrich Leberecht Fleischer (1801–1888) als Leipziger Hochschullehrer von internationalem Rang,” University of Leipzig: Diplomarbeit, 1986.
- Berger, Claudia. “The 'Berlin' Nefertiti Bust.” In *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500–2000*. Edited by Regina Schulte. New York: Berghahn Books, 2006.
- Berman, Nina. *Orientalismus, Kolonialismus und Moderne: Zum Bild des Orients in der deutschsprachigen Kultur um 1900*. Stuttgart: M and P, Verlag für Wissenschaft und Forschung, 1996.
- Bilsel, Can. *Antiquity on Display: Regimes of the Authentic in Berlin's Pergamon Museum*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Blackbourn, David and Richard J. Evans, *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century*. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Bode, Wilhelm von, ed. *Die Sammlung Oscar Huldchinsky*. Berlin: Cassirer, 1928.
- Boelcke, Willi. *Krupp und die Hohenzollern in Dokumenten, 1850–1918*. Frankfurt: Athenaion,

1970.

- Bohm, Claudia. "Richard Schöne." In *Archäologenbildnisse. Porträts und Kurzbiographien von Klassischen Archäologen deutscher Sprache*, edited by Reinhard Lullies and Wolfgang Schiering (Mainz, 1988).
- Bohrer, Frederick N. "Inventing Assyria: Exoticism and Reception in Nineteenth-Century England and France." *Art Bulletin* 80 (1998): 336–356.
- Bohrer, Frederick N. *Orientalism and Visual Culture: Imagining Mesopotamia in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Borchardt, Ludwig, Daniel Wuensch, and Klaus P. Sommer, *Ludwig Borchardt: Die altägyptische Zeitmessung*. Göttingen: Termessos, 2013.
- Borgmann, Karsten. "'The Glue of Civil Society': A Comparative Approach to Art Museum Philanthropy at the Turn of the Twentieth Century." In *Philanthropy, Patronage, and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain, and North America*, edited by Thomas Adam, 34–55. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Forms of Capital." In *Cultural Theory: An Anthology*. Edited by Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- Brackman, Arnold C. *The Luck of Nineveh: Archaeology's Great Adventure*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1978.
- Bredenkamp, Horst. *Antikensehnsucht und Maschinenglauben: Die Geschichte der Kunstkammer und die Zukunft der Kunstgeschichte*. Berlin: Wagenbach, 1993.
- Brownell, Susan. *The 1904 Anthropology Days and Olympic Games: Sport, Race, and American Imperialism*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 2008.
- Burchardt, Lothar. "Professionalisierung oder Berufskonstruktion?" *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 6 (1980).
- Cecil, Lamar. *Wilhelm II: Emperor and Exile, 1900–1941*. Chapel Hill, NC; London: The North Carolina University Press, 1996.
- Ceram, C.W. *Gods, Graves, and Scholars*. New York: Knopf, 1951.
- Chamberlain, Muriel Evelyn. *The Scramble for Africa*. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Chevalier, Nicole. "Die französische Archäologie zwischen 1860 und 1940." In *Das Archäologie und Politik zur Zeit des Kolonialismus (1860–1940)*, edited by Charlotte Trümpler, 316–323. Essen: Dumont, 2008.

- Clark, Christopher M. *Kaiser Wilhelm II*. Harlow: Longman, 2000.
- Collon, Dominique *Ancient Near Eastern Art*. London: British Museum Press, 1995.
- Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. New South Wales: Allen & Unwin, 1995.
- Cordoba, J.M. *Walter Andrae und die Wiederentdeckung Assurs das abenteurer der architektonischen zeichnung innerhalb der archäologie des alten orientis*. Madrid: University of Madrid, 2003.
- Curtis, John E. and Julian E. Reade, eds., *Art and Empire: Treasures from Assyria in the British Museum*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1995.
- Demhardt, Imre Joef. *Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft 1888–1918. Ein Beitrag zur Organisationsgeschichte der deutschen Kolonialbewegung*. Wiesbaden: Selbstverlag, 2002.
- Dodson, Michael. *Orientalism, Empire and National Culture: India, 1770–1880*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Doede, Werner. *Die Berliner Secession*. Ullstein Verlag, 1977.
- DOG, *Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft: seit 1898 im Dienste der Forschung*. Berlin: Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft, 1984.
- DOG. “Satzung der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft.” *DOG*. Accessed December 10, 2014. <http://www.orient-gesellschaft.de/satzung.html>.
- Dyson, Stephen L. *In Pursuit of Ancient Past: A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. New Haven, CT; London: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Eassom, Simon. *Critical Reflections on Olympic Ideology*. Ontario: The Centre for Olympic Studies, 1994.
- Easton, Donald F. “Heinrich Schliemann: Hero or Fraud?” *The Classical World* 91.5 (1998): 335.
- Eley, George. “Is All the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Society Two Decades Later.” In I.J. McDonald, ed., *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Elmarsafy, Ziad. ed., *Debating Orientalism*. Houndmills; Basingstoke; Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Epkenhans, Michael and Ralf Stremmel, eds., *Friedrich Alfred Krupp. Ein Unternehmer im Kaiserreich*. München: Beck, 2010.

- Faulstich, Werner. *Medienwandel im Industrie- und Massenzeitalter (1830–1900)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
- Field, Geoffrey G. *Evangelist of Race: The Germanic Vision of Houston Stewart Chamberlain*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Finkel, Caroline. *Osman's Dream: The History of the Ottoman Empire*. Basic Books, 2007.
- Fox, Robert. "Scientific Enterprise and the Patronage of Research in France." *Minerva* 11 (1973) 442–444.
- Friedrichsmeyer, Sara, Sara Lennox, and Susanne Zantop, eds., *The Imperialist Imagination: German Colonialism and Its Legacy*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Fromkin, David. *A Peace to End all Peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*. Macmillan, 2010.
- Fück, Johann. *Die Arabischen Studien in Europa: bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1955.
- Galos, Adam. *Die Hakatisten. Die deutsche Ostmarkenverein. Ein Beitrag der Geschichte der Ostpolitik des deutschen Imperialismus*. Berlin: Verlag der Wissenschaften, 1966.
- Geiss, Imanuel. *German Foreign Policy, 1871–1914*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Geppert, Alexander C.T. *Fleeting Cities. Imperial Expositions in Fin-de-Siècle Europe*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Gifford, Prosser and Alison Smith, eds., *Britain and Germany in Africa: Imperial Rivalry and Colonial Rule*. 1967.
- Giloi, Eva. *Monarchy, Myth, and Material Culture in Germany 1750–1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Goethert, Friedrich. "Conze, Alexander Christian Leopold," *NDB* 3 (1957): 348.
- Göttlicher, Franz. *Koloniale Gesellschaften und Verbände*. Bremerhaven: Wirtschaftsverlag, 2004.
- Gürpınar, Doğan. *Ottoman Imperial Diplomacy: A Political, Social and Cultural History*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2014.
- Hanisch, Ludmila. *Die Nachfolger der Exegeten: deutschsprachige Erforschung des Vorderen Orients in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003.

- Hasselhorn, Benjamin, *Politische Theologie Wilhelms II.* Berlin: Dunker & Humblot, 2012.
- Hearn, Jeff. "Notes on Patriarchy, Professionalization and the Semi-Professions." *Sociology* 16.2 (1982): 184–202.
- Held, Bettina. *Kaiser-Freidrich-Museums-Verein: Tradition, Leidenschaft, Kunstverstand.* Berlin: Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Verein, 2006.
- Hergemöller, Bernd-Ulrich. *Mann für Mann, Biographisches Lexikon zur Geschichte von Freundschaft und männlicher Sexualität im deutschen Sprachraum.* Hamburg: Männerschwarm Skript-Verlag, 1998.
- Hertz, Thomas *Die Industrie- und Handelskammer zu Berlin. Ein Beitrag zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte Berlins.* Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Herzog, Werner. *Prinz Heinrich von Schoenaich-Carolath 1852–1920. Freimaurer und Politiker im deutschen Kaiserreich.* Schwerin: Stock & Stein, 1999.
- Hiles, Timothy W. *Thomas Theodor Heine: Fin-de-Siècle Munich and the Origins of Simplicissimus.* Peter Lang International Academic Publishers, 1996.
- Hobsbawn, E.J. "From Social History to the History of Society." *Daedalus* 100 (1971): 20–45.
- Hoffmann, Stefan-Ludwig, Jürgen Kocka, and Arnd Bauerkämper, eds. *Geselligkeit und Demokratie, Vereine und zivile Gesellschaft im transnationalen Vergleich 1750–1914.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2003.
- Höpp, G. "Hinrich Leberecht Fleischer und die Arabische Aufklärung." In *Orientalistische Philologie und arabische Linguistik*, ed. W. Reuschel, 7–12. 1990.
- Hrouda, Barthel "Koldwey, Robert." *NDB* 12 (1979): 459–460.
- Huerkamp, C. *Der Aufstieg der Ärzte im 19. Jahrhundert. Vom gelehrten Stand zum professionellen Experten.* Göttingen, 1986.
- Hugill, Peter J. "German Great-Power Relations in the Pages of "Simplicissimus", 1896–1914" *Geographical Review* 98.1 (2008).
- Hull, Isabel V. *Absolute Destruction: Military Culture and the Practices of War in Imperial Germany.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Hull, Isabel V. *The Entourage of Kaiser Wilhelm II.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.

- Impey, Oliver and Arthur MacGregor, eds., *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- Irwin, Robert. *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and Their Enemies*. London: Allen Lane, 2006.
- Jarausch, Konrad H. "Introduction." In *German Professions, 1800–1950*, edited by Konrad H. Jarausch and Geoffrey Cocks. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Johanning, Klaus. *Der Babel-Bibel-Streit. Eine forschungsgeschitliche Studie*. Frankfurt am Main, 1988.
- Jung, Martin "Schoenaich, von." *NDB* 23 (2007): 380–381.
- Justi, Ludwig. "Bode, Arnold Wilhelm v.," *NDB* 22 (1955): 347–348.
- Kaelble, Hartmut. "Social History in Europe," *Journal of Social History, Special Issue: The Futures of Social History* 37 (2003): 34–35.
- Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Verein, *Wilhelm von Bode: Museumsdirektor und Mäzen: Wilhelm von Bode zum 150. Geburtstag*. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 1995.
- Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Verein. "Gründungsmitglieder." *Kaiser Friedrich-Museums-Verein* Accessed October 20, 2014. (http://www.kaiserfriedrich-museums-verein.de/cms/front_content.php?idcat=33).
- Karuscheit, Heiner. *Deutschland 1914: vom Klassenkompromiss zum Krieg*. Hamburg: VSA, 2014.
- Kasaba, Reşat. *The Ottoman Empire and the World Economy: The Nineteenth Century*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988.
- Kästner, Volker. "Puchstein, Otto" *NDB* 20 (2001): 756–757.
- Kay, Carolyn Helen. *Art and the German Bourgeoisie: Alfred Lichtwark and Modern Painting in Hamburg, 1886–1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Klengel, Horst. "Hugo Wincklers Tagebücher." *Instanbuler Mitteilungen* 45 (1993): 511–516.
- Klüger, Hermann. *Friedrich Delitzsch, der Apostel der neubabylonischen Religion: ein Mahnruf an das deutsche Volk*. Leipzig: Krüger, 1912.
- Kobrack, Christopher. *National Cultures and International Competition: The Experience of Schering AG, 1851–1950*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Kocka, Jürgen. "Losses, Gains and Opportunities: Social History Today," *Journal of Social*

History 37.1 (2003).

Köhne-Lindenlaub, Renate. "Krupp, Friedrich Alfred," *NDB* 13 (1982): 135–138.

Kolonial-Wirtschaftliches Komitee and Geo A. Schmidt. *Das Kolonial-Wirtschaftliche Komitee: ein Rückblick auf seine Entstehung und Seine Arbeiten aus Anlass des Gedenkjahres 50-jähriger deutscher Kolonialarbeit*. Berlin: Kolonial-Wirtschaftliches Komitee, 1934.

Kontje, Todd. *German Orientalisms*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press 2004.

Kronthal, Arthur. *Ryszard Witting: szkis biograficzny*. Poznan: s.n., 1931.

Kubie, Nora Benjamin. *Road to Nineveh: The Adventures and Excavations of Sir Austen Henry Layard*. New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Kuhrau, Sven. *Der Kunstsammler im Kaiserreich: Repräsentation in der Berliner Privatsammlerkultur*. Kiel: Verlag Ludwig, 2005.

Kundrus, Birthe. ed., *Phantasiereiche. Zur Kulturgeschichte des deutschen Kolonialismus*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2003.

Kunze, Max. *Short Guide, Pergamon Museum: Collection of Classical Antiquities, Museum of Western Asiatic Antiquity*. Berlin: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin; Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 1992.

Laak, Dirk van. *Über alles in der Welt; deutscher Imperialismus im. 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. München: C.H. Beck, 2005.

Larsen, Mogens Trolle. *The Conquest of Assyria: Excavations in an Antique Land 1840–1860*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkley; London; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977.

Lehmann, Reinhard G. *Friedrich Delitzsch und der Babel-Bibel-Streit*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1994.

Lerner, Andrea. and Avinoam Shalem, *After One Hundred Years: The 1910 Exhibition "Meisterwerke Muhammeddanischer"*.

Liebersohn, Harry. "Religion and Industrial Society: The Protestant Social Congress in Wilhelmine, Germany." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 76.6 (1986): 1–59.

Littmann, Enno. "Delitzsch, Friedrich Conrad Gerhard." *Neue Deutsche Biographie (NDB)* 3 (1957): 582.

- Lloyd, Seton. *Foundations in the Dust*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1980.
- Loth, Wilhelm. *Katholiken im Kaiserreich. Der politische Katholizismus in der Krise des wilhelminischen Deutschland*. Düsseldorf: Droste, 1984.
- Macdonald, Keith M. *The Sociology of the Professions*. London: Sage Publications Ltd, 1995.
- Macfie, Alexander L. *Orientalism: A Reader*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.
- Mackenzie, John M. *Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Mackenzie, John M. *The Partition of Africa, 1880–1900, and European Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*. New York; London: Methuen, 2005.
- Maenner, Ludwig. *Prinz Heinrich zu Schoenaich-Carolath. Ein parlamentarisches Leben zur wilhelminischen Zeit (1852–1920)*. Berlin; Stuttgart: Deutsch Verlags-Anstalt, 1931.
- Malatesta, Maria. *Professional Men, Professional Women: The European Professions from the 19th Century until Today*. Translated by Adrian Belton. London; New Delhi; Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2011.
- Malley, Shawn. *From Archaeology to Spectacle in Victorian Britain: The Case of Assyria, 1845–1854*. Farnham, Surrey, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012.
- Mangold, Sabine. *“Eine weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft”: Deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004.
- Marchand, Suzanne L. *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race and Scholarship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Marchand, Suzanne. *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970*.
- Matthes, Olaf. “James (Henri) Simon,” *Neue Deutsche Biographie (NDB)* 24 (2010): 436–438.
- Matthes, Olaf. *James Simon. Die Kunst des sinnvollen Gebens*. Berlin: Hentrich & Hentich, 2011.
- Matthes, Olaf. *James Simon: Mäzen im Wilhelminischen Zeitalter*. Berlin: Bostelmann & Siebenhaar, 2000.
- McAleer, Kevin, *Dueling: The Cult of Honor in Fin-de-Siècle Germany*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- McClelland, C.E. “Zur Professionalisierung der akademischen Berufe in Deutschland,” in W.

- Conze and J. Kocka, eds., *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*. Stuttgart, 1985.
- McGovern, Francis H. and John N. McGovern, "BA' Portrait: Paul Émile Botta" *The Biblical Archaeologist* 49.2 (1986): 111.
- Meinert, Hermann. "Adickes, Franz," *NDB* 1 (1953): 67.
- Meisbach, Julius. *Friedrich Alfred Krupp—wie er lebte und starb*. Köln: Verlag K.A. Stauff & Cie., 1903.
- Miller, Edward. *That Noble Cabinet: A History of the British Museum*. London: 1973.
- Miller, Gregory D. *The Shadow of the Past: Reputation and Military Alliances before the First World War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012.
- Mommsen, Wolfgang J. "Kaiser Wilhelm II and German Politics." *Journal of Contemporary History* 25 (1990): 289–316.
- Moxey, Keith. *The Practice of Theory: Poststructuralism, Cultural Politics, and Art History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994.
- Müller, Martin L. "Siemens, Johann Georg von." *NDB* 24 (2010): 375–376.
- Nathaus, Klaus. *Organisierte Geselligkeit. Deutsche und britische Vereine im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2009.
- Niyogi, Chandreyee *Reorienting Orientalism*. New Delhi; Thousand Oaks, CA; London: SAGE Publications, 2006.
- Ohlsen, Manfred *Wilhelm von Bode: zwischen Kaisermacht und Kunsttempel*. Berlin: Mann, 1995.
- Oldenburg, Jens. *Der Deutsche Ostmarkenverein, 1894–1934*. Berlin: Logos, 2002.
- Pallat, Ludwig. *Richard Schöne, Generaldirektor der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der preussischen Kunstverwaltung 1872–1905*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Palmer, Alan. *The Decline and Fall of the Ottoman Empire*. Faber & Faber, 2011.
- Paret, Peter. *The Berlin Secession. Modernism and Its Enemies in Imperial Germany*. Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Pargiter, Frederick Eden. ed. *Centenary Volume of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland 1823–1923*. London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1923.

- Perlitt, Lothar. "Heinrich Ewald. Der Gelehrte in der Politik." In *Theologie in Göttingen eine Vorlesungsreihe*, ed. Bernd Müller, 157–212. Göttingen: 1987.
- Peter A. Clayton and Martin J. Price, eds. *The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World*. London; New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Peterson, Lars. "Die Orientreise des deutschen Kaisers 1898 und die Ausgrabungen in Baalbek," in *Das Archäologie und Politik zur Zeit des Kolonialismus (1860–1940)*, edited by Charlotte Trümpler, 410–419. Essen: Dumont, 2008.
- Platz-Horster, Gertrud. "Schöne, Richard Curt Theophilus." *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 23 (2007): 403–404.
- Polaschegg, Andrea. *Der andere Orientalismus. Regeln deutsch-morgenländischer Imagination im 19. Jahrhundert*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Preissler, Holger. "Die Anfänge der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (ZDMG) 145.2 (1995): 247.
- Price, Laurence W., *A Brief Biography of Dr. Ira Maurice Price, 1856–1939*. Bremerton, Washington: L.W. Price, 1995.
- Quataert, Donald. *The Ottoman Empire, 1700–1922*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Reade, Julian. *Assyrian Sculpture*. London: British Museum Press, 1983.
- Real, J an. "The Religious Conception of Race: Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Germanic Christianity." In *The Third Reich: Essays on the National-Socialist Movement in Germany*, edited by Edmond Vermeil, 243–286. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1955.
- Reinke, Herbert. "'Armed as if for War': The State, the Military, and the Professionalisation of the Prussian Police in Imperial Germany." In *Policing Western Europe: Politics, Professionalism, and Public Order, 1850–1940*, edited by Clive Emsley and Barbara Weinberger, 55–73. New York: Greenwood Press, 1991.
- Retallack, James. *Germany in the Age of Kaiser Wilhelm II*. Basingstoke: St. Martin's Press, 1996.
- Ricke, Herbert. "Borchardt, Ludwig." *NDB* 2 (1955), 455.
- Riemschneider. "F nfzig Jahre Hethitologie." *Das Altertum* 12 (1966): 174–187.
- R hl, John C.G. *Der Aufbau der Pers nlichen Monarchie, 1888–1900*. M nchen: C.H. Beck, 2001.

- Röhl, John C.G. *Der Weg in den Abgrund, 1900–1941*. München: C.H. Beck, 2008.
- Röhl, John C.G. *Kaiser, Hof und Staat. Wilhelm II. und die deutsche Politik*. München: C.H. Beck, 1988.
- Rose, Jacqueline. *States of Fantasy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Rosenberg, H. *Probleme der deutschen Sozialgeschichte*. Frankfurt, 1969.
- Ross, Corey. *Media and the Making of Modern German: Mass Communications, Society, and Politics from the Empire to the Third Reich*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Roth, Ralf “German Urban Elites in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries.” In *Who Ran the Cities?: City Elites and Urban Power Structures in Europe and North America, 1750–1940*, edited by Robert Beachy and Ralf Roth, 127–160. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., 2007.
- Rydell, Robert W. *All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Saggs, H.W.F. “Introduction.” In *Nineveh and its Remains* by A.H. Layard. New York: 1970.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin Books, 1978.
- Schnapp, Alain “French Archaeology: Between National and Cultural Identity.” In *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, edited by Margarita Diaz-Andreu and Timothy Champion, 48–67. London: University College London Press, 1996.
- Schöllgen, Gregor ed. *Escape into War? The Foreign Policy of Imperial Germany*. Oxford: Berg, 1990.
- Schultz, Bernd. *James Simon: Philanthrop und Kunstmäzen*. Berlin; London, New York and Munich: Prestetel, 2007.
- Schützenhofer, Victor. “Krupp, Arthur.” *NDB* 13 (1982): 146.
- Scott, Joan W. “Fantasy Echo: History and the Construction of Identity,” *Critical Inquiry* 27.2 (2001): 284–304.
- Scott, Joan W. “Gender: Still a Useful Category of Analysis?,” *Diogenes* 57.1 (2010).
- Shakoor, Abida. *Origins of Modern Europe: Medieval National Consciousness*. Aakar Books, 2004.
- Sherman, Daniel J. *The Construction of Memory in Interwar France*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

- Siehr, Kurt G. "The Beautiful One has Come—to Return." In *Imperialism Art and Restitution*. Edited by John Henry Merryman. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Silberman, Neil Asher, *Digging for God and Country: Exploration, Archaeology, and the Secret Struggle for the Holy Land 1799–1917*. New York; Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.
- Silva, Elizabeth B. "Gender, Home and Family in Cultural Capital Theory." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56.1 (2005): 83–103.
- Simmonds, Stuart and Simon Digby, eds., *The Royal Asiatic Society: Its History and Treasures*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.
- Sinha, Mrinalini. *Colonial Masculinity: The 'Manly Englishman' and the Effeminate Bengali' in the Nineteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Sprengling, Martine, Frederic Woodward, John A. Wilson, John R. Sampey, Shailer Mathews, George L. Robinson, Edgar J. Goodspeed, Elizabeth M. Price, and Maurice T. Price, "In Memoriam: Ira Maurice Price." *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 57.2 (1940): 113–136.
- Stoecker, Helmut. *German Imperialism in Africa: From the Beginnings until the Second World War*. London: Hurst & Co., 1986.
- Synopsis of the Contents of the British Museum* 53rd edition (London: 1848) in Frederick N. Bohrer, "The Times and Spaces of History: Representation, Assyria, and the British Museum," in *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourse, Spectacles*, ed. Daniel J. Sherman and Irit Rogoff (University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 203–204.
- Thoral, Marie-Cécile. "Napoleon's Egyptian Campaign and Nineteenth Century Orientalism: Perception and Memory in Autobiographical Accounts and Novels." In *War Memories: The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in Modern European Culture*. Edited by Alan Forrest, Étienne François, and Karen Hagemann, 114–136. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Tosh, John. "Introduction." In *Manliness and Masculinities in Nineteenth-Century Britain: Essays on Gender, Family, and Empire*, by John Tosh, 1–12. Harlow, England; New York: Person/Longman, 2005.
- Traill, David A. *Schliemann of Troy: Treasure and Deceit*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Turner, Bryan S. *Orientalism: Postmodernism and Globalism*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Umbach, Maiken. *German Cities and Bourgeois Modernism, 1890–1924*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

- Varisco, Daniel Martin. *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 2007.
- Voss, Susanne. "Ludwig Borchardts recherche zur herkunft des Ebers" *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 65 (2009): 373–376.
- Warraq, Ibn *Defending the West: A Critique of Edward Said's Orientalism*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2007.
- Wartke, Ralf B. *Auf dem Weg nach Babylon: Robert Koldewey, ein Archäologenleben*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 2008.
- Wehler, Hans-Ulrich. *History as a Historical Science*. Frankfurt; Main, 1974.
- Weicker, Hans. *Kiatschou: das deutsche Schutzgebiet in Ostasien*. Jiaozhou: A Schall, 1908.
- Weiler, Ingomar. "The Predecessors of the Olympic Movement, and Pierre de Coubertin," *European Review* 12 (2004).
- Weir, Todd H. *Secularism and Religion in Nineteenth-Century Germany: The Rise of the Fourth Confession*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Wendel, Günter. *Die Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft 1911–1914. Zur Anatomie einer imperialistischen Forschungsgesellschaft*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975.
- Wilhelm, Gernot. ed., *Zwischen Tigris und Nil: 100 Jahren Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft in Vorderasien und Ägypten*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1998.
- Witton Davies, Thomas. *Heinrich Ewald Orientalist and Theologian 1803–1903: A Centenary Appreciation*. London: Unwin, 1903.
- Woköck, Ursula. *German Orientalism: The Study of the Middle East and Islam from 1800 to 1945*.
- Yorulmaz, Naci. *Arming the Sultan: German Arms Trade and Personal Diplomacy in the Ottoman Empire before World War I*. London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2014.
- Young, David C. *The Modern Olympics: A Struggle for Revival*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Zantop, Susanne. *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family & Nation in Precolonial Germany*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Zwicker, Lisa Fetheringill. *Dueling Students: Conflict, Masculinity, and Politics in German Universities, 1890–1914*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2011.