

German Orientalism in the Age of Empire

Religion, Race, and Scholarship

Nineteenth-century studies of the Orient changed European ideas and cultural institutions in more ways than we usually recognize. “Orientalism” certainly contributed to European empire-building, but it also helped to destroy a narrow Christian-classical canon. This carefully researched book provides the first synthetic and contextualized study of German *Orientalistik*, a subject of special interest because German scholars were the pacesetters in oriental studies between about 1830 and 1930, despite entering the colonial race late and exiting it early. The book suggests that we must take seriously German orientalism’s origins in Renaissance philology and early modern biblical exegesis and appreciate its modern development in the context of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century debates about religion and the Bible, classical schooling, and Germanic origins. In ranging across the subdisciplines of *Orientalistik*, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire* introduces readers to a host of iconoclastic characters and forgotten debates, seeking to demonstrate both the richness of this intriguing field and its indebtedness to the cultural world in which it evolved.

Suzanne L. Marchand completed her BA in history at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1984 and her PhD at the University of Chicago in 1992. She then served as assistant and associate professor at Princeton University (1992–9), before moving to Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, where she is now professor of European intellectual history. She is the author of *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (1996) as well as numerous articles on the history of art, archaeology, anthropology, classical studies, and the humanities generally.

More Praise for *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire*

“Suzanne Marchand has written a dazzling work of scholarship, a tour de force as an intellectual history of modern Germany. The erudition and breadth of material presented demonstrates that Suzanne Marchand is one of the great scholars of her generation. Essential reading for students in numerous fields, including religion, biblical studies, history, Asian studies, ancient Near East studies, and philology, her book is also an extremely important contribution to the field of Jewish studies, brilliantly illuminating its rise, development, influence, and significance.”

– Susannah Heschel, author of *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany*

“Suzanne Marchand’s enormously learned, contextually rich, and conceptually complex study of the scholarly traditions and cultural practices that defined the ‘peculiarities’ of German Orientalism in the modern Imperial age finally provides a comprehensive, convincing response to questions that historians of modern Germany have been asking since the publication of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* more than thirty years ago. But her book does more than simply fill a gap in historical scholarship or supplement existing paradigms of analysis. Marchand’s work reframes the issue by setting the processes whereby representatives of the ‘West’ constructed their own cultural identities by appropriating and ‘othering’ the ‘Orient’ within the longue duree of Europe’s own cultural civil wars. By emphasizing the immense diversity and motivational ambivalence of German Orientalism, she has produced a story that opens the tradition to critical, reciprocal, post-Imperial appropriations.”

– John Toews, University of Washington

PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE

Edited by Hartmut Berghoff
with the assistance of David Lazar

The German Historical Institute is a center for advanced study and research whose purpose is to provide a permanent basis for scholarly cooperation among historians from the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States. The Institute conducts, promotes, and supports research into both American and German political, social, economic, and cultural history; into transatlantic migration, especially in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; and into the history of international relations, with special emphasis on the roles played by the United States and Germany.

Recent books in the series

- Manfred Berg and Bernd Schaefer, editors, *Historical Justice in International Perspective: How Societies are Trying to Right the Wrongs of the Past*
Carole Fink and Bernd Schaefer, editors, *Ostpolitik, 1969–1974: European and Global Responses*
Nathan Stoltzfus and Henry Friedlander, editors, *Nazi Crimes and the Law*
Joachim Radkau, *Nature and Power: A Global History of the Environment*
Andreas W. Daum, *Kennedy in Berlin*
Jonathan R. Zatlin, *The Currency of Socialism: Money and Political Culture in East Germany*
Peter Becker and Richard F. Wetzell, editors, *Criminals and Their Scientists: The History of Criminology in International Perspective*
Michelle Mouton, *From Nurturing the Nation to Purifying the Volk: Weimar and Nazi Family Policy, 1918–1945*

German Orientalism in the Age of Empire

Religion, Race, and Scholarship

SUZANNE L. MARCHAND

Louisiana State University

GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE

Washington, D.C.

and



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press & Assessment
 978-0-521-51849-9 — German Orientalism in the Age of Empire
 Suzanne L. Marchand
 Frontmatter
[More Information](#)



CAMBRIDGE
 UNIVERSITY PRESS

Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314-321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05-06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment,
 a department of the University of Cambridge.

We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of
 education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521518499

German Historical Institute

1607 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20009, USA

© Suzanne Marchand 2009

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions
 of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take
 place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2009

Reprinted 2010 (thrice)

First paperback edition 2010

Reprinted 2010, 2011 (thrice), 2013

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Marchand, Suzanne L., 1961–

German orientalism in the age of empire : religion, race, and scholarship /

Suzanne Marchand.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-51849-9 (hardback)

1. Orientalism – Germany – History – 19th century. 2. Middle East – Study and teaching
 – Germany – History – 19th century. 3. Asia – Study and teaching – Germany – History –
 19th century. 4. Orientalism – Germany – History – 20th century. 5. Middle East – Study
 and teaching – Germany – History – 20th century. 6. Asia – Study and teaching – Germany
 – History – 20th century. 1. Title.

DS61.9.G3M37 2009

950.072'0943–dc22 2008053038

ISBN 978-0-521-51849-9 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-16907-3 Paperback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence
 or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this
 publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will
 remain, accurate or appropriate.

*For my mother who insisted we go to Istanbul;
my husband who cheerfully moved to Berlin;
my sister, who cherishes the ancients' idiosyncracies;
And in memory of my father, who marveled at the contradictions
of the modern world*

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>page</i> xiii
<i>Introduction</i>	xvii
1. Orientalism and the Longue Durée	1
Individuals, Institutions, Iconoclasm	6
The Discrete Charm of Chronology	11
Orientalism and the Enlightenment	15
Oriental Civilizations in the Enlightenment	21
The Peculiarities of German Orientalism	28
Herder and Michaelis: The Fate of the Enlightened Old Testament	38
2. Orientalists in a Philhellenic Age	53
Friedrich Schlegel: Renaissance and Revelation	58
Orientalism and Classicism in the Wake of the <i>Creuzer Streit</i>	66
To Be a German Orientalist, 1820–1870	72
The Long Road to <i>Wissenschaftlichkeit</i>	74
Classics-Envy and Its Intellectual Consequences	78
The Glass Half Empty: Orientalism as a Career	84
On Patrons and the Public	95
3. The Lonely Orientalists	102
Biedermeier Bible Criticism or How to Study Jews – and Greeks	105
The (Even Longer) Road to “Scientific” Judaism	113
The Lonely Arabists	118
The Indo-Europeanists	123
Positivism and the Origins of the Aryan-Semitic Divide	124
Fetishizing the Vedas	131
Buddha and the Young Hegelian	134
Poetic Wisdom’s Last Proponent: Friedrich Rückert	138
Carl Ritter: Oriental Geography in Western Libraries	141

	Germans Abroad: Neither Conquerors Nor Friends	143
	Ferdinand Von Richthofen: An East Asian Encounter	153
4.	The Second Oriental Renaissance	157
	Orientalism as a Career, 1871–1900	162
	Three Against the Churches: Paul de Lagarde, Theodor Nöldeke, and Julius Wellhausen	167
	Paul de Lagarde: The Orientalism of the Future and the Positivism of the Present	168
	Theodor Nöldeke: Liberal Semitist	174
	Julius Wellhausen: Hebraism and Realism	178
	An Islamic Renaissance?	186
	New Power, New Sources: The Flourishing of Indology in the Era of the Raj	190
	Beyond the Bible? Assyriology and Egyptology in the High Liberal Age	194
	Assyriology’s Escape from Infancy	196
	Egyptology for Realists: Adolf Erman	203
	Eduard Meyer: Universal Historian in a Specialized Age	206
5.	The Furor Orientalis	212
	To Be a (Furious) Orientalist	216
	Return to Diffusionism, or the Problem of Universalism in a Philological Culture	227
	Panbabylonism: An Assyriological Revolt and Its Cultural Consequences	236
	Babel und die Bibel Revisited	244
	After the “Affair”	249
6.	Toward an Oriental Christianity	252
	Liberal Theology in Crisis	256
	The Religious-Historical School	259
	The Oriental Origins of New Testament Christianity	267
	Buddha versus Jesus; or, Fin de Siècle Christians and the Problem of Parallels	270
	Persia and Hellenistic Judaism	279
	Orientalizing Saint Paul	284
7.	The Passions and the Races	292
	On Aryans and Semites	295
	Paul Deussen, Schopenhauerian Christian	300
	Popularizing the Aryan Indian: Leopold von Schroeder and Houston Stewart Chamberlain	311

<i>Contents</i>	xi
<i>Semitistik</i> in the Post-liberal Period	321
Ignaz Goldziher: Man between Two Laws	323
8. Orientalism in the Age of Imperialism	333
The Culture of German Imperialism	335
German Orientalists and the Actuality of Empire	339
Colonialism and Its Orientalist Institutions	348
Martin Hartmann, Enlightened Arabist	356
Carl Becker: Colonialism and <i>Kulturgeschichte</i>	361
East Asia’s Place in the Sun	367
Otto Franke: Orientalism in the Age of “Indirect” Colonialism	377
Erwin Baelz: The Orientalism the Kaiserreich Could Not Use	383
9. Interpreting Oriental Art	387
Oriental Art and the Ethnographic Museum	393
Oriental Carpets and Austrian Art Historians	398
Josef Strzygowski: The Art-Historical Furor Orientalis	403
Exhibiting the Orient in Munich and Berlin	410
The Turfan Expeditions and the Intellectual Consequences of the Central Asian Antiquities Race	416
10. Orientalists and “Others”	427
Orientalists and Others, 1900–1918	429
The Orientalists and the Great War	436
Declaring <i>Jihad</i>	438
Utility, at Last	446
Losing the Eastern Propaganda War: Turks, Armenians, and Jews	454
Richard Wilhelm, German Mandarin	463
Epilogue	474
Orientalism’s Indian Summer: Weimar Scholarship and Its Discontents	476
Orientalism and Nazism	487
Why German Orientalists Laid the Foundation for Multicultural Thinking, but Could Not Develop It	495
<i>Select Bibliography</i>	499
<i>Index</i>	513

Acknowledgments

It would be the height of insolence, not to mention an act of inexcusable ingratitude, to open a book that offers a contextual, critical history of the practice of scholarship without acknowledging that this book too “came from somewhere.” It came chiefly from my very cluttered office in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, but it was also shaped by my visits to German archives and libraries, my years as a faculty member at Princeton University, and by my encounters, personal and electronic, with a large number of people who provided me with crucial references or made helpful criticisms. This book – very long in gestation – was also made possible by grants from various patrons, who have been extremely supportive without being at all intrusive, or even impatient. In what follows, I will try to express my appreciation to those who have been most important in helping me put together this long and complicated study, but the fact remains: a book that takes a dozen years to research and write will owe debts to many people and circumstances, debts the author will never entirely manage to acknowledge, much less repay.

Let me begin at the beginning, and thank, first of all, my wonderful Princeton colleagues amongst whom I was living and working when I first began this project. Here especially I would like to thank Hans Aarsleff, Peter Brown, Natalie Zemon Davis, Lionel Gossman, Anthony Grafton, Peter Lake, and Anson Rabinbach, as well as the members of the team with whom I wrote *Worlds Together, Worlds Apart*, Jeremy Adelman, Stephen Aron, Stephen Kotkin, Gyan Prakash, Robert Tignor, and Michael Tsin; the rich (and contentious!) discussions we had about how to conceive this world history textbook greatly influenced my thinking on many things, one of which was German orientalism. In 1997, I profited greatly from a Humboldt Stiftung fellowship, which I used to begin my archival research in Berlin and to discover just how enormous and complex the topic I had chosen to write on really was. In 2000–1, I was lucky enough to be chosen to be a Fellow at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin; this year was vital both to my further exploration of the libraries and archives and to my reshaping of the project. At the Wiko, I benefited particularly from my conversations with Philippe Burrin, Deborah Shuger, and Jacques Waardenburg, and from my interactions with the members of the “Indische Schwerpunkt,” Partha Chatterjee, Navid Kermani, Velcheru Narayana Rao, David Shulman, and Sanjay Subramanyam, all of them “orientalists” of the most distinguished and insightful kind, and all of them delightful iconoclasts too, each in his own way.

I am very grateful also to the staff members of the Geheimes Staatsarchiv in Berlin, the Museum für Indische Kunst, and the Handschriftenabteilung at the

Staatsbibliothek Berlin for their assistance in locating and using archival materials; I have also used in this book some material I gathered in researching my previous one, then located in the Auswärtiges Amt Archiv in Bonn and the Zentrales Staatsarchiv in Potsdam (I have indicated new locations for this material in the bibliography). But I found that most of the subjects I was dealing with were so under-researched that the published primary and secondary material on them had not yet been put into synthetic form, or properly contextualized, and so there are many individuals or topics surveyed herein for which an exploration of archival sources is still needed; in fact, it is one of the author's hopes that this book will stir interest in some of these long-forgotten subjects and that other scholars will now seek out unpublished letters, diaries, and documents. In any event, I discovered that the printed primary source material left behind by modern German orientalists was vast and, to really get to know it, I would need, first of all, a great library and, secondly, some time to read it.

Here is where the ACLS and LSU played critical roles. The ACLS offered me a Burkhardt Fellowship, which I took in 2003–4; LSU very generously gave me a year off then as well as another year off in 2005–6 to read and to begin writing my book. The second year off was supported by an Atlas Grant from the LSU Board of Regents, a marvelous program, which, like the Burkhardt Fellowship, helps busy associate professors get that second book finished. I owe the completion of this volume to these granting agencies and to Paul Paskoff and Gaines Foster, my excellent departmental chairmen, who have helped me organize leaves and supported my research in every possible way. As for the library – though LSU's isn't world-class, the Interlibrary Loan Office made it seem like it is, and I cannot fail to include them in my thanks. Finally, I would like to thank Cambridge University Press for its willingness to publish this long manuscript, and the German Historical Institute in Washington, D.C., for its generous support for its publication. It has been an honor to work with both of these great cultural institutions.

Of course, books are also the products of personal exchanges of ideas and information, and I have many people to thank as well. Among those who provided me with very helpful references I would especially thank Mustafa Aksakal, Margaret Anderson, Ali Anooshahr, David Armitage, Tuska Benes, Nina Berman, Thomas Broman, Peter Brown, John Connelly, Natalie Zemon Davis, Omnia El-Shakry, Anthony Grafton, Anselm Hagedorn, Ludmila Hanisch, Stefan Hauser, John Henderson, Susannah Heschel, Steven Korenblatt, Anthony La Vopa, Kris Manjapra, Peter N. Miller, Klaus Mühlhahn, David Mungello, Perry Myers, Lynn Nyhart, Elisabeth Oliver, Jürgen Osterhammel, Reza Pirbhay, Till van Rahden, Karl Roider, Dietmar Rothermund, Martin Ruehl, David Schimmelpennick von der Oye, Ismar Schorsch, Jonathan Sheehan, Harvey Shoolman, Helmut Walser Smith, Jacques Waardenburg, George Williamson and Margherita Zanasi. I have also benefited greatly from exchanging work with Nina Berman, Heiner Feldhoff, Nick Germana, Alexander Haridi, Wolf Liebeschütz, Douglas McGetchin, Peter Park, Indra Sengupta, Sergei Stadnikov, and my own students, Roshunda Belton, Eva Giloi, Heather Morrison, Martin Ruehl, and Derek Zumbro from whom I learned so much about their subjects, and about mine.

Acknowledgments

xv

Some people have gone the extra mile (or given my verbosity, the extra marathon) and read and critiqued whole chapters for me, in many cases saving me from errors or unsound lines of argument. I would like to offer them a special thanks: Alex Bevilacqua, Gary Cohen, Marwa El-Shakry, Anselm Hagedorn, Bradley Herling, Peter Jelavich, Christine Kooi, Michael Laffen, Harry Lieber-son, David Lindenfeld, Tomoko Masuzawa, John Pizer, Bernard Porter, Brian Porter-Szucs, Martin Ruehl, Jonathan Sheehan, Harvey Shoolman, Andreas Sommer, Jonathan Sperber, and Lynn Zastoupil. I will be eternally grateful to David Lazar for checking the whole manuscript for footnote typos. My deepest thanks goes to five people I have endlessly hounded for references and plied for information, reactions, and ideas: Margaret Anderson, Anthony Grafton, Ludmila Hanisch, Kris Manjapra, and George Williamson. I can't imagine what this book would look like without them; I wouldn't even want to try.

Finally, a brief and wholly insufficient line of gratitude to my friends, many of whom are listed above, and to my family members – thanks for putting up with me and my German orientalist for so long. My husband, Victor Stater, deserves far more thanks for his wisdom, wit, patience, and never-failing confidence in me than a line or two in the acknowledgments – but I expect he will be embarrassed even by this. Having heard about “Mom’s book” for so long, my sons, Bertie and Henry, will be as glad as I am to see it off my desk. They too have contributed to it, mostly by making my extra-textual life boundlessly joyful. They are not mentioned in the dedication this time only because they are already in possession of something more valuable than my book: my heart.

Introduction

In an essay published in 1907, the Indologist and orientalist popularizer Hermann Brunnhofer offered a revealing account of the Orient's interest to Westerners, one that bears quoting at length:

The longing for the Orient accompanies the Occidental from the cradle to the grave. When the young farmer's wife of the Far West, deep in the most remote forest valley of the Rocky Mountains, holds her first-born child on her lap and imparts to him the elements of the Christian faith, she tells him about the shepherds of Bethlehem in the land of Judea, far, far on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. She tells him about the star, which the wise men from the land of Chaldaea followed, and then of the rivers of the Nile and the Euphrates, of Mount Ararat on which Noah's ark came to rest after the Flood, of Mount Sinai from which Moses brought the earliest tables of the law to the people of Israel, of the great cities of Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre and Sidon, of the world conquerors Cyrus of Persia and the Pharaoh in Egypt-land.

... The Bible is the book through which the world of the West, even in times of the most melancholy isolation, remains persistently tied to the Orient. Even when one ignores its character as a sacred book of revelation, and examines it from a historical and geographical standpoint, the Bible can be seen as a world-historical book of wonders, as the book which ever again reawakens in the Aryans of the West, who have deserted their homeland, that longing for the Orient which binds peoples together. ...

Brunnhofer then followed this immediately with a brief sketch of the origins and history of European oriental studies:

It was also religious need which in the educated circles of the West provided the most powerful impetus for the study of the Orient. The world of the West was captivated in its inner being by the information that it received through the Bible about the peoples of the Orient. But that which sufficed to please the taste did not satisfy the curiosity, which was afterward awakened. The Bible's accounts of language, morals and religions of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Phoenicians, Medes and Persians were too scant not to inspire the desire, in the era of the renaissance of the sciences, for richer and more trustworthy information about the lives of the peoples of the East. So arose, at first, in closest connection to the Biblical scholarship inspired by the Reformation, an oriental philology and archaeology. These [sciences] limited themselves for many centuries to the study of the language and religion of the Semitic people. But towards the end of the previous century the languages and literatures of the Sanskrit-Indians and the Zoroastrian Persians were rediscovered, and then arose, quickly and at the same time as the philological study of Semitic

languages and religions, Sanskrit and Zend philology, to which soon too Egyptology and Sinology were added.¹

Brunnhofer was in some ways an exceptional scholar; he authored several books on Homer, Goethe, and the Hermeticist-heretic-magus Giordano Bruno, and – probably to ingratiate himself with Russian patrons – translated into German the oriental travels of the Czarevich.² What made him confident to speak as an orientalist, about the history of orientalism, was his specialized knowledge of Sanskrit philology and his publications on ancient “Aryan” culture and languages – but here he was saying nothing his contemporaries would have found surprising, or even particularly interesting. Indeed this whole passage was nothing more than a rather anodyne prologue for a rave review of Indologist Max Müller’s enormously important series of classics in translation, *Sacred Books of the East* (50 vols., 1879–1904). The point is that Brunnhofer’s career and his picture of western orientalism have virtually nothing to do with the one recent studies have conjured, and we begin this book by wondering why that might be, and in what ways we can reconcile the two points of view.

Some sort of reconciliation, or reckoning, is necessary if we are finally to answer the question, which was posed immediately upon the publication of Edward Said’s *Orientalism* in 1978, but which has never been treated in detail: what lies at the heart of German orientalism? Said famously, and self-consciously, left the Germans out of his analysis, despite the well-known fact that they were the pacesetter European scholars in virtually every field of oriental studies between about 1830 and 1930. He said simply that Britain and France “were the pioneer nations in the Orient and Oriental studies,” and that their positions, politically and intellectually, were taken over by the Americans after World War II. He reproached himself for seeking “to provide an understanding of academic Orientalism and pay[ing] little attention to scholars like [Heymann] Steinthal, [Max] Müller, [Carl Heinrich] Becker, [Ignaz] Goldziher, [Carl] Brockelmann, [Theodor] Nöldeke” (all of whom do have attention paid to them in this book), but insisted that

at no time in German scholarship during the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century could a close partnership have developed between Orientalists and a protracted, sustained national interest in the Orient. There was nothing in Germany to correspond to the Anglo-French presence in India, the Levant, North Africa. Moreover, the German Orient was almost exclusively a scholarly, or at least a classical, Orient: it was made the subject of lyrics, fantasies, and even novels, but it was never actual, the way Egypt and Syria were actual for Chateaubriand, Lane, Lamartine, Burton, Disraeli or Nerval. . . . What German Oriental

¹ Hermann Brunnhofer, “Die heiligen Bücher des Orients,” in idem, *Oestlisches Werden: Kultur-aus-tausch und Handelsverkehr zwischen Orient und Okzident von der Urzeit bis zur Gegenwart* (Bern, 1907), pp. 25–7.

² Brunnhofer’s works include *Urgeschichte der Arier in Vorder-und Centralasien* (Leipzig, 1893); *Arische Urzeit* (Bern, 1910); *Homerische Rätsel* (Leipzig, 1898); *Russlands Hand über Asien* (St. Petersburg, 1897); *Goethes Bildkraft im Lichte der ethnologischen Sprach- und Mythenvergleichung* (Leipzig, 1893); *Giordano Bruno’s Weltanschauung und Verhängniss* (Leipzig, 1882); and the translation of Prince Espere Esperovich Uchomski’s two-volume *Orientreise seiner kaiserlich Hoheit des Grossfürsten-Thronfolgers Nikolaus Alexandrowitsch von Russland*, trans. Hermann Brunnhofer (Leipzig, 2 vols., 1894–99).

scholarship did was to refine and elaborate techniques whose application was to texts, myths, ideas, and languages almost literally gather from the Orient by imperial Britain and France.³

Said's statements were immediately recognized to be misleading, for the Germans did not merely follow in the tracks of others. Nor did they lack an "actual" relationship with the East – the German-speaking polities have had a very long and important relationship with both the Holy Land and the Ottoman Empire, and the Wilhelmine Empire did have colonial interests, and even colonial territories (Qingdao and Samoa, for example) in the East.⁴ It seemed clear that by excluding the Germans – as well as the Russians, Dutch, Greeks, and Italians – Said was engaging in a deliberate sort of deck-stacking: focusing exclusively on French and British literature and scholarship produced during the high imperial age, he was able to conclude that "orientalism" was a product of empire. But Said's paradigm took hold, perhaps because his grand claims did teach us to see so much that we had missed. And despite its dodges and flaws, Said's analysis has, until recently, continued to structure virtually all discussions about the relationship between the European mind and the cultures of the East, even when the Germans are added to the mix.

The last few years have seen an increasing number of attempts to redress Said's omissions and efforts to refine his model. There have been highly sophisticated critiques of the intimate relationships between European science and colonialism, and equally sophisticated challenges to the subalternist "iron cage."⁵ While earlier work focused heavily on England, and secondarily on France, we have recently seen the appearance of a number of fine studies of Russian and Dutch imperialism, and many more seem to be in the works.⁶ There are now a number of excellent treatments too of orientalizing "othering" as the process occurred in Japan and the Ottoman Empire.⁷ In literary studies and art history in particular, scholars

³ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York, 1978), pp. 17, 19.

⁴ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 19; Nina Berman has shown, with emphasis on the Crusades and other religious encounters, that Said vastly overstated the case in claiming that the German Orient was never "actual." See Berman, "Thoughts on Zionism, in the Context of German Middle East Relations," in *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 24, no. 2 (2004): 134. Berman's forthcoming book will document myriad forms of "actual" encounter between Germans and Asians and force us to rethink the exclusion of the Germans from studies of orientalism. Professor Berman has kindly allowed me to read several chapters of her manuscript, the provisional title for which is *Beyond Orientalism: Germany and the Middle East, 900–2000*.

⁵ To cite just a very few: Gyan Prakash, *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India* (Princeton, NJ, 1999); Bernard S. Cohen, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge* (Princeton, NJ, 1996); C. A. Bayly, *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780–1870* (Cambridge, 2000); David Washbrook, "Orient and Occident: Colonial Discourse Theory and the Historiography of the British Empire," in *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 5, ed. Robin Winks; J. J. Clarke, *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Asian and Western Thought* (London, 1997). On Germany specifically, Russell Berman, *Enlightenment or Empire: Colonial Discourse in German Culture* (Lincoln, NE, 1998); George Steinmetz, *The Devil's Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa and Southwest Africa* (Chicago, IL, 2007).

⁶ Michael Francis Laffen, *Islamic Nationhood and Colonial Indonesia* (London, 2003); on Russia, Daniel R. Brower and Edward Lazzerini, eds., *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700–1917* (Bloomington, IN, 1997); Alexander Etkind, "Orientalism Reversed: Russian Literature in the Times of Empires," in *Modern Intellectual History* 4, no. 3 (2007): 617–28.

⁷ Stefan Tanaka, *Japan's Orient: Rendering into History* (Berkeley, CA, 1993); Ussama Makdisi, "Ottoman Orientalism" in *American Historical Review* 107, no. 3 (2002): 768–96.

have become increasingly sensitive to the subtle and often contradictory ways in which the “Orient” was invoked or read.⁸ Finally, the last few years have seen the publication of careful new studies of particular branches of German *Orientalistik* such as Sabine Mangold’s “*Eine weltbürgerliche Wissenschaft*”: *Deutsche Orientalistik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2004), Indra Sengupta’s *From Salon to Discipline: State, University and Indology in Germany, 1821–1914* (Heidelberg, 2005), and Pascale Rabault-Feuerhahn’s *L’archive des origines: Sanskrit, philologie, anthropologie dans l’Allemagne du XIXe siècle* (Paris, 2008). My book is deeply indebted to all of this important new work.

But at present there is still no comprehensive treatment, in German or English, of modern German orientalism, the field Said himself knew to be a key exception to his claims.⁹ Moreover, there are very few studies of modern orientalism that allow us to take seriously Hermann Brunnhofer’s history of the field and that seek to understand the specific roles played by orientalist scholarship in the cultural histories of Europe’s diverse states, comprehending the discipline’s debts to and rivalries with theology and classics. Fewer still detail the local politics of orientalism – its educational institutions, disciplinary hierarchies, interpretive traditions, canons of evidence, divisions of labor, and the individual obsessions and innovations, religious longings and personal grievances, overweening ambitions and just plain hard work that shaped its practice. Let me be clear: in no way am I advocating a return to the pre-Saidian way of writing the history of oriental studies. We do not need more uncritical histories of oriental scholarship – there are *Festschriften* and heroic biographies enough – that deny that orientalism had a politics. We need, instead, a synthetic and critical history, one that assesses oriental scholarship’s contributions to imperialism, racism, and modern anti-Semitism, but one that also shows how modern orientalism has furnished at least some of the tools necessary for constructing the post-imperialist worldviews we cultivate today.¹⁰

That is what this book seeks to offer. It is a critical history of the *practice* of oriental scholarship, one that treats the politics of the field, but does so without presuming that those politics were primordially and perpetually defined by imperialist relationships. It is not a book about “orientalism” in the wider sense of “the image of the Orient” all Germans possessed or the “discourse on the Orient” they purportedly all shared; whether such things existed is something I very much

⁸ See, for example, Bradley L. Herling, *The German Gita: Hermeneutics and Discipline in the German Reception of Indian Thought, 1778–1831* (New York, 2006); Todd Kontje, *German Orientalisms* (Ann Arbor, MI, 2004); Nina Berman, *Orientalismus, Kolonismus und Moderne; Zum Bild des Orients in der deutschsprachigen Kultur um 1900* (Stuttgart, 1997); Andrea Polaschegg, *Der andere Orientalismus. Regeln deutsch-morgenländischer Imagination im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 2005), and the older, but still useful, René G  rard, *L’Orient et la pens  e romantique allemande* (Nancy, 1963).

⁹ Of course, there are many specialized studies, in addition to those just cited, upon which I draw heavily. To cite just a few: Ludmila Hanisch, *Die Nachfolger der Exegeten: Deutschsprachige Erforschung der Vorderen Orient in der ersten H  lfte des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Wiesbaden, 2003); Wilhelm Halbfass, *India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding* (Albany, NY, 1988); Stephen Vernoit, ed., *Discovering Islamic Art: Scholars, Collectors and Collections, 1850–1950* (London, 2000).

¹⁰ Of course, the multi-cultural worldviews common in European and American academic circles surely still retain Eurocentric elements, as Tomoko Masuzawa has recently demonstrated in *The Invention of World Religions: Or, How European Universalism was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago, IL, 2005).

doubt. Whether or not we could access such an image or discourse by cobbling together statements by a colonial official here and a novelist there is, to me, even more dubious, and I have decided, for theoretical as well as evidentiary reasons, not to try to create such an entity. My evidentiary reasons for rejecting the idea that German “orientalism” was a single, shared discourse are on display throughout the book. But the theoretical underpinnings of my work require a bit of elaboration here, especially as the rest of this book seeks self-consciously not to wear its theory on its sleeves. I do want to make a generally important contribution to European intellectual and cultural history, and my readers should know what sort of contribution to the study of knowledge-making this book purports to be.

Perhaps most provocatively, this book calls into question the widely used method of discourse analysis, at least as it has been applied to the study of European “orientalism.” All too often, it seems to me, those who have followed Said’s lead and adopted the Foucauldian tactic of analyzing only the surfaces of the texts they study end up simply reiterating what we know, namely that people make representations for their own purposes; too rarely do they ask about the *variety* of those purposes, or about the rootedness of those representations in weaker or stronger interpretations of original sources. Too frequently, discourses are identified by selectively assembling lines and phrases from disparate texts, and in the attempt to make power relations paramount, modern commentators are led to pick out metaphors or generalizations that have more to do with our own interests than with the authors’ original ideas. This is not really Foucault’s fault; his primary purpose was to offer a philosophical deconstruction of the identities we have unreflectively assumed, and his work has helped us to gain critical purchase on the institutions, sciences, and thought-structures of both past and present. But the re-elaboration of his philosophical critiques as historical methodology regularly results in tendentious bricolage, and when applied indiscriminately, this method frequently produces distorted and present-oriented pictures of hypostatized entities such as “orientalism.”

When applied to the study of “the Orient” this method is particularly pernicious, delivering a definition of identity which presumes a primordial, binary distinction between “Europe” and “the Orient.” We find ourselves believing that all Europeans – whether women or men, aristocrats or peasants, classicists or orientalists, Czechs or Scots – were actually cognizant of and bound by this reified “discourse,” no matter who these individuals were, what they did or did not know, and what the context was in which their statements were made. Perhaps the distinction between European and Oriental was crucial for some individuals; but where is the proof that this binary distinction *actually* was what mattered most to all or even the majority of nineteenth-century inhabitants of the landmass we are calling “Europe”? Surely at least some Europeans defined themselves by means of other sets of distinctions – male and female, Christian and Jew, academic philologist and on-the-spot diplomat, German and Frenchman?¹¹ When scholars take up the subject of “orientalism,” they seem to forget that many of those they lump together as “Europeans” did not inhabit this identity exclusively, or without

¹¹ Billie Melman’s wonderful *Women’s Orient: English Women and the Middle East, 1718–1918* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1992), suggests the importance of gender for the western travelers’ interpretation of eastern cultures.

discomfort; there were plenty of self-critical Britons, Bavarians, and Hungarians who were worried enough about Europe's own warts – its history of intolerance, its materialism, its erasure of traditions, its tendency to treat others as means to an end – that they emigrated, converted, or risked destroying their own careers, or even lives, by publicizing their grievances. Some lived their lives in borderlands like Sweden, Estonia, or Croatia where they themselves felt “orientalized” – and believed the ultimate “other” sat in Rome, St. Petersburg, or Vienna, not in Istanbul, Cairo, or Delhi. We cannot *start* with the belief that Europeans found the categories “European” and “Oriental” primordial or totalizing and hope to discover how complicated these cultural relationships might really have been.

In what follows, I will show that the variable mix of identities inhabited by even the subgroup of Europeans studied here *did* make for different relationships to Asia and its cultures. Some, of course, did despise “mysterious India” and “decadent Persia,” and thought the West wholly untainted by “oriental” values and vices. But as Brunnhofer suggested, every Christian certainly knew that he or she shared the “Holy Land” and some of their holy scriptures with eastern peoples, and professional students of the Orient were perhaps even more aware than most laypersons that the Orient had been continually linked to Europe from the earliest times. The peoples of the Near East, at least, were known to inhabit places with languages, cultures, and histories, which were both shared and not shared with post-Renaissance Christian Europe – and Central Europeans especially knew that the Ottoman Empire continued to cast a long shadow across the Bosphorus. Even some forms of racial thinking, fleshed out by specialists but widely popularized, were founded upon linkages between East and West, as was the case in speculative reconstructions of “Aryan” and “Semite” origins. It is far too simplistic to say that nineteenth-century Europeans always thought of themselves as a united group, over and against “the oriental other.” In some contexts, the peoples of Asia were rendered “others” – but in other contexts they were treated as kin: relatives, wayward brothers, long-lost fathers, or sons in need of tutelage, but family members, just the same. We need to appreciate the richness and complexity of Europeans' relations with the Orient in order to see just how much imposing that binary distinction distorts our understanding of the lives of “others,” by whom I mean, this time, the eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and early twentieth-century Europeans whose worldviews differed so much from those we now hold.

The foregoing explains why this book focuses on the *practice* of oriental studies in Germany rather than on “the German image of the Orient.” It seems to me that this is an important way, if surely not the only one, of finding what Bradley Herling has called “a third way,” a means to understand orientalism which does not become merely a critique of ideology (*à la* Said) or a hermeneutical defence of scientific progress.¹² The study of practice is an important way in which historians of science have tried to get beyond the constructionist/progressivist impasse, and it

¹² Bradley Herling has kindly allowed me to cite here his very important methodological mapping of this terrain, “‘Either a Hermeneutical Consciousness or a Critical Consciousness’: Renegotiating Theories of the Germany-India Encounter.” His paper was originally presented at the German Studies Association Conference in Saint Paul in September 2008. Kris Manjapra is also seeking a “third way”; see his “‘Ecumenical Thinking’: Gadamer’s Hermeneutics and the Critique of Post-colonial Theory,” forthcoming in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 2010.

is an approach early modern intellectual historians have used to good effect; but it has been slow to catch on amongst students of modern ideas. In my case, I focus on the knowledge-making practices of those individuals who counted as “orientalists” in their cultural milieux, namely the men (and they were mostly men) who invested time and effort in actually learning to read and/or speak at least one “oriental” language. This means that it is heavily a book about academics, though it also contains extensive treatments of travelers and diplomats, popularizers and missionaries, pastors and rabbis. These are the people who chose “knowing the Orient” as a career, and they were, after all, the individuals nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German society believed most worthy to write and speak about eastern cultures; even after Imperial Germany entered the colonial race, it was chiefly to them that Germans looked to explain the religious, historical, and cultural significance of Asia, and to understand its complex linguistic, artistic, and ethnographic relationships with Europe. Sometimes they also helped rule or exploit it – and those instances too need careful elaboration. By trying to understand why these individuals wrote or did certain things at certain times I hope to be able to illuminate the ways in which the techniques they pioneered were used to explore new areas or to shore up old prejudices, to advance ambitions, and to undermine conventions, to exploit others or to attempt to liberate them. I am not writing this book to resurrect “orientalism” or to bury it, but out of the profound conviction that we need a critical history of its practice and its practitioners in order to understand our more recent efforts at writing postcolonial and global history as part of a much longer, and much more complicated, trajectory.¹³

For the purposes of this book, then, “orientalism” is defined as a *set of practices*, practices that were bound up with the Central European institutional settings in which the sustained and serious study of the languages, histories, and cultures of Asia took place. Many, but by no means all, of the scholars treated in this book actually did call themselves “orientalists” – some would have described themselves as theologians, classicists, historians, geographers, archaeologists, or art historians. Their designation as such became increasingly conventional as academic specialization drove disciplinary development and increasingly divided those who studied the so-called *Naturvölker* of sub-Saharan Africa, Australasia, and the New World from those who studied *Kulturvölker*, people of high culture, refined spirituality, and (critically) readable ancient texts. Beginning about 1800, further divisions were made, at least in the philosophical faculty, between those who studied Greek and Roman texts and those who studied other ancient texts (there were as yet few academic posts for the study of modern European history or languages). This meant that institutionally speaking, an entity called “orientalism” was created under which virtually all non-classicizing humanists, from

¹³ The general understanding of the origins of postcolonial thought divorces it from older forms of scholarship in ways that make it seem almost a *deus ex machina*, a sudden and entirely salutary development dating to the last decades of the twentieth century. I do not wish to invalidate subaltern criticism, which has contributed so much to the decentering of Europe; nor do I wish to criticize the institutionalization of world history – I am, after all, one of seven authors of a world history textbook (Robert Tignor et al., *Worlds Together, Worlds Apart*, vol. 2, 2nd ed. 2008). On the contrary, I simply want to show that today’s conceptions and preoccupations were foreshadowed, and in some ways, prepared for, by the orientalists of the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. For more on this, see the Epilogue, herein.

Assyriologists to Sinologists, were thrown together, like the diverse animals of a single continent housed in one particular section of a zoo. Societies, journals, and institutes defined themselves as “oriental” often in the same way, meaning, essentially, the study of *Kulturvölker* beyond the classical world. It is this institutionally defined subject position, above all, that holds this book together, rather than an “ism,” a political stance or the intellectual coherence of “*Orientalistik*.” Even so, I should also note that some of those who made important contributions to what by the end of the century began to be called *Orientforschung* continued to identify themselves primarily as theologians, archaeologists, comparative linguists, or even classicists. Practices and subject matter were shared across institutional divisions, perhaps even more than in today’s universities.

Oriental studies in German-speaking Central Europe certainly was different from British and French “orientalism,” for reasons that have to do with Imperial Germany’s late leap into the colonial race, but also with other cultural factors, such as the Austrian Habsburgs’ long and usually “hot” border with the Ottoman Empire, the power of the tradition of Christian Hebraism in German Protestant territories, and the cultural dominance of Germandom’s state-sponsored universities. How different its practices really were from those of others – including not only the French and British, but also the Russians, Dutch, Italians, and Swedes – is something that deserves further comparative study. Here, however, I will argue that the cultural politics of *Orientalistik* were defined much less by “modern” concerns – such as how to communicate with or exert power over the locals – than by traditional, almost primeval, *Christian* questions, such as (1) what parts of the Old Testament are true, and relevant, for Christians? (2) how much did the ancient Israelites owe to the Egyptians, Persians, and Assyrians? (3) where was Eden and what language was spoken there? and (4) were the Jews the only people to receive revelation? The German Reformers’ attempts to clean up God’s Word had involved orientalist knowledge from the first – and indeed sixteenth-century humanists had already struggled with many of the philological and chronological questions that would plague their descendants 300 years later. Although new sources were added, the old ones – particularly the Old Testament, the church fathers, and classical authors – continued to exert a powerful effect on the imaginations of even the most cutting-edge scholars long beyond the Enlightenment.

In addition to cultural factors, numerous a priori points of departure shaped individual perspectives on Asian culture and history: does humankind progress, or is what we see the result of a fall from a more perfect state? Can people borrow and learn from one another peacefully, or are conquest or racial mixing the only way cultures really affect one another? Are humans essentially monotheists, or nature-worshipping animists? Is religion the foundation of stable societies, or an opiate elites use to suborn the masses? It will be my job in this book to appreciate the persistence of such questions, sources, and orientations, while also showing how these were, over the course of the last 200 years, posed in ever more specialized terms, complicated by new evidence, and voiced to an ever-larger public. It will also be my job to show how various forms of racial speculation arose in the course of these debates and how Germany’s quest to bask in imperialist sunshine, after 1884, contributed to, but did not wholly transform, these older debates and traditions.

Thus if this book seeks, in new ways, to provide an answer to a question posed by Edward Said, it is not ultimately a book framed by a Saidian, or an anti-Saidian, theoretical structure, and as grateful to him as I am for putting this highly important field on the map, Said's work will, from this page forward, scarcely be mentioned. To the extent that his framework insisted on a totalizing, global view of European–oriental relations, it simply does not help me understand what the German scholars were actually saying and doing.¹⁴ As I became more and more interested in finding out what German orientalism, as a cultural phenomenon, actually was, I became less and less convinced that it was about European culture “setting itself off against the Orient” or that its leading ideas were informed by the imperial experience.¹⁵ I would certainly agree with Said that European orientalism was enabled by the exerting of imperial authority over the East – how else can we explain the flood of manuscripts, artifacts, and specimens that gave library-bound scholars in the West the ability to claim themselves to be world specialists in medieval Persian poetics or Sanskrit literature?¹⁶ And I would also agree that European orientalism “has less to do with the Orient than it does with ‘our’ world.”¹⁷ But unlike many of the recent commentators on Europe's “culture of imperialism,” I do not think that all knowledge, orientalist or otherwise, inevitably contributed to the building of empires, or even to the upholding of Eurocentric points of view. In general, I find presumptuous and rather condescending the conception, so common to these readings of cultural history, that all knowledge is power, especially since the prevailing way of understanding this formulation suggests that power is something sinister and oppressive, something exerted against or over others. Of course, knowledge can be used in this way, but knowledge as understanding can also lead to appreciation, dialogue, self-critique, perspectival reorientation, and personal and cultural enrichment. Oriental studies did

¹⁴ Said's rich readings of individual texts sometimes undercut a theory which demands that imperial politics is always *the* structuring element. Like Bernard Porter, I recognize that empire might have been structuring the cultural institutions and mental operations of nineteenth-century actors in ways that have not left traces in their texts, but I am rather dubious about depending on the proverbial “argument from silence,” all too often invoked by those who wish to claim that European culture in this period was completely suffused with dreams or fantasies of empire. See Porter, *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: Empire, Society and Culture in Britain* (Oxford, 2004). I agree with Dorothy Figueira that one of the main problems with Said's method is that it imposes a primarily political authorial intention onto texts, “disregarding the testimony of a work's language, reception and character as narrative, poetry, translation, scholarship or artistic performance. By consigning to a secondary position the work of individual artists, a text becomes a commentary on a political situation rather than an expression of the motivations and desires that inspire the individual artist or scholar.” Dorothy Matilda Figueira, *Translating the Orient: The Reception of Sakuntala in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Albany, NY, 1991), p. 5.

¹⁵ Cf. Said, *Orientalism*, p. 3.

¹⁶ We have only to think of the situation the other way round to see this. Imagine hundreds of scholars in Isfahan, Cairo, Tokyo, Calcutta, Beijing, and Istanbul reading, writing, and publishing vast quantities of material about the Germanic tribes, Anglo-Saxons, and Gauls – but almost never doing so in German, English, or French. Imagine the same group of scholars collecting multitudes of medieval European manuscripts, and taking them off to libraries in Baghdad and Shanghai; picture Iranian scholars excavating the castles of the Teutonic knights, while Chinese archaeologists tackled Stonehenge – both groups telling Europeans how the reconstructions should look, and pilfering, buying, or otherwise extracting artifacts to fill the museum basements in Teheran and Beijing to overflowing. Surely the Germans, English, and French would have found this intolerable? On the other hand, one might well ask, would the Russians or the Portuguese have minded?

¹⁷ Said, *Orientalism*, p. 12.

partake of and contribute to the exploitation and “othering” of nonwesterners, to be sure; but it also has led to positive outcomes of the type just listed, and I cannot subscribe to a philosophical stance that suggests that such things do not motivate or characterize the pursuit of knowledge.

Before we leave the theoretical realm, I would like to invoke another series of critical assessments of western orientalism with which I am in rough agreement. This position, first roughed out by the nineteenth-century Indian philosopher Ramohan Roy, but recently restated by Amartya Sen, underlines the West’s tendency, at least since the Enlightenment, to contrast the East’s spirituality or “imaginative irrationality” with western rationality.¹⁸ Characteristic of William Jones’s Indophilia as well as the Indophobia of James Mill, this parceling out of talents, as Sen argues, has led to the undervaluing of India’s materialist and rationalist traditions; the same critique could be applied to discussions of the special talents of the Semites, who have repeatedly been praised for their soulfulness but damned for their failure to create secular institutions or beautiful works of plastic art.¹⁹ As Partha Chatterjee also notes, this division of the western material world (including technology, science, economy, and politics) from the eastern spiritual world reproduced itself in anti-colonial nationalisms, which regularly recommended accepting and imitating the former (seen as culturally inessential) while insisting that cultural core identities lie in the spiritual realm.²⁰ Both those who loved the East, and those who despised it, tended to play down its materiality and even its quotidian forms of existence, a tendency exacerbated in the German scholarly world in which ancient and religious texts remained central to the study of the Orient.

But two important corollaries to this claim have been overlooked. First of all, if European intellectuals tended to spiritualize the East, they also tended to find distasteful material engagements with “others”; nineteenth-century academics in particular evinced little interest in the East’s modern economic, military, or political conditions. To assess or address any of these topics was a job for the journalist, official, or businessman, none of whom had the same sort of cultural respectability as did the academic. That is to say, the intellectual work, which was most closely related to the real practices of colonialism, or pre- or postcolonial exploitation, was something the scholars did not think worth their time or worthy of their training (though some of their students did end up in such jobs, and during the Great War, many credentialed academics did do some of this sort of work). Of course this does not mean that the scholars did not endorse colonial endeavors (most did), but it does mean that they recognized that there were different ways of speaking about the Orient, and that they chose to speak about things of less utility and more permanence rather than about, for example, the price of land in Egypt or how to draw up a contract in China. If they focused on the ancient Orient and its

¹⁸ Bimal Krishna Matilal, “On Dogmas of Orientalism,” in K. K. Das Gupta, P. K. Bhattacharyya, and D. K. Choudhury, eds., *Sraddhanjali: Studies in Ancient Indian History* (Delhi, 1988), pp. 17–18; quotation p. 18. Amartya Sen, *The Argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian History, Culture and Identity* (New York, 2005), pp. 139–160.

¹⁹ Kalman P. Bland, *The Artless Jew: Medieval and Modern Affirmations and Denials of the Visual* (Princeton, NJ, 2000); Margaret R. Olin, *The Nation Without Art: Examining Modern Discourses on Jewish Art* (Lincoln, NE, 2001).

²⁰ Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments* (Princeton, NJ, 1993), p. 6.

religions – and they did – this surely suggested that they thought modern eastern cultures static or degraded and of incidental interest; but many members of the educated elite thought the same was true of their own culture, which is why the study of classical antiquity was dominant in educational institutions and why religious reformers emphasized the virtues of Jesus and the apostles, rather than those of contemporary Christians.

Students of orientalism seem too often to forget that all western scholars and intellectuals since the time of Alexander the Great, or even since Napoleon's Egyptian escapade, have not taken the part of the European would-be conqueror or the orthodox churches, and that, inevitably, other sorts of truth seekers appear who look to the East when the West faces critical challenges and despairs of its own answers.²¹ The East has often offered iconoclasts a trump card to play in religious or cultural conflicts in the West, as demonstrated by the case of Giordano Bruno, the great champion of the Egyptian philosopher-prophet Hermes Trismegistus, or more recently, by Martin Bernal, author of the incendiary *Black Athena*.²² Though generated by thoroughly western rivalries and concerns, invoking the Orient has often been the means by which counter-hegemonic positions were articulated; "orientalism" then, has played a crucial role in the *unmaking*, as well as the making, of western identities.

The foregoing discussion clarifies, I hope, the ways in which this study is informed, but not structured, by recent critiques of "orientalism" as a whole. Let me now clarify how it diverges not only from the Saidian grand narrative, but also from conventional disciplinary histories, which actually share with the critical school some interesting common assumptions. Both of these share, for example, a secularization story and a rough chronology – beginning in about 1780 and concluding more or less in the present day. I have found neither of these to be very helpful. The secularization story and the chronology are linked, for the presumption is that just about 1780, the preoccupations of the Renaissance and Reformation (biblical criticism and classical antiquity) disappear from orientlists' horizons, and at the same time, conveniently for Said, real European colonization in Asia begins. This narrative – underwritten by Raymond Schwab's insistence that an "oriental Renaissance" begins in Europe with Anquetil Duperron's publication of the Zend Avesta in 1771²³ – then draws on various romantic figures to demonstrate a purportedly new European interest in the Orient. The later nineteenth century, in Schwab's view, elaborated this romantic paradigm in various ways; but in fact, nothing important really changes. In the discipline's own histories, once scientificness sets in, ideology, error, rivalries, generational

²¹ Nina Berman shows, interestingly, how crusading enthusiasm wore off in the Germanys in the wake of disillusionment with the actual conduct of warfare and the straying of German Christianizing ambitions from the Holy Land to the Slavic East. Friction between German secular leaders and the Pope also contributed to the increasingly widespread criticism of the Crusades in the later twelfth century, criticism which, she shows, took the form of admiration for the nobility of Muslim leaders and warriors and/or attacks on the brutality or decadence of their Christian counterparts. See Nina Berman, "Thoughts on Zionism in the Context of German Middle Eastern Relations," pp. 137–40.

²² Bruno was burned at the stake on orders from the Pope in 1600. See Chapter 1.

²³ Raymond Schwab, *The Oriental Renaissance: Europe's Rediscovery of India and the East, 1680–1880*, trans. Gene Patterson-Black and Victor Reinking (New York, 1984), p. 11. Schwab's book was originally published as *La renaissance orientale* (Paris, 1950).

conflicts, joblessness, poor libraries, and religious convictions are written out; the positivistic cold shower that doused romantic orientalism's flames seems to wash away all externalist sins, and although knowledge grows, again, no fundamental changes occur. The conclusion for both is in one way or another the present, with both parties claiming we are in some way the product of the revolution of the 1780s, for better (the disciplinary historians) or worse (the Saidians).

There are many ways in which my story conflicts with this one. First of all, inspired by my readings and colleagues in early modern studies, I think 1780 is a problematical opening date. Critical changes were already underway in Europe's understanding of "the other" in the seventeenth century, and many of the claims made and questions asked in the later nineteenth century have even older roots in the Renaissance and Reformation. Consistently, too, scholars working in the nineteenth century returned to texts produced in the Hellenistic era and to problems articulated already by the Church fathers (and their "heretic" antagonists). The longer I study the subject, the more struck I am by the continuities and/or recurrent themes that have characterized European study of the East over this very *longue durée*. In many ways, this book sees itself as a continuation of the rich early modern literature on humanistic orientalism rather than as a study of the origins of the modern disciplines we now inhabit.²⁴

Secondly, I cannot share the presumption that secular scholarship entirely displaced theological studies at the eighteenth century's end. Over the course of this long book, we will have ample opportunity to observe the various ways in which *Orientalistik* was not a fully secular science, perhaps especially in the German-speaking world, but elsewhere, I would wager, as well. Hand in hand with this assumption has been the notion that oriental studies in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were primarily concerned with the modern world, and with India and/or with Islam; I think this book will demonstrate the narrowness of that view. *Orientalistik* was, as Brunnhofer said, a field propelled forward by Reformed *Bibelforschung* – note that even in the passage from 1907 quoted earlier he makes no mention whatsoever of studies of modern Asia. It is my argument that this tradition, while modified in some respects and richly enhanced by a

²⁴ The study of early modern orientalism is enjoying something of a Renaissance these days, provoked especially by the work and encouragement of Anthony Grafton and by renewed interest in the history of classical philology and biblical criticism. See, for example, Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford, 2 vols., 1983), and *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA, 1991), as well as other titles; Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Entzauberung Asiens* (Munich, 1998); David Sorkin, *The Berlin Haskalah and German Religious Thought: Orphans of Knowledge* (London, 2000); Debora K. Shuger, *The Renaissance Bible: Scholarship, Sacrifice and Subjectivity* (Berkeley, CA, 1994); Jonathan Sheehan, *The Enlightenment Bible: Translation, Scholarship, Culture* (Princeton, NJ, 2005); Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, *Philosophia perennis: Historical Outlines of Western Spirituality in Ancient, Medieval and Early Modern Thought* (Dordrecht, 2004); Paula Findlen, ed., *Athanasius Kircher: The Last Man Who Knew Everything* (New York, 2004); Peter N. Miller, *Peiresc's Europe: Learning and Virtue in the Seventeenth Century* (New Haven, CT, 2000). There are also older, very rich works to draw on here, including Donald Lach, *Asia in the Making of Europe*, 9 vols. (1965–1993); Frances Yates, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (Chicago, IL, 1979); D. P. Walker, *The Ancient Theology: Studies in Christian Platonism from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century* (Ithaca, NY, 1972); Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart* (Neukirchen, 1956); Frank Manuel, *The Broken Staff: Judaism through Christian Eyes* (Cambridge, MA, 1992); David E. Mungello, *Curious Land: Jesuit Accommodation and the Origins of Sinology* (Wiesbaden, 1985).

massive increase of new source materials, especially after 1880, was still very much alive, at least as late as 1914. Understanding the powerful shaping force of the tradition of Christian humanism will be one of the main missions of this book, and its centrality reminds us – as have so many recent works in German social and political history – that being modern does not necessarily entail being secular.

Thirdly, while I emphasize the continuities that link oriental studies to earlier ideas and practices, I also pay careful attention here to institutional, intellectual, and political changes over the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. There is a familiar conceit that Europe's conception of the Orient was formed in the 1780s or 1820s and then remained unchanged until the present; from that time on, it is argued the romantic and/or imperially subordinated Orient had become a central part of European cultural and scholarly life. Getting to know the East better was simply a matter of perfecting the already existing understanding of its peoples, languages, and histories, or of ratifying preexisting prejudices. But in light of the reading and research I have done, this Whiggish disciplinary history is simply untenable. The worst part of this disciplinary emplotment is that it makes the struggle to obtain *Wissenschaftlichkeit* – and in some cases, to avoid being labeled a heretic – seem easy and the attempt to sketch cultural history fruitless. It also offers a very distorted view of the study of the Orient in nineteenth-century Germany, giving pride of place to philosophy (for Hegel plays all too central a role) rather than to the disciplines that really sustained and transformed the study of the East, namely, philology, theology, and, to a lesser extent, geography. And it does not take stock at all of extremely important changes at the fin de siècle, or during the Great War. I have sought to plunge the reader into the world of those who labored, largely unsung, at orientalism's philological face over the course of the eventful era between about 1750 and 1918 in order to understand not only how indebted they were to past traditions, but how much, decade by decade, their world changed.

I should clarify at the outset that I am writing this book as a scholar of German cultural and intellectual history. In no way can I claim to be a professional orientalist; indeed, I believe I may be unusually impartial in my recounting of the history of the field simply because I was not trained as an expert in any part of it. I have tried to understand the subfields' parameters and protocols – and consulted experts on a number of subjects – but I have not learned the Orient's many languages, something that by 1830 was already a remarkable feat and that, thanks to subsequent discoveries and decipherments, would be humanly impossible today. I apologize in advance for errors specialists might find in this book; but I hope my status as outsider, as well as my familiarity with the evolution of German cultural and political institutions more broadly, will help rather than hinder the goal of understanding the significance of orientalist scholarship for modern German cultural history. I hope that specialists will read the book, not only to gain new perspectives on the history of their own fields, but also to better understand how orientalism as a whole evolved over the course of two centuries of its development. There are always dangers involved in writing the history of a discipline from the outside, but I hope they will be offset by my desire to understand in broad historical terms what it meant to be a German orientalist.

If the book will, I hope, interest practicing orientalists, I am also hopeful that it will appeal to nonspecialists, theologians, classicists, and historians. I am reasonably sure that the first two groups will appreciate the importance of the subject matter, and early modern historians too will probably share my interest in many of these questions. Modern cultural historians may find the book's preoccupations rather arcane, in part, I think, because we all too often fail to take seriously the nineteenth century's absorption in the ancient world and its range of knowledge about the past. I would like to convince my fellow modernists that the topic I have chosen is by no means a narrow one and that in fact the topic deserves more study in the future.

In the chapters of this book I cover in some detail Assyriology, Egyptology, biblical criticism, Indology, Persian studies, Arabic linguistics, Islamic studies, Sinology, and Japanology. I should also note that each of these subfields was actually pursued in multiple ways, by scholars primarily interested in pure philological work, or by those specializing in comparative mythology and linguistics, history of religions, art history, history, geography, or archaeology. Each of these fields had a slightly different dynamic owing to the major texts upon which it relied (and how many of them were, at any point in time, accessible and comprehensible to Europeans) as well as to the particularities of individual practitioners and institutional locations. Different fields, too, aspired to different sorts of culture-political significance. For example, *fin de siècle* Assyriology played a highly significant role in debates about the veracity of the Old Testament, whereas contemporary Sinology had little to do with these religious debates and entangled itself much more in colonial questions. This diversity necessitated dividing chapters into subsections, but I have also tried to emphasize the ways in which individuals and institutional developments fit together and form part of the larger culture. There is a significant amount of detailed information in this book, on subjects ranging from Saint Paul's debts to Persian philosophy to the supposed proto-Kantianism of the Vedas. But I hope to convince readers that the developments and debates I survey have implications for many wider questions in German intellectual and cultural history, and deserve to be far better understood than seems to the case at present.

The size and complexity of this book's subject have made it imperative that I limit my investigations in several important ways. First of all, I have chosen to focus not on the conceptions of the Orient held by "great men" such as Hegel, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Max Weber, and Freud, but rather to detail the careers and ambitions of lesser-known figures like Justus Olshausen, Theodor Nöldeke, Paul Deussen, Adolf Erman, and Leopold von Schroeder. I have done so in part because the men in the first list were not, by the standards of their contemporaries, "orientalists" – though some may have known a little Hebrew, they were not skilled in the reading of oriental languages, and did not (to my knowledge) read nonwestern texts in their original forms. An additional reason to exclude the big names is that a considerable amount of ink has already been spilt in explicating their ideas, whereas the work of the men on the second list is practically unknown, at least outside small circles of directly descended experts. Though I hope sketching this galaxy of minor figures will help some of intellectual history's fixed stars to shine with new light, I also think our notions about whose ideas mattered in the

nineteenth century are woefully narrow and it may well be time to train our telescopes elsewhere.

By omitting coverage of some of the “great” men, I have prevented the book from becoming even longer than it is. But it still includes a mass of long-forgotten names, from Walter Andrae (Assyriologist of an esoteric sort) to Bartholomäus Ziegelbalg (author of a Tamil dictionary and translator of the New Testament into Tamil). Overwhelmed by the number of such obscure men, some readers might find it hard to believe that many, perhaps a majority of, German oriental experts of the period are not even mentioned in my index. I have had to make choices and have selected some for their recognized innovations, some for their typicality with respect to other scholars in the field, and some because they played important roles as provocateurs or popularizers. I had to curtail my investigations even of those, like C. F. Andreas, who had what might be called “interesting” lives; Andreas, for example, whose parents were German-Malayan and aristocratic Armenian, spent some time as postmaster general of Persia before landing his job in middle-Persian philology at the University of Göttingen; he played an important role in deciphering the manuscripts brought back to Berlin by the Turfan Expeditions (see Chapter 9), but is better known to intellectual historians as the long-suffering husband of that most notorious of neoromantic muses, Lou [Andreas] Salomé.²⁵ I cannot hope to do justice to Andreas here – in fact, he is only mentioned once again briefly in this book. I can only apologize in advance for the cursory treatment he and many of his fellows receive here and hope that other scholars see fit to excavate more thoroughly territory I can only survey.

Selection is not the only difficulty, of course, connected with inquiries into the everyday life of scholarship. Compared with that of Andreas, the lives of most of the other orientalist were not so “interesting” and as a consequence, finding detailed information about some figures, like the rather obscure Brunnhofer, has been difficult. Sometimes the volume of work is an issue (as in the case of the Austrian scholar Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall); sometimes the work is so narrowly positivistic that teasing out its ideological underpinnings requires specialized learning I do not possess. Sometimes, too, one needs to restore so many contexts at once – as for example in the quest to evaluate the contributions of the Islamicist, politician, and pundit Carl Heinrich Becker – that only a partial treatment of a career or a person can be attempted. There are, of course, many other things about the individuals, and their work, that specialists in the fields they represent will understand and appreciate much better than I can, though I have tried to pay close attention to the meanings, for example, of dating the Psalms in a particular way, or of attributing certain characteristics to Buddha at one or another point in time. In many ways, this book is simply an attempt to map this vast and sometimes treacherous territory. I can only hope that others expand on (and, as the logic of scholarship dictates, supercede) what I sketch here.

²⁵ There is some interesting material on Andreas in Rudolph Binion’s old but wonderful *Frau Lou: Nietzsche’s Wayward Disciple* (Princeton, NJ, 1968) (see esp. pp. 133–5); but it might be rewarding to follow this up, given the couple’s long and close (but of course unusual) relationship, and Lou’s intimate relations with a large number of influential intellectuals, including Nietzsche, Rilke, and Freud.

One of the things I want to know is what it was actually like to be an orientalist. Why did some well-educated Germans choose this field of study, especially when it was largely unfashionable, and usually unprofitable, to do so? For it was never particularly easy or popular to be an orientalist. One had to learn a battery of difficult languages, often with little assistance; it took a special sort of person to commit himself to such a field of study when resources, manuscripts, colleagues, and positions were much more numerous in classics. Often enough, one had to battle other peoples' prejudices on top of these material and institutional difficulties. Consider Simon Ockley's difficulties, as he saw them, in 1708: Ockley, as Jürgen Osterhammel explains, "not only had to deal with material that was linguistically extremely difficult and had hardly been touched by an editor's hands, with 'dusty Manuscripts, without Translation, without Index; destitute altogether of those Helps which facilitate other Studies'; in addition he had to attempt to understand, without western arrogance, a historical and literary consciousness that expresses itself in its own unique forms."²⁶ More than 200 years later, the Sinologist Richard Wilhelm explained to a friend the hardships involved in trying to interest Weimar Germans in Chinese cultural history. In the past couple of years, Wilhelm wrote, he had been living "the life of a vagabond," dragging slides and lectures everywhere, attending many *gemütlich* get-togethers "in which one has always to inform people that the Chinese do not eat earthworms and rotten eggs and only rarely kill their little girls . . ."²⁷ Although many lived to over-ripe old ages, a not inconsiderable number of orientalist perished in the field, among whom we could list Eduard Schultz, who was killed by Kurds while copying inscriptions in Van, and five of the six members of the expedition sent to "Arabia felix" in 1761. More generally, however, we should recognize that in the context of the times, choosing to be an orientalist was, on the whole, not to choose a career with political influence or significant cultural clout.

What was "the Orient" for these men? German writers and scholars did believe in the existence of "the Orient" as a geocultural concept, and for the sake of expediency, I will often refer, as my subjects sometimes did, to the vast and diverse cultural territory east of Istanbul as "the East" or "the Orient," using the scare quotations only when it seems imperative to underline the derogatory or dismissive implications of the term's usage. But they also were perfectly well aware that *Asien* (used interchangeably, but much less often, than *Orient* or the more poetic *Morgenland*) was – like Europe itself – not politically or religiously uniform. They were indeed proficient at juxtaposing one part of "the" Orient to another, making China, for example, exemplary of rational ethics and ordered stability, while Judea is blamed for inventing irrational otherworldliness and inhumane intolerance. It is important, in fact, to see clearly the important changes in European conceptions and passions over time, as China, for example, lost luster at the same time interest in ancient India was waxing. Moreover, though there were cultural trends – encouraged and exacerbated by state or private patrons – interests and passions did differ among individuals. We should not expect even orientalists

²⁶ Quoted in Jürgen Osterhammel, "Neue Welten in der europäische Geschichtsschreibung (ca. 1500–1800)," in *Geschichtsdiskurs*, vol. 2, ed. Wolfgang Küttler et al. (Frankfurt, 1994), p. 208.

²⁷ Richard Wilhelm quoted in Salomé Blumhardt Wilhelm, *Richard Wilhelm: Der geistige Mittler zwischen China und Europa* (Düsseldorf, 1956), p. 347.

who were contemporaries to speak with one voice any more than American or European area specialists do today – they were, as we like to think ourselves, individuals driven by different desires, demands, interests, and tastes, though their choices were, as are ours, limited and shaped by the political and institutional horizons we inhabit.

One of the subjects on which this history of *Orientalistik* hopes to throw new light is the history of humanistic endeavor in the context of the changing cultural landscape of the later nineteenth century. The universities in the Germanys were the site of major cultural and political battles over the course of the nineteenth century, battles over control of Christian doctrine as well as over the nature of Germandom's past and the proper behavior of citizens in the present. Positioned, quite awkwardly, between the secular humanities (classics and *Germanistik*) and the still highly influential if embattled theological faculty, "orientalism" was right at the heart of controversies about the future of *Wissenschaft*, as well as being central to an issue neither of its brother philologies could easily address: the past and future of religion. Having modeled itself, as much as it was able, on secular classical philology in the early nineteenth century, orientalism was just coming into its own at the century's close, at which time, however, it had to struggle with both widespread crises of religious belief and the dissolution of the humanities' monopoly over cultural production. This, then, is not only a story about the lives and careers of the orientalist; it is also a story about the internal dynamics and demographics of cultural production, the collapse of older forms of *Bildung* and *Wissenschaft*, and the opening up of a new marketplace of ideas, and the often successful resistance mounted to the advent of this brave new world.

In this endeavor, I offer here an overview of the cultural politics of German "orientalism," focusing heavily, but not exclusively, on its academic manifestations. Offering first a short history of the field, I will emphasize its entanglement in German cultural politics and the field's formative relationships to the study of classical antiquity and Biblical exegesis (Chapters 1 and 2). I will then describe the changes in scale, in depth of research, and in the public accessibility of texts, which occurred as the nineteenth century wore on. In the period between about 1820 and 1880, specialization, new sources of patronage, and the waning of clerical power in the cultural sphere *as well as* colonial aspirations drove scholarly interests deeper into the East (Chapters 3–5). A chapter (Chapter 6) I did not anticipate writing – on the profound impact of oriental studies on interpretations of the New Testament – in the end had to be written; it is not a chapter that an orientalist, or a typical modern cultural historian, would write, but it nicely illustrates two things we have missed: first, the reconvergence of theology, classics, and oriental studies at the fin de siècle and second, the ongoing power of oriental studies to shape Christians' view of the scriptures. It is followed by a closer investigation of the relationships between race and religion in studies of the East (Chapter 7), and then by a long chapter, which treats directly the Second Empire's development of colonial sciences (Chapter 8), and a shorter one, which surveys the study of oriental art (Chapter 9). The final chapter (Chapter 10) takes up the critical question of German orientalist's relationships with nonwestern "others," and traces some of these relationships through the disastrous course of the Great War. The book ends in about 1918, as the imperial era (for the Germans, at

any rate) comes to an end, as the philological-historicist tradition folds its tents and as non-Europeans begin to play an increasingly visible and important role in German “orientalist” pursuits and intrigues. But, as the epilogue suggests, I believe there are many legacies of the era I treat that lasted well into the twentieth century and I hope that others too will continue this story down to contemporary times.²⁸

²⁸ There are fascinating other studies underway here, many of which can be cast as studies of the exchange of knowledge, and the transformations of relationships on both sides of the Europe/non-Europe divide precisely because the authors are able to work in two or more linguistic and historical contexts at once. Here I will mention only Kris Manjappa’s dissertation, “The Mirrored World: Cosmopolitan Encounter between Indian Anti-Colonial Intellectuals and German Radicals, 1905–1939” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, May 2007), and the recent *Modern Intellectual History* volume, “An Intellectual History for India,” ed. Shruti Kapila (April 2007), but I know there is much more work of this sort going on at present.