

Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung 21

Herausgegeben von Stefanie Schüler-Springorum
für das Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung
der Technischen Universität Berlin

Redaktion:

Werner Bergmann, Marcus Funck, Brigitte Mihok

Geschäftsführende Redakteurin: Juliane Wetzel

Ⓜ | METROPOL

[2012]

From Feuding Medievalists to the Berlin Antisemitismusstreit of 1879–1881

The Antisemitismusstreit and Its Antecedents

In the November 1879 issue of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*—its editor, Professor Heinrich von Treitschke, turned, towards the end of an essay entitled “Unsere Aussichten”, to attacking the Jews of Germany in general, and the Jewish historian Heinrich Graetz in particular, for their insistence upon remaining apart and not fully integrating into Germany.¹ That essay, which included the infamous complaint about Germany being inundated by young trouser-selling Polish Jews and popularized the slogan “Die Juden sind unser Unglück” – the line that was later to grace the front page of every issue of *Der Stürmer*² – touched off a public debate generally known as *Der Berliner Antisemitismusstreit*. An anthology of letters, articles, and essays written during the next year and a half fills more than 850 pages.³ This episode

- 1 Heinrich von Treitschke, *Unsere Aussichten*, in: *Preußische Jahrbücher* (PrJ) 44 (1879), p. 559–576; p. 572–576 deal with Jews. For an English translation of those last pages see Marcel Stoetzler, *The State, the Nation, and the Jews: Liberalism and the Antisemitism Dispute in Bismarck’s Germany*, Lincoln 2008, p. 311–316. Numerous people helped me generously with various details of this project, but pride of place goes to Berndt Schaller of Göttingen.
- 2 On that slogan’s “success”, see esp. Ulrich Wyrwa, *Genese und Entfaltung antisemitischer Motive in Heinrich von Treitschke’s „Deutscher Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert“*, in: Werner Bergmann/Ulrich Sieg (eds.), *Antisemitische Geschichtsbilder*, Essen 2009, pp. 100.
- 3 Karsten Krieger (ed.), *Der „Berliner Antisemitismusstreit“ 1879–1881: Eine Kontroverse um die Zugehörigkeit der deutschen Juden zur Nation – Kommentierte Quellenedition* (2 vols.), München 2003. For an earlier and smaller anthology, see Walter Boehlich (ed.), *Der Berliner Antisemitismusstreit*, Frankfurt a. M. 1965. The most recent studies of the Streit of which I know are Stoetzler, *The State*, and George Y. Kohler, *German Spirit and Holy Ghost: Treitschke’s Call for Conversion of German Jewry: The Debate Revisited*, in: *Modern Judaism* 30 (2010), p. 172–195.

is generally recognized as a watershed in the history of German antisemitism, for Treitschke's status endowed antisemitism with respectability it had not previously enjoyed. As Theodor Mommsen put it in his 1880 response to Treitschke: "was er sagte, war damit anständig gemacht";⁴ fifteen years later Mommsen would dub Treitschke "der Vater des modernen Antisemitismus", for his attack on the Jews made antisemitism "salonfähig".⁵

Due to the awesome dimensions and consequences of German antisemitism during the next sixty-five years, much scholarship has been devoted to uncovering the roots of the Antisemitismusstreit. It has focused on two main fronts: on Treitschke himself, tracing adumbrations of the views, and tone, that emerged in "Unsere Aussichten" and in its follow-ups; and on more general developments in Germany in the years that preceded the appearance of that 1879 essay. Among those developments, three are especially important: the stock market crash of 1873, blamed by many upon Jewish entrepreneurs ("Gründer");⁶ the rise of popular antisemitism, fanned by such figures as Adolf Stoecker and Wilhelm Marr;⁷ and, most basically, the atmosphere of German nationalism that came along with the wars of the 1860s and the foundation of the Empire early in 1871 – an atmosphere to which Treitschke himself made a very serious contribution.⁸ Treitschke's lectures

4 Theodor Mommsen, *Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum*, Berlin 1880, p. 11, also in: Krieger, *Berliner Antisemitismusstreit*, I, no. 91, p. 704 (original italics). Cf. below, n. 12.

5 Theodor Mommsen, letter of 7 May 1895 cited in Lothar Wickert, *Theodor Mommsen: Eine Biographie*, IV, Frankfurt a. M. 1980, pp. 239, n. 14.

6 See esp. Norbert Kampe, *Von der „Gründerkrise“ zum „Berliner Antisemitismusstreit“: Die Entstehung des modernen Antisemitismus in Berlin, 1875–1881*, in: Reinhard Rürup (ed.), *Jüdische Geschichte in Berlin*, Berlin 1995, p. 85–100; Andreas Dorpalen, *Heinrich von Treitschke*, New Haven 1957, p. 242; Jacob Katz, *The Preparatory Stage of the Modern Antisemitic Movement (1873–1879)*, in: Shmuel Almog (ed.), *Antisemitism through the Ages*, Oxford 1988, p. 279–289; Krieger, *Berliner Antisemitismusstreit*, I, pp. x.

7 See Günter Brakelmann, *Adolf Stoecker als Antisemit (2 vols.)*, Waltrop 2004; Moshe Zimmermann, *Wilhelm Marr: The Patriarch of Anti-Semitism*, New York 1986; Werner Bergmann, *Ein „weltgeschichtliches ‚Fatum‘“: Wilhelm Marrs antisemitisches Geschichtsbild in seiner Schrift: „Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum“*, in: Bergmann/Sieg (eds.), *Antisemitische Geschichtsbilder*, p. 61–82.

8 See Dorpalen, *Heinrich von Treitschke*, p. 226–269; Ulrich Wyrwa, *Heinrich von Treitschke: Geschichtsschreibung und öffentliche Meinung im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* 51 (2003), p. 781–792.

in the 1870s were massively attended events that aroused much patriotic fervor.⁹ That was an atmosphere that emphasized the importance of Germanenthum¹⁰ and left outsiders such as Jews all the more anomalous and, accordingly, all the more vulnerable.

These two foci are, of course, quite appropriate, and have uncovered much that is valid. It seems, however, that another context, intermediate between Treitschke himself and German society at large, might also deserve some attention. Namely, the fact that both Treitschke and Mommsen (his most prominent opponent in the Antisemitismstreit¹¹) were professors of history at the University of Berlin suggests that along with study of Treitschke as an individual, and of German society at large, it might be fruitful to look at the Antisemitismstreit in the context of academic debates and feuds of the day.

It is certainly clear that the Antisemitismstreit had implications within the academic world. Note, for example, that in its wake Mommsen insisted on excluding Treitschke from the Prussian Academy of Sciences, and when finally (1895) Treitschke was accepted Mommsen resigned in protest, explaining that Treitschke

- 9 See Dorpalen, Heinrich von Treitschke, pp. 227. For Treitschke's employment of antisemitic caricatures in his lectures, see *ibid.*, p. 244. On the rise of antisemitism among students in the wake of the Antisemitismstreit, see Norbert Kampe, *Studenten und „Judenfrage“ im deutschen Kaiserreich: Die Entstehung einer akademischen Trägerschicht des Antisemitismus*, Göttingen 1988; Konrad H. Jarausch, *Wissenschaft und Politik*, in: Ilka Thom/Kirsten Weining (eds.), *Mittendrin: Eine Universität macht Geschichte – Eine Ausstellung anlässlich des 200-jährigen Jubiläums der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, Berlin 2010, p. 258.
- 10 Note that Marr's „Der Weg zum Siege des Germanenthums über das Judenthum“, published early in 1879, went through twelve editions that same year.
- 11 On Mommsen's role in the Antisemitismstreit, see Lothar Wickert, *Theodor Mommsen und Jacob Bernays: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Judentums zu Mommsens 150. Geburtstag*, 30. 11. 1967, in: *Historische Zeitschrift (HZ)* 205 (1967), p. 265–294 (esp. p. 267–272); Christhard Hoffmann, *Die Verteidigung der liberalen Nation: Mommsen gegen Treitschke im „Berliner Antisemitismstreit“ 1879/80*, in: Alexander Demandt/Andreas Goltz/Heinrich Schlange-Schöningh (eds.), *Theodor Mommsen. Wissenschaft und Politik im 19. Jahrhundert*, Berlin/New York 2005, p. 62–88; Jürgen Malitz, „Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum“: Theodor Mommsen und der Berliner Antisemitismstreit, in: Josef Wiesehöfer (ed.), *Theodor Mommsen: Gelehrter, Politiker und Literat*, Stuttgart 2005, p. 137–164; Gangolf Hübinger, *Gelehrte, Politik und Öffentlichkeit: Eine Intellektuellengeschichte*, Göttingen 2006, esp. p. 88–91.

was “der Vater des modernen Antisemitismus”.¹² Similarly, when Treitschke was appointed editor of the *Historische Zeitschrift* in 1895, Mommsen declared he would not write even a line for the journal – a stance Friedrich Meinecke explained as deriving from the same issue.¹³ The possibility that the Antisemitismusstreit also had antecedents in the academic world should not be ignored.

From 1879 back to 1871

According to a letter Treitschke wrote from a Swiss mountain resort late in August 1879, his vacation reading included the eleventh volume (1870) of Heinrich Graetz’s *Geschichte der Juden*. The book infuriated him. He could hardly find words to express his disgust and anger about what he saw as Graetz’s *Todhaß* of Christianity and the German nation, especially insofar as they were accompanied by persistent complaints, nonetheless, about the Germans’ failure to accept the Jews with brotherhood.¹⁴ As scholars have noted, this was the immediate impetus for that part of “Unsere Aussichten” that focused upon Jews.¹⁵ The connection is obvious, for example, in the letter complaining about Graetz’s “*Todhaß gegen ‘den Erzfeind,’ das Christenthum, und gegen die deutsche Nation*”, which corresponds to the opening of Treitschke’s comments on Graetz in “Unsere Aussichten” a few months later.

Although the similarity of Treitschke’s 1879 comments about Graetz’s volume to those made in a January 1871 review of it in the *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* has been noted,¹⁶ it seems that we should go further and realize

12 See above, n. 5.

13 Friedrich Meinecke, *Erlebtes, 1862–1901*, Leipzig 1941, p. 197.

14 See Treitschke’s *Briefe*, III/2, 502–3 (no. 878), excerpted in Krieger, *Berliner Antisemitismusstreit*, I, 3–5 (no. 1).

15 See, inter alia, Wyrwa, *Genese und Entfaltung*, pp. 96; Michael A. Meyer, *Heinrich Graetz and Heinrich von Treitschke: A Comparison of Their Historical Images of the Modern Jew*, in: *Modern Judaism* 6 (1986), p. 1–11.

16 *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* (LCD), 14 January 1871, cols. 29–31. On the similarity of views expressed here to those later expressed by Treitschke, see Michael A. Meyer, *Great Debate on Antisemitism: Jewish Reaction to New Hostility in Germany, 1879–1881*, in: *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* (LBIYB) 11 (1966), p. 154. The review caused Graetz some embarrassment and he reacted in a letter to Zarncke (23 January 1871) in which he complained about the review’s “denunciatorischen Charakter” and asked – appar-

that Treitschke was directly influenced by that review, which was signed “M. L.” Treitschke and M. L. both characterize Graetz as “fanatic”; open their discussion by ascribing to him “hatred” of both Christianity and Germanism, in that order; focus on the latter; and take umbrage at Graetz’s self-“overestimating” preference for Jews such as Börne and Heine rather than Luther, Lessing, Goethe, and Fichte, and at Graetz’s claim that it was Jewish “education” of the Germans that endowed them with their fine literary style.¹⁷ Given the fact that Graetz’s volume fills more than 600 pages but Treitschke’s comments about it address only these themes, and given these verbal agreements, it is impossible that this similarity is a matter of chance. The only major element of M. L.’s review missing from Treitschke’s attack on Graetz is M. L.’s focus on Graetz’s preference for the French – a theme much less important nearly a decade after the Franco-Prussian war.

Further proof of Treitschke’s use of M. L.’s review is offered by a passage in his history of modern Germany.¹⁸ Here, after stating that only a relatively small number of Jews served in the Prussian army in the war against Napoleon, Treitschke offers, in a footnote, the following evidence: “Militär-Wochenblatt 1843, Seite 348. Geschichte der Organisation der Landwehr in Westpreußen (Beiheft zum M. W. Bl. 1858) Seite 120.” The very same references are offered in support of the same statement in col. 30 of M. L.’s review of Graetz (the only difference being that M. L. referred additionally to pp. 108 and 118 of the 1858 item), and it is impossible to imagine that this could be a coincidental result of independent research. This impression, which derives from the relative obscurity of the items in question, is bolstered impressively by the fact that both writers’ references to the 1843 item exhibit the same peculiarities: both misspell the title of the journal (which was Germanized from *Militair-Wochenblatt* into *Militär-Wochenblatt* only in the 1870s); both omit the article’s title (“Über die Zahl der Juden in der preußischen Armee während der Kriegsjahre 1813, 14 und 15”) as well as the number (44) and date (4 November

ently unsuccessfully – for permission to respond. Citations of letters to Friedrich Zarncke, the editor of the LCD, relate to Zarncke’s Nachlass in the special collections department of the Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek; my thanks to Steffen Hoffmann, of that department, who kindly supplied me copies.

17 On the latter point see also below, n. 37.

18 Heinrich von Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, II, Leipzig 1882, p. 418.

1843) of the issue; and both cite only the second of the article's two pages. If it is difficult enough to imagine that Treitschke, who had no special interest in military history, and who only rarely used footnotes or cited bibliography in this work,¹⁹ would have independently taken an interest in this particular point and independently located and cited these obscure items, it is virtually impossible that he would independently cite the 1843 article in the very same partial and erroneous way.²⁰

M. L. was Max Lehmann (1845–1929), who eventually became a professor of history at the University of Göttingen.²¹ This identification,²² which was generally unknown at the time the review was published²³ and first suggested to me on the basis of the review's focus on military history²⁴ and later bolstered by the discovery

- 19 For example: apart from this footnote on p. 418, between p. 400 and p. 429 there are only four others (on pp. 402, 410, 419).
- 20 As for the 1858 item (*Geschichte der Organisation*): M. L. did not give the volume's title (referring to it only as the *Beiheft* to *Militair-Wochenblatt* [MWB]) and along with p. 120 (cited by Treitschke) he also referred to its pp. 108 and 118. It therefore seems that in this case, at least, the move from M. L.'s review to Treitschke's work involved some additional checking, although one may suspect that it was not done by Treitschke himself.
- 21 On Lehmann, see his autobiographical memoir: "Max Lehmann", in: Sigfrid Steinberg (ed.), *Die Geschichtswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, I, Leipzig 1925, p. 207–232; his daughter's biographical introduction to his posthumous work: *Max Lehmann, Bismarck: Eine Charakteristik*, ed. Gertrud Lehmann, Berlin 1948, p. 5–25; the obituary by Friedrich Meinecke in *HZ* 141 (1930), pp. 449; Waltraut Reichel, *Studien zur Wandlung von Max Lehmanns preußisch-deutschem Geschichtsbild*, Göttingen 1963; Günter Vogler, *Max Lehmann*, in: Joachim Streisand (ed.), *Studien über die deutsche Geschichts-Wissenschaft*, II, Berlin 1965, p. 57–95; and – alongside the more expected handbooks – Renate Heuer (ed.), *Lexikon deutsch-jüdischer Autoren*, XV, München 2007, p. 265–269.
- 22 Already posited, without argument or evidence, by Meisl, Heinrich Graetz, p. 127, n. 50, who is followed by Meyer, *Great Debate on Antisemitism*.
- 23 See Meisl, Heinrich Graetz, who reports that at the time it was published many – although (he says) not Graetz – thought the review was by Moritz Lazarus, a prominent Jewish philosopher.
- 24 My thanks to Prof. Dennis E. Showalter of Colorado College, who suggested Lehmann's name when I asked him if he knew of any German M. L. of ca. 1870 who specialized (as Showalter himself) in modern German military history. As Lehmann reports, he was born "zwischen zwei Kasernen", grew up to the tunes of military bands, and from early on avidly read the MWB; see his autobiographical memoir, in: Steinberg (ed.), *Die Geschichtswissenschaft*, p. 208, also the end of the foreword of: *Max Lehmann, Scharnhorst*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1886–87. For this focus in the LCD review of Graetz, note that the only points M. L. checked in detail pertain to military history.

that Lehmann demonstrably wrote scores of reviews for the *Literarisches Centralblatt für Deutschland* (LCD) in those years²⁵ and especially by the oblique way M. L. refers in some of those reviews to works by Lehmann,²⁶ was eventually confirmed by the discovery, in the library of the University of Göttingen, of Lehmann's personal copy of the eleventh volume of Graetz's *Geschichte*. That volume, which has numerous marginal notes in Lehmann's handwriting, is most probably the copy upon which he wrote his review.²⁷

Lehmann's close relationship with Treitschke beginning in the 1870s is easily demonstrated – by more than twenty surviving letters from him to Treitschke and thirty from Treitschke to him,²⁸ by several articles by Lehmann in Treitschke's *Preussische Jahrbücher* 1872–1874, by Treitschke's praise for Lehmann in an 1876 review²⁹ and

- 25 See Lehmann, in: Steinberg (ed.), *Die Geschichtswissenschaft*, p. 216, where he complains that, in the early 1870s, he was spending too much time writing reviews for the LCD and other journals. I found more than sixty reviews by M. L. in LCD 1869–1873, virtually all on works on modern German history – mostly military history. For Lehmann's name in a cumulative list of LCD reviewers, see LCD 1874, col. 1731.
- 26 Three examples: In LCD 1871, cols. 1170–1171, M. L. complains that the work under review cites a certain "ausführliche Untersuchung" about a Cologne chronicle but ignores its arguments. M. L. does not give any bibliographical details about that "detailed study", but a check of his references to the book reviewed shows that it was Lehmann's own dissertation: Max Lehmann, *De annalibus qui vocantur Colonienses maximi quaestiones criticae*, Diss. Berlin 1867. Similarly, in reviews in LCD 1873, cols. 1002 and 1065, M. L. refers with approval to articles in HZ 1873, without mentioning the name of their author(s); both are by Max Lehmann. At LCD 1871, col. 1233, M. L. refers to his own study "an einer anderen Stelle" of the battle of St. Privat (August 1870); M. L. reverts to that topic in two other LCD reviews (1871, col. 1335 and 1872, col. 625) and Max Lehmann addresses it in HZ 30 (1873), esp. 124.
- 27 See n. 37.
- 28 These letters, from the 1870s to 1895 (Treitschke died in 1896), are found, respectively, in Kasten 7 and 16 of Treitschke's papers in the manuscript division of the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin. Treitschke's are all addressed "Lieber Freund"; Lehmann's move, over the years, from "Hochverehrter Herr Professor" to "Hochverehrter und lieber Freund". For two published letters from Treitschke to Lehmann, see Treitschkes *Briefe* III/2, nos. 935 and 997.
- 29 PrJ 37 (1876), p. 451–455 (= Treitschke, *Historische und politische Aufsätze*, IV, Leipzig 1897, p. 325–330). This essay, about Lehmann's 1875 *Knesebeck und Schön*, opens with praise for him in general and, near the end, claims that even skeptics who take the time to check Lehmann's arguments will find themselves forced to accept them.

by Lehmann's frequent flattery of Treitschke in his LCD reviews.³⁰ Further evidence is supplied by an 1878 letter by Treitschke in which he praises the first volume of Lehmann's *Preußen und die katholische Kirche* as "vortrefflich" and recommends Lehmann himself ("der ist mal ein ganzer Kerl").³¹ Similarly, note that Lehmann, who would later underline their friendship and dilate upon it in his own autobiographical memoir,³² memorialized it in 1886 in the dedication of his *Scharnhorst* ("Heinrich von Treitschke in Dankbarkeit und Treue gewidmet"), and that Treitschke sat next to Lehmann at the 1888 Berlin going-away party on the eve of the latter's departure for a position in Marburg.³³ Indeed, a few years later Lehmann stated that he had not only respected Treitschke; he had loved him.³⁴ It is therefore quite a safe guess that it was Lehmann who, perhaps in the course of one of the many hours the two spent together, as he fondly recalls in his autobiographical memoir,³⁵ directed Treitschke's attention both to Graetz's *Geschichte XI* and to his own review of it. But be that as it may, there is plenty of evidence that Lehmann was supplying materials to Treitschke during these years.³⁶ Indeed, the very copy of Graetz that Treitschke read in 1879 had been lent to him by Lehmann – the copy Lehmann had reviewed nine years earlier.³⁷

- 30 See, inter alia, LCD 1869, col. 169; 1870, col. 1054; 1872, cols. 448, 648; 1873, col. 426. See also his "Die Wehrkraft Frankreichs im Vergleich mit der deutschen", in: *Grenzböten* 29 (1870), p. 329–340.
- 31 Treitschkes Briefe, III/2, no. 868.
- 32 Lehmann, in: Steinberg (ed.), *Die Geschichtswissenschaft*, p. 215, pp. 219.
- 33 Meinecke, *Erlebtes*, p. 147.
- 34 Lehmann to P. F. Kehr, 1894, quoted by Reichel, *Studien zur Wandlung*, pp. 95, n. 16.
- 35 Lehmann, in: Steinberg (ed.), *Die Geschichtswissenschaft*, pp. 219.
- 36 As Treitschke noted in a letter of 5 July 1876 – Treitschkes Briefe, III/2, no. 833. Many of Treitschke's letters to Lehmann in the dossier cited in n. 28 ask for help with bibliography; note especially that of 5 September 1878, in which Treitschke asks Lehmann to see if he can find material on a certain topic in the *MWB*. This shows well who Treitschke's "Referent" for such topics was.
- 37 Knowing the way meticulous scholars work, it is perhaps not wild to imagine that Lehmann lent the volume to Treitschke with a copy of his LCD review of it folded neatly inside. The conclusion that Treitschke used Lehmann's copy of vol. 11 of Graetz's *Geschichte* derives from the precise, intensive, and enthusiastic work of Prof. Dr. Berndt Schaller of Göttingen and of Karsten Krieger of Berlin. First, Schaller located, at my suggestion, a copy of the Graetz volume, full of penciled marginalia, precisely where one might expect to find the books of a deceased Göttingen professor: in the *Niedersächsische Staats- und Univer-*

From Lehmann back to Jaffé, Pertz, and Mommsen

Having concluded that a very significant element of Treitschke's attack on the Jews in "Unsere Aussichten", indeed its most specific element,³⁸ may be traced back to Lehmann's January 1871 review, we should now ask what that earlier context has to offer in explanation of the attitude later echoed by Treitschke.

The immediate background of Lehmann's outrage against Graetz was the Franco-Prussian war. Graetz's eleventh volume deals with the period from the mid-eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century and, understandably, gives significant enthusiastic space to the French emancipation of the Jews. It was, therefore,

sitätsbibliothek in Göttingen (call number: 8 H E UN 122/33:11). Then he deciphered and transcribed most of the marginalia, which are in tiny handwriting and frequently quite a challenge, and along the way determined that while most are by Lehmann (a conclusion that Schaller characterizes as "höchst wahrscheinlich" and 95% certain, based upon comparison to Lehmann manuscripts in the Göttingen University archives), a few – some in ink – are in another hand. In the wake of that finding, Krieger painstakingly compared the handwriting of the latter to that of two Treitschke letters: one of 1874 in the collections of the Humboldt-Universität (Christa Schwarz [ed.], *Autographen der Universitätsbibliothek*, Berlin 1980², no. 1150) and the other of 1884 (reproduced after p. 566 of *Treitschkes Briefe*, III/2). Krieger determined that a marginal note ("Wer?") on p. 391 of the Graetz volume (nine lines after the inset poem) was definitely written by Treitschke, and that several others probably were: two each on pp. 175 and 369 and one each on p. 406 ("gut gelogen!") and p. 408 ("Unverschämtheit" instead of Graetz's "Kühnheit"). Krieger's conclusions were based primarily upon the handwriting, but they are bolstered by the correspondence of the topics commented upon to those that interested Treitschke in "Unsere Aussichten". Note, especially, that "Wer?" on p. 391 is a reaction to Graetz's claim that people (Treitschke angrily asked "who?") considered Heine to be on the same level as Goethe, or higher; that the markup on p. 369 responds to Graetz's praise for Heine and Börne by pejoratively changing Graetz's references to them as a "Zwillingspaar" and "diesen beiden Juden" into "Zwillingslumpen" and "diesen beiden Judenlummeln", respectively; and that the comment "Gut gelogen!" on p. 406 comes at the end of a paragraph in which Graetz claims that Börne and Heine, the "Erzieher" of Germany, "educated" the Germans to freedom and to elegant language. My most sincere thanks to Schaller and Krieger for their careful and thorough work; to Dr. Noam Mizrahi for rechecking p. 406 of the Graetz volume for me; and to Dr. Helmut Rohlfing of the Göttingen SUB and Dr. Marion Neiss of the Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung at the Technische Universität in Berlin, who arranged for the loan of the volume to the ZfA library, where Krieger was able to examine its marginalia.

38 Graetz's volume is the only publication specifically mentioned in that essay, and with the exception of a passing reference to Börne, Graetz is the only Jew mentioned critically.

quite unfortunate that it appeared in the spring of 1870³⁹ and came up for review as the war was breaking out in mid-summer. Lehmann's review was written in the context of a wave of German wartime patriotism, and the combination of a Jewish author and a Francophile stance could not help but elicit a wrathful review. As Lehmann would himself comment retrospectively, in another context, "Unter dem Kriegsgetümmel der Jahre 1870 und 1871 [...] hat sich auch der Gelehrte im stillen Studierzimmer nicht entziehen können."⁴⁰

Apart from that general background, however, another point is very suggestive. Just a few years earlier (1867), Lehmann had completed his Berlin doctorate under the supervision of a Jewish advisor, Prof. Philipp Jaffé (1819–1870), and since then they had remained in close contact and collaborated in scholarly work. That is especially interesting in light of the fact that Jaffé committed suicide early in April 1870, a few months before Lehmann wrote his review. Although Jaffé's name is hardly recalled today,⁴¹ in his day he was a very prominent editor of medieval Latin texts and the first Jewish professor in Prussia.⁴² His suicide, moreover, was something

- 39 In February 1870 Graetz was still complaining that the volume had not yet appeared, but by June he was sending copies to his friends. See Michael Reuven (ed.), *H. Graetz: Tagebuch und Briefe*, Tübingen 1977, Letters 83 and 88.
- 40 LCD 1872, col. 133. For Lehmann's own pronounced hatred of and contempt for the French in 1870/71, see numerous comments in his "Die Wehrkraft Frankreichs", p. 329–340 (signed August 1870) and, especially, his angry rejection of the notion that France was a "große Nation" with a "civilisatorischer Mission" (LCD 1871, col. 479), along with other reviews by Lehmann *ibid.*, cols. 229–230 and 1008–1009. On sensitivities concerning Jewish loyalty at the time, see Christine G. Krüger, "Sind wir denn nicht Brüder?": Deutsche Juden im nationalen Krieg 1870/71, Paderborn 2006.
- 41 Note, for example, that the entry on him in Brockhaus shrank from 29 lines in the 1884 edition down to 14 by 1931 and 5 by 1970; by 1990 it was gone. Similarly, although the 1904 Jewish Encyclopedia and 1929 Jüdisches Lexikon had substantial entries about Jaffé, there was none in the 1931 German Encyclopedia Judaica or the 1971 English one. Sic transit.
- 42 See Carl Pinn, *Jüdische Dozenten an der Berliner Universität*, in: *Ost und West* 10 (1910), p. 639–654. On Jaffé's fascinating life and career see *ibid.*, pp. 640; Hermann Bärwald, *Juden als deutsche Historiker*, in: *Jahrbuch für Israeliten* 5619 (Wien 1858), p. 141–169 (p. 141–158 on Jaffé); Ottokar Lorenz, *Zur Erinnerung an Philipp Jaffé*, Wien 1870 (reprinted from *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 21 [1870], p. 276–284); Alfred Dove, *Philipp Jaffé*, in: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* (ADB) 13 (1881), p. 636–642 (= *idem*, *Ausgewählte Schriftchen*, Leipzig 1898, p. 353–360). Among the handbooks, see esp. Heuer (ed.), *Lexikon deutsch-jüdischer Autoren*, XIII, p. 38–43.

of a cause célèbre that invited people to take sides. It seems that Lehmann's review, which came out so sharply not only against Graetz but also, willy-nilly, against German Jews in general, must be understood on this background as well.

Since handbooks that cite an 1868 baptismal record claim Lehmann was born Jewish and baptized only in his twenties,⁴³ I at first thought that his angry review of Graetz should be understood as an expression of an apostate's zeal, proving to himself and others just how far he had left Judaism behind. That entailed the conclusion that Lehmann's emphasis, in his writings, upon having been born and bred Protestant,⁴⁴ was a lie, a case of protesting too much. However, upon examination it turned out the handbooks were wrong, although the origin of their mistake was understandable. Namely, Lehmann's dissertation states he was born in Berlin on 19 May 1845, so when the 1868 baptismal record of a Max Lehmann born to Jewish parents in Berlin on 19 July 1845 was discovered it was natural to assume that this was the same person, the baptismal record erring about the month of his birth.⁴⁵ However, additional checking turned up a July 1845 baptismal record of another Max Lehmann, born in Berlin on 19 May 1845 – and, as the birthday, so too the names of the parents listed in that latter entry are the same as those given by our Max Lehmann in his dissertation.⁴⁶ That is, the Max Lehmann who reviewed Graetz in January 1871 was born a Christian, and there is no reason to doubt his explicit statements about his Protestant upbringing.⁴⁷

43 See esp. Heuer, *ibid.*, XV, p. 265–269; so too the brief entry in Renate Heuer (ed.), *Bibliotheca Judaica*, II, Frankfurt a. M./New York, 1984, p. 21. I followed the latter in a Hebrew article on Graetz in: *Zion* 70 (2004/5) p. 300, n. 23.

44 According to the c.v. appended to his doctoral dissertation, “Berolini a.d. XIV Kal. Jun. anno huius saeculi XLV natus sum patre Carolo philos. doctore, matre Clara e gente Knapiana... Fidei addictus sum evangelicae” (Lehmann, *De annalibus qui vocantur Colonienses maximi*, p. 71). Similarly, the first page (p. 207) of his autobiographical memoir underlines his Protestant upbringing; note also his daughter's reference to his “ausgesprochene protestantische Religiosität” (Bismarck, p. 24), and the two essays on Luther in his *Historische Aufsätze und Reden*, Leipzig 1911, p. 1–37.

45 My thanks to Prof. Renate Heuer, who confirmed to me that the assumption, that the month listed in the 1868 baptismal entry must be mistaken, was the only basis of the assertion that Prof. Max Lehmann was of Jewish birth.

46 My thanks to Mr. Bert Buchholz of the Evangelisches Landeskirchliches Archiv in Berlin, who located and sent me both baptismal records.

47 To ice that cake, note that Lehmann's doctoral c.v. says his father's name was Karl, that the opening of his autobiographical memoir says his father was born in Eisleben and studied

Nevertheless, I find it difficult to imagine that a scholar whose Jewish “Doktorvater” and patron had committed suicide just a few months earlier could write so angrily about Jews without there being some larger story. That story was not, apparently, one of hostility between Lehmann and Jaffé, for – as we shall see – they remained close right up to the time of Jaffé’s death. Rather, it concerns an acute and protracted scholarly feud that dominated Jaffé’s last years and, in the end, overcame him.

Ninety years ago Harry Bresslau pieced a good part of this episode together (although without relating it to the Antisemitismstreit).⁴⁸ The story revolves around the relationship between Jaffé and Georg Heinrich Pertz, the director of the renowned publication project, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (MGH) virtually since its establishment in 1819, who was also chief librarian of the royal library in Berlin.⁴⁹ Jaffé originally got along famously with Pertz, dedicating a book to him in 1845 and thanking him lavishly in the preface of his 1851 magnum opus.⁵⁰ Pertz, for his part, helped Jaffé find a publisher for the 1845 volume, publicly took pride

in Halle, and that Ms. Karin Keller of that university’s archives kindly informed me that a Karl Lehmann of Eisleben registered to study theology there in 1823, at the age of seventeen and a half, and studied there until 1825. A student of theology was almost certainly a Protestant.

- 48 See Harry Bresslau, *Geschichte der Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Hannover 1921, p. 378–385, 462–468. Apart from the general literature on Jaffé, see also Horst Fuhrmann, „Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen“: Gelehrtenleben im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, dargestellt am Beispiel der *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* und ihrer Mitarbeiter, München 1996, p. 108–115. Jaffé’s drafts and other papers relating to this episode are preserved in Dossier B78 (entitled “Streit Jaffé-Pertz, 1854–1869”) in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (MGH) archives (housed in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich), which Bresslau used. My thanks to Prof. Dr. Arno Mentzel-Reuters of the MGH for his kind help with the use of its archives. According to a notation on the dossier, it was presented to the archives in 1877 by Jaffé’s friend E. Dümmler.
- 49 On the MGH and Pertz, see also Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, I, Berlin 1873³, p. 14–25, and Michael David Knowles, *Great Historical Enterprises*, III: *The Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, in: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 10 (1960), p. 129–150 (reprinted in: idem, *Great Historical Enterprises – Problems in Monastic History*, London 1963, p. 65–97).
- 50 “...Dr. G. H. Pertz aus innigster Verehrung gewidmet vom Verfasser” (*Geschichte des deutschen Reiches unter Conrad dem Dritten*, Hannover 1845); *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, Berlin 1851, p. iv.

in the fact that Jaffé's 1851 work was written in the royal library,⁵¹ and, beginning in 1854, employed Jaffé at the MGH. Jaffé worked there for almost a decade, contributing to numerous MGH publications.⁵²

In 1862, however, the relationship between the two soured and turned into war. This may be traced to two reasons, of which one was more or less structural and the other – personal. The structural reason was anchored in the fact that Pertz (b. 1795) was getting old and, in thinking about a successor to head the MGH, was set upon appointing his own son, Karl (b. 1828). That created resentment among the older and more seasoned MGH scholars,⁵³ who resented the nepotism and considered themselves much better qualified. This resulted in several episodes in which Karl's work was held up to general scorn in learned reviews. Two of these came already in the 1850s and early 1860s, and they are surprisingly similar: In both, after the elder Pertz discovered a manuscript and entrusted it to Karl for editing and publication, a vociferous chorus of scholars proclaimed that Karl botched the job.

I know of no involvement of Jaffé in the first episode, which related to a text by Granius Licinianus.⁵⁴ But when, in 1861, Karl published an MGH edition of the *Annales Colonienses maximi* and it too was trashed by numerous scholars,⁵⁵ it is very difficult not to see Jaffé's hand in, or behind, a long and detailed condemnation of the work. Namely, an anonymous review of the volume in LCD 1862 (cols. 24–27) di-

51 Both points are emphasized by Jaffé at p. 86 of the MGH dossier mentioned in n. 48, in which Jaffé proudly quotes Pertz's report in *Die königliche Bibliothek in Berlin in den Jahren 1846–1850*, Berlin 1851, p. 15.

52 For summaries of Jaffé's work for the MGH see Dove, *Philipp Jaffé*, pp. 638 (= *Ausgewählte Schriftchen*, pp. 356), also Lorenz, *Erinnerung*, p. 5.

53 For the claim that Pertz kept the more talented workers down so as to enhance Karl's chances of succeeding him, see Wilhelm Wattenbach, *Georg Heinrich Pertz*, in: ADB 25 (1887), p. 409; Leopold von Ranke, *Aus Werk und Nachlaß, I: Tagebücher* (ed. W. P. Fuchs), München 1964, p. 428.

54 For the critical storm over K. Pertz's 1857 edition of this text, see Nicola Criniti, *Granius Liciniano*, in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II/34.1* (ed. Wolfgang Haase), Berlin 1993, p. 125–136.

55 Inter alia: Rudolf Usinger, in: *Siegfried Hirsch, Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich II., I*, Berlin 1862, p. 450, n. 2; Georg Waitz, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich I.*, Berlin 1863², p. 225, n. 1, and idem, *Ueber die Vita Ezonis oder Historia foundationis monasterii Brunwilarensis*, in: *Nachrichten von der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen*, 1863, p. 13.

vides into a long first section praising Jaffé for his manifold and wonderful contributions to the volume; two more paragraphs that praise other prominent MGH veterans, Wilhelm Wattenbach and Georg Waitz; and a long concluding section dedicated to trashing Karl Pertz's edition of the Cologne chronicle. The review was published anonymously, but the details about Jaffé's work and praise for him contrast so diametrically with the treatment of Pertz junior that it must have aroused Pertz's anger against Jaffé and may well have led him to suspect, as I do, that it was written by Jaffé or in collaboration with him. The fact that around the same time Jaffé published two highly laudatory reviews of works by Waitz,⁵⁶ who eventually would become the favorite of Pertz's opponents, will have only exacerbated the tension.

Next, and more personally, came the episode that brought about the final break between Jaffé and Pertz. Jaffé's research for the MGH had taken him to Italian libraries in 1860 and 1861, and his contacts there turned into an attractive invitation to accept a senior position at the Florence archives. For reasons unknown to Jaffé, however, that invitation fizzled away.⁵⁷ When Jaffé discovered, in the summer of 1862, that the explanation was that Pertz, preferring to keep his star editor in his own stable, had torpedoed the Florence appointment, he understandably became enraged. Perhaps on the background of earlier slights as well, real or imagined,⁵⁸ and certainly on the background of resentment of Pertz's preference for his own son, whom Jaffé considered a second-class scholar, Jaffé immediately gave notice, and in the spring of 1863 left the MGH.⁵⁹

- 56 See LCD 1861, cols. 582–583, and 1862, cols. 691–693 – reviews of the third and fourth volumes of Waitz's *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*. The fact that Jaffé authored the second review, which appeared in the 16 August 1862 issue of LCD, is shown by a 24 July 1862 letter to Zarncke with which he submitted his review “des Waitzischen Werks”. The fact that Jaffé wrote the first review too is indicated by the way the second opens with a retrospective reference to it as by the same reviewer.
- 57 On this episode, see esp. Silio P. P. Scalfati, Francesco Bonaini e gli studiosi del mondo tedesco, in: Irene Cotta/Rosalina Manno Tolu (eds.), *Archivi e storia nell'Europa del XIX Secolo*, Roma 2006, pp. 333.
- 58 So Dove, in his obituary for Jaffé on the first two pages of the *Berlin Nationalzeitung* of 12 April 1870. True, Bresslau, *Geschichte der Monumenta*, p. 380, doubted there had been other “Kränkungen”, but Jaffé may have seen things differently.
- 59 The delay was due to Pertz's insistence that Jaffé stick to the terms of his contract, which required six months' notice before quitting. This must have intensified Jaffé's resentment toward Pertz all the more; so Bresslau, *Geschichte der Monumenta*, p. 383. Bresslau cites

At that point, Jaffé might have gone back to trying to make it as a private scholar. Luckily, however, just before the crisis powerful patrons had created for him, at the University of Berlin, an adjunct professorship of such auxiliary historical fields as Latin paleography, diplomatics (study of formal documents), and chronology.⁶⁰ One of those patrons was Leopold von Ranke, Jaffé's teacher and one of the grand old men of German historiography; another was Mommsen. The latter, Jaffé's near contemporary, professor of history at the University of Berlin and secretary of the Prussian Academy of Sciences, was a great and powerful scholar with whom Jaffé was "eng befreundet."⁶¹

When Jaffé first accepted the appointment at the University of Berlin, in the spring of 1862, he had planned to work there alongside his position at the MGH. Now, however, the university position became his only one – until Mommsen helped Jaffé to find the funds and the publisher (Weidmann – the publisher of Mommsen's own *Römische Geschichte* and other works) to begin a series of editions of medieval texts. Thus was born Jaffé's series, *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum* (BRG), of which six volumes were eventually to appear.⁶² Jaffé's series competed directly with the MGH, and some of his work included texts already published by the MGH, which afforded Jaffé ample opportunity to offer devastating criticism of Pertz's work.⁶³ Pertz, for his part, of course found opportunities to complain about Jaffé's work, and even attempted to consign Jaffé's editions to oblivion, urging MGH

Hermann Hüffer (*Lebenserinnerungen*, Berlin 1912, p. 125), who reports an April 1863 conversation with Jaffé who was "heftig erbittert gegen Pertz" but now happy to be free of his hold upon him. For similar impressions, see Lorenz, *Erinnerung*, p. 10.

- 60 See Eckart Henning, *Die historischen Hilfswissenschaften in Berlin*, in: Reimer Hansen/Wolfgang Ribbe (eds.), *Geschichtswissenschaft in Berlin im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Persönlichkeiten und Institutionen*, Berlin 1992, pp. 370.
- 61 Bresslau, *Geschichte der Monumenta*, p. 384. See below, n. 70.
- 62 The last volume (*Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum* [BRG] 6) was completed and published posthumously in 1873 by Wattenbach and Dümmler. Jaffé had dedicated to them, respectively, BRG 3 and 5. See the anonymous but enthusiastic review of BRG 6 in LCD 1873, 1581–1583.
- 63 See BRG 4 (1867), pp. 503 (the volume is dedicated "Theodoro Mommsen"). Here, in his introduction to his own edition of Einhard's life of Charlemagne, Jaffé first observes that of the more than twenty editions of the work, Pertz's 1829 MGH edition is the "most miserable" ("aerumnosissimam"). Then he proceeds to justify that assessment by supplying a long list of mistakes in Pertz's edition.

scholars to use earlier and inferior editions of works rather than those prepared by Jaffé.⁶⁴ The feud between Pertz and Jaffé thus remained alive and well and notorious throughout the 1860s, and the fact that it is preserved mainly in Latin footnotes and long-forgotten reviews⁶⁵ should not lead us to think that it was not the talk of academic circles – which often relish such controversies.

Mommsen's involvement, in finding Jaffé the university position and establishing his BRG, fits into a pattern that gives broader meaning to his support for Jaffé. Already in 1856, after Pertz denied him access to the newly-found manuscript of Granius Licinianus, Mommsen expressed quite intense hostility for Pertz, calling him and his son "library-dragons" and saying he could not stand them;⁶⁶ seven years later Mommsen was still complaining bitterly about Pertz's autocratic management of the library.⁶⁷ Thus, Mommsen was a natural ally of Jaffé's in his feud with Pertz.

- 64 See Bresslau, *Geschichte der Monumenta*, pp. 463, referring, inter alia, to Pertz's review, in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen (GGA)* 1868 (21 October 1868), pp. 1687, of some of Jaffé's work. In this review, when Pertz suggests a correction of a reading offered by Jaffé he apologizes that in this case too, as in "hundert ähnlichen Fällen," he would not have drawn any attention to Jaffé's error were it not necessary to controvert Jaffé's numerous adulators and expose, once and for all, the true weakness of their hero's purported skill with documents. Pertz refers to those adulators as "die Schüler aller Orten" – an allusion to a scene in *Faust* (l. 1934) that shows how easy it is for the Devil to make tyros think he is a great scholar.
- 65 For some other items, note especially the complaint about the MGH's "irresponsible" failure to publish letters, and the material in praise of Jaffé's work in general, and the BRG in particular, in the 1866 edition of Wattenbach, *Geschichtsquellen*, pp. 17, 26. See also Dümmler's reviews of Wattenbach's 1866 volume and of Jaffé's BRG 3 (1866) and 4 (1867) – respectively in LCD 1866, cols. 771–772; 1866, cols. 689–691; and 1867, cols. 1268–1269. (All three are signed only Δ [delta], but Dümmler's authorship of the first, and of other LCD reviews signed Δ [such as LCD 1870, 1004–6], is shown by the list of his publications supplied by Robert Holtzmann, Ernst Dümmler, in: *Mitteldeutsche Lebensbilder*, V, Magdeburg 1930, pp. 448; *ibid.*, pp. 432 and 434, Holtzmann underlines Dümmler's support for Jaffé in his struggle with Pertz.) Of these three reviews, the first especially praises Wattenbach for criticizing the MGH; the second heaps praise upon Jaffé's work and underlines the advantages of Jaffé's edition of Wilibald's life of St. Boniface as compared to Pertz's; and the third explicitly praises Jaffé for using a certain text by Walafrid which, although its value had long been recognized, was consistently ignored by Pertz in his editions, and complains that Pertz – as opposed to Jaffé – depended upon a host of inferior witnesses instead of discovering the best one.
- 66 See Wickert, *Mommsen*, III (1969), pp. 671.
- 67 Lothar Wickert (ed.), *Theodor Mommsen – Otto Jahn: Briefwechsel, 1842–1868*, Frankfurt a. M. 1962, p. 290, n. 247.

More broadly, we may observe that Mommsen, a philologically-oriented historian who himself had edited several ancient and medieval Latin works,⁶⁸ was a kindred spirit of Jaffé's and had great respect for his work. Note, for example, that Mommsen included two appendices by Jaffé in his own 1861 edition of Cassiodorus' chronicle.⁶⁹ Their friendship, respect, and sharing of scholarly interests are well reflected by more than thirty letters from Mommsen to Jaffé (all addressed "Lieber Freund" and signed "Ihr Mommsen") and sixteen from Jaffé to Mommsen (all addressed more formally, to "Hochverehrter Herr Professor" and signed "Ihr [ganz] ergebener Jaffé"),⁷⁰ as well as by Mommsen's most warm and touching words in memory of Jaffé in an 1876 article (see below, n. 94).

Mommsen was a good friend of various other Jews as well – including the philologist Jacob Bernays,⁷¹ the politician Ludwig Bamberg, ⁷² and the scholarly brothers Solomon and Théodore Reinach in Paris,⁷³ just as he was to be one of the founding members of the Verein zur Abwehr des Antisemitismus.⁷⁴ Given the fact that, despite the sharpness of his criticism of Treitschke's attack on the Jews in the Antisemitismstreit, Mommsen nevertheless asserted that German Jews should be baptized as part of the price of becoming part of the German nation, which makes it difficult to discern a disagreement in principle between him and Treitschke, it seems that in large measure the distinction between them was one of style. That

68 See Oswald Redlich, *Mommsen und die Monumenta Germaniae*, in: *Zeitschrift für die oesterreichischen Gymnasien* 67 (1916), p. 865–875, reprinted in: *ibidem.*, *Ausgewählte Schriften*, Zürich 1928, p. 141–155.

69 Theodor Mommsen, *Die Chronik des Cassiodorus Senator vom J. 519 n. Chr. nach den Handschriften herausgegeben*, in: *Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der königlich-sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 3 (1861), p. 677–689.

70 These letters are preserved in Mappen 1–2 of the Jaffé file in Mommsen's papers at the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.

71 See esp. Wickert, *Theodor Mommsen und Jacob Bernays*.

72 See Malitz, „Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum“, pp. 154, 158.

73 Adelheid Mommsen, *Mein Vater: Erinnerungen an Theodor Mommsen*, München 1992, pp. 109.

74 See Malitz, *Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum* p. 158. On Mommsen and the Jews, see also Christhard Hoffmann, *Juden und Judentum im Werk deutscher Althistoriker des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, Leiden 1988, pp. 87–132; Wickert, *Theodor Mommsen und Jacob Bernays*; Stanley Zucker, *Theodor Mommsen and Antisemitism*, in: *LBIYB* 17 (1972), p. 237–241.

makes the importance of these friendships all the more salient. Indeed, a great scholar who was Mommsen's son-in-law explicitly reports that Mommsen's response to Treitschke derived not so much from "abstract liberal theories" as from his personal friendship with Jews.⁷⁵ That may also have played a role when, earlier in the 1870s, Mommsen directed the manipulations and the coalition that succeeded, finally, to the removal of Pertz from the directorship of the MGH.⁷⁶

Back in the 1860s, things came to a crisis when, early in 1868, Jaffé somehow lost a late medieval manuscript that he had borrowed from the royal library for use in a paleography class.⁷⁷ Pertz had a field day. Although Jaffé made good the loss by purchasing a more valuable manuscript and donating it to the library, Pertz denied Jaffé library privileges, defied repeated ministerial instructions to restore Jaffé's privileges, and, eventually, spread the accusation that Jaffé had once worked as a spy for the secret police. Jaffé, who took it all very badly,⁷⁸ spent hours agonizing over letters and drafts complaining about Pertz's chicanery⁷⁹ and, eventually, in preparing and circulating, early in May 1869, a public broadside denying Pertz's allegation and denouncing him.⁸⁰ When that brought no results, he began – after venting

- 75 See Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Erinnerungen, 1848–1914*, Leipzig 1928², p. 181, n. 1. See also Treitschke's *Briefe*, III/2, no. 895 (also in: Krieger, *Berliner Antisemitismusstreit*, II, no. 102), where Treitschke notes the basic similarity of their views, also Stoetzel, *The State*, p. 125, and Malitz, „Auch ein Wort über unser Judenthum“, p. 155.
- 76 See Bresslau's detailed account of that process (*Geschichte der Monumenta*, p. 478–521), summarized succinctly by Fuhrmann, „Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen“, p. 50, as „unter der Federführung Mommsens“.
- 77 The identity of the manuscript is unknown. According to Jaffé (p. 75b of the MGH dossier cited in n. 48), it was unimportant and so damaged that he could only identify it as being of liturgical nature. My own attempts to identify the manuscript, and/or locate it, have remained fruitless.
- 78 As early as 27 June 1868 Lehmann wrote Sybel that, due to the conflict with Pertz, Jaffé “in einer Weise aufgeregt worden ist, daß ich für seine Gesundheit ernstlich besorgt bin” (Reichel, *Studien zur Wandlung*, pp. 115, n. 74).
- 79 These documents are found in the MGH file mentioned in n. 48.
- 80 In the MGH dossier (n. 48) this broadside is followed, on p. 70, by a list of those to whom Jaffé planned to mail it. Thus, for example, Hermann Sauppe's name is first among those of the Göttingen addresses, and a copy of the broadside is indeed found among Sauppe's papers in the University of Göttingen archives. The list is something of a “Who's Who” of German medieval scholarship of Jaffé's day – apart from Berliners, to whom Jaffé could distribute the broadside by hand.

some of his spleen in another LCD salvo against Pertz and the MGH⁸¹ – to devote himself to the preparation of drafts of a long complaint against Pertz, detailing once again the entire story, pedantically formulated in painstaking detail, with numerous documentary appendices.⁸² In the end, however, for whatever reason(s)⁸³ – perhaps he had his doubts as to how many people would take his complaint or his document seriously⁸⁴ – Jaffé put an end to his troubles another way, by shooting himself on 3 April 1870, while visiting Wittenberge. The Wittenberge police's notice thereof, which asked the Berlin police to notify Jaffé's "Angehörige," was copied and – given the fact that Jaffé was a bachelor and also estranged from his family, especially since his baptism in 1868⁸⁵ – forwarded to Mommsen. It is preserved among Mommsen's papers, a most poignant testimony to Mommsen's friendship for the otherwise "more and more self-isolating" scholar.⁸⁶ Jaffé was buried in the Wittenberge churchyard; his grave no longer exists.⁸⁷

- 81 LCD, 22 May 1869, cols. 634–635. This piece – formally a review of a work by Karl Friedrich Stumpf – is anonymous, but Jaffé's authorship is guaranteed by a 9 May 1869 letter to Zarncke in which he promises to submit his piece about Stumpf with alacrity. Jaffé could submit the Stumpf review so quickly because it relates to no details of Stumpf's work. Rather, the body of the review is devoted to a harsh denunciation of the MGH and Pertz, including the standard canard that Pertz threw materials together without editing (cf. n. 115).
- 82 These documents fill p. 74–87 of the MGH dossier cited in n. 48.
- 83 For "hopelessness" and "social isolation" as factors consistently linked to suicide, see Thomas E. Joiner, Jr./Jessica S. Brown/LaRicka R. Wingate, *The Psychology and Neurobiology of Suicidal Behavior*, in: *Annual Review of Psychology* 56 (2005), esp. pp. 301. My thanks to Prof. Henri Zukier for referring me to this survey.
- 84 I make that suggestion because even Jaffé's closest disciples and admirers wrote that he had been overly sensitive; see Dove, Philipp Jaffé, p. 641, also Lorenz, *Erinnerung*, pp. 10. If they published such assessments even when they should have been restrained by *de mortibus nihil nisi bene*, it is very likely that while he still lived they tried to convince him that his campaign of self-vindication was overdone and superfluous. That will have been terribly frustrating for Jaffé, for the matter obviously burned in his bones.
- 85 On Jaffé's estrangement from his family see Fuhrmann, „Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen“, pp. 113. Jaffé was born in Schwersenz, Posen, a town of which about half the population was Jewish. On the traditional Jewish context in Posen, in which Jaffé's family remained, see his letters to his parents in Fuhrmann, „Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen“, pp. 149, 151.
- 86 That characterization is Fuhrmann's, *ibid.*, p. 114.
- 87 My thanks to Mr. Reinhard Jaap, administrator of the Wittenberge cemetery, who located the ledger listing Jaffé's burial there on 6 April 1870.

The Aftermath

Jaffé's suicide aroused discussion of what caused it. Observers from outside the guild seem to have focused upon his baptism, which preceded the suicide by little more than two years.⁸⁸ Some speculated that Jaffé had undertaken baptism "aus Carrière-macherei", that is, in the hope of bettering his chances for a regular academic appointment, and killed himself when that failed to materialize.⁸⁹ Others, including a prominent Jewish newspaper, understandably preferred to assert that the baptism itself reflected a psychological disturbance which continued to plague him until finally he could stand it no longer.⁹⁰ Yet other Jews preferred, just as understandably, to believe that it was self-recrimination over the baptism, or the isolation that it supposedly created, that eventually led him to the final step.⁹¹

Within the guild, however, Jaffé's friends and colleagues tended to view his feud with Pertz as the main cause of the suicide.⁹² Jaffé's "allzu frühem, durch besondere Umstände tief erschütterndem Tode", as one of his supporters recalled the event even three years later (LCD 1873, 1581), thus made him into a martyr for the anti-Pertz camp. As Wattenbach was to put it, if in general it was the case that as Pertz got older resentment of his autocratic nature became quite widespread among his colleagues, it was especially the deterioration of Pertz's relationship with Jaffé into bitter hatred that did Pertz in.⁹³ Moreover, two additional episodes of the early 1870s

88 According to Heuer (ed.), *Lexikon deutsch-jüdischer Autoren*, XIII, p. 38, Jaffé was baptized on 6 February 1868. As Dove noted in his *Nationalzeitung* obituary, Jaffé put off baptism until after the death of his father. Since Jaffé's father died on 29 Dec. 1866 it seems that Jaffé honored his memory by waiting out the traditional Jewish year of mourning before his final break with Judaism.

89 So Alexander Kohut, *Berühmte Israelitische Männer und Frauen in der Kulturgeschichte der Menschen*, II, Leipzig 1901, p. 128.

90 *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums*, 19 April 1870, pp. 311.

91 On the popularity of the former view among Jews: Dove, Philipp Jaffé, p. 641 (= *Ausgewähl. Schriftchen*, p. 360). For the latter view: *Der Israelit*, 13 April 1870, 2. Beilage, p. 285.

92 See esp. Lorenz, *Erinnerung*, p. 11: „Man wird nicht sagen können, dass sein Tod eine ausschliessliche Folge dessen sei, was Pertz ihm gethan hat, aber die gesammte Natur und Anlage Jaffé's war nicht dazu geschaffen, einen solchen Kampf mit einem im Range sehr hoch stehenden [...] herrschenden [...] mit Rücksichten menschlicher und herzlicher Art völlig unbekanntem Manne, wie Pertz, zu bestehen.“

93 Wattenbach, *Georg Heinrich Pertz*, p. 409; Bresslau, *Geschichte der Monumenta*, pp. 384, 468.

contributed to preserving pietas toward Jaffé and righteous indignation on his behalf, which translated into hostility both to the aging Pertz and his son Karl: When an 1873 Rostock dissertation was discovered to have plagiarized Jaffé's lectures, his friends and students rallied about his memory in righteous indignation,⁹⁴ and when Karl published an MGH edition of Merovingian texts it was subjected – even more severely than his editions of Granius Licinianus and the Cologne chronicle – to devastating reviews. Theodor Sickel reviewed the edition in an eighty-page volume that left no stone on another, and K. F. Stumpf devoted more than sixty pages to doing the same in the *Historische Zeitschrift*.⁹⁵ Both condemned Karl Pertz of bad scholarship and sloppy work, and his father – of bad planning and mismanagement. Moreover, to rub it in, Sickel's volume repeatedly and prominently depended upon an 1850 study by Waitz,⁹⁶ who was now clearly the anti-Pertz camp's candidate to take over the MGH,⁹⁷ and Stumpf's HZ review, similarly, was republished as a sepa-

- 94 See E. Steindorff, in: GGA 1873, p. 1437–1440 and H. Grotefend, in: HZ 31 (1874), pp. 164 – reviews and exposures of: Wilhelm Dabis, *Abriß der römischen und christlichen Zeitrechnung*, Berlin 1873. The reviewers were students of Jaffé's and could compare Dabis' work with their own notes from Jaffé's lectures. On the episode, see Theodor Mommsen, *Die deutschen Pseudodoktoren*, in: PrJ 37 (1876), p. 17–22.
- 95 *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Diplomatum imperii, Tomus I* [hrsg. v. K. Pertz], besprochen von Th. Sickel, Berlin 1873; Karl Friedrich Stumpf, *Über die Merovinger-Diplome*, in: HZ 29 (1873), p. 343–407.
- 96 See Sickel, *Monumenta...Diplomatum imperii*, pp. 9, 17, 20, 64, 71, and esp. p. 75 (references to Waitz's review, in GGA 1850, p. 604–632, of a French compendium similar to K. Pertz's; Sickel holds Waitz's work up as a model, ignored by K. Pertz).
- 97 Bresslau, *Geschichte der Monumenta*, p. 484, cites a letter from a Prussian official that shows that already by early 1873 public opinion decidedly viewed Waitz as Pertz's successor. The same was already stated by von Ranke in a July 1870 letter to Waitz (Leopold von Ranke, *Zur eigenen Lebensgeschichte* [ed. Alfred Dove, Leipzig 1890], p. 492 = idem, *Das Briefwerk* [ed. W. P. Fuchs, Hamburg, 1949], p. 501). Indeed, already in 1867 von Ranke was pushing for Waitz's appointment; see Leopold von Ranke, *Neue Briefe* (B. Hoefl/H. Herzfeld eds.), Hamburg 1949, p. 495. This – as is indicated by letters in Wilhelm Erben, *Georg Waitz und Theodor Sickel: Ein Briefwechsel aus der Blütezeit der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung*, in: *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Klasse* (1926), pp. 127 – is the background of Georg Waitz, *Über die Zukunft der Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, in: HZ 30 (1873), p. 1–13, where, despite the urbane and optimistic stance, Waitz does not abstain from referring to K. Pertz's Merovingian MGH volume (which had been condemned by Stumpf in the preceding issue of HZ) as "leider vielfach mangelhaften" (p. 4).

rate brochure with a pointedly anti-MGH title and dedication to Waitz.⁹⁸ Finally, to ensure this indictment of the Pertzes became generally known the LCD published a review of both critiques together, with an appropriately damning conclusion.⁹⁹ It must have been clear all around that Karl Pertz's edition was being used as the nail in the coffin of the Pertz regime at the MGH, and that Jaffé's death was the hammer that pounded it in.

For although these reviews had their real contents, it is difficult to understand their thoroughness and ferocity without reference to the Jaffé affair. Note that Stumpf, who was the representative of the Vienna Academy of Sciences to the MGH's governing board, had learned his trade as Jaffé's apprentice.¹⁰⁰ As for Sickel, whose antipathy for the Pertzes and ties with Jaffé went back at least as far as 1863¹⁰¹ – it is enough to point to the passage early in his review where he complains about the way that the MGH had been run in the preceding decade, with “verdiente Mitarbeiter” leaving;¹⁰² just in case the allusion was not explicit enough, Sickel went on to

98 Stumpf, *Über die Merovinger-Diplome in der Ausgabe der Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (1873).

99 See LCD 1873, pp. 1255.

100 See Wattenbach's entry on Stumpf in *ADB* 36 (1893), pp. 757. For Stumpf's special debt to Jaffé, see also Karl Friedrich Stumpf, *Die Reichskanzler, vornehmlich des X., XI. und XII. Jahrhunderts*, Innsbruck 1865, pp. 34. Stumpf was (according to Bresslau, *Geschichte der Monumenta*, p. 466) one of those to whom the elder Pertz had sent his accusation that Jaffé spied for the secret police, so Stumpf's review of the younger Pertz's work functioned, inter alia, as a rejection of Pertz senior's hope to find in him an ally. For Stumpf's antipathy toward “die Direktion” of the MGH (= the elder Pertz), see H. Siegel's tribute to Stumpf in *Almanach der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* [Wien] 32 (1882), pp. 171.

101 For Sickel's clash with the Pertzes early in the 1860s, when he was refused access to materials collected by the MGH, see his *Monumenta...Diplomatum imperii*, 3, and at length in his *Die Urkunden der Karolinger I: Urkundenlehre*, Wien 1867, vii-viii. Wattenbach referred to this episode, as evidence for Pertz's “Engherzigkeit”, in: *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, I (1873), p. 18. For Sickel's collaboration with Jaffé in 1863, see Erben, *Georg Waitz und Theodor Sickel*, p. 74, n. 2. Several letters of 1866–1867 from Jaffé to Sickel are found in the latter's *Nachlass* in the archives of the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung in Vienna. My thanks to Dr. Paul Herold of that Institut, who located and scanned the letters for me.

102 Sickel, *Monumenta...Diplomatum imperii*, p. 4. For the way Pertz ran the MGH as if it were a private concern see also *ibid.*, p. 28. The same year, 1873, Wattenbach characterized Pertz's style as “durchaus monarchisch” (*Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, I, p. 21).

underline how joyously Jaffé's independent BRG was welcomed.¹⁰³ As for the LCD review that popularized Stumpf's and Sickel's criticism – it was apparently authored by Wattenbach, one of Jaffé's close friends.¹⁰⁴

If, then, by 1875 a coalition of scholars, led by Mommsen, was able to force Pertz to retire from the MGH, and to keep his son out, appointing instead Waitz – who had already done his share in the anti-Pertz and pro-Jaffé camp – to direct it, along with a broad academic board of directors, this must be seen to a considerable extent as backlash against Pertz's treatment of Jaffé. Jaffé's death epitomized Pertz's tyrannous regime and made it the sacred duty of Jaffé's friends to continue his struggle. With the help of a collateral campaign to discredit Pertz's son and heir apparent, victory was eventually achieved. Pertz died in 1876, his son – in mental derangement¹⁰⁵ – five years later.

Max Lehmann in 1870

Apart from its functioning in Jewish debates about baptism and from its consequences for the Pertz and the MGH, Jaffé's suicide also had special implications for Lehmann, and so, in due course, for Treitschke's "Unsere Aussichten". For if we now return to our question concerning the genesis of Lehmann's angry review of Graetz, it will be of fundamental importance to recognize that as long as Jaffé was alive Lehmann had been a faithful and diligent soldier in Jaffé's war against Pertz – and so Jaffé's suicide left Lehmann an orphan, professionally. Although the import of the events summarized in the preceding section is that, several years after Jaffé's death, his faction was victorious, that was nowhere in sight in the latter half of 1870 – when Lehmann must have been thinking hard about his own future, around the same time he was composing his review of Graetz.

103 Sickel, *Monumenta...Diplomatum imperii*, p. 4, see also p. 9, where Jaffé is listed among those whose contributions to the MGH Pertz unjustly ignored.

104 The article is signed "W." – which is how Wattenbach frequently abbreviated his name (e.g., in his notes to the second edition of Jaffé's *Das Leben der Königin Mathilde*, Leipzig 1891). Georg Waitz, in contrast, used "G.W."; see, for example, his quite positive review of a Jaffé volume in *HZ* 11 (1864), p. 427.

105 Fuhrmann, „Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen“, p. 50.

To grasp how dire Lehmann's situation was after Jaffé's suicide, it is important to realize, first of all, that Lehmann's 1867 doctoral dissertation was a major round of the Pertz-Jaffé feud. The text upon which the dissertation focused, suggested to Lehmann by Jaffé (as Lehmann notes on its first page), was the Cologne chronicle most recently (1861) edited, for an MGH volume, by none other than Karl Pertz – the edition already trashed in a review we traced, directly or indirectly, to Jaffé.¹⁰⁶ It is no surprise that Lehmann's dissertation offers very sharp criticism of both Pertz's work. From the dissertation's first page, where Lehmann documents the scholarly consensus that Karl was not clever enough to edit the work properly,¹⁰⁷ to the conclusion, where Lehmann declares that Karl's views about such a fundamental issue as the authorship of the chronicle are both unfounded and wrong, Lehmann skirmishes incessantly with both Pertz about matters large and small.¹⁰⁸

It is, accordingly, not going too far to say that, for both "Doktorvater" and "Doktorand", Lehmann's dissertation was a hatchet job. And Lehmann delivered the goods: as reviewer after reviewer noted, his work was far superior to K. Pertz's.¹⁰⁹

106 See above, after n. 55. Note an 1866 letter to von Sybel (quoted in Reichel, *Studien zur Wandlung*, p. 115, n. 74), in which Lehmann explains that he and Jaffé chose the topic precisely because they knew that Pertz junior had "nicht eben mustergültig" edited the text and had thereby left others a fertile field to plow.

107 "...non eam, quam deceret, solertiam adhibitam esse" (Lehmann, *De annalibus*, p. 1).

108 Note, for example: p. 3 (demonstrative correction of K. Pertz's report about which manuscript a certain editor used); p. 5 (correction of K. Pertz's translation of a Latin date); p. 8, n. 2 (K. Pertz's argument cannot be followed); p. 10, n. 3 (Lehmann corrects a reading by G. H. Pertz); *ibid.* n. 3 (another disagreement with K. Pertz); p. 19 (the similarity between two texts is greater than K. Pertz imagined); pp. 38, n. 6 (demonstration that G. H. Pertz misdated a letter); etc.

109 Note the favorable and detailed anonymous review of Lehmann's dissertation in LCD, 23 June 1867, cols. 624–626: it begins by noting it is well known that K. Pertz had not lived up to the standards of care and certainty that otherwise characterized the MGH, and concludes that Lehmann had now "erledigt" the essential questions. So too A[dolf] Cohn's longer and more detailed review in GGA 1867, p. 1982–1991, which opens with a long complaint about MGH work not being as good as it used to be and ends with regret that Lehmann was not employed by the MGH. Even the review of Lehmann's volume by C. V. in HZ 17 (1867), pp. 406, while less enthusiastic than the other two, opens by noting that the work is "durch Fleiß und Scharfsinn ausgezeichnet" and aimed to make good all that K. Pertz had failed to do. C. V. was probably Conrad Varrentrapp; see HZ 32 (1874), p. 365–371. Not surprisingly, Cohn and Varrentrapp are included in Jaffé's mailing list (n. 80).

That is, Lehmann's dissertation functioned the same way as the earlier trashings of the younger Pertz's editions of Granius Licinianus and the Cologne chronicle, Jaffé's skirmishing with the Pertzes in his BRG, and Stumpf's and Sickel's massive 1873 condemnations of K. Pertz's MGH edition of Merovingian texts.

Moreover, after he completed his dissertation Lehmann remained Jaffé's disciple. In 1868 Jaffé asked him to join him in his work on the BRG,¹¹⁰ and Lehmann later reported¹¹¹ that he had the impression that Jaffé was grooming him to be his own successor.

True, Lehmann's work on the BRG didn't come to much; its most direct fruit is the index he prepared for BRG 5.¹¹² But there was more. First, Lehmann published a detailed and highly favorable review of that BRG volume, ignoring the fact that he worked for Jaffé and on the volume but not failing to include several complaints about the older Pertz's work on the same material.¹¹³ Then, that same year, Lehmann proceeded to publish a substantial piece of his own concerning a text in that BRG volume, building upon and defending an emendation and a dating suggested by Jaffé.¹¹⁴ Finally, just a few weeks before Jaffé's suicide there appeared what seems to have been Lehmann's last contribution to Jaffé's cause: an anonymous but lengthy and terribly nasty LCD review of a book by Pertz senior. That review opens, guns blazing, with the declaration that the volume does not belie the well-known shortcomings of Pertz's work ("Die bekannten Untugenden Pertzischer Geschichtsschreibung verleugnet auch dieser Band nicht"), and then, having stuck his knife in, the reviewer turns it around and around, celebrating Pertz's errors, confusion, and sloppiness. This review was by Lehmann, and if I could easily discover that, certainly contemporaries could too.¹¹⁵

110 As Lehmann happily reported in his letter to Sybel cited in n. 78.

111 In an 1874 letter to Treitschke quoted by Vogler, Max Lehmann, p. 60, n. 17; see also Lehmann's autobiographical memoir, p. 215.

112 BRG 5 (1869), p. 846–865.

113 HZ 22 (1869), p. 173–182.

114 „Das Aufgebot zur Heerfahrt Ottos II. nach Italien“, *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte* 9 (1869), p. 435–444. For Lehmann's defense of Jaffé's conclusions, see the first three pages of the article.

115 The review (LCD, 19 March 1870, cols. 332–335) is about G. H. Pertz, *Das Leben des Feldmarschalls [...] Gneisenau, III* (1869). So far, my attempts to locate Lehmann's personal copy of the volume, so as to compare its marginalia with the review, have remained fruit-

When in April 1870 Jaffé suddenly committed suicide, Lehmann was thus left out in the cold. He had lost his patron, and with the folding of Jaffé's BRG, Pertz's MGH was again the only similar project around. But Lehmann had destroyed, indeed pulverized, any chance he ever had of finding employment there.

In such a context, with the doors closed to him in his profession, we can well understand that Lehmann, consciously or not, needed to hitch his wagon to a new star. Thus it came naturally to him to think about changing his career, and moving back to his first love, one that fit in well with the times: Prussian military history (see n. 24). Indeed, already in 1869 he had published an article in that field in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, and numerous book reviews indicate the same interest – and it was via that HZ article that he came to Treitschke's attention and entered his circle.¹¹⁶ That was at the very time that Treitschke was beginning to reveal his own antisemitic leanings.¹¹⁷

less. Nevertheless, it seems virtually certain that the review is by Lehmann, for: (1) the book is about one of Lehmann's heroes (about whom he wrote often, including articles in HZ 62 [1889] and in *Velhagen und Klasings Monatshefte* 1896/97, vol. 2); (2) Lehmann was reviewing very often in the LCD in those years, and especially works on Prussian military history were referred to him (see n. 25); (3) the review ends, on col. 335, with a reference to p. 89 of Pertz's volume, which reports a certain violation of orders by Scharnhorst – and not only is Scharnhorst another of Lehmann's heroes, but that very same incident and page were emphasized, two years later (LCD 1872, col. 382), in an M. L. review of a book about Scharnhorst; (4) the review's basic complaint, that Pertz presents much important material but does not know how to present it and his editing and writing is terrible, is precisely what Lehmann wrote the next year in LCD 1871, col. 558 (signed M. L.), where he complains that a certain author who praised another work by Pertz had failed to distinguish between the material and the way Pertz handled it.

116 See Lehmann's autobiographical memoir, p. 215.

117 According to Dorpalen (Heinrich von Treitschke, p. 241), throughout the 1860s Treitschke avoided antisemitism, his attitude changing only in the late 1870s. Hermann von Petersdorff, who was a student of Treitschke, reports (in ADB 55 [1910], p. 306), however, that Treitschke's hostility toward Jews grew especially in the wake of the economic crisis of 1873, and others put the change even earlier. Wyrwa, *Genese und Entfaltung*, p. 95, indicates that already in 1870, with the foundation of the Empire coming into sight, Treitschke began to express criticism of the Jews, attributing to them too much power in society (especially in the press) and mocking those who complain about the repression of Jews. Similarly, for a reference to an 1869–1871 essay as Treitschke's first published "wirklich dèzidiert antisemitischen Äusserungen", see Boehlich, *Berliner Antisemitismustreit*, p. 242; see also *ibid.*, pp. 258.

In the nature of things, however, Lehmann's old-new orientation around Prussia and militarism, and his new friendship with Treitschke, could not sit well with pietas toward a Jew. A young scholar is often identified as a student of his or her Doktorvater, and being identified as the disciple and collaborator of a Jew – especially, of one around whose memory others were rallying – was, for Lehmann, a handicap.

Thus, if it was natural for any young red-blooded German to take a nationalist stance in 1870, and that would in any case entail some degree of antagonism toward Jews, for Lehmann the problem was all the more acute. The months following Jaffé's death will have put pressure upon him to take a stand dissociating himself from Jews. He also may well have felt betrayed by Jaffé, who had left him to fend for himself. One way or another, or both, his angry review of Graetz must be understood as his entrance ticket into the new camp. That is not to say it was consciously meant as such, only that it functioned that way – and that had Jaffé still been alive Lehmann probably would have abstained from writing so angrily about Jews. Certainly, it seems, without Jaffé's suicide Lehmann's personal circumstances would not have encouraged him to write that way, and, even if he had, he would not have had such a need to cultivate a new patron – who turned out to be Treitschke.

Conclusion

Our venture into medievalists' feuds and alliances in the two decades that preceded the Antisemitismusstreit points to a context that seems to have contributed significantly, if indirectly, to that fateful episode. Namely, at least two firm lines connect the Antisemitismusstreit of 1879/81 back to the Pertz-Jaffé feud of the 1860s, and neither seems yet to have been the object of scholarly interest: Treitschke's dependence upon Lehmann's 1871 review, not to mention his use of Lehmann's copy of Graetz, have apparently not been noticed,¹¹⁸ and Mommsen's support for Jaffé has attracted next to no attention and has not, to my knowledge, been brought into connection with his stance in the Antisemitismusstreit.¹¹⁹ Nor have biographers

118 Lehmann's name is not mentioned in the literature on the Antisemitismusstreit (apart from Meyer, *Great Debate on Antisemitism*), nor in most studies of Treitschke.

119 Suffice it to say that none of the studies listed in n. 11 mentions Jaffé, Pertz, or Lehmann.

of Lehmann viewed his move from medieval philology and history into modern history as requiring any explanation. Although much attention has been devoted to Lehmann's changing views of Prussian history, which eventually turned radically away from the nationalist position he espoused in his 1871 review of Graetz,¹²⁰ his aborted first career as a medievalist has virtually been ignored.¹²¹

Of course, historians must be careful not to ascribe too much importance to their own debates and feuds. No one would suggest that something like the Antisemitismusstreit would not have occurred had Pertz lent Mommsen the manuscript of Granius Licinianus in 1856, or had Pertz not torpedoed Jaffé's Florentine appointment in the early 1860s, or had Pertz had no son to groom to succeed him, or if Karl had been a more talented philologist, or if Lehmann had not grown up to the tunes of Prussian military bands, or if Jaffé had not suggested to him a dissertation topic that was so eminently anti-Pertzian, or if Jaffé had not lost a manuscript in 1868 or committed suicide in 1870, or if the Francophile eleventh volume of Graetz's *Geschichte* had not come up for review during the Franco-Prussian War, or if someone other than Lehmann had been asked to review it, or if Jaffé had put off his suicide until after Lehmann wrote the review, or if Lehmann had lent Treitschke some nice or racy novel to read during his Swiss vacation instead of volume XI of Graetz's *Geschichte*. The blooming of modern German antisemitism in general, and the genesis of Treitschke's "Unsere Aussichten" in particular, derived from larger and deeper historical developments, and had they not come about one way they could have done so in another.

Nevertheless, apart from their basic reasons historical developments have their specific circumstances, and a full understanding of the former requires a full understanding of the latter as well. Indeed, the distinction between reasons and cir-

120 Apart from the two major studies of Lehmann's *œuvre* mentioned in the next note, see also Hans Kohn, *The Mind of Germany: The Education of a Nation*, New York 1960, p. 324. Meinecke summarized Lehmann's development in a nutshell: „Der einstige konservative Heißsporn endete [...] als Bekenner zur Weimarer Verfassung“ (HZ 141 [1930], p. 450).

121 So Reichel, *Studien zur Wandlung*, p. 16, who opens her discussion of Lehmann's development with his first article on modern history, relegating his earlier works to a footnote (p. 93, n. 3) that offers only the bibliographical details. So too Vogler, *Max Lehmann*, p. 61, characterizes Lehmann's first works on Prussian history, published in 1869 and 1874, as "seine ersten Forschungsarbeiten", carefully adding between dashes the rider "von seiner Dissertation und einem Aufsatz zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte abgesehen" but giving those earlier studies no attention at all. Neither scholar mentions the detailed review cited in n. 113.

cumstances is often less than clear. As the epitaph (“Alles ist Frucht, alles Samen”) on Lehmann’s tombstone proclaims,¹²² nothing happens without cause, and nothing remains without effect. In the present case, what I have suggested is that the fact that Lehmann, although quite a talented student of medieval Latin texts, was frustrated because he could not find a position after his patron had died, derived from rivalries among German medievalists in the 1850s and 1860s; that his frustration, and need to dissociate himself from Jaffé, goes a long way toward explaining both his angry review of Graetz and his change of profession, accompanied by the cultivation of a new patron, Treitschke; and that it was that friendship that was directly responsible both for the specific focus of Treitschke’s anti-Jewish disgust and fury in the summer of 1879 and for some of the contents and even wording of Treitschke’s expression of that fury a few months later in a publication that was to have epoch-making implications. Similarly, I suggest that Mommsen’s troubles with the Pertz reinforced and deepened his friendship with Jaffé, and that his ensuing role as Jaffé’s patron and defender against Pertz were part of a web in the context of which we should also understand his roles, within the following decade, as standard-bearer first of the anti-Pertz coalition and then, in the *Antisemitismusstreit*, of Treitschke’s critics. Perhaps others will be able to fill out this picture even more – fleshing out the relationships I have sketched and perhaps investigating others as well.¹²³

122 My thanks to Berndt Schaller, who located it in Göttingen and photographed it for me.

123 Especially Zarncke’s role might be a fruitful field of inquiry: Did he have any particular reason to allow his LCD to play such an active role in the feuding? Perhaps Ranke’s too: he was Jaffé’s teacher, also Waitz’s, Wattenbach’s, and Dümmler’s. But he was also Pertz’s contemporary and friend; see his *Tagebücher*, p. 426–429, where, writing in the wake of Pertz’s death, Ranke asserts that Jaffé was more to blame than Pertz for the feud between them.