Edward Said’s *Orientalism* has received both praise and criticism. Among the criticisms leveled is the charge that Said’s neglect of German scholarship misses an important part of Orientalism in the West. Robert Irwin, for example, notes that German Biblical scholarship was critically influential as a “motivating force for the study of Islam” and that the “German form-critical techniques” developed to study the Old Testament influence on the way “Western scholars interpret[ed] the Koran and the early Islamic community.” Bernard Lewis claims that Said’s neglect of German scholarship calls into question his entire project and likens it to writing a history of European music without a discussion of the German contribution.¹ More generally, critics have noted that the presence of an influential Orientalist scholarship in Germany, as well as the absence of any significant Germany colonies in the Orient, calls into question Said’s claim that there is a confluence between scholarship and political power in Orientalist discourse. Neither critics nor supporters, on the other hand, have given much attention to Said’s claim that there is a similarity between Orientalism and anti-Semitism. Said states this in his introduction, where he notes that in “addition and by an almost inescapable logic, I have found myself writing the history of a strange secret sharer of Western anti-Semitism. That anti-Semitism, and as I have discussed it in its Islamic branch Orientalism resemble each other is a historical, cultural, and political truth that needs only be mentioned to an Arab Palestinian for its irony to be perfectly understood” (1978:27–28). Elsewhere, Said has faulted critics of his work on Orientalism for seeing “in the critique of Orientalism an opportunity for them to defend Zionism . . . and launch attacks on Palestinian nationalism,” instead of giving attention to the similarity “between Islamophobia and anti-Semitism” (1985:9).

An earlier version of this essay was delivered to the Tri-Regional Meeting of the American Academy of Religion/Society of Biblical Literature, Early Judaism and Modern Scholarship in Boston, March 31, 1995. The respondents to the paper were Anthony Saldirini of Boston College and Jay Harris of Harvard University, both of whom provided very useful feedback.

The goal of this essay is to address these two neglected areas of Orientalism: German scholarship and the similarity between Orientalism and anti-Semitism. My argument, however, runs somewhat against the grain of both Said’s analogy and the role of German scholarship in Orientalism. First, I do not consider Orientalism and anti-Semitism as comparable discourses. “Anti-Semitism” was a self-proclaimed movement of German Aryans that emerged in the late nineteenth century, and I question the utility of using that term to designate the general representation of Judaism, either by Said or others. Instead, I follow Bryan Turner who treats the representation of Judaism within a broader Orientalist discourse. Thus, according to Turner:

Although Edward Said has argued that there is a tenacious persistence within the Orientalist discourse by which Islam is reproduced in western analysis, it can also be said that the accounting scheme for understanding Judaism is equally persistent. Whereas Islam appears a series of gaps, Judaism is represented as a system of contradictory combinations: usurious behavior and traditional economics; a universal God and exclusive pariah membership; a rational anti-magical ethos and irrational practices. The problem of “the Jewish Question” can thus be seen as a problem of locating Judaism at the intersections of rationality/irrationality, universalism/particularism, exclusion/inclusion and of modernity/tradition. Within Orientalism, there are two related discourses for Semites: the Islamic discourse of gaps and the Judaic discourse of contradictions. In turn, these discourses point to the question of capitalist origins.  

Second, and accordingly, I will focus on the German Biblical scholars and their representation of Jews and Judaism, rather than the influence of Biblical scholarship on Islamic studies. I will explore the relationship that Turner suggests between the Judaism of contradictory combinations and the Jewish Question. My specific thesis is that the knowledge of the Jewish past produced by Biblical scholars as “the Judaism of contradictory combinations” served to legitimate the institutional practices of an expanding nation-state and the subjugation of its “oriental” Jewish population. The “intersections” that Turner speaks about are those between knowledge and power and between the expanding nation-state and its ideology of Jewish corporate dissolution. German Biblical scholarship thus constitutes the “missing link,” so to speak, in German Orientalist representation and the conjunction between knowledge and power.

I will proceed as follows. I will treat Biblical scholarship and the Jewish question in Part 1. I will begin with an analysis of Biblical scholarship, with particular attention to Germany, to provide examples that show how Biblical scholars represented Judaism as a religion of contradictory combinations. I will include here a few comments on the relationship of this representation to intellectual developments of the time. I will follow this with a discussion of the Jewish Question, showing that political writers also portrayed Judaism as a religion of contradictory combinations. I will then discuss the relationship between the

---

political and scholarly discourse, showing the lines of confluence between them, and their intersection with institutional pressures designed to bring about the complete dissolution of a corporate Jewish identity. I will suggest some possible lines of future investigation in Part 2. Here I will also discuss the representation of Judaism in relationship to anti-Semitism, Orientalism in general, Said’s Orientalism in particular, and post-colonial discourse. My goal here is to follow Walter Benjamin and “brush history against the grain”—which in this case means brushing both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic “histories” against the grain of current analysis, transgressing the boundaries of Orientalism and counter-Orientalism.

I. THE STUDY OF JUDAISM, GERMAN BIBLICAL SCHOLARSHIP, AND THE JEWISH QUESTION

A. Inventing Judaism as a Religion of Contradictory Combinations

The modern study of Judaism, that is, study based on modern historical-literary critical methods, was initiated and developed by European Christians.3 The purpose of this study was, as George Foot Moore noted over seventy years ago, “apologetic or polemic rather than historical.”4 As Euro-Christians began to re-conceptualize their own religious tradition within the new philosophical and historiographical paradigms of the enlightenment, they also engaged in the incidental study of Judaism as the context or foil for Christianity. Judaism was not unique in this regard, and both Pailin and Hourani have noted similar uses of Islam and other religions in enlightenment scholarship.5 Jewish scholars were latecomers to the critical field of Jewish studies. Their own scholarly work was either linked to internal Jewish debates on reform or was defensive and apologetic in the face of a Christian scholarship that was hostile to Jews and Ju-

3 I prefer the term “Euro-Christian” to both “European” and “Western.” As Hay and Delanty have noted the idea of “Europe” is an extension and achievement of the ecumenical goal of Christianity. See Dennis Hay, Europe: The Emergence of an Idea, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1968); and Gerard Delanty, Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995). Even granting a decline of Christianity since the eighteenth-century enlightenment, contemporary European culture (I include the United States here) cannot be understood without the recognition of the influence of Christian ideas and religion. Ignoring the Christian element, as is common, is a sort of epistemological trick that minimizes religious influences on European thought and is very much tied in with Orientalists and other representations which see the Other as “religious” and the west as “secular.” The term “Judaico-Christian” is unacceptable since this “tradition” is a twentieth-century American political ideology and not a common and ancient, historical, cultural or religious tradition shared by Jews and Christians. Moreover, when writers use the term “Judaico-Christian,” they often mean simply “Christian,” assuming that Judaism is representable through Christian categories. See Mark Savad, American Christianity and the Judeo-Christian Tradition (Ph.D. Diss., Syracuse University, 1985), and my example in note 6 below.


Thus, the emergence of modern critical study of the Bible and Judaism does “not reflect any Christian-Jewish dialogue.” On the contrary, two fundamental features informed, and to some degree still inform, Euro-Christian studies of Judaism: first, the presumption of Christian authority to define the Jewish past; and, second, the assumption of immutable difference between Christianity and Judaism. These are also two elements that Said and others have seen as central to Orientalism.

Modern Christian scholarship on Judaism began with the study of the “Old Testament.” This designation is strictly Christian, and both the term and its modern study are to some degree inseparable from an earlier Christian ideology of succession which situates Christians as the true Israel of the present and Jews as the false Israel of the past. The temporal dislocation of Jews is created by the invention of a Christian Time in which Jesus stands as the starting point, both temporally and socially. Judaism is situated on the pre-Jesus side of the temporal line, where its significance lies only in its function as precursor and preparation for Jesus and the Gospel. This implies the necessary demise of Judaism, which is henceforth articulated as a religion out of time, an essence without history, amounting to what Fabian refers to as a “denial of coevalness,” that is, the placement of the subject of one’s study into another time. Even the very notion of an “Old Testament” is an “allochronic device” used to displace Jews in the new, Christian Time: It subverts Jewish self-representation and situates Jews and Judaism as a segment of a universal history. This Christian allochronic
theology persisted into the post-enlightenment period, where it was articulated within new notions of progress and universal time, notions that were also incorporated into the critical study of the Old Testament.11

Critical Old Testament scholarship, in turn, is largely a German endeavor. German Protestant Biblical scholarship grew out of enlightenment critiques of religion and shared its biases against priestly hierarchy and ritual. Like their enlightenment predecessors, Protestant scholars presumed that Jesus and early Christianity represented a rational and universal religion that was in marked contrast to that of the particularistic, legalistic, and priestly Judaism. They differed, however, in their estimation of the Old Testament and the Mosaic laws. Whereas the French philosophers and English deists had regarded the Old Testament as part of a single immoral and superstitious “Jewish religion,” Protestant scholars distinguished between an earlier, prophetic Mosaic-Israelite religion and a later, priestly-rabbinical “Jewish” religion. It was this later Jewish religion that became the religion of priestly particularism, hierarchy, and tyranny. Many German scholars considered the Babylonian exile as the point of rupture between the earlier and later religions: It was the loss of national institutions that altered the religious nature and corporate structure of the early Israelites, exposing them to foreign influences and causing a degeneration of pristine Mosaism into Judaism.

An early example of this is the Mosaisches Recht (1775) of J. D. Michaelis, a professor of Oriental languages at Göttingen. Michaelis argued that the Mosaic laws were in origin a “civil,” not a “religious,” code and that the harshness of these laws was due to two factors: their original “oriental” context and the hardness of the Israelites hearts. Moses made laws that were intended to preserve the Israelites from the peoples surrounding them, but he necessarily formulated these laws in accordance with the standards of the time. Despite this, however, the Mosaic laws were morally superior to those of other contemporary peoples and become problematic only when applied outside their original time and context (I: § 1–16). Accordingly, Michaelis rejected later Jewish understanding of the original Mosaic laws: “I do not take explanations and reasons of Mosaic laws from the Talmud. The oral traditions of the somewhat ignorant rabbis, which one finds collected in the Talmud, can teach us about Jewish law common at the time that these men lived, but not the meaning of the Mosaic law” (I, 1: § 18). That “meaning” can only be understood by Christian scholars such as Michaelis. The misunderstanding of the Mosaic laws began with the Babylonian exile, when “certain conscientious but incompetent” individuals interpreted the Mosaic laws in a new context and thus distorted them through this misunderstanding. Prominent among these distortions was the later Jewish prohibition of war on the Sabbath (I, 2: § 196).

Michaelis, like his contemporary at Halle J. S. Semler, worked from the assumption that the Old Testament was a unified and historical work. And like Semler he made a fundamental distinction between the text and Word of the Old Testament. The “Word” refers to those Biblical passages that speak of Jesus as savior Christ; the text refers to the remaining parts of the Bible, that is, Jewish history. The latter was subject to analysis and revision; the former was not. Both Semler and Michaelis presumed that Jewish history had its proper fulfillment in Christianity. Jewish sacred scripture was, therefore, the authoritative source of the Jews’ own displacement in Time—though again “authoritative” only through the interpretation of Christian scholars. Later scholars continued to presume the fulfillment of the Jewish history in Jesus and their own authority to interpret the Old Testament, but they built this on a more critical reading of the texts. Thus, scholars such as Eichhorn and Ilgen, building on the work of Spinoza, Astruc, and Simon, asserted that the Old Testament was composed of a variety of sources. However, they continued to believe that Moses was the creator of the Mosaic laws and that the accounts presented as early were recorded at or near the time of the events they portray. This view began to change in work of J. S. Vater and W. M. L. de Wette, who argued against the unified composition and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. They also challenged the view that all of the Old Testament accounts were historical. De Wette’s work proved to be the more influential, and his Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament (1806–07) initiated a new era in Biblical studies. De Wette argued two main points in the Beiträge: that the bulk of the accounts in the Pentateuch were “myths” and not history and that the story of Israel presented in the Old Testament is radically at variance with historical reality. Israel’s real history was to be determined through a critical, literary-historical analysis of the Old Testament, and such an analysis “showed” that the Mosaic-authorized priestly cult was a development of the later Monarchical period and was brought to its culmination in the post-exilic religion. De Wette presumed with previous scholars that the later religion was more particularistic and legalistic than the earlier. However, he was innovative in that he asserted that the date of different Old Testament sources could be determined on the basis of their attitude toward law: the more formal the legal traditions, the later in time they occurred. De Wette also introduced here the claim that the book of Deuteronomy represented the apogee of legalism and that the book of Chronicles was a post-exilic priestly work that had distorted the nature of Israel’s earliest religion.

In his later works, more reflective of his philosophy of religion derived largely from the philosopher Jacob Friedrich Fries, 12 de Wette asserted that the

12 Fries was a follower of Kant, who differed from his master in that he rejected the need for transcendental proofs. Fries believed that human perceptions of unity, value, harmony, and so forth, were real perceptions that were apprehended by the human facility of Ahndung, or intimation. Ahndung allows humans to sense reality, and myths, poetry, and philosophy are varying forms of expression of
Babylonian exile brought about a complete rupture in the religion and history of Israel, leading to a post-exilic and legalistic religion of contradictory combinations. De Wette distinguished these two religions by contrastive terms, "Hebraism" versus "Judaism." This view first appears in his 1813 *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments*, in which he states that:

The sojourn in a foreign land under a foreign people of completely a different outlook and religion, in addition to the impact the destruction of the state (*Staats*) had upon the people, must have been of decided influence upon their religion. This influence was so great that we must view the nation (*Nation*) after the Exile as a different one, with a different world-view and religion. We call the people in this period Jews (*Juden*), and in the period before Hebrews (*Hebräer*); and what belongs to the post-exilic culture is called Judaism (*Judenthum*), while in the pre-exilic culture it is called Hebraism (*Hebraismus*) (1813:48). 13

De Wette referred to Judaism "a degenerate, petrified Hebraism" (1813:114, *Das Judenthum ist entarteter, erstarter Hebraismus*). The post-exilic Jews, according to de Wette, recognized their own decline and attempted to compensate through the codification and classification of laws and the creation of a theocracy. Judaism thus became "a thing of concepts and devotion to the letter (des Begriffs und des Buchstabenwesens). This had two significant consequences. First, the post-exilic Jews put an inordinate emphasis on sin and the need to compensate for sin through ritual action (1813:48–49); and second, they mistook symbolic expressions of a universal rule of God, for the God of a particular people, misrepresenting divine rule as a theocratic, hierarchical state (1813:114). This, in turn, gave rise to a religion of essential contradictory combinations: a universal versus a particularistic-nationalistic view of divinity, a free and prophetic worship versus a formalized and priestly-legalistic cult, and an emphasis on feeling versus an emphasis on conceptualizing knowledge as a means of divine apprehension (1813:64, 91, 101). Although these contradictions were present as tendencies in the original Hebraic religion, they assumed specific historical form in post-exilic Judaism. They reached their apogee in the first century AD, where they found resolution in the birth of Jesus and the growth of early Christianity. Jesus took the positive Hebraic tendencies— universalism, prophetism, spontaneity, feeling—and fashioned them into a religion of essen-

---

13 In latter editions this reads: “Judaism is the unsuccessful (verunglückte) restoration of Hebraism and a mixture of the same positive elements with the foreign mythological-metaphysical teachings; it is ruled by a reflexive mind without any living, vigorous emotions (Gefühl): it is a chaos that awaits a new creation. Its characteristic features are 1) In place of moral action there is metaphysical reflection, and in there much development. 2) Due to the symbolic misunderstanding a written religious source without independent production [arises]. What 3) was living and vigorous (Lebens und der Begeisterung) in the case of Hebraism, is a thing of concepts and devotion to the letter in the case of Judaism” (1831:114).
tial freedom. The Pharisees and Talmudic rabbis took the negative tendencies—particularism, legalism, formalizing, conceptualizing—and produced a religion of essential constraint (de Wette 1813:184–5).

This basic model remained the center of de Wette’s subsequent works, such as the Über Religion and Theologie: Erläuterungen zu seinem Lehrbuch der Dogmatik (1815) und Über die Religion, ihr Wesen, ihre Erscheinungsformen und ihren Einfluss auf das Leben (1827), though these are now linked to his universal philosophy of religious development. Here, history became a series of ruptures and restorations, in which the original Hebraism degenerated into Judaism and was unable to over come its political limitations (Beschränktheit). Jesus transcended Jewish national limitations and brought the universal Hebraic elements to completion. The negative elements persisted in either Talmudism, or in Catholicism, “a Christianity sunken into Judaism” (ein zum Judenthum herabgesunkenes Christenthum); and restoration took place through Luther. Decline set in again, this time through dogmatic, conservative Protestantism, so now liberal critical scholarship was to restore the present to its fulfillment (1815:88ff). De Wette also situated Israelite religion against the religions of Egypt and Greece. These latter religions were never able to transcend nature and achieve an ethical view of divinity. The Greeks came close, but their religion degenerated due to the lack of a coherent national body (1815:81–83). Similarly, Jews also came close to expressing an ethical religion, but the resultant post-exilic degeneration necessitates the fulfillment of Hebraic transcendence and morality in Jesus.14

De Wette’s model of post-exilic contradictory Judaism became the basis of all subsequent liberal scholarship. While later scholars made adjustments in some of the specific details of de Wette’s model, so that Deuteronomy came to be seen as the beginning rather than the culmination of the legalistic tendencies, and a documentary hypothesis was adopted to account for the different Old Testament sources, the post-exilic Judaism of contradictory combinations persisted. All of the major liberal scholars after de Wette, such as Gesenius, Gramberg, George, von Colln, Vatke, Ewalt, Graf, and Duhn, represented Judaism as a post-exilic religion, separate from pre-exilic Israel and composed of es-

14 De Wette diverged from Hegel in a number of respects regarding Judaism. First, he separated Hebraism from Judaism, while Hegel treated Judaism (i.e., the religion of the Old Testament and Talmud) as a whole. Second, he accorded Hebraism a central role in shaping modern German-Protestant society. Where Hegel had privileged Greece, de Wette privileged Hebraism as the fountain of modern cultural values such as spontaneity, individualism, and a balance between reason and feeling. Third, de Wette was to the left of Hegel in terms of his political views, though Hegel was more liberal in respect to granting civil rights to Jews (see below). For Hegel’s view of Judaism, see Sholomo Avineri, “The Fossil and the Phoenix: Hegel and Krochmal on the Jewish Volksgeist,” 47–63 in History and System: Hegel’s Philosophy of History (Proceedings of the 1982 Sessions of the Hegel Society of America, Robert L. Perkins, ed., Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984); and Peter C. Hodgsoon, “The Metamorphosis of Judaism in Hegel’s Philosophy of Religion,” The Owl of Minerva, 19 (1987), 41–52. For Hegel’s view of Jewish emancipation, see Shlomo Avineri, “A Note on Hegel’s Views on Jewish Emancipation,” Jewish Social Studies (1963), 25:2, 145–51.
sentential contradictions that were resolved through Jesus. Their work, written against conservative Protestant scholarship, culminates in Julius Wellhausen’s *Prolego-mena zur Geschichte Israel’s* (1878), in which de Wette’s contested model became Jewish history “the way it really was.” I will provide some examples from liberal scholarship before I treat Wellhausen.

Wilhelm Gesenius was a student of de Wette who taught at Halle. He produced a Hebrew lexicon (1810) and grammar (1813), both of which are still used, and a number of studies of Hebrew language and religious development. The philological conclusions of his *Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache und Schrift* (1815) parallel, he claimed, the historical conclusions of de Wette (1815:38, n. 44). Thus, a “new epoch for the language and literature begins with the exile” (1815:25); and post-exilic books such as “Daniel, Ester, and Jonah contain legends with a degraded Jewish flavor” (*im einen gesunkenen jüdischen Geschmacke*, 1815:26). The contradictory tendencies are found in the post-exilic language, which was a combination of pure Hebrew with “chaldean-tinged” Hebrew (1815:26ff); and in literature such as Chronicles, which uncritically combines older Hebraic stories with post-exilic Priestly accounts (1815:26ff). J. K. W. Vatke, a liberal Hegelian at Berlin, combined Hegel’s dialectic with de Wette’s scholarship and applied them to an analysis of the Old Testament in his *Biblische Dogmatik* (1835). Vatke saw the Israelite religion undergoing a gradual development from crude nature worship to a transcendent monotheism. While a variety of contradictory tendencies were resolved in this process, they reached their height in the post-exilic period, though a bit later than de Wette argued: For Vatke, they arose in the course of the Maccabean uprising (circa 168 BCE), when a belief that salvation would come in the form of a temporal kingdom, went against counter-tendencies of salvation in an abstract, super-sensory world (1835:589). In both cases, a general longing for a unity through a higher world order ultimately “overcomes the limits (*Schrankten*) of the Old Testament principles,” though these contradictory tendencies “in Judaism are not reconciled until Christianity unites the truths of both extremes into a higher unity” (1835:590). Heinrich Ewald was a professor of Old Testament and Oriental languages at Göttingen, who took a more positive approach to the Old Testament in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1843–59).15 Ewald argued against the de Wettian view in that he claimed that the Old Testament contained reliable information on the early form of Israelite religion. Like Vatke, Ewald’s model is one of general movement, without the ruptures that de Wette posited: All of Israelite history was a steady movement toward the Perfect Religion, Christianity. However, the exile constitutes an “internal transformation” of the religion, which now “presents the most startling contrasts and apparently inexplicable contradictions. While, on the one hand, Israel is impelled with the utmost strength towards the final completion of its destiny, viz.

15 I am citing from the English translation, *The History of Israel* (London, 1867–86), with attention to the third German edition (1864).
the perfection of the true religion, extending to the utter destruction of its national limitations (ih rer volksthümlichen schranken) . . . other impulses [theocracy and a quest for national restoration] on the contrary, draw it back from this goal” (1843–59:5, 37).

Julius Wellhausen, who based his literary and historical analysis to a large degree on the work of de Wette while also incorporating the work of Gesenius, Vatke, Ewald, and many others, represented post-exilic Judaism and its Mosaic law as “the residuum of a ruined state . . . itself not a state at all, but an unpolitical artificial artifact.” Judaism’s necessary counterpart is foreign rule, and in its nature it is “intimately allied to the old Catholic church, which was in fact its child” (1957[1927]:422). Jews were no longer a nation (Volk), but a religious community (Religionsgemeinde). The post-exilic priests attempted to preserve the religion of ancient Israel by combining ancient festivals, prophetic traditions, and customs with a cultic theocracy founded on the Mosaic law. The result, however, was a contradictory combination of universal and particular, law and prophecy, freedom and constraint, and the complete rupture of Jews from the progress of history. These combinations found their resolution in Jesus, and Wellhausen summarized this process and the relationship of Judaism to the earlier Hebraism in an influential article, published in the Encyclopedia Britannica, in 1881: “It is not easy to find points of view from which to pronounce on the character of Judaism. . . . It lives on the stores of the past, but is not simply the total of what had been previously acquired; it is full of new impulses, and has an entirely different physiognomy from that of Hebrew antiquity so much so that it is hard even to catch a likeness. Judaism is everywhere historically comprehensible, and yet it is a mass of antinomies. . . . The Gospel develops hidden impulses of the Old Testament, but it is a protest against the ruling tendency of Judaism” (1957:508–10). These hidden impulses were the universal, prophetic, and free tendencies of ancient Israel, which were made manifest in

16 Wellhausen was a student of Ewald and acknowledged his influence in a later memoir. The Prolegomena is dedicated to him. He cites George, Graf, and Reuss as important influences, though he says that he “learned best and most” from Vatke’s Biblische Theologie (1835:14). He referred to de Wette as “the epoch making founder (Eröffner) of historical criticism in this field . . . he was the first clearly to perceive and point out how disconnected are the alleged starting point of Israel’s history and that history itself” (1835:4–5). While Wellhausen states that de Wette did not succeed in reaching a secure position, he notes that he was the first “to perceive and demonstrate the gap between the alleged starting point of Israelite history and the history itself” (1835:4). Elsewhere in the Prolegomena he follows de Wette in regard to Chronicles, whose work here was “not improved upon.” (1957:166). Even more explicitly, he described de Wette as “a clever chap” and stated that “all that I did in the Old Testament was in his books already.” See Rudolph Otto, The Philosophy of Religion (London: Williams and Norgate, 1931), 152. Note also that literary aspect of the theory is significant in supporting the authority of the model. Building on de Wette’s initial claims, Wellhausen argues that the very literary structure of the Old Testament proves the disjunctive and contradictory nature of Judaism and the resolving function of Christianity. I am citing from the English translation of the second edition, Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel (New York: Meridan Books, 1957), with attention to the sixth German edition (Berlin, 1927).

17 These views are presented throughout the final section of the Prolegomena, which is called “Israel und Das Judentum.”
Christianity, while the ruling tendency of particularistic, tyrannical, legalism persists in Rabbinism: “Judaism had to be maintained whatever the cost” (1957:540).18

These examples show how Biblical scholars portrayed Judaism as a post-exilic religion of contradictory combinations. Judaism was a later degeneration of Hebraism, or ancient Israel, whose contradictions were resolved through Jesus and Christianity. This resolution meant the universalization of Israel’s prophetic, liberative tendencies and a release from its particularistic, legalistic, constraints. As Adolph Harnack would say in his Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den Ersten Drei Jahrhunderten (1902), “Gentile Christianity brought a process to completion which had in fact commenced long since in a part of Judaism—the release of Jewish religion from its constraints and its transformation to a world-religion (die Entschränkung der judischen Religion und ihre Transformation zur Weltreligion, 1902:61). Since Christianity is the completion of Israel’s history, the persistance of Judaism after Christianity places Jews against the course of history.”

This view reveals theological presuppositions. Rendtorff, Silberman, and Levenson, among others, have noted that the separation of an earlier Israel from a later contradictory Judaism accorded with Protestant and earlier Christian theological representation. Biblical scholars presented these older conceptions in critical terms, transforming theological assertions into social and historical processes but still represented Judaism as a religion of the past.19 Solomon Schechter referred to the “higher criticism” of Protestant Biblical scholars as “higher anti-Semitism,” and citing Wellhausen’s Prolegomena in particular, said that critical scholarship “burns the soul though it leaves the body unhurt.” Higher criticism was leading to the destruction of Judaism through the attack on its foundations in the Old Testament, “denying all our claims for the past, and leaving us without hope for the future.”20 Their views cannot be contested. As I noted above, the treatment of the Jews and their sacred scriptures within an authoritative Christian framework, which began before the eighteenth century, might be seen as having its roots in the universal histories created by Christian imperial intellectuals such as Eusebius and Augustine. Furthermore, George Foot Moore skillfully mapped out the continuity between older theological conceptions and nineteenth-century Biblical scholarship in 1921, tracing lines of influence through the transmission of spe-

18 I am still citing from the reprint included in the 1957 English translation of the Prolegomena.
cific Christian texts.\textsuperscript{21} Moreover, the portrayal of Judaism in the work of de Wette, Wellhausen, and other scholars is hardly sympathetic; and contemporary German Jews certainly saw a fine line, if any, between the work of Biblical scholars who portrayed Judaism as a degenerate religion and the claims of the anti-Semites that Judaism was a degenerate influence on contemporary German society.\textsuperscript{22}

At the same time, others have noted that the Protestant critique of Judaism may have reflected the ongoing struggle between Protestants and Catholics in Germany and that Jews and Judaism were just a foil for these debates. Certainly the many references to Catholicism as a later manifestation of Judaism in the work of liberal scholars show that Catholicism was considered a force to be reckoned with. This is clear in de Wette’s work, where his own rationalist-liberal scholarship paralleled his political views as expressed in his \textit{Die neue Kirche, oder Verstand und Glaube in Bunde} (1814 [1815]). Liberal Protestantism, according to de Wette, should serve as the basis of a unified Germany centered on Prussia and rooted in the Christian Bible and rationalist interpretation. Austria was to be excluded because of its strong Catholic influence and the harmful effects this would have, and was already evident, as the result of a renewed interest in mythology. Moreover, Uriel Tal has noted that liberal Protestants emphasized the separation of Israel from Judaism and claimed that the latter acted more as a degenerate religion akin to Catholicism, in their “attempt to make Christianity more palatable to the educated class as a religion and as a component of German national consciousness and culture.”\textsuperscript{23} Accordingly, we can read Protestant liberal Biblical scholarship as a “foundational historiography” which sought to base a new German national identity on an Israelite past that was free of both Judaism and Catholicism. This is also clear in de Wette’s work, in which he rooted nineteenth-century ideals of individuality, spontaneity, freedom, and the healthy balance between rationality and feeling, in the Hebraic, not Greek, past.\textsuperscript{24} Since this Hebraic religion was superior to

\textsuperscript{21} Moore was a Christian scholar who wrote a subsequent work designed to present Judaism in its own voice and counter the authoritative Christian constructions of Jewish past. See his \textit{Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim} (3 vols., Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–30).

\textsuperscript{22} On the other hand it is possible to read the Wellhausen’s \textit{Prolegomena} against the anti-Semites and other opponents of Jews. First, by defining “Judaism” as a “religious community” since the time of the Babylonian exile, Wellhausen is saying in effect that Jews are not a “nation within a nation” but a religious community within the German nation. Thus, Jews are by the very nature of their corporate structure capable of assimilation into Germany. Second, by separating Hebraism from Judaism, Wellhausen frees German Christianity of any taint of Judaism and absolves Jews from the charge that they have contaminated German culture. Protestantism comes out of ancient Israel, not Judaism, and ancient Israel has all of the qualities—vitality, purity, spontaneity—admired by the Aryans.


\textsuperscript{24} This was going against the grain of contemporary scholars, such as Hegel and F. A. Wolf, who considered the ancient Hebrew–Jewish culture inferior to that of the ancient Greeks. For example,
the Greek religion and had no intrinsic relationship to Judaism (which is not only a degeneration of the latter but a completely different people and religion), contemporary Protestants could thus have all the benefits of ancient Hebraism without the taint of Greek or Jewish religion—and, by implication, of both Catholicism and contemporary mythologizing.

It might thus be argued that Protestant Biblical scholars were less interested in representing the Jewish past than Protestant present. Their images of Jews, and the contradictions in ancient Jewish society, were the images and contradictions of contemporary Germany. These scholars were using the past, as well as their critical scholarship, to fight political and identity battles in the present. In this reading, Jewish past was not so much the subject of their analysis but its field of representation—Jewish past was “good to think” about the German Protestant present. Yet, this alone does not account for the Judaism of contradictory combinations. Political writers in the nineteenth century also presented Judaism as a post-exilic religion of contradictory combinations in need of resolution. However, where Biblical scholars saw Jesus and early Christianity as the resolution of Judaism, political writers accorded the same function to the German Protestant nation-state: The resolution of Jewish contradictions would be accomplished through the dissolution of an allochronic Jewish identity through its assimilation into the Protestant nation-state. This line of intersection points to another reading of “Judaism as a religion of contradictory combinations,” one which shifts my analysis from scholarship to politics, from knowledge to power, and from Christian theology to Orientalism.

B. The Jewish Question

To understand the relationship between politics, power, and Orientalism, I suggest that we view the Jews in Germany as a colonized population. Before the initial formation and expansion of the nation-state, Jews lived in relatively autonomous and self-determining communities which were treated as single units by Christian authorities for the purposes of taxation and control.25 Although there was a significant amount of interaction, social and intellectual, between Jews and Christians in the pre-state period, the majority of the population re-

Wolf wrote that the “Hebraic nation did not raise itself to the level of culture, so that one might regard it as a learned, cultured people. It does not even have prose, but only half-poetry. Its writers of history are but miserable chroniclers. They could never write in full sentences; this was an invention of Greeks.” See Vorlesungen über die Altertumwissenschaft, 1 (1831), 14; cited in Ismar Schorsch, Jewish Reactions, 346.

garded Jews as a foreign and “oriental” population, essentially in opposition to Christianity and in divinely mandated exile from their ancient homeland in the East. This was a view shared by Jews as well. The rise of the nation-state with its ideology of a single, unified and institutionally centered corporate identity, and its ethical and religious basis in Christianity, transformed these Jewish communities into a “state within the state.” The Jewish Question was, in effect, the question of Jewish corporate status in the new nation-states.

The administrators and intellectuals of the new states regarded coeval Jews and Judaism as “corrupt and debased.” The signs of degenerate Judaism were the oriental and superstitious religious practices embodied in the Talmud and observed in Jewish communities, the Jewish hostility and mistrust of Christians, and the occupational tendency of Jews to engage in commerce and trade. Such Jewish degeneration was seen as an obstacle to Jewish integration within a nation-state, unlike a rational Christianity, which could serve as the basis of communal solidarity and religious expression, using agriculture as the economic foundation and patriotism and participation in the military as the sign of loyalty to the state. The Jewish Question therefore became a series of questions concerning the capacity of Jews to participate in the state. Would the emancipation of degenerate Jews cause the decline of the wider society? What was the cause of Jewish degeneration? Was it due to something essential to Judaism—its oriental nature? Talmudic customs? Or was it the result of centuries of Christian persecution? How could Jews become farmers if they were predisposed to commerce? How could Jews become soldiers if they could not fight on the Sabbath? Did the Talmud preach hatred of non-Jews and disdain of non-Jewish authorities? Was the Talmudic interpretation of the Mosaic Laws a misunderstanding of those laws? And what was the basis of the Rabbinical leadership who were so resistant to assimilation (that is, Germanization and Protestantization)? The specific answers to these questions varied over time, but the general conclusion was that Jews would have to exchange “rights for regeneration.” This meant that Jews would have to recreate themselves and their religion in the image of German Protestantism, and the various edicts and laws drafted to grant Jews rights also included concrete plans and institutions for changing the corporate structure and identity of Jews.

The initial round of debates were stimulated by the effects of the French revolution and resultant liberal movement in various parts of Germany. One of the earliest contributions was Christian Wilhelm von Dohm’s Über die bürgerliche Verbesserung der Juden (1781 [1783]). Dohm was a liberal civil servant, a

26 The East, of course, is as much an idea as a direction. Nevertheless, the Judaism of the pre-state period clearly had more in common with other religions associated with East, Islam for instance, than it had with European Christianities. Jewish ritual language, prayer chanting, legal traditions, and scriptural exegesis saw their formation in the East and bear more than strong resemblance to their Islamic counterparts.

27 Sorokin, The Transformation, 23.
friend of the Jewish philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn, and a strong supporter of Jewish emancipation. Dohm presumed that coeval Jews, the majority at least, were degenerate,28 though he argued that the degeneration of Jews—“these unfortunate Asiatic refugees” (unglücklichen asiatischen Fluchtlinge, 1781:6)—was not an essential trait of Jews but the result of centuries of Christian persecution. As such, an improvement was possible if the cause of the degeneration was removed. Dohm used comparative data to show that other degenerate peoples—the gypsies, the Irish—were capable of improvement, once the conditions of oppression were removed. And he noted that this was the case with Jews in Spain, Italy, and France, who had improved, once social restrictions were lifted. Dohm also noted the contradictory nature of Judaism. Jewish loyalty to their ancient faith, an admirable trait, also produces pettiness and clannishness. The strong Jewish family ties and fidelity were contradicted by a love of profit and usury. Again, Dohm stated that these were later developments due mainly to Christian oppression and pointed out that they were not found in the original Mosaic religion (1781:94ff). In conceptualizing the model for regeneration, Dohm outlined a detailed plan in which Jews would be granted full and immediate equal rights but agree to government-sponsored occupational restructuring and moral education. He felt this would help them to achieve “reason by the clear light of knowledge” and overcome the barriers of occupational specialization and shackles of the (understandable in Dohm’s view) hatred and distrust that many Jews now felt for Christians. However, Dohm also required that the government take steps to insure that Christians also give up their prejudices against Jews and instead regard them as “their brothers and fellow men” (1781:117). Near the end of his essay Dohm summarizes his arguments, presenting an overview of Jewish history:

Certainly the unnatural oppression, under which the Jews have been living for centuries, has contributed to their general moral corruption (Verderbtheit) and to the degeneration (zur Ausartung) of their religious laws from their original goodness and utility. Moses intended a permanent, thriving state and his law contains nothing contrary to this purpose. . . . Only when all civil societies of the earth excluded them, did they forget the [proper] relationship of their religion to [the civil societies]. As their only occupation, commerce, gave them leisure . . . they strove by anxious observance of certain customs and holidays to achieve special holiness . . . because civil virtue was made impossible for them. . . . This anxious ceremonial and petty spirit which has now crept into the Jewish religion will disappear as soon as they are allowed a greater sphere of activity. As members of the political society, they will make its interests their own. They will then reform (umbilden) their religious laws and regulations accordingly, and return to the

28 The very expression, bürgerliche Verbesserung (civil improvement), indicated a presumption of Jewish degeneration. This was a double entendre referring both to the “improvement” of Jews’ civil status by the state as well as an “improvement” of the Jews themselves (Katz, From Prejudice, 35) notes that in discussions of Dohm’s proposals, Mendelssohn substituted the term bürgerliche Aufnahme (acceptance, reception) for bürgerliche Verbesserung, which reflects his awareness of the negative implications of this term.
freer and nobler ancient Mosaic covenant, albeit explained and adapted to the changed
times and circumstances, and also finding the authorizations in their Talmud
(1781:143–4).29

Dohm’s essay drew widespread attention and numerous responses. The first
to respond was A. F. Büsching, an historian and former mentor of Dohm.
Büsching rejected Dohm’s call for Jewish emancipation. While Büsching agreed
with Dohm in principle, he doubted Jews could accomplish the high goals Dohm
set for them. Jews were simply not capable of making the moral advances nec-
esary to take part in modern German society. Büsching argued that Dohm’s mis-
take was that he had incorrectly grounded his defense of Jewish religion on the
basis of the original and superior Mosaic Law, although the Jewish religion was
founded upon the later Talmudic and not the earlier Mosaic law (1781:300).30
Moreover, Büsching contested Dohm’s claim that Christian persecution alone
accounted for Jewish degeneration and hatred of Christians. Citing the notori-
ous Entdecktes Judenthum (1700 [1710]) of J. A. Eisenmenger,31 Büsching
claimed that the proof of Jewish degeneration and misogyny is “actually found
in the statements of the remnant Jews (abgefallen Juden) . . . the Talmud . . . [and
the books] of the Talmudic Jews (Talmudischen Juden). These preceded the per-
secutions of Christians and indicated that Jewish degeneration and hostility to
Christians, while not essential, is rooted in their Talmudic religion. Thus, “so
long as the majority of Jews stick to their mosaic-talmudic religion, one must
judge them according to the same” (1801:300–1), and emancipation is out of the
question. This was essentially the same conclusion he made in his earlier
Geschichte der jüdischen Religion, in which he had linked the degeneration of
the Mosaic law to the later Talmudic Judaism (1799:180–1, 204).

Another respondent was a Pastor named Schwager.32 He began in full agree-
ment with Dohm, rejecting the traditional charges made against Jews (ritual

29 Dohm consulted Mendelssohn as he wrote the work and was given drafts before its publica-
tion. Edward Breuer states that Mendellsohn was aware of the public impact of Dohm’s book and
wanted to limit its focus to issues such as the Sabbath laws and the ability of Jews to perform mili-
tary service. He was thus willing to ignore the disparagement of contemporary Jewish religion, con-
tained even in the sympathetic work of Dohm, for tactical reasons. Breuer also points out that the
final phrase, auch in ihrem Talmud die Befugnisse finden, appears out of joint syntactically. Since
Dohm attached a footnote at this point stating that “a great Jewish scholar” had informed him that
Talmudic and later Rabbinical traditions made it the duty of Jews to defend a city under attack or
to save any life, even on the Sabbath, Breuer suggests that the phrase auch in ihrem Talmud die
Befugnisse finden might have been added at the suggestion of Mendellsohn. See his essay, “Poli-
tics, Tradition, History: Rabbinical Judaism and the Eighteenth-Century Struggle for Civil Equal-
30 I am citing from Büshing’s original article, published in Wöchentliche Nachrichten von neuen
Landcharten, geographischen, statistischen und historischen Büchern und Schriften, 9:299–302,
319–20, 331–5.
31 Eisenmenger was a deceased professor of Oriental Languages in Heidelberg. Jews in Frank-
furt vigorously protested the publication of his book and delayed its appearance for ten years. See
J. Katz, From Prejudice, 13–22.
32 I am citing from the second edition of Dohm’s Über die burglerische Verbesserung der Juden
(1783), which included the response of Schwager and others to the first edition.
murder, deicide) and criticizes Christians for their harsh treatment of them (1783:76ff, 96ff). However, he considered Dohm’s claims that Jews were capable of regeneration theoretically valid but nearly impossible for them in practice: “We must view people as they actually are, not as models of how we really want them to be” (1783:102). Real Jews were “a completely foreign nation” with customs that are “completely different” and incapable of modification (1783:98). Jews were fit for citizenship “in Asia, and as an independent nation” but not in the northern hemisphere (1783:99). He also noted the physical differences that separate Jews from Germans: “The Jew reveals in his hair and physical features just how far he stands from us (whether above us or below us is not the question here) . . . and his spirit is equally different from ours” (1783:100). Thus, according to this, Jews are best suited, by temperament and custom, to commerce; and a farming life is almost impossible for them. Moreover, Jews would never be able to become useful soldiers since they would not give up their religious customs: “The Jew clings to his rabbis and his Talmud, and has thus allowed himself to become dreadfully indolent since the time of the Maccabees. Perhaps, eventually (perhaps also not) an individual could assuage his guilty conscience over the desecration of the Sabbath; however . . . I state it before you that the Jewish soldier in the field would be as religious and conscientious of his Sabbath as he was at home. . . ! (1783:104).

These debates continued into the nineteenth century. France’s defeat of Prussia and subsequent occupation of the western Rhine stimulated further debates and edicts. Laws to emancipate Jews were enacted in those territories that France occupied or influenced: the Jews of Westphalia in 1808 and Frankfurt in 1811, Baden in 1807–09, Württemberg in 1807–11, and Bavaria in 1813. These in turn stimulated the Prussian Edict of Emancipation in 1812, which was part of a general plan of social revitalization and modernization. The edict abolished the autonomous status of Jews and required the adoption of German names and the use of German in all legal transactions. In return, Jews were granted citizenship with full and equal rights. Despite these laws, however, only those Jews who showed signs of regeneration were allowed to assume hitherto forbidden occupations, which in most cases meant converting to Christianity. The Prussian revitalization was built upon the fostering of popular patriotism, and the subsequent defeat of Napoleon at Jena in 1813 in the “War of Liberation” brought about a re-evaluation of laws of Jewish rights. Many states ignored or rescinded their edicts of emancipation and this stimulated a new round of debates.

One of the contributors was Jacob Friederich Fries, a friend and colleague of de Wette. Fries’s contribution was a pamphlet entitled, Über die Gefährdung des Wohlstandes und Charakters der Dutschen durch die Juden (1816). Fries argued that “Judaism” was the real obstacle to Jewish emancipation. Jews, as individuals, were the brothers of other Germans, but Judaism had no place in present German society because it was a “remnant from a primitive time (ein
Ueberbleibsel aus einer ungebildten Vorzeit) which one should not merely re-
strict but completely wipe out (nicht beschränken, sondern ganz ausrotten
soll). The civil situation of the Jews will improve exactly when Judaism (Ju-
denthum) is wiped out” (1816:10). Fries asserted that Jewish “society” (Ges-
selschaft) consists of four contradictory elements. Jews are “a single nation . . .
a political association . . . a religious party and a middleman and petty-trader
caste” (1816:12), all of which constitute threats to the nation-state. In dis-
cussing the religious element Fries asked if the state should tolerate the Jewish
religion. He answered that

It should not be tolerated on three grounds. 1. Because Jehovah, according to the Mo-
saic teachings, is merely a national God and they alone are his people; 2. Because the
Jews do not live and learn according to the Mosaic teaching, but according to the Tal-
mud; 3. Because their so-called religion is not a positive religion . . . but a theocratic
state-constitution (theokratischen Staatsverfassung, 1816:13).

He added that the Jewish Talmudic tradition is falling away from pure Mosaism
and the moral teachings of the Prophets. It consists of “completely degenerate
superstitions” (ganz verderbliche Aberglaube) . . . and completely unsuitable
ceremonial services” (1816:13–14).

The debates on the Jewish Question subsided somewhat in the twenties and
thirties, only to increase dramatically in the 1840s, when Bruno Bauer and
Karl Marx made their contributions. The new round of debates was due to the
proposed changes in Jewish status by the new King, Friedrich Wilhelm IV.
The King called for a revocation of all previous edicts of emancipation and a
return of Jews to the status of foreign residents. This raised a storm of protest
among both Jews and non-Jews, stimulating a new round of books and pam-
phlets. The new debates attracted the attention of Bauer, a former Biblical
scholar and now an independent writer in Berlin,33 and he entered the fray
with his Die Judenfrage (1843). The essence of Bauer’s reply was that as long
as the state remains Christian, emancipation is impossible. Jews would sim-
ply be emancipated into a state that is itself in need of emancipation from re-
ligion. However, Bauer had much to say in respect to Jewish emancipation as
well. He accused Jews of wanting to monopolize the status of victims of op-

33 Bauer’s early studies on the Old Testament are almost apologetic in tone. They defend the
harsher Biblical narratives from Deistic criticism and the Mosaic law from the “new critique” of
de Wette. His programmatic article, “Prinzipien der mosaischen Rechts und Religions-Verfassung,”
was published in 1837 (Zeitschrift für spekulative Theologie, 2:292–306). Here Bauer rejects the
approaches advocated by Michaelis and de Wette, as well as their explanations for the origins of
the Mosaic law. According to Bauer, Michaelis viewed the law as an “artifice of Moses” used to
protect the people from pagan influence; while de Wette saw it as a priestly “coup” which curtailed
the free development of the people (1816:303). Against this Bauer presented an Hegelian approach,
albeit lacking the source criticism of Vatke, in which the Mosaic law is a manifestation of the peo-
ple’s spirit and consciousness. He applies this methodology to the text in his two-volume Die Re-
ligion das Alten Testaments (1838). Here the Mosaic law is the highest expression of the people’s
consciousness, which in turn is the highest expression of the universal spirit at that time.
pression (1816:23, 91), and he presented Judaism as a religion of contradictions. In fact, according to Bauer, there was “no more vacillating and inconsistent national spirit (unsicherem und unconsequentern Volkseist) than the Jewish [spirit]: It develops in contradiction to its limitations (im Gegensatz zu seiner Beschränktheit), it progresses to ideas which would mean the abolition of its Law, but then it stops in its progress, does not really go forward . . . this means, that there is no more consistent national spirit than the Jewish one, its progress is not really progress, its development is no development, and despite the higher ideas which were urged upon it, it remains what it is.” (1816:33).

Bauer laid the main cause for this Jewish lack of development and inconsistency to the “oriental nature” (orientalischen Wesen) of Jews and noted that such “stationary nations exist in the Orient, because human liberty and the possibility of progress are still limited there” (1816:11). It was this oriental nature that caused Jews to revere a Mosaic Law that had long since been superseded by time and Christianity.

Marx’s response took the form of two essays, Zur Judenfrage and the Die Fähigkeit der huetugen Juden und Christen frei zu werden (1844). Neither essay treated the Jewish Question as a separate issue. The first also addressed the relationship of religion to society in general, and the second treated the Jewish Question in terms of a discussion of bourgeois society. I will focus on the second essay. In line with his general criticism of Hegel, Marx sought to expose the contradictions between an egocentric bourgeois civil society and the modern state and used “Judaism” and the Jewish Question as a means to this end. Marx took the metaphorical approach, drawing an analogy between Judaism and civil society. The basis of the Jewish religion was “practical need, egoism,” this is the basis of bourgeois civil society as well (1844:166). Judaism was thus the precursor to a full-fledged bourgeois society. However, since the spirit of practical need and egoism—“self-interest”—was essentially “passive,” Judaism could not effect the creation of civil society by itself: self-interest, that is, Judaism, “is only perfected in the Christian world.” Hence, the contradictions inherent in bourgeois society, individual versus social needs, god (money) versus human beings, are those in Judaism as well and were now manifest in the “world” through the Christian perfection of Judaism in civil society. Moreover, all of the features that characterize the abstract Jewish religion, “the contempt for theory, arts, history, and man as an end in himself,” became the concrete expression of the bourgeois individual, who is a now a Jew in all but name (1844:167). Marx diverged to some degree from other contributors to the

34 Thus, on page 91 he says: “Is it always only Jews who have gained and lost in history? Are there no other people who have been marked by history, who have experienced something? Always and always, only the Jews” (Immer und immer nur die Juden!).

35 I am citing from Karl Marx Werke: Artikel Enwürfe März 1843 bis August 1844 (Berlin: Deitz Verlag, 1982).
Jewish Question in that he saw no difference between Mosaic and Rabbinical Judaism, nor did he recognize any positive Judaic elements in contemporary society, which was completely sunken into Judaism: “It is not only in the Pentateuch or in the Talmud, but also in contemporary society that we find the essence of the present day Jew . . . not only as the limitations of the Jew, but as the Jewish limitation of society (nicht nur als Beschränktheit des Juden, sondern als die judische Beschränktheit der Gesellschaft). The answer to the Jewish Question was therefore the answer to the Question of modern society: “The social emancipation of the Jew is the emancipation of society from Judaism,” i.e., the abolition of Judaism/civil society is the emancipation of mankind from the contradictory combinations of both. While Marx never associated Judaism with the Orient in either of these essays, his Judaism as bourgeois civil society has many of the Orient’s typical features: passive, a-historical, and reduced to an essence.

I should mention another response to this round of debates, the essay, “Die Juden und die freie Gemeinde” (1847), by a Doctor Kleinpaul of Hamburg, who was a member of the Protestant Free Church, a loose collection of congregations composed mainly of liberals and rationalists who eschewed any connection with the state church. Kleinpaul followed Bauer in arguing that Jewish efforts to receive political emancipation by the willing hand of the present system were futile—such an emancipation was against the very structure of the present state. Instead, Kleinpaul believed that Jews should join Christian liberals in attacking the present political system (1847:1). However, in order to do so, Kleinpaul argued that Jews would have to give up the positive elements of their religion: the Sabbath, dietary laws, and the messianic belief. These were obstacles to Jewish participation in the very liberal society that alone was capable of emancipating Jews—emancipating them from both the conservative Christian state and traditional Judaism. Jews would thus first have to liberate themselves and then help liberal Christians overturn the present system. Kleinpaul saw a number of obstacles to Jewish self-emancipation, among these was the immutable nature of Judaism. He attributed this characteristic to the fact that Jews were “an oriental people” (ein orientalisches Volk). He cites the well-known fact that the “Orient is the place of reli-

36 Not all political writers, or Biblical scholars, viewed the Jewish past in terms of decline. Some argued that Judaism, as Mosaism or otherwise, was characterized from the very beginning by an anti-social, fanatical, and particularistic spirit. The degenerative model was favored by Protestant liberals, who supported the integration and reform of coeval Jews. Those who opposed both tended to favor a model of an essential Mosaic corruption. See Ludwig Christian Paalzow, Die Juden: Nebst einigen Bermerkungen über das Sendschreiben an Herrn Teller zu Berlin (Berlin, 1799), Der Jude und der Christ—eine Unterhaltung auf dem Postwagen (Berlin, 1803); Friedrich Wilhelm Grattenauer, Über die physische und moralische Verfassung der heutigen Juden (Leipzig, 1791); Friedrich Bucholz, Moses und Jesus oder über dasy intellektuelle und moralische Verhältniss der Juden und Christen (Berlin, 1803).

37 Published in Kirchliche Reform, 1–7 (1847).
gious immutability” and notes that “Judaism (Judenthum) has kept the same form from the time of the exile until the present” (1847:3).38

Jews were granted full rights under Bismarck and the unification of the German states. The Jewish Question did not disappear but returned again under the guise of the racial question. We can now speak of anti-Semites proper here and an anti-Semitism that, as a self-proclaimed German “nativizing” movement, sought to remove all foreign, specifically Jewish, influences in Germany. For some this entailed an attack not only on Judaism but Christianity as well, though in general it meant the complete Germanization (de-Judaization) of Christianity. The Judaism of these writers, however, shows similar features with that of earlier contributors in that it continued to represent Judaism as a religion of contradictory combinations, though these are now largely racial.

The characteristic example here is Huston Chamberlain’s Die Grundlagen des 19en Jahrhunderts (1889).39 According to Chamberlain, the original Israelites were a heterogeneous combination of Aryan and Semitic peoples, a mixture that resulted in contradictory Aryan tendencies of freedom, spirituality, and vitality versus Semitic tendencies of domination, materialism, and degeneration. Jews developed their distinct character in contradiction to the Aryan elements of Israel. While the early tribe of Judah was composed largely of Semitic, Bedouin-like raiders, who lived a rapacious and predatory life against the Aryan elements, the real rupture between Aryan Israelites and Semitic Jews came with the Babylonian exile. Post-exilic “Judaism” was not the result of a normal national life but “an artificial product, produced by a priestly caste . . . with the help of alien rulers” (ET 1912, I:358–9, 448–66). It is at this point that the Jewish character began to form “by progressive development of certain mental qualities and systematic starving of others.” The positive Aryan traits were systematically culled out in favor of the Semitic traits, a process completed by the Babylonian Talmud (1889:476). Moreover, Jesus and the early Christians were Aryan Israelites who expressed the essential freedom and spirituality of the Aryan mind against the Judaism of their day, though this Aryan genius was lost through the later re-Judaization of Christianity.40

The Jewish Question persisted into the twentieth century until it found its final solution in the mass extermination of Europe’s Jewish population. Biblical

38 He adds that this is seen in Europe as well, among the Oriental-like Russians and Greeks (1847:38).
39 I am citing from the 1912 English translation, Foundations of the Nineteenth Century (London: John Lane).
40 Chamberlain represents Jesus and Christianity in vol. 2. Paradoxically, Nazi historiography was perhaps closer to the truth than that of liberal Protestants, insofar it is less likely that Protestants are the “true Israel” than it is that German was colonized and that German native traditions were destroyed, by Roman and Roman-Christian conquest. Jews of course did not colonize Germany, but since Christianization did mean in effect the substitution of native ancestors, sacred symbols, and divinities, for their Jewish equivalents, then we can certainly speak of this as an ancient “Judaization” of Germany. We forget that Christianity is no more native to Germany than it is to...
scholars under the Nazis continued to represent Judaism as a degenerate religion of contradictions and, like Chamberlain, presented these combinations in terms of racial characteristics.\(^{41}\) These developments do not constitute part of my analysis, however; and I will stop here. The above examples are sufficient, I believe, to show the parallel between the model of the Jewish past promoted by Biblical scholars and that of the Jewish past as represented by political writers on the Jewish Question. The similarity is transparent. In both cases coeval Judaism was represented as a degeneration of ancient Israel, characterized by contradictory combinations, Talmudic, and a-historical. I have already indicated that liberal scholars used the Jewish past as a metaphor upon which to build their universal history and identity. The anti-Semites did the same, as did Marx, albeit only on different grounds. Judaism, for all of these scholars, was good to think. Yet, the Judaism of contradictory combinations was more than just a metaphorical element in German identity-politics, foundational historiography, or social emancipation. It was also a function of a political program to dissolve Jewish corporate identity in Germany. At this level the metaphor of Jewish past becomes the meaning of Jewish present—and presence—in contemporary society.

C. Biblical Scholarship and the Jewish Question: Knowledge, Power, and Discourse

How, then, may we view the “Judaism of contradictory combinations” within the context of the expanding nation state? Jews, as I noted, constituted a semi-autonomous group, a fact reflected in their relatively independent culture and institutions. Jewish communities in Europe had been relatively autonomous for centuries and could have very well gone on being so in the absence of the nation-state and its ideology and its centralizing, foundation-

---

alizing, tendencies. Jewish autonomy was thus seen as an obstacle to Jewish integration into the nation-state and, indeed, as a threat to its very raison d’État. It is here, in this intersection between Jewish autonomy and German-Protestant internal colonization, that we can locate the meaning of the Judaism of contradictory combinations: a distinct and coherent Jewish identity (particularism), an autonomous religious-exegetical system (legalism and theocracy), self-representation through an “independent” history (a-historical), and an active native, rabbinical, leadership (tyranny) are in opposition to German Protestant national identity (universalism), Christian society (prophetism), world history (progress), and constitutional forms (freedom). Accordingly, the contradictory tendencies that scholars posited within Judaism were in fact the contradictions between Judaism and the nation-state; and the scholarly-political discourse served to legitimize the institutional practices that sought to bring about Jewish dissolution.

The notion of degeneration is similar. Like the notion of “savagism” in Ireland and North America, the “degeneration” of Jews was as a discourse of difference in which a minority population, in the context of an expansionist state, was articulated as the need of that population for regeneration or civilization. This in turn legitimized institutional practices to accomplish the state’s goals of social and economic change. Understandably, the leadership of the subordinate group becomes the focus of special attack in such a context. This happened in Ireland during British colonization, when the British claimed that the Irish chieftains were the main obstacles to the effective assimilation and subjugation of the general population and accused them of maintaining their rule over the people through tyranny. Similarly, the Spanish and then later American colonists in the land of the Hopis accused Hopi priests of using coercive power and priestly oppression to prevent their people from accepting the benefits of European civilization and religion.42 The same is the case in Germany, where the priestly-derived rabbinical leadership and the Talmud were situated as the real obstacles to Jewish progress and the real tyranny over Jewish life. In all these cases a discourse of difference built on notions of degeneration and savagism was used to displace or divert native leadership and effective resistance.

Furthermore, in separating Hebraism from Judaism, Biblical scholars were creating a “golden age” in the Jewish (Christian) past. Dohm had used this notion to describe pristine Mosaism—the Mosaism which Jews had to revive in order to improve themselves; and Wellhausen uses the term in reference to Ancient Israel (Hebraism/Mosaism). Yet, both Mosaism and moral improvement were seen as having their perfection in Christianity. Thus, the improvement of Jews ultimately meant their conversion to Christianity. This in fact

was the view of most political writers and is reflected in institutional prac-
tices that encouraged the conversion of individual Jews in order to achieve
regenerate occupational status and in the “reform” of Judaism that encour-
aged the replacement of “Oriental” practices with Protestant, that is ful-
filled pristine Mosaic, forms of religion. This situation has parallels else-
where. The creation of a Hindu golden age by British scholars in India and a
Buddhist golden age by British and American scholars in Sri Lanka also
served to encourage individuals or elites into adopting the colonizers world
view and to create collaborative institutions for effecting the regeneration of
themselves or their society. As Mukesh Srivastava states, the appropriation
of the power to represent present India as a decline from a “Golden Age” is
also the power to translate this not only to Europeans and Americans but to
“the Indians themselves” (1992:53). The same applies to Jewish intellectual
movements in Germany, including Zionism (see below), where representa-
tion of the colonizer became the self-representation of the colonized.

A key feature in each of the above functions is the schema of a progressive
history that Jewish past is set within. If I can refer to the discourse of Bib-
lical scholars on Jewish past as Judeography, then “the exilic period” served
the function of a Judeographic present from which all subsequent Jewish “his-
tory” is judged. The only movement from this point is through Jesus and

43 See Michael A. Meyer, Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Ju-

44 For India’s Golden Age in European scholarship, see David Kopf, British Orientalism and
the Bengal Renaissance: The Dynamics of Indian Modernization 1773–1835 (Berkeley: Universi-
ty of California Press, 1969); and Mukesh Srivastava, “Mosaic of Narrative Manipulations: Pow-
er and Production of Subjectivity in (post) colonial India,” Economic and Political Weekly (1992).

On Sri Lanka, see Richard Gombrich, “Protestant Buddhism,” in Theravada Buddhism, A Social

45 I want to point out that Protestant scholars were not completely inventing Jewish past and that
in some cases their own views accorded with native Jewish views. Thus, contemporary Jews also
saw their present as a decline from a past, though Jews did not separate an ancient Israel from a lat-
er “Judaism.” Decline was associated with galut—dispersion—and not with “Rabbinic Judaism.”
There were also nineteenth-century German Jewish critiques of traditional Jewish rabbinic leader-
ship, though these critiques are to be distinguished from their Protestant counterparts because in
many cases they were reproductions of the Protestant representation and based on the attempt of
Jewish Wissenschaft scholars and rabbis to wrest Jewish leadership from the traditional rabbinic
leadership. See Meyer, Response to Modernity; and Schorsch, Jewish Reactions. This confluence
between native and colonizer’s representation is not specific to Germany. Irwin notes how Orient-
talists adopted notions of Islamic decline from Ibn Kaldhun, Back and Forth, 111; and Sheldon Pol-
lack notes that the “Brahmanizing tendency” of British scholars may have “recapitulated a pre-
colonial Brahmanizing tendency on the part of the medieval ruling elites.” “Deep Orientalism?
Notes on Sanskrit and Power Beyond the Raj,” in Orientalism and the Postcolonial Predicament,
Carol A. Breckenridge and Peter van der Veer, eds. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press,
1993), 76–133.

46 This is my own term, which I coin as a parallel to “Ethnography.” Stephen G. Burnett has
used terms such as “ethnography” and “ethnographer” in his essay, “Distorted Mirrors: Antionius
of the Jews: 1492 and After” (University of California at Davis, April 2, 1992).
Christianity—and in Germany only through Protestantism and the nation-state. This is what Fabian refers to as “chrono-politics,” by which he means “schemes of a one-way history: progress, development, modernity” and their “negative mirror images: stagnation, underdevelopment, tradition.” Fabian was not referring to German Jews, but his meaning is applicable. Biblical scholarship, like Anthropology, emerged and established itself as an “allochronic discourse.” It is a discourse with the Jewish referent “removed from the present of the speaking writing subject.”47 The contributors to the political debates on the Jewish question also presumed an allochronic, fulfilled, Judaism. For Biblical scholars, it was the pristine Christianity of the (ever-present) past; while for political writers it was the fulfilled Protestantism, secularism, and socialism of the present. In both cases the references to the “limitations” or “limiting” (Beschränktheit, schranken, beschrankten) of Judaism indicated its restricted, or restricting, nature, while the overcoming of these limitations (Harnack’s Entschränkung) was the fulfillment of Judaism and “world history.” Chrono-politics served as the “ideological foundations” of geopolitics here as well.48 The creation of authoritative Time went together with the creation of authoritative Space, in this case the Space of the new nation-state; and the ideological subordination of Jews in Time served the institutional subordination of Jews in Space.

Such a reading is supported by two factors. First, Biblical scholars such as Michaelis, de Wette, and Wellhausen were not only aware of the Jewish Question but often took part in the debates or made references to it in their scholarly works. Michaelis was a respondent to Dohm’s essay and opposed Jewish emancipation on the grounds that as long as Jews persisted in Talmudic Judaism, a religion out of its proper time and place, they should not be given emancipation. Michaelis applauded Dohm for admitting what others had not been willing to admit: that Jews were indeed the most degenerate people in Europe. However, Michaelis felt that Dohm was far too optimistic concerning the Jewish potential for improvement and that the emancipation of degenerate Jews would only bring harm to Christian society.49 He had expressed similar views in his Mosaisches Recht, in which he mixes scholarly interpretations with political discourse in his comments on the Sabbath. Post-exilic Jews misinterpreted the Sabbath laws by prohibiting war on the Sabbath (II:129–30). As a result, contemporary Jews “still feel the unfortunate consequences of their misunderstanding . . . a people that cannot bear arms . . . can never be on equal footing with other citizens . . . the law of Moses, however, is quite blameless . . . for it never prohibited them from fighting on the Sabbath” (II:138).

---

47 *Time and Other*, 143–4.

48 Ibid.

49 Michaelis’ response was published in the second of Dohm’s *Über die burglerische Verbesserung*. I am citing from the text as it appeared originally in the *Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek*, 19 (1782), 1–40.
De Wette expressed his views on the Jewish Question in his 1822 semi-autobiographical novel, *Theodor oder des Zweiflers Weihe*, in which he stated that he “would tolerate the Jews, but not allow them any civil rights, because their religion is not merely a religion, but also a national union, and consequently dangerous to the state. . . . Let the government tolerate them, but restrain their growth . . . without oppressing them. Let it encourage them to educate their children in Christian customs, and favor every movement among them toward freeing themselves from the service of the letter, and the rabbinical hierarchy” (II, 348).50 Ewald made a number of references to coeval Jews in his *Geschichte*, calling them a people of the past who lack the forces of learning and art, the pre-requisites of “true independence.” As a result Jews were motivated by the “mere lower instinct of self-preservation” (*selbterhaltung*) and will resort to “unworthy means” in order to survive (ET VII:443). He argues that the best that coeval Jews can do is to “oscillate . . . between a lofty past, which they claim as their own but which they do not even rightly understand and value,” and Christianity “with its ever-growing treasures of knowledge and piety” (VII:443–4). Finally, Wellhausen referred to contemporary events in his *Encyclopedia Britannica* article, in which he commented on the significance of Jewish customs such as circumcision for preserving Jewish identity. However, he noted that “the so-called emancipation of the Jews must inevitably lead to the extinction of Judaism wherever the process is extended beyond the political to the social sphere” (1881:548).

Second, Jews in Germany were quite aware of the relationship between knowledge and power at work in Germany. Leopold Zunz, a preacher and scholar, sounded what is now a familiar counter-hegemonic note by charging that Christian scholars and theologians “dictate to the state the law against Jews—and under the authority of such hate and contempt . . . institutions for the vulgar pursuit of Jews flourish.” Thus, the “equality of Jews in theory and in practice” would come about only if Jews developed their own Wissenschaft to counter majority historiography (*Geschichte und Literatur*, 1845:21). Zunz repeatedly petitioned the Prussian government for permission to establish a chair in Jewish studies at a German university, noting that the negative representation of Judaism in the university, the place where “officials and legislators” were educated, leaves “their traces in edicts and laws.” Zunz cited the various policy debates he attended, noting the ignorance of the participants on the reality of Judaism. He states that although laws had been changed regarding the emancipation of Jews, Jewish scholarship was still kept in the ghetto; and he argued that “social and scientific interests” would be furthered if the study of Jewish history was taken from the domain of theology and placed within the disciplines of history and philosophy.51 His petition was refused. The Prussian

50 I am citing from the English translation by F. Clarke, *Theodore or the Skeptic’s Conversion* (Boston: Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature, 1841).

minister, von Ladenburg, claimed that since the emancipation laws were in place to alter the Jewish status as a "state-within-a-state," the establishment of a Jewish chair would be counterproductive to this goal and reinforce "the particularistic character of Judaism." This, moreover, would constitute a "preferential treatment of the Jews and an abuse of the university," since it would make scholarly interests subordinate to political concerns.\(^5^2\) This was clearly a veiled threat: If Zunz persisted in wanting a separate chair for the study of Jewish history, he risked the charge of wanting a separate Jewish "state" and was thus in violation of the "agreement" that Jews would exchange corporate identity for emancipation. In other words, and Ladenberg all but says this in his own words, the universal _Entschränkung_ Jews necessitated the academic _Beschränktheit_ of a particular Jewish history. Law and political discourse recapitulate one another, and German Jews must abide by the official history as well as by the official laws.

Heinrich Graetz, Zunz’s younger contemporary, was even more explicit in his attack on majority scholarship. His essay called “Die Construction der judischen Geschichtcie,”\(^5^3\) presented a direct challenge to majority Judeography by reading the Jewish past through Hegelian categories.\(^5^4\) Graetz represented Judaism as the original "protest" (Protestantismus) against the immanence and immorality of nature, neither oriental nor occidental, and constantly developing in history. Coeval Judaism was the embodiment of Jewish past in that it possessed national, religious, and philosophical aspects reflecting each of the major periods of its history. However, these different periods were not ruptures, and Graetz rejected any distinction between a pre- and post-exilc religion (1845:20). Moreover, the "Talmud limitations (talmudischen Beschränkungen)" were not additions to the "letter" (Buchstaben) but fully within the essential spirit of a unified and progressive Judaism. The Talmud saved Judaism from complete dissolution (1845:55–58). Graetz also directly attacked majority Christian historiography. He noted that the “Christian conception of history” denied Judaism any independent status after the loss of “national independence.” Judaism was given a few lines or a footnote which only highlight its place in the margins of majority history. More significantly, Graetz did not shirk from noting that most scholars

---

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 317.

\(^{53}\) _Zeitschrift für die religiosen Interessen des Judentums_, 3 (1845) 81–97, 121–32, 361–8, 413–21.

\(^{54}\) This inversion of Hegelian categories was a common tactic of German Jewish scholarly resistance to contemporary historiography and judeography, and it was employed by Reform scholars as well. Another example is Solomon Formstecher’s _Die Religion des Geistes_ (1841). The work was written explicitly to counter the negative representation of Jews in German Universities and presents Judaism as the essence of the world Spirit or Idea. Christianity is only one manifestation of this Jewish Idea, arising as a necessary but temporary stage in the unfolding of a universal Judaism. Once its historical task is complete. Christianity will disappear—but Judaism, the essential idea, will remain (1841:74ff, 393ff). Formstecher also rejects the use of different terms to describe different periods of Jewish history: "I do not utilize the designations Hebraism (Hebraismus), Israelitism (Israelitenthum) . . . for the representation of Judaism (Judenthum) . . . both terms . . . as contrasts, are found to be a product of capriciousness . . . Hebraism and Judaism remain just names, which are found hanging on preconceived non-historical definitions." (1841:vii–viii).
subordinated the Jewish past to that of the Christian in order to silence a voice that necessarily challenged its hegemonic constructions:

The stylus of the world historian races cursorily over the martyrdom of Jewish history, as if he feared to arouse through these bloody recollections the conscience lulled to sleep by sophistry, as if he feared to conjure the spirits of vengeance through a loud word . . . this habit of lowering Judaism into the grave, of issuing Jewish history a death certificate is also quite convenient; one thereby avoids the difficulty which would loom before any strictly Christian construction of world history. Thus, all the more urgent is the demand on us to vindicate the right of Jewish history, to present its tenacious and indestructible character (1848:49, my emphasis).\(^{55}\)

Graetz, like Zunz, characterized the German Jewish Reform movement as a form of Jewish corporate suicide. Both felt that Jewish Reformers were playing into the hands of majority ideology not only by reducing Jewish identity into an essential Idea without any of the necessary concrete forms but also by their extreme criticisms of the Talmud. Graetz, in a letter to Raphael Kirchheim, said that the great question of the day was “will Judaism survive or disappear? For I regard it as disappearing if it is christianized (verchristlicht), or as Heine says, if it spins נשים from the wool of the Lamb of God. I will fight against the christianization of Judaism (Verchristianisierung des Judenthums), which is entailed in the reform of Judaism, to my last breath and with all the weapons at my command.”\(^{56}\) Zunz, Graetz, and other German Jews promoted what we would today call a multi-ethnic notion of the nation-state,

\(^{55}\) I am citing from Schorch’s translation here: Heinrich Graetz, The Structure of Jewish History (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America (1975), 93–94. Graetz was even more assertive, if not offensive, in the Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart (English trans., History of the Jews; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891–98). Here, Graetz was openly critical of Protestant Biblical scholars. Michaelis hated Jews because he was once insulted by a Jewish-French officer, an anti-Jewish animosity that affected his scholarship (ET, V:360). Similarly, scholars such as Eichhorn, Gesenius, Von Bohlen, and de Wette were “filled with antipathy to the Jews, and were thereby hindered from arriving at a correct understanding of the Old Testament” (V:695). He also castigated the “Teutomania” of German nationalist leaders and political writers such as Fries. He held Islam and Muslim Spain as enlightened counterparts to a barbaric Christian Europe, praised the Jewish capacity to survive an intolerant and oppressive Christianity, and claimed that the achievements of German culture were impossible without the influence of German Jews, past and present. It is no surprise that he came under sharp attack from majority historians such as Heinrich Treitschke, who saw Graetz’s work reflecting a growing and “dangerous spirit of arrogance” among Jews: “What a fanatical fury against . . . Christianity, what deadly hatred just of the purest and most powerful representatives of the German character, from Luther to Goethe and Fichte. And what hollow, offensive self-glorification? Here it is proved with continuous satirical invective that the nation of Kant was really educated to humanity by the Jews only, that the language of Lessing and Goethe became sensitive to beauty, spirit, and wit only through Börne and Heine!” (in Walter Boehlich, Der Berliner Antisemitenstreit [Frankfurt, 1988], 10–11). Graetz responded, and a public debate ensued. However, “not a single important Jewish spokesman defended the Jewish historian. . . The consensus was unmistakable: Graetz had tactlessly blundered” in his condemnation of German heroes and culture (Schorsch, Jewish Reactions, 70). Even Graetz’s initial responses focused on particulars and avoided the larger issues.

where Jews would persist in the German state as a distinct, corporate sub-
group. Judaism, in their view, could and should persist through specific con-
crete forms (circumcision, specific customs, etc.) that preserved a separate Jew-
ish identity.

It was a short step from this view to that of a Jewish national identity advo-
cated by Moses Hess in his *Rome und Jerusalem* of 1862. Hess transformed
Marx’s Judaism as metaphor for bourgeois society into that of Judaism as the
metaphor for nationalist revival. The revival of Jewish national identity, ac-
cording to Hess, was the rejuvenation of nationalist identity throughout the
world (EG 1958:19). The separation of Christianity from Judaism was the sep-
aration of Christianity from “national life,” so Christianity is undergoing dis-
solution in the post-enlightenment world. Christianity suffers from “the irrec-
 oncilable conflict between particularism and universalism, materialism and
spirituality, until every nation acquires its own historical religion. every people
must, like the Jewish people, become a people of God.” Judaism did not suffer
from such contradictions as long as Jews recognize their religion as a “nation-
al cult.” Jewish Reform, however, was attempting to “establish disbelief in the
national foundation of our religion,” and this would lead to a disintegration of
Judaism in contradictions (1958:50). Hess saw three conditions for the revital-
ization of Judaism: a common native soil, legal sovereignty, and the founding
of Jewish organizations for agriculture, industry and commerce “in accordance
with Mosaic, i.e. socialistic principles.” These are the basis “on which Judaism
in the Orient will rise again . . . through which the whole of Judaism will be re-

Hess’s view remained a minority one in Germany even after the rise of an
organized Jewish nationalist movement elsewhere in Europe. German Jews
were wary of any organized Jewish response, especially one that emphasized
a separate and particular Jewish identity, since they felt that this would play
into the hands of those who accused Jews of constituting a state within the
state. The earliest German Jewish organization, the *Deutsch-Israelitscher
Gemeindebund* (formed in 1869), was a voluntary association of several Ger-
man-Jewish communities. The task of the Gemeindebund was to represent the
various Jewish communities under its jurisdiction to the state authorities in mat-
ters of social welfare and administration. The Gemeindebund initially avoided
any reference or activity related to anti-Jewish agitation. However, with the rise
of anti-Jewish and anti-Semitic political parties in the 1870s and 1880s, the as-
sociation felt compelled to respond by issuing pamphlets in defense of Jews and
Judaism and to make appeals to the government. Then in 1885 three members
of the Gemeindebund’s board met with three Christian and three Jewish me-
dieval historians to constitute the Historical Commission of the Gemeindebund.

---

The purpose of the commission was to assemble and order all of the sources for writing a reliable history of Jews in Germany. In 1889, at the Gemeindbund’s fifth national convention, Harry Bresslau, explicitly declared that the intention of the commission was as Schorsch notes, to “end the domination of Jewish historiography by theologians and orientalists.”

These efforts, individual and corporate, which came to naught when dissolution in radical form caught up with Jews in Germany, do indicate a Jewish awareness of the links between scholarship and knowledge. Similarly, the remarks of Michaelis, de Wette, Ewald, and Wellhausen also support the confluence between scholarship, political discourse, and institutional practices associated with the Jewish Question. The Judaism of contradictory combinations served the needs of the nation-state’s integration and colonization of its Jewish population in that it transformed an active Jewish presence into a static Judaism of the past, translated conflicts between a Jewish corporate identity and the nation-state as contradictions within Judaism, and utilized a contrived separation of an ancient Israel from a post-exilic Judaism to de-legitimize coeval Jewish institutions and identity. Biblical scholarship reflected and recapitulated these views, producing a scholarly discourse on Jewish past that was both a foundational historiography and authoritative Judeography, serving present needs through exegesis of the past. Moreover, both the representations of political writers and critical scholars intersect with a broader Orientalist discourse in that they treat Jews explicitly as “Orientals” and in that they represent Judaism with typical Orientalist characteristics, portraying it as degenerate, tyrannical, fanatical, anti-Western, and allochronic.

58 Schorsch, Jewish Reactions, 44–46.

59 Moreover, the Jewish effort to combat this authoritative historiography constitutes a significant early challenge to the Western intellectual hegemony and anticipates later twentieth-century critiques of dominant discourses, ethnographic authority, etc. John M. Efron, Defenders of the Race: Jewish Doctors and Race Science in Fin-de-Siècle Europe (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), has already spoken of the need to revise the now-traditional model that the dominant anthropological discourse was only disrupted after the Second World War. He argues that critics have been lead astray through understanding Anthropology’s enterprise as “merely one in which white Europeans have gone into the field to observe other, distinctly different races.” What modern critics have overlooked “is that in the nineteenth century, anthropology classified the Jews as a race” and that the existence of (largely German) Jewish counter race texts “calls into question the notion that postwar European de-colonization was the first challenge to the majority discourse of European anthropology” (1994:2–3). The scratching pens of Zunz, Graetz and other German Jews should be added to the list of counter-hegemonic, and counter-Orientalist genologies. At the same time, whether the Jewish (and Christian) efforts at establishing a counter-Jewish discourse would have prevented subsequent events is impossible to say. The crisis in Germany was not one of representation alone nor one between Christians and Jews. While liberal Protestant scholars, Marx, and the Aryanizers, portrayed developments in modern Germany as metaphorically linked to developments in Jewish past, the economic and political problems of nineteenth-century Germany were not rooted in the Jewish Question. All Germans, Jews and Christian, were caught in a web of significant economic and political developments and in the end were unable to direct these developments to serve the general interest. That is not a specifically German problem nor one of the nineteenth century alone.
II. ISLAM’S STRANGE SECRET SHARER

The above analysis bears out Said’s claim that there is a connection between the production of knowledge, political power, and Orientalism in Western scholarship. It also bears out Turner’s claim that Judaism and the Jewish Question can be read as part of an Orientalist accounting scheme that situates Judaism as a religion of contradictory combinations. I believe that I have shown that this was the case in Germany, where the representation of Judaism as a religion of contradictory combinations shows a strong agreement with both the political debates and institutional practices associated with the Jewish Question and what Said and others have referred to as Orientalism. Jews were Germany’s internal “oriental” colony, and the ideology of the nation-state necessitated the dissolution of Jewish corporate institutions and identity. The post-exilic, contradictory Judaism of Biblical scholars served that goal in so far as it projected Jews into an allochronic Time, a Judeographic present, from which all forward chronological movement could take place only through the fulfillment of Judaism by Christianity. This in turn paralleled the political discourse and the institutions of the state which associated the resolution of Jewish contradictions with the dissolution of Judaism by the nation-state. In both cases the progression of Judaism meant christianization and “transubstantiation.” German Biblical scholarship can thus be situated as the German “missing link,” and Judaism as Islam’s strange secret sharer, in the Orientalism of the West. This conclusion raises further possibilities for understanding Orientalism, the post-colonial representation and response, and the study of Judaism; and I can think of a number of other directions that future studies can take.

First, there remains the question of the relationship between Biblical scholarship and the study of Islam. Biblical scholars were Orientalists in the broad sense of that term, with many engaging in the study of other Oriental peoples and literature. Ewald, for example, carried out important studies on Sanskrit and Arabic literature, while Wellhausen left Biblical scholarship to take up the study of Islam. He noted that he “made the transition from the Old Testament to the Arabs with the intention of getting to know the wild vine upon which priests and prophets grafted the Torah of Yahweh. For I have no doubt that some idea of the original characteristics with which the Hebrews entered history, may most easily be won by means of a comparison with Arabic antiquity.” Future investigations might examine not only the contribution of

60 Cited in Kurt Randolph, “Wellhausen as an Arabist,” Julius Wellhausen and His Prolegomena to the History of Israel (Semeia, 25 [1983], 111–55). On Ewald, see T. Witton Davies, Heinrich Ewald: Orientalist and Theologian (1803–1903; London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1903). I have not mentioned Max Weber in this analysis, in part because I was treating nineteenth-century German scholarship. Weber appears to take the metaphorical approach to Judaism, transposing its (putative) contradictory tendencies into socio-economic relations of pariah versus inclusive identity, superstitious versus anti-magical practices, etc., and transferring them into a universal economic history in which the resolution and fulfillment of Israelite contradictions is modern Protestant-Capitalistic society.
German Biblical scholars on the study of Islam but also the intersection of their representation of Judaism with their representation of Islam and Arabs. Second, we might want to explore the representation of Judaism in the work of non-German European Christian scholars in France, England, and elsewhere. Renan, Robertson-Smith, and Keunen, among others, all saw significant parallels between Jews and Muslims as a single “Semitic” people. An investigation into these correlations would significantly add to the understanding of what Turner calls “Orientalism’s two related discourses for Semites.”

Third, there is also the relationship between Christian and Orientalist representations of Jews. Despite myths of Christian “innocence” and “Jewish power,” Christians have long stood in a relationship with Jews that is characterized by political power and cultural hegemony; and Christians have long maintained the authority to represent Jews and Judaism. Moreover, Christians have done so in terms that resemble what is now called Orientalist representation: allochronic, tyrannical, mythical, and so forth. Future investigations might therefore map out these lines of knowledge, power, and representation and perhaps match them with earlier Christian representations of Muslims. A related in-

There is much more to Weber’s views on Judaism than this, of course, but this strikes me as a significant feature of his work in relationship to my own analysis. See also Tony Fahey, “Max Weber’s Ancient Judaism,” American Journal of Sociology, 88:1 (1982), 62–87; and Jay A. Holstein, “Max Weber and Biblical Scholarship,” Hebrew Union College Annual, 46 (1975), 159–79.

Keith W. Whitelam’s Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History (London: Routledge, 1996) takes yet another approach and explores the relationship between Orientalism, Biblical scholarship, and Zionism. Whitelam claims to analyze Biblical scholarship as an Orientalist discourse that was closely linked to British colonialism and Zionism. While some of his specific points are insightful, the work as a whole lacks “discursive depth.” Thus, Whitelam all but ignores nineteenth-century Biblical scholarship, and as a result fails to see that Judaism is as much an invention of Biblical scholarship as ancient Israel. Reading the Invention of Ancient Israel we have no sense of Biblical scholarship’s discursive functions in nineteenth-century Germany or its links with institutional practices designed to dissolve a Jewish identity. The invention of an ancient Israel or Hebraism served this colonial ideology of dissolution, a fact that is completely absent in Whitelam’s work. Indeed, in some places Whitelam makes it appear as if Biblical scholars were dupes of the Zionist movement in inventing an ancient Israel that served Jewish nationalist interests—rather than seeing that Zionists adopted the model of Jewish past promoted by German Biblical scholars. See especially pages 74–78, and Neils Peter Lemche’s similar comments: “Clio is Also Among the Muses! Keith W. Whitelam and the History of Palestine: A Review and a Commentary,” Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament (1996), 108. Whitelam’s work lacks discursive depth in another respect as well. He claims that Christian Biblical scholars and Jewish Zionists displaced and silenced Palestinian history through giving ancient Israel (but not Judaism, I would add) a central place in that history. By Palestinian history Whitelam generally means the history of the non-Israelite peoples in ancient Palestine, whose history was “silenced” by the Christian and Zionist emphasis on Israel. Whitelam leaves out the earlier impact of Roman Christianity and Islam here. Long before Biblical scholars and Zionists came on the scene, Christians and Muslims had privileged Israelis as the people of the original revelation and had placed Israel’s history and divinity at the center of their own imperialist ideologies, silencing not only the history of the other people in Palestine, but local histories in Africa and Asia as well.

vestigation here would be a study of the relationship between early Christian notions of religious succession and nineteenth-century notions of cultural evolution. Robertson-Smith’s ideas of evolution are inseparable from those of Wellhausen, and both are linked to Christian theological triumphalism. We cannot continue to separate Christianity and missionization from colonialism, conquest, and domination by asserting a myth of original (essential) Christian innocence in which Jesus represents the religion of freedom and liberation and Judaism, the religion of constraint and tyranny. Burton Mack’s deconstruction of this myth as a mask for Christian power is enormously significant for discussions on authority and representation, Orientalist or otherwise; yet his work is thus far known only to a few beyond the discipline of religious studies. Clearly, however, there are strong confluences between this Christian theology of succession to Jewish identity, the situating of subordinated Jews as points of danger, and later European Christian ideologies of progress, world history and imperialism.

A fourth approach would be to examine the representation of Jews and Judaism by Christians and Muslims. Both Christians and Muslims have articulated foundational histories based on a succession to Jewish status as the primary people of a universal divinity; and both have applied this secessionist ideology to the conquest of other people. This process is ongoing in Africa and South America today as Muslims and Christian missionaries continue to promote an Israeliite past in their attempts to convert natives—processes that remain linked to economic exploitation and an East–West conflict. In this context, Islam’s “strange secret sharer” is Christianity, since both share a representation of Jews as a subordinate people, both assume the authority to define Jewish past and presence, and both transfer this triumphalist ideology to other peoples. This approach would be helpful in that it would treat ideologies of subordination and representation that have an extended history (with nu-

---

64 A Myth of Innocence.
65 I have argued that this Christian myth of innocence has also been used to transform Judaism into a metaphor for native cultures around the world, who are then positioned as oppressive traditions in need of liberation and civilization. Jews and Jewish past, as I already noted, have been “good to think,” and this metaphorical extension of Jewish identity and history perhaps constitutes another line of investigation. These arguments were presented in a paper called, “The Real Hidden Victim: Jesus as Perpetrator in Rene Girard’s Theory of Violence,” at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Religion/Society of Biblical Literature in Chicago, IL., “Ideological Criticism Group/Reading, Rhetoric, and Hebrew Bible Joint Sessions” (1994). Some have claimed that these triumphalist notions stem from the Jewish Bible and the myth of conquest, such as Richard Rowling, Israel’s Original Sin: A Catholic Confession (San Francisco: Catholic Scholars Press, 1994). However, even if the Old Testament reflects such a view, which is debatable—see Jon Levenson’s “Is There a Counterpart in the Hebrew Bible to New Testament anti-Semitism,” Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 22:2 (1985), 242–260—ascribing its application by Christians and Muslims to a Jewish origin is a mythical displacement of power and responsibility onto an authoritative center, comparable to blaming Native Americans for the American tobacco industry because the former introduced the leaf to Europeans.
merous ruptures and transformations no doubt) and that move across divisions of East and West. It would also be helpful because it would provide a unified critique of two religious-imperial systems that have a history of interaction and conflict, an important relationship in the development of capitalism, and in which Jews and Judaism have played a variety of roles.66

This last approach, moreover, would be in line with Foucault’s suggestion that power has multiple points of articulation. In this case the articulation of a Jewish status as significant for the foundational ideologies of Christians and Muslims does not stem from an authoritative Jewish center but is articulated and re-articulated by Christians and Muslims when they promote their own present as a fulfillment of an original revelation to Jews and when this foundational identity is used for conquest and subordination. Furthermore, (still following Foucault) it would also highlight the real resistance to hegemonic representation that the persistence of Jewish self-representation—and identity—reveals: It is the assertion of a “subjugated knowledge” against authoritative Christian and Muslim representations.

On the other hand, I suggest that there are a number of factors at work against the pursuit of these alternative lines of investigation. First, the triumph of liberal Protestant Biblical scholarship was also the triumph of rationalism, liberalism, and the freeing of the past—however temporary—from conservative political and religious forces in nineteenth-century Germany. Liberal Protestants favored a democratic, unified German state in which every particular identity would be subsumed under a universal German-Protestant identity and the state itself transformed into a “moral being” whose external laws would be written on the hearts of its citizens.67 Their struggle was not unopposed, and indeed rationalist scholarship came under attack during the conservative reaction that followed the War of Liberation. De Wette was forced from his chair in Berlin for supporting a radical student movement, while Gesenius and other Halle rationalists fought a constant battle against the Hengstenberg faction’s bid to remove them from their positions. Hengstenberg made sure that Vatke never received a permanent professorship and forced Bauer to leave Berlin for Bonn, where he was then dismissed in 1841 for taking part in an anti-government rally.68 Since rationalist Biblical scholarship continues to support contemporary representations of Jews and Judaism by Muslims, see the late Isma’il al Faruqi’s work, *Islam and the Problem of Israel* (Islamic Council of Europe 1980); and Fazlur Rahman’s “Islam’s Attitude Toward Judaism,” *The Muslim World*, 72 (1982), 1–13.


Sie werden Philister ganz wie wir,
Und treiben es endlich noch ärger;
liberal democracy against religious and political conservatism and since the separation of Israel from Judaism continues to serve as the foundational identity for Euro-American Christians, the representations of German Biblical Scholarship are still seen as having a positive hegemonic function, that is, they are still considered “objective scholarship.” This places practical limits on the extent to which contemporary scholars want to deconstruct Biblical scholarship, since too radical a critique would expose that scholarship to the charge that it is an ideological construction.

Second, the contradictory forces at work in Germany and elsewhere in Europe were resolved, to some degree, only after two massive wars, millions of deaths, and the nearextermination of European Jews. The extensive Jewish Orientalist colonies no longer exist in Europe: Nazi de-Judaization was a European de-Orientalization. However, American Jews have come to rely upon a similar de-Orientalization to insure, rather than undermine, Jewish identity and survival. Judaism (and not just ancient Israel) is now regarded as one of the pillars of Western civilization. This de-Orientalizaion of Judaism is based upon the promotion of a “Judeo-Christian” tradition, the use of rationalist-critical scholarship now applied to Judaism in a more affirming way and upon a repudiation of Graetz’s anti-Christian stance. This is not to deny that Judaism remains subordinated in the western, Judeo-Christian discourse69 nor that there remains considerable Jewish discontent with majority historiography, but I suggest that Jews have learned the lesson well that survival lies with, and not against, Euro-Christianity. Certainly the survival of the state of Israel relies upon the support of European Christians and, therefore, upon the maintenance of a Western, anti-oriental, civilizing ideology. The use of anti-Semitism as a legitimating discourse serves an important function here. On the one hand it is an effective counter-discourse to the Christian “myth of innocence,” even as it

69 In many cases when a writer uses the term “Judeo-Christian,” they often use it in a way that subverts a Jewish voice. An example is Anne McClintock’s, “The Return of Female Fetishism and the Fiction of the Phallus,” New Formations, 19:1, 1–22, an analysis on the rise of pornography among women with attention to the work of Lacan. At one point, McClintock states that Lacan’s narrative on the family “offers a tragic, philosophical replica of the Judeo-Christian narrative.” This sentence is immediately succeeded by the following: “In the male birthing ritual of baptism, a priestly midwife initiates the soul into citizenship of the church” (1993:15). There is certainly nothing Judeao in “the male birthing ritual of baptism” nor the initiation of the soul into the church by “a priestly midwife,” yet McClintock describes this as an element in a “Judeo-Christian narrative.” On the same page McClintock states that “the Judeo-Christian notion of the world as linguistic allegory” is found in the biblical verse: “In the beginning was the word, and the word was made flesh.” She quotes here from the Gospel of John, which can hardly be considered as a text that represents a Jewish notion of the world. Unwittingly, I suspect, McClintock submerges and subordinates Jewish tradition into a Christian, privileging Christianity as the representative voice for the “Judeo-Christian narrative.” For similar examples see Edward Said, Beginnings: Intention and Method (New York: Basic Books, 1975), 178–9; and Johannes Fabian, Time and Other (1983), 1–3.
serves on the other as a foundational identity for Jews in the West. This being the case, there is little to be gained in too close an examination of the Orientalist and hegemonic aspects of German Biblical scholarship by Jews in the United States or Israel. Such an examination might undermine the links that have been forged to insure Jewish survival. As a result, Jewish self-representation remains intimately linked with the promotion of a “Judaeo-Christian” tradition against the non-West and against a Jewish-Muslim common discourse.

Third, I believe that Said’s reference to Orientalism or Islamophobia as the “strange secret sharer” of Western anti-Semitism was largely a rhetorical flourish serving the strategic intent of this work to counter Zionist representation and authority. Said is attempting to resist Zionism and this clearly informs much of Orientalism, in which he reverses and recapitulates the Zionist model of anti-Semitism. Where Zionists present anti-Semitism as a trans-historical hatred of Jews that begins in antiquity and culminates in the Holocaust, Said offers Orientalism as a counter trans-historical hatred of Muslims and Arabs that likewise begins in antiquity and culminates in Palestinian expulsion. This strategic function serves both to legitimate Palestinian nationalism and as a pan-Arab discourse against the “Zionist West.” Moreover, Orientalism has become the “foundational history” of many others as well and has been effective to the point that Jews now must compete with (other) Orientals for the position of the West’s Other. Thus, where “anti-Semitism” represents a de-orientalizing discourse because it roots Jews in the West, Orientalism is a “judaizing” discourse because it roots Muslims and Arabs in Jewish meta-history of oppression by the West.73 Moreover, Said and other critics of Zionism have applied rationalist Biblical scholarship against the Zionist reading of history, apparently having no problems with this particular discipline of Western scholarship.

70 This Judeo-Christian invention of Judaism as a religion of the West seems much more problematic than the Zionist invention of a Jewish nation in the East. Jewish links to an ancient homeland in Palestine are pre-Zionist and present in Jewish prayers, pilgrimages, rituals, and history as well as in Christian and Muslim representations of Jews as a people in exile. On the other hand, the Jewish links to the West are of a more recent and of more problematical nature.


72 The trope West, in this case, also masks the role of Christianity both in Europe and in modern colonization. This serves to minimize the distance between Jews and Europe, as well as maximizing that between Arab Christian intellectuals such as Said and European Christians—both of whom otherwise have to acknowledge a common history of subordination over Jews.

73 See his essay, “Michael Walzer’s Exodus and Revolution: A Canaanite Reading,” in Blaming the Victims: Spurious Scholarship and the Palestinian Question, Edward Said and Christopher Hitchens, eds. (London: Verso Books, 1988). See also Isma’il al Faruqi, Islam and the Problem of Israel, where he supports his own model of Judaism as a religion of contradictory combinations through an “objective historian’s examination of the Torah” and an “unbiased reading” of the text, which shows that, first, it is composed of “many strata deriving from periods separate by hundreds of years; that its compilation must have been the work of centuries, thus repudiating once and for all the Jewish claim that the text of the Torah is verbatim revelation, as well as the Rabbinical claim,
These factors work against a serious treatment of Judaism and Islam as elements of a common discourse by Said.\textsuperscript{74}

In other words, my suggestions for alternative lines of research would serve neither the interests of Israeli, Palestinian or other nationalisms nor the critiques of culture and imperialism articulated today. This, however, would be their chief merit, since they would avoid collaboration with current identity and representational politics and transgress boundaries of East and West, Orientalism and counter-Orientalism, power and knowledge. In line with such a transgression, it is possible to read anti-Semitism and Orientalism as two post-colonial discourses that emerged as a response to European Christian colonialism and that reflect the foundational identities and new found power of post-colonial Jewish and Arab elites. Similarly, Zionist historiography is alternatively seen as no different than other post-colonialist nationalist historiography, since it transforms colonialist images of native past into a foundation history: In this case, an ideology in which the regeneration of Judaism into Israel is linked to the re-establishment of Jews on their native land.\textsuperscript{75} These alternative readings are perhaps a more accurate reflection of lines of colonial and post-colonial power, knowledge and discourse; though, as I noted they would not serve the interests of current identity politics. Nevertheless, I suggest we pursue them. The understanding of Judaism and the Jewish Question as “Islam’s strange secret sharer’s” of Orientalism in the West opens up new possibilities for violating “disciplinary borders and transgressing authoritative historical frontiers.”\textsuperscript{76}

---

\textsuperscript{74} This may perhaps partly explain Said’s neglect of Germany, since he thereby avoids dealing with the German representation of Jews as “Orientals,” a transgression of the boundaries he is attempting to construct in his Orientalism.


\textsuperscript{76} Gyan Prakash, “Orientalism Now,” \textit{History and Theory}, 34:3 (1995), 201. It may also open up new possibilities for understanding the common interests that unite the economic elites of the West and the East through a global capitalism that is far more “transgressive of boarders and authoritative frontiers” than any analysis of representation.
And this accords well with the task of the culture critic which, as Said notes, is “not to accept the politics of identity as given, but to show how all representations are constructed, for what purpose, by whom, and with what components.”