

Published as Herman Paul (2019), *Ranke vs Schlosser: Pairs of Personae in Nineteenth-Century German Historiography*. In: Herman Paul (red.) *How to Be a Historian: Scholarly Personae in Historical Studies, 1800-2000*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. 36-52.

## **Ranke vs. Schlosser: Pairs of Personae in Nineteenth-Century German Historiography**

Herman Paul, Leiden University

### **Introduction**

In 1877, the Berlin dramatist, novelist, and literary critic Paul Lindau convened an imaginary parliament to discuss the question whether Friedrich Christoph Schlosser had been great enough a historian to deserve a commemorative address on the occasion of his hundredth birthday. The members of parliament whom Lindau invoked in the pages of *Der Salon*, a German cultural monthly, included both real and imaginary characters. Among the former were such well-known historians as Heinrich von Sybel, the director of the Prussian archives, and Heinrich von Treitschke, who occupied a chair at the University of Berlin as well as a seat in the *Reichstag*. Other real-life characters included Joseph Hillebrand, a Giessen-based philosopher, historian, and novelist who had made no secret of his sympathy for Schlosser,<sup>1</sup> and Wilhelm Oncken, one of the thriving forces behind a Schlosser monument soon to be unveiled in the Frisian city of Jever.<sup>2</sup> Together with some eloquent parliamentarians born out of Lindau's own imagination, the four men engaged in spirited debate over Schlosser's merits as a historian, with applause and cheers from other delegates, a dignified president trying to keep order when emotions ran high, and interruptions of a sort that led Treitschke remark

that it was advantageous not to understand everything that was said (a playful reference to Treitschke's near-deafness).<sup>3</sup>

Although Lindau was known for his light-hearted, satirical prose,<sup>4</sup> one of the striking features of 'The Literary Parliament' is how historically accurate were the views that he ascribed to Hillebrand, Oncken, Sybel, and Treitschke. Almost everything Lindau made them say about Schlosser was derived from their published work. This is most apparent in the case of Sybel, whose *Kleine historische Schriften* (1863) were quoted complete with quotation marks and page references.<sup>5</sup> But even where quotation marks were absent, Lindau did not give his imagination free rein. Hillebrand's statements were quoted literally from *Die deutsche Nationalliteratur seit dem Anfange des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (vol. 3, 1846), while a couple of other interventions in the debate seem to have been based on a 1857 brochure containing a collage of mostly endorsing reviews of Schlosser's *Weltgeschichte für das deutsche Volk* (19 vols., 1844-1857).<sup>6</sup> So, although 'The Literary Parliament' was a work of fiction, it was so only to a point: it mirrored part of a decades-long debate among German historians over Schlosser's professional merits.<sup>7</sup>

Much the same is true for Lindau's observation that historians discussed those merits in terms of virtues and vices. When Lindau invoked the 'representative H. v. Treitschke' as arguing that Schlosser had lacked 'one of the first virtues of the historian', he used a formula – the 'first' or 'highest' virtue – that historians had been using since at least the eighteenth century. The phrase referred not simply to dispositions or character traits that historians regarded as indispensable for historical scholarship, but more specifically to hierarchies of virtues: which of the virtues traditionally associated with historical studies deserved most weight? Lindau's literary parliament thus not only depicted German historians as discussing

their professional vocation in terms of virtues, but more specifically also portrayed them as engaged in debate over the relative importance of those virtues.

The nineteenth-century debate over Schlosser's virtues and vices provides an interesting glimpse on why historians disagreed on their 'first' or 'highest' virtue and, more specifically, on how they conducted debate on so abstract a theme. I will argue that they did so under reference to embodied models of virtue that I call 'scholarly personae'. Although these personae were named after real-life historians such as Schlosser, they were usually highly stylized models, defined in contrast to each other and created in response to points of contestation in historians' understanding of their professional vocation. Scholarly personae, in short, represented different catalogues of virtues, or different answers to the question what made a good historian.

### **The highest virtue**

When in 1842 the 65-year old Schlosser, long-time professor of history in Heidelberg, announced his plan for a multi-volume world history, the *Allgemeine Zeitung* welcomed this idea effusively. It argued that no living German historian was better suited for this task than Schlosser, given his 'love of truth', 'objectivity', 'thoroughness', and 'sharp sight' (*Scharfblick*) – virtues that distinguished the Heidelberg historian from authors whose 'pretended objectivity' was only a cover for 'diplomatic slyness' (*Schlaueit*).<sup>8</sup> When two years later Schlosser's opening volume arrived from the press, thanks mostly to the efforts of Schlosser's assistant, Georg Ludwig Kriegk,<sup>9</sup> reviewers phrased their praise in terms of virtues, too. Drawing on gendered national stereotypes, they applauded Schlosser's 'German diligence', 'German thoroughness', and 'masculine enthusiasm for the higher moral law', which the *Frankfurter Journal* reckoned among 'the inherited virtues [*Erbtugenden*] of German

character'. Some noted that Schlosser did not belong to 'the so-called objective school of history', given that he was intent on identifying moral rights and wrongs in history, thereby blaming especially the mighty and powerful for moral corruption. In these moral judgements, though, Schlosser was said to display 'the strictest conscientiousness' as well as 'the most beautiful feelings for justice'. Paired to 'uncompromising zeal for truth and truth alone', his 'impartiality' of judgement was hailed as a cardinal virtue for historians.<sup>10</sup>

This vocabulary of virtue was not particularly surprising, given that it dominated nineteenth-century German moral discourse more generally.<sup>11</sup> Also, Schlosser's reviewers stood in long tradition of defining scholarly integrity in terms of virtues and vices. Already in early modern Europe, 'love of truth', 'impartiality', and 'conscientiousness' counted as scholarly virtues, with vices as 'dogmatism' and 'speculation' serving as their negative counterparts.<sup>12</sup> As Stevin Shapin has demonstrated for seventeenth-century England, virtues in the sense of cultivated character traits were important because they served as markers of reliability: virtuous character was an index of scholarly trustworthiness.<sup>13</sup> Against this background, Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen argues that nineteenth-century historians, just like their early modern predecessors, were interested in virtues because they perceived them as guarantees of trustworthiness.<sup>14</sup>

This, however, is not the whole story. Apart from that trustworthiness could be defined in various ways, Schlosser's example shows that creating reliable knowledge about the past was not unanimously regarded as the most important part of the historian's vocation. Schlosser, said the *Illustrierte Zeitung*, was more interested in fostering public morality than in 'empirical establishment of facts'.<sup>15</sup> Writing history with an eye to 'the circumstances of the time' and 'the needs of the present', another admirer declared, is what distinguishes 'the real historian' from those merely producing academic knowledge.<sup>16</sup> Although, of course, few

denied the importance of acquiring reliable knowledge, disagreement existed on its relative significance vis-à-vis other historiographical aims. How important was factual accuracy in comparison to societal impact, style of writing in comparison to erudite learning, or political edification in comparison to methodological purity? Was it true, as Ludwig Häusser argued in 1841, that it amounted to a virtue not to keep digging in the ‘rubbish’ of historical records, but to allow the ‘breath of the creative spirit’ to blow through the dust?<sup>17</sup>

These were relevant questions in a time when Leopold von Ranke, F. C. A. Hasse, and others began to convene academic historical seminars (*historische Übungen*) and when a specialized *Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft* (1844) appeared on the market, followed by the *Historische Zeitschrift* (1859).<sup>18</sup> Schlosser’s *Weltgeschichte*, targeted at ‘the German people’, appeared at a time when German historians found themselves disagreeing on who were their prime audience: educated middle class readers or fellow historians in an emerging professional guild?<sup>19</sup> Although twentieth-century literature on ‘professionalization’ has highlighted the growing importance of professional peers as primary readers of historical literature, the emergence of more specialized audiences was neither linear nor uncontested. The dream of German unification, for instance, inspired quite a few historians to blur distinctions between historical writing and political journalism.<sup>20</sup> Opinions were sharply divided, however, on the extent to which the ‘political professor’ – a scholar putting his learning into the service of a nationalist cause – was an appropriate role model for historians.<sup>21</sup> Political and intellectual developments in mid-nineteenth-century Germany thus contributed to disagreement on the relative importance of the aims that historical studies could serve.

It was in relation to such prioritizing of aims that classic formulas regarding the ‘first’ or ‘highest’ virtue of the historian, such as used by Treitschke and quoted by Lindau, gained in importance,<sup>22</sup> together with related phrases like the historian’s ‘first duty’, ‘first task’, or

'highest commandment'.<sup>23</sup> For the relative weight attached to virtues such as 'impartiality of judgement', 'zeal for truth', and 'feeling for justice' was corollary to the relative importance of the aims that historical study was supposed to serve. Thus, when historians argued that 'criticism' was 'the most indispensable quality of the historian' or, by contrast, presented 'a feeling for the scholarly needs of present-day man' as 'the first and greatest quality of the historian', such prioritizing of virtues amounted to taking stances on the historian's task.<sup>24</sup> Treitschke's verdict that Schlosser had lacked 'one of the first virtues of the historian', namely 'real historical objectivity', thus reveals at least as much about Treitschke's understanding of the historian's vocation as it does about Schlosser.<sup>25</sup>

Unsurprisingly, in Schlosser's case, such evaluations often focused on the appropriateness of moral judgement in history, given that the Heidelberg historian had not hidden his moral indignation of historical characters whom he perceived as engaged in corruption and injustice.<sup>26</sup> Because of this honest moral judging, argued the literary historian Heinrich Kurz in 1859, Schlosser 'still occupies one of the most prominent places among our history writers', despite others being more proficient in source criticism or more gifted with literary brilliancy.<sup>27</sup> Considerably more critical, however, was Heinrich von Sybel's verdict that Schlosser had done a disservice to historical scholarship by subordinating the 'autonomy of historical writing' to 'other considerations' (*andere Rücksichten*), including especially moral reflection and judgement.<sup>28</sup> Other Ranke scholars joined Sybel in portraying Schlosser as engaged in judging the past with an eye to the present, more than in objective searching for 'historical truth'.<sup>29</sup>

After Schlosser's death in 1861, the debate continued with undiminished intensity. Schlosser's Heidelberg pupil Georg Gottfried Gervinus, of whom Lindau claimed that in him 'you see all Schlosser's failures and strengths even clearer than in himself',<sup>30</sup> poured oil on

troubled waters by publishing a book-length necrology of his teacher that has rightly been described as a 'manifesto of the Schlosser school'.<sup>31</sup> Its apologetic tone elicited harsh criticism from Johann Wilhelm Löbell, one of Sybel's predecessors in Bonn, who argued that Schlosser's presumed virtues were better conceived of as vices.<sup>32</sup> Similarly, the young Carl von Noorden, a former student of Löbell and Sybel, castigated Schlosser for superimposing his own moral standards on the past, thereby showing an underdeveloped appreciation for the 'variety of human aspirations and spiritual persuasions'.<sup>33</sup> These attacks elicited further responses from the philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey, among others,<sup>34</sup> and resulted in a debate that exercised historians and non-historians alike, judging by private correspondences and printed statements on the 'battle' over Schlosser's virtues and vices.<sup>35</sup>

### **Contrastive models**

Conspicuously, this dispute over the extent to which Schlosser embodied 'the ideal of a real historian' was soon indistinguishable from reflection on historiographical ideals as such.<sup>36</sup> The controversy over Schlosser's moralizing historiography, in other words, was increasingly also a debate on the desirability of historians acting as moral judges. Consequently, as von Noorden observed in 1862, Schlosser was gradually stylized into a symbol of a morally driven sort of history writing. While Schlosser had initially simply been a proper name, referring to an individual born in Jever in 1776, the mid-nineteenth-century debate over his virtues and vices turned the proper name into a more generic name, denoting a type of historian who issued explicit moral judgement on the past. This caused the debate over Schlosser to revolve around what von Noorden perceptively called his *idealisirten individuellen Eigenthümlichkeit* – the 'idealized individual distinctiveness' or schematized features that were perceived as distinguishing Schlosser's mode of being a historian from others.<sup>37</sup>

Most prominent among those others was Ranke. Whenever mid-nineteenth-century historians evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of Schlosser's *Gelehrtentypus*, they compared Schlosser to Ranke. One of Lindau's characters, too, made such a comparison in declaring that 'Schlosser is Schiller, Ranke Goethe. Schlosser is a pronounced Kantian, Ranke a veiled Hegelian. Schlosser is formless in his writing, Ranke artistic in its form. The one is a male spirit, the other a female one.'<sup>38</sup> This echoed a *topos* that had emerged in the second quarter of the century, when Ranke was not yet primarily associated with objectivity, but with an artist's eye for colour, texture, and detail as well as a talent for seeing the whole in the part, or the broad course of history reflected in individual moments of life.<sup>39</sup> Although Wilhelm Dilthey somewhat exaggerated when he remembered German historians in the 1830s and 1840s as being preoccupied with playing Ranke and Schlosser off against each other,<sup>40</sup> it is true that the two were frequently compared, not only on their styles of writing and philosophical orientations,<sup>41</sup> but also and especially on their attitudes towards moral judgement of the past. While Schlosser was turned into a representative of 'moralist' history, Ranke's refusal to let moral judgement prevail over silent wonder at the diversity of human existence became known as 'aestheticism'.<sup>42</sup>

This was not the only schematic contrast drawn between Schlosser and Ranke. Although both men held, or had held, university positions, Schlosser's admirers, such as the Heidelberg gymnasium teacher Georg Weber, turned their hero into a popular historian who positively distinguished himself from the academic historian that was Ranke. Unhindered by 'professorial guildism' and the 'vain haughtiness' of professional scholars, Schlosser had 'given voice and expression to the consciousness of the people', no matter how much mockery his work had provoked 'in the higher circles' of German society, wrote Weber in characteristic anti-elitist prose.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, as an 'advocate of the people', dressed in a prophet's cloak,

Schlosser had called to account the mighty and powerful with a moral audacity that no state-paid academic was likely to display: 'Schlosser's world history is therefore a court of justice, to which those who are usually protected from judicial judgement are made to account . . .'<sup>44</sup>

As these examples illustrate, the names of Schlosser and Ranke did not merely refer to individuals; they corresponded to different models of how to be a historian, characterized by different catalogues of virtues.

### **Scholarly personae**

When I designate such models of virtue as 'scholarly personae', I am using a term that historians of science have coined to draw attention to repertoires available for defining 'scholarly selfhood', or modes of being a scholar.<sup>45</sup> Yet as Gadi Algazi recently observed, historians have appropriated this concept in different ways for different purposes.<sup>46</sup> Some of them equate personae with templates for what societies understand or expect a scholar to be. Although such templates vary across time and space, they often do so only slowly and to limited extents: the early-modern trope of the absent-minded professor is still a recognizable stereotype. Such personae, moreover, are not limited to specific fields of enquiry: the absent-minded scholar can be a philologist as well as a mathematician.<sup>47</sup>

Other historians, by contrast, treat scholarly personae as 'masks' that can be put on and off as the situation requires. For them, personae are self-images that scholars cultivate in their attempts to claim authority or to demand recognition from others. Although such self-fashioning draws on culturally sanctioned scripts, the emphasis in this second approach lies on the politics of voice, dress, and gesture.<sup>48</sup> So, whereas in Braudellian terms the first approach is located in the slowly changing realm of 'structural history', the second is a key

example of ‘evenemential history’ in so far as personae can differ from person to person and change from day to day.<sup>49</sup>

If the choice were just between these two approaches, interpreting the contrastive models of virtue embodied by Schlosser and Ranke in terms of scholarly personae would yield little insight. There is a third approach, however, located at an intermediate level between the structural and the evenemential, which fits the case study much better. Characteristic of this intermediate approach is that it defines scholarly personae as models of professional selfhood to which scholars in the past referred, positively or negatively, in articulating their views of that it meant to be a biologist, a chemist, or an art historian. That is to say, first, that personae are treated as actors’ categories – what were the models that scholars in the past found important enough to invoke in discussing their vocational identities? – and, second, that they usually, though not always, come in the plural. For just as the model of the ‘pure scientist’ only made sense in contrast to the ‘applied scientist’, so the nineteenth-century *Sachphilologe* was unimaginable without its implied other, the *Sprachphilologe*.<sup>50</sup> Scholarly personae, in this third approach, are therefore modes of being a scholar – discipline-specific in some cases, discipline-transcending in others – that were available to scholars in the past and served as points of orientation especially in contexts of disagreement about the purposes that scholarly enquiry should serve.<sup>51</sup>

Although nineteenth-century German historians rarely used the term ‘personae’,<sup>52</sup> the models they associated with Schlosser and Ranke were scholarly personae in Algazi’s third sense of the word. They denoted different modes of being a historian, corresponding to distinct catalogues of virtues. In referring to Schlosser’s and Ranke personae, I am therefore not proposing an innovative tool for historiographical analysis; I am giving a name to a

phenomenon that German historians at the time discussed with some intensity among themselves.

### **Areas of contestation**

What difference, then, does a study of such personae make for our understanding of nineteenth-century German historiography? First, it allows us to explain why Schlosser continued to serve as a point of orientation, positively or negatively, for German historians even after Schlosser's 'school' had disappeared. On the occasion of his centenary in 1876, commemorative speakers and writers almost unanimously agreed that Schlosser's days were over.<sup>53</sup> Even at Heidelberg, where Schlosser had taught for many years, Bernhard Erdmannsdörffer almost apologized for celebrating Schlosser's birthday: 'Despite close personal memories, a broad gulf [*eine weite Kluft*] separates him and us.'<sup>54</sup> Nonetheless, Erdmannsdörffer saw in 'Schlosser's manner' something worth retrieving, without endorsing all of it.<sup>55</sup> While acknowledging that Schlosser's historical writing did not meet the standards of modern 'historical method and technique', he admired 'the depth and delicacy of his feeling' – a quality poorly nurtured among historians whose primary interest seemed to lie in methodological rigor.<sup>56</sup>

Even more positive was the Königsberg historian Franz Rühl, who in 1880 claimed Schlosser as a forerunner of universal history (*Universalgeschichte*). While relativizing the Schlosser-Ranke dichotomy, Rühl used Schlosser to promote an eighteenth-century cosmopolitan attitude conducive to transnational modes of history writing that nineteenth-century nationalists, to Rühl's regret, had failed to appreciate.<sup>57</sup> So, Rühl, too, invoked Schlosser as a contrastive model of virtue, even though the features of this persona had changed: the former moralist had now become a cosmopolitan rationalist.

What this example illustrates is that personae were not discussed in the abstract, but invoked in relation to fault lines or areas of contestation. The relevance of Schlosser's or Ranke's persona was positively correlated to the contested character of the commitments they were perceived as embodying. This explains why Sybel could argue in 1886 that the old dichotomy between Ranke and Schlosser no longer made sense.<sup>58</sup> After the Franco-Prussian War and the *Kulturkampf*, among other things, issues of moral judgement had dropped down the historians' priority list. Other personae, such as the patriotic historian paradigmatically embodied by Treitschke, had made their appearance. Still, as Rühl's example shows, old names could reappear as labels for new personae, bearing on contemporary issues.

Much the same happened to Ranke. Once the Berlin *Altmeister* had ceased to be an antipode to Schlosser, he was reappropriated, most notably by Erdmannsdörffers's former student Max Lenz, as a larger than life example of 'objectivity'.<sup>59</sup> This new Rankean persona was intended as an alternative to Treitschke's, as Lenz explained his Berlin students in 1901 by sharply contrasting Treitschke's political pathos with Ranke's sober objectivity.<sup>60</sup> At the same time, Catholic historians of traditional leaning habitually regarded Ranke as personifying such typically Protestant evils as scholarly naturalism, which excluded miracles from the realm of the possible.<sup>61</sup> For them, Ranke was an antipode to Johannes Janssen, the conservative Catholic apologist whose name in turn served as a byword for dogmatism in Lenz's Protestant circles.<sup>62</sup> Interestingly, younger Catholic scholars such as Georg Hüffer and Wilhelm Diekamp refused to choose between Ranke and Janssen and resolved this dilemma by invoking a third persona, embodied by the seventeenth-century Maurists, whom they perceived as harmoniously combining virtues of accuracy and criticism with faith and loyalty to the church.<sup>63</sup>

## Navigating personae

This is not to say that every historian defined his own pairs of personae. To the contrary, all the contrasts mentioned so far – Schlosser vs. Ranke, Ranke vs. Treitschke, Ranke vs. Janssen – were widely shared dichotomies. They served as coordinates on imaginary maps of the historical discipline, schematically representing different understandings of what counted as the historian's 'first' or 'highest' virtue. Yet while these maps were broadly shared, different historians made different use of them. If Schlosser and Ranke represented opposite ends of a spectrum, historians could position themselves at different points along this spectrum. They did not need to identify with a single persona, but could try to mediate or negotiate between several of them. Not all historians, in other words, were like Gervinus, who closely followed Schlosser's example, or Hubert Ermisch, who stayed loyal to the model of his teacher Georg Waitz.<sup>64</sup>

By drawing attention to historians who did not fit single categories, research focused on scholarly personae therefore allows, in the second place, for a higher degree of inclusion than histories of schools. Erdmannsdörffer is a case in point. As a former student of Johann Gustav Droysen closely befriended with Treitschke, whom he succeeded in 1874 as professor in Heidelberg, Erdmannsdörffer seemed predisposed towards membership of the 'Prussian Historical School'. It is no coincidence, however, that his name is absent from Robert Southard's study of this Prussian School.<sup>65</sup> As illustrated by his carefully restrained writing style, Erdmannsdörffer felt too much attracted to Rankean objectivity to fit Treitschke's mold.<sup>66</sup> Also, while his letters to Droysen reveal a lively interest in politics, he was never politically active.<sup>67</sup> His research, too, moved beyond the political by venturing into 'cultural history', as Karl Lamprecht would soon call it.<sup>68</sup> On top of that, Erdmannsdörffer did not have the rhetorical powers of his predecessors in Heidelberg, which forced him to develop an

alternative to a tradition of spectacular lecturing associated with Häusser and Treitschke.<sup>69</sup> Erdmannsdörffer, in other words, wove his way between some of the dominant models of his time – engaging for many years in meticulous source editing while longing for work of greater scope and applauding Treitschke’s nationalist historiography while himself striking more reserved tones.<sup>70</sup>

In such navigating, Erdmannsdörffer was not alone. In the closing decades of the nineteenth century, German historical studies were populated with figures like Friedrich von Bezold, who felt torn between his teachers Sybel and Waitz,<sup>71</sup> Ludwig Weiland, who tried to correct the limitations of Waitz-style source criticism with literary imagination as exemplified by Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann,<sup>72</sup> and Alfred Naudé, who resembled Erdmannsdörffer in trying to carve out a middle position between Treitschkean patriotism and Rankean objectivity.<sup>73</sup> What these examples show is that the historiographical landscape was not neatly divided into parcels or schools. There was space for dialogue and ambiguity. While some historians stuck to a single persona, not seldom out of faithfulness to a highly regarded teacher, others manoeuvred their own way, positioning themselves with nuance at some distance from the schematic positions that served as scholarly personae.

### **Political contexts**

Naturally, the amount of freedom that scholars enjoyed in plotting their own professional path greatly differed. While Erdmannsdörffer only found himself confronted with Heidelberg expectations that he could not meet, other historians, especially in non-professorial positions, were significantly more restricted in their manoeuvring space, if only because of political and religious sensibilities in the German Empire shortly after the *Kulturkampf*. Illustrative is the case of Waitz’s former student Hermann Grauert, who shared with many Catholic historians

of his generation a desire to overcome the aforementioned dichotomy between Ranke and Janssen. This became apparent in 1886, when Grauert wrote a lengthy necrology of Waitz in the journal of the Catholic Görres Society that was significantly more appreciative of Rankean objectivity than customary in Catholic circles.<sup>74</sup> The piece provoked a small revolt within the Görres Society and almost costed Grauert his editorship of the journal. Moving too close to Ranke, ‘the most dangerous enemy of the Catholic church’,<sup>75</sup> amounted to a career threat. This offers a clue as to why Grauert subsequently kept silent about his preferred personae and, more generally, why many Catholic historians around 1900 thought it safer to engage in empirical research than to indulge in historiographical reflection.<sup>76</sup>

So, although scholarly personae, understood as coordinates on imaginary maps of the field, encourage research on map-making activities that helped historians understand and articulate what it meant to be a scholar, such research cannot ignore the social, political, and religious realities in which such map-making took place. In so far as personae specified whether it was appropriate for historians to be patriotically committed to the nation or loyal to the Vatican, they were charged with political or religious meaning. Subsequently, praise and criticism of such personae amounted to taking a stand on contested issues. This in turn implies that the emergence, popularity, and impact of these models cannot be understood without careful consideration of political and religious sensitivities in early Imperial Germany. A final, not exclusive, but important advantage, then, of studying personae is that it contributes to a deeply contextual understanding of what it meant to be a historian in an age when demarcations between history, politics, and religion were as contested as those between history, literature, and journalism.

## **Conclusion**

Paul Lindau's parliamentary debate, with which I began this chapter, ended with a majority of the house voting in support of a commemorative address in Schlosser's honor. Ironically, however, the voters' motives were mixed: 'A quarter of the majority . . . votes for it out of enthusiasm, a quarter out of generosity, so as not to spoil the committee's joy, a quarter in order to read their names among the contributors to a monument, a quarter because Schlosser's *Weltgeschichte* was one of their father's books, which they themselves have never read, though.'<sup>77</sup> In reality, erecting a *Denkmal* in Jever appeared even more difficult. Prominent historians such as Waitz refused to join the committee,<sup>78</sup> probably because Waitz's favourite virtues – 'criticism', 'penetration', and 'precision' – did not match with Schlosser's.<sup>79</sup> Also, financial contributions fell painfully short. Only after two years' delay, a cheap and simple monument could be unveiled.<sup>80</sup>

In framing the German debate over Schlosser's monument in parliamentary terms, Lindau aptly conveyed to what extent late nineteenth-century German historical studies was a divided house. Not unlike the *Reichstag*, historical scholarship was divided into parties that found themselves disagreeing on fundamental issues.<sup>81</sup> Although secondary literature conventionally refers to 'the' historical discipline in the singular, studying this discipline through the prism of scholarly personae reveals that its members not seldom identified with a specific persona, a 'highest virtue', or a particular model of professionalism more than with a discipline at large, on the nature of which they disagreed in the first place. Scholarly personae therefore help correct overly unified accounts of German historical scholarship by drawing attention to a disunity among historians that expressed itself in controversies like the long-running debate on Schlosser's historiographical merits.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph Hillebrand, *Die deutsche Nationalliteratur seit dem Anfange des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts, besonders seit Lessing, bis auf die Gegenwart, historisch und ästhetisch-kritisch dargestellt*, vol. 3 (Hamburg: Friedrich und Andreas Perthes, 1846), p. 433.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Schlosser-Denkmal’, *Zeitung für das höhere Unterrichtswesen Deutschlands*, 4 (1875), 271; ‘Das Schlosser-Denkmal in Jever’, *Illustrierte Zeitung*, 71 (1878), 461-462.

<sup>3</sup> [Paul Lindau], ‘Das literarische Parlament’, *Der Salon für Literatur, Kunst und Gesellschaft* (1877), 226-230.

<sup>4</sup> Roland Berbig, ‘Paul Lindau: Eine Literatenkarriere’, in Peter Wruck (ed.), *Literarisches Leben in Berlin, 1871-1933* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1987), pp. 88-125; Anneliese Eismann-Liche, ‘Paul Lindau: Publizist und Romancier der Gründerjahre’ (PhD thesis, University of Munster, 1981).

<sup>5</sup> [Lindau], ‘Literarische Parlament’, 228, under reference to Heinrich von Sybel, *Kleine historische Schriften* (Munich: J. G. Cotta, 1863), pp. 349, 350, 352.

<sup>6</sup> *Friedrich Christoph Schlosser und dessen Weltgeschichte für das deutsche Volk: Eine Sammlung literarischer Urtheile* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag der Expedition von Schlosser’s Weltgeschichte, 1857).

<sup>7</sup> Ellen-Charlotte Sellier-Bauer offers a brief overview of this *Historikerstreit* in *Friedrich Christoph Schlosser: Ein deutsches Gelehrtenleben im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2004), pp. 24-33.

<sup>8</sup> ‘Schlosser und seine neue Weltgeschichte’, *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung* (30 May 1842).

<sup>9</sup> F. C. Schlosser, ‘Einleitende Vorrede des Verfassers der Weltgeschichte’, in *F. C. Schlosser’s Weltgeschichte für das deutsche Volk*, ed. G. L. Kriegk, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Franz Varrentrapp, 1844), pp. iii-xxiv. On Griegk’s role, see also Dagmar Stegmüller, ‘Popularisierungsstrategien in Friedrich Christoph Schlossers “Weltgeschichte für das

---

deutsche Volk”“, in Carsten Kretschmann (ed.), *Wissenspopularisierung: Konzepte der Wissensverbreitung im Wandel* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2003), pp. 197-210, at pp. 199-201.

<sup>10</sup> *Düsseldorfer Journal* (20 January 1857); *Frankfurter Journal* (17 January 1857); *Illustrierte Zeitung* (27 December 1857), all as quoted in *Schlosser und dessen Weltgeschichte*, pp. 12-14.

<sup>11</sup> Manfred Hettling and Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann (eds), *Der bürgerliche Wertehimmel: Innenansichten des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

<sup>12</sup> Matthew L. Jones, *The Good Life in the Scientific Revolution: Descartes, Pascal, Leibniz, and the Cultivation of Virtue* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006); Sorana Corneanu, *Regimens of the Mind: Boyle, Locke, and the Early Modern Cultura Animi Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011); Sari Kivistö, *The Vices of Learning: Morality and Knowledge at Early Modern Universities* (Leiden: Brill, 2014); Kathryn Murphy and Anita Traninger (eds), *The Emergence of Impartiality* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

<sup>13</sup> Steven Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

<sup>14</sup> Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen, ‘Inventing the Archive: Testimony and Virtue in Modern Historiography’, *History of the Human Sciences*, 26:4 (2013), 8-26, at 20.

<sup>15</sup> *Illustrierte Zeitung* (27 December 1857), as quoted in *Schlosser und dessen Weltgeschichte*, p. 14.

<sup>16</sup> G. G. Gervinus, *Friedrich Christoph Schlosser: Ein Nekrolog* (Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1861), pp. 58, 65.

<sup>17</sup> Ludwig Häusser, ‘Die historische Literatur und das deutsche Publikum’ (1841), in Häusser, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1869), pp. 3-17, at pp. 6, 5.

<sup>18</sup> On *historische Übungen* as offered by Ranke and many of his students, see Hans-Jürgen Pandel, ‘Von der Teegesellschaft zum Forschungsinstitut: Die historischen Seminare vom

---

Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ende des Kaiserreichs’, in Horst Walter Blanke (ed.), *Transformationen des Historismus: Wissenschaftsorganisation und Bildungspolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Waltrop: Hartmut Spenner, 1994), pp. 1-31 and Kasper Risbjerg Eskildsen, ‘Private Übungen und verkörpertes Wissen: Zur Unterrichtspraxis der Geschichtswissenschaft im neunzehnten Jahrhundert’, in Martin Kintzinger and Sita Steckel (eds), *Akademische Wissenskulturen: Praktiken des Lehrens und Forschens vom Mittelalter bis zur Moderne* (Basel: Schwabe, 2015), pp. 143-161. On history journals in nineteenth-century Germany, see esp. Theodor Schieder, ‘Die deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft im Spiegel der Historischen Zeitschrift’, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 189 (1959), 1-104.

<sup>19</sup> Dieter Langewiesche, ‘Die Geschichtsschreibung und ihr Publikum: Zum Verhältnis von Geschichtswissenschaft und Geschichtsmarkt’, in Dieter Hein, Klaus Hildebrand, and Andreas Schulz (eds), *Historie und Leben: Der Historiker als Wissenschaftler und Zeitgenosse: Festschrift für Lothar Gall zum 70. Geburtstag* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006), pp. 311-326.

<sup>20</sup> Niklas Lenhard-Schramm, *Konstrukteure der Nation: Geschichtsprofessoren als politische Akteure in Vormärz und Revolution 1848/49* (Münster: Waxmann, 2014); Robert Southard, *Droysen and the Prussian School of History* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1995).

<sup>21</sup> Ulrich Muhlack, ‘Der “politische Professor” im Deutschland des 19. Jahrhunderts’, in Ronald Burkholz, Christel Gärtner, and Ferdinand Zehentreiter (eds), *Materialität des Geistes: Zur Sache Kultur: Im Diskurs mit Ulrich Oevermann* (Weilerswist: Velbrück, 2001), pp. 185-204.

<sup>22</sup> Heinrich von Treitschke, ‘F. C. Dahlmann’, in Treitschke, *Historische und politische Aufsätze vornehmlich zur neuesten deutschen Geschichte*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1865), pp. 359-445, at p. 378; Karl Hillebrand, ‘G. G. Gervinus’, *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 32 (1873),

---

379-428, at 403; Ludwig Weiland, 'Zum Andenken an Reinhold Pauli: Vortrag gehalten auf der Versammlung zu Kiel', *Hansische Geschichtsblätter*, 12 (1883), 1-9, at 9.

<sup>23</sup> Julian Schmidt, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, vol. 3, 3rd ed. (Leipzig: Friedrich Ludwig Herbig, 1856), p. 405; review of G. G. Gervinus, *Geschichte der neunzehnten Jahrhunderts seit den Wiener Verträgen*, vol. 1, *Die Grenzboten*, 14 (1855), 441-453, at 443; [Carl von Noorden], 'Zur Beurtheilung Friedrich Christoph Schlosser's', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 8 (1862), 117-140, at 132; Walther Schultze, 'Gerhard von Brogne und die Klosterreform in Niederlothringen und Flandern', *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, 25 (1885), 221-271, at 223; E. Reimann, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Friedrich des Grossen* (Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1892), p. 80 n. 3.

<sup>24</sup> [G. G.] Gervinus, self-review of *Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung*, vol. 1, *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur*, 28 (1835), 900-915, at 911; Karl Weinhold, 'Festrede', in *Schiller-Denkmal: Festaussgabe*, vol. 2 (Berlin: Riegel, 1860), pp. 66-74, at p. 69; Richard Treitschke, 'Adolph Schmidt's Geschichte der Denk- und Glaubensfreiheit im ersten Jahrhundert der Kaiserherrschaft und des Christenthums', *Die Grenzboten*, 7 (1848), 117-123, 157-163, at 117.

<sup>25</sup> [Lindau], 'Literarische Parlament', 229, quoting Treitschke, 'F. C. Dahlmann', p. 413.

<sup>26</sup> Dagmar Stegmüller, 'Friedrich Christopher Schlosser und die Berliner Schule', in Ulrich Muhlack with Christian Mehr and Dagmar Stegmüller (eds), *Historisierung und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2003), pp. 49-60, esp. pp. 58-59; Michael Gottlob, *Geschichtsschreibung zwischen Aufklärung und Historismus: Johannes von Müller und Friedrich Christoph Schlosser* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989), pp. 211-240; Georg Gülder, 'Die Geschichtsauffassung Friedrich Christoph Schlossers' (PhD thesis Ruprecht Karls University Heidelberg, 1966), pp. 86-107.

---

<sup>27</sup> Heinrich Kurz, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur mit ausgewählte Stücken aus den Werken der vorzüglichsten Schriftsteller*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1859), p. 687.

Similarly: Heinrich Wuttke, 'Schlosser, der Geschichtschreiber', *Die Grenzboten*, 3 (1844), 193-210.

<sup>28</sup> [Heinrich] v[on] Sybel, review of F. C. Schlosser, *Geschichte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, *Neue Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, 3 (1844), 53-63, 81-92, at 92.

See also Heinrich von Sybel, 'Ueber den Stand der neueren deutschen Geschichtschreibung' (1856), in Sybel, *Kleine Historische Schriften*, p. 352.

<sup>29</sup> Georg Waitz, 'Deutsche Historiker der Gegenwart: Briefe an den Herausgeber (I)', *Allgemeine Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 5 (1846), 520-535, at 522-523; Cf. Stegmüller, 'Friedrich Christoph Schlosser', pp. 49-52.

<sup>30</sup> [Lindau], 'Literarische Parlament', 228.

<sup>31</sup> G. P. Gooch, 'The Growth of Historical Science', in A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and Stanley Leathes (eds), *The Cambridge Modern History*, vol. 12 (Cambridge: [Cambridge] University Press, 1910), pp. 816-850, at p. 826.

<sup>32</sup> [Johann Wilhelm Löbell], *Briefe über den Nekrolog Friedrich Christoph Schlossers von G. Gervinus: Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik Schlossers vom litterarischen Standpunkt* (Chemnitz: Otto May, 1862), pp. 23, 40.

<sup>33</sup> [Von Noorden], 'Zur Beurtheilung', 136.

<sup>34</sup> [Wilhelm Dilthey], 'Friedrich Christoph Schlosser', *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 9 (1862), 373-433; Georg Weber, 'Friedrich Christoph Schlosser', *Unsere Zeit*, 6 (1862), 314-326.

<sup>35</sup> E.g., Wilhelm Dilthey to Rudolf Haym, 31 October 1861, in Dilthey, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Gudrun Kühne-Bertam and Hans-Ulrich Lessing, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), p. 201; Karl Dilthey to Wilhelm Dilthey, 29 May 1862, *ibid.*, p. 247, and

---

Karl Dilthey to Wilhelm Dilthey, November 1862, *ibid.*, pp. 260-262 (reporting on heated public discussions in Bonn).

<sup>36</sup> [Von Noorden], 'Zur Beurtheilung', 132.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 126. One is reminded here of Johan Huizinga's distinction between 'Luther as a specimen of the biological species' and 'Luther as a historical phenomenon'. J. Huizinga, 'De taak der cultuurgeschiedenis', in Huizinga, *Cultuurhistorische verkenningen* (Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1929), pp. 1-85, at p. 26.

<sup>38</sup> [Lindau], 'Literarische Parlament', 227.

<sup>39</sup> Günter Johannes Henz, *Leopold von Ranke in Geschichtsdanken und Forschung*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2014), pp. 128, 129, 140, 145, 146. For a historiographical reappraisal of Ranke's visual aesthetics, see J. D. Braw, 'Vision as Revision: Ranke and the Beginning of Modern History', *History and Theory*, 46 (2007), 45-60 and Daniel Fulda, *Wissenschaft aus Kunst: Die Entstehung der modernen deutschen Geschichtsschreibung 1760-1860* (Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), pp. 404-410.

<sup>40</sup> Wilhelm Dilthey, 'Erinnerungen an deutsche Geschichtsschreiber' (c. 1862), in Dilthey, *Vom Aufgang des geschichtlichen Bewusstseins: Jugendaufsätze und Erinnerungen*, ed. Erich Weniger (Leipzig; Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1936), pp. 215-231, at p. 215.

<sup>41</sup> [Karl Hagen], 'Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung (Beschluß)', *Der Adler*, 3 (1837), 9-11, at 10-11; 'Die Reformation in französischer und deutscher Auffassung', *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* (1840), 645-646, 649-650, 653-655, 817-819, 829-831, at 818; review of Leopold Ranke, *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation*, vols. 4 and 5, *Leipziger Repertorium der deutschen und ausländischen Literatur*, 1:3 (1843), 565-572, at 565-566.

<sup>42</sup> Julian Schmidt, *Geschichte der deutschen Nationalliteratur im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Friedrich Ludwig Herbig, 1853), pp. 318-332; A. Lübber, 'Zur Charakteristik

---

dreier deutscher Geschichtsschreiber', *Deutsche Monats-Hefte*, 6 (1855), 229-231; Kurz, *Geschichte*, vol. 3, 697.

<sup>43</sup> Weber, 'Friedrich Christoph Schlosser', 325, 324.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 326.

<sup>45</sup> See the agenda-setting theme issue of *Science in Context*, 16:1-2 (2003), edited by Lorraine Daston and H. Otto Sibum.

<sup>46</sup> Gadi Algazi, 'Exemplum and Wundertier: Three Concepts of the Scholarly Persona', *Low Countries Historical Review*, 131:4 (2016), 8-32, at 9-16.

<sup>47</sup> Lorraine Daston and H. Otto Sibum, 'Introduction: Scientific Personae and Their Histories', *Science in Context*, 16 (2003), 1-8. On absent-mindedness as an early-modern *topos*, see Gadi Algazi, 'Geistesabwesenheit: Gelehrte zu Hause um 1500', *Historische Anthropologie*, 13 (2005), 325-342 and 'Gelehrte Zerstretheit und gelernte Vergesslichkeit: Bemerkungen zu ihrer Rolle in der Herausbildung des Gelehrtenhabitus', in Peter von Moos (ed.), *Der Fehltritt: Vergehen und Versehen in der Vormoderne* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2001), pp. 235-250.

<sup>48</sup> Mineke Bosch, 'Scholarly Personae and Twentieth-Century Historians: Explorations of a Concept', *Low Countries Historical Review*, 131:4 (2016), 33-54. See also Richard Kirwan, 'Introduction: Scholarly Self-Fashioning and the Cultural History of Universities', in Kirwan (ed.), *Scholarly Self-Fashioning and Community in the Early Modern University* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 1-20.

<sup>49</sup> Fernand Braudel, 'Histoire et sciences sociales: la longue durée', *Annales*, 13 (1958), 725-753.

<sup>50</sup> Paul Lucier, 'The Origins of Pure and Applied Science in Gilded Age America', *Isis*, 103 (2012), 527-536; R. Steven Turner, 'Historicism, *Kritik* and the Prussian Professorate, 1790 to 1840', in Mayotte Bollack and Heinz Wismann (eds.), *Philologie und Hermeneutik im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), pp. 450-489, at p. 466.

---

<sup>51</sup> I elaborate on this third model in Herman Paul, ‘The Virtues and Vices of Albert Naudé: Toward a History of Scholarly Personae’, *History of Humanities*, 1 (2016), 327-338 and ‘Sources of the Self: Scholarly Personae as Repertoires of Scholarly Selfhood’, *Low Countries Historical Review*, 131:4 (2016), 135-154.

<sup>52</sup> See, however, Paul Yorck von Wartenburg to Wilhelm Dilthey, 6 July 1886, in Wilhelm Dilthey, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Gudrun Kühne-Bertam and Hans-Ulrich Lessing, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), p. 145.

<sup>53</sup> Georg Weber, *Friedrich Christoph Schlosser der Historiker: Erinnerungsblätter aus seinem Leben und Wirken: Eine Festschrift zu seiner hundertjährigen Geburtstagsfeier am 17. November 1876* (Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1876), p. vi.

<sup>54</sup> B. Erdmannsdörffer, *Friedrich Christoph Schlosser (geb. 17. Nov. 1776, gest. 23 Sept. 1861): Gedächtnissrede zur Feier von Schlossers hundertjährigem Geburtstag am 17. November 1876 in der Aula der Universität Heidelberg gehalten* (Heidelberg: J. Hörning, 1876), p. 4.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21, 13.

<sup>57</sup> Franz Rühl, ‘Friedrich Christoph Schlosser’, *Nord und Süd*, 13 (1880), 350-371. Note that this article appeared just before Ranke published the first volume (1881) of his *Weltgeschichte*. For Rühl’s subsequent evaluation of the latter in comparison to Schlosser’s, see Franz Rühl, ‘Ueber den Begriff der Weltgeschichte’, *Deutsche Revue*, 30:4 (1905), 110-122.

<sup>58</sup> Heinrich v[on] Sybel, ‘Gedächtnisrede auf Leopold v[on] Ranke, gehalten in der kgl. preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin am 1. Juli 1886’, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 56 (1886), 463-481, at 478. A similarly distanced stance was adopted by Franz X. von

---

Wegele, *Geschichte der deutschen Historiographie seit dem Auftreten des Humanismus* (Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1885), p. 1062.

<sup>59</sup> Hans Heinz Krill, *Die Rankerenaissance: Max Lenz und Erich Marcks: Ein Beitrag zum historisch-politischen Denken in Deutschland, 1880-1935* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1962).

<sup>60</sup> Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Max Lenz papers, inv. no. 8, 'Geschichte der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung' (1901), transcript by Martin Hass, 144-145.

<sup>61</sup> Thomas Brechenmacher, *Großdeutsche Geschichtsschreibung im neunzehnten Jahrhundert: Die erste Generation (1830-48)* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1996), pp. 460-475; Ulrich Muhlack, 'Die wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Indexverfahrens gegen Rankes Papstgeschichte', in Hubert Wolf, Dominik Burkard, and Ulrich Muhlack, *Rankes 'Päpste' auf dem Index: Dogma und Historie im Widerstreit* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2003), pp. 169-201, at pp. 189-201.

<sup>62</sup> Max Lehmann, *Friedrich der Grosse und der Ursprung des Siebenjährigen Krieges* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1894), p. 139; Hans Delbrück, 'Ueber den Ursprung des Siebenjährigen Krieges (Nachtrag)', *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 86 (1896), 416-427, at 417-418.

<sup>63</sup> Bernd Mütter, 'Georg Hüffer (1851-1922): Ein katholischer Historiker zwischen Kirche und Staat, Ultramontanismus und Historismus', *Westfälische Forschungen*, 61 (2011), 307-343, at 328.

<sup>64</sup> Gangolf Hübringer, *Georg Gottfried Gervinus: Historisches Urteil und politische Kritik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); Michael Ansel, *G. G. Gervinus' "Geschichte der poetischen National-Literatur der Deutschen": Nationbildung auf literaturgeschichtlicher Grundlage* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990); Jana Lehmann, *Hubert Ermisch 1850-1932: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der sächsischen Landesgeschichtsforschung* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2001).

<sup>65</sup> Southard, *Droysen and the Prussian School*.

---

<sup>66</sup> J. Wille, 'Bernhard Erdmannsdörffer', in Fr. von Weech and A. Krieger (eds), *Badische Biographien*, vol. 5 (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1906), pp. 151-160, at p. 156.

<sup>67</sup> Willy Andreas, 'Briefe Erdmannsdörffers an Johann Gustav Droysen', *Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins*, 81 (1929), 557-587.

<sup>68</sup> G. v[on] Below, 'Bernhard Erdmannsdörffer', *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, 4 (1901), 275-278, at 276.

<sup>69</sup> Eberhard Gothein, 'Bernhard Erdmannsdörffer †: Ein Gedenkwort', *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 104 (1901), 15-22, at 20-21.

<sup>70</sup> Bernhard Erdmannsdörffer to Heinrich von Treitschke, 18 June 1869 and 18 November 1877, Berlin State Library, Heinrich von Treitschke papers, inv. no. K5:164; B.

Erdmannsdörffer, 'Treitschkes Deutsche Geschichte', *Die Grenzboten*, 42 (1883), 232-250.

<sup>71</sup> Bonn University Archive, inv. no. Bh Bez., 'Lebenserinnerungen' (undated) by Friedrich von Bezold, 47.

<sup>72</sup> Ludwig Weiland, *Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann: Rede zur Feier seines hundertjährigen Geburtstages am 13. Mai 1885 im Namen der Georg-Augusts-Universität gehalten* (Göttingen: Wilh. Fr. Kaestner, 1885) and *Georg Waitz (geb. 9. October 1813, gest. 24. Mai 1886): Rede gehalten in der öffentlichen Sitzung der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften am 4. Dezember 1886* (Göttingen: Dieterichsche Verlags-Buchhandlung, 1886).

<sup>73</sup> Paul, 'Virtues and Vices', 334.

<sup>74</sup> Herm[ann] Grauert, 'Georg Waitz', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 8 (1887), 48-100. I discuss this case at greater length in Herman Paul, 'The Virtues of a Good Historian in Early Imperial Germany: Georg Waitz's Contested Example', *Modern Intellectual History*, 15 (2018), 681-709.

<sup>75</sup> Gustav Schnürer to Heinrich Schrörs, 1 February 1888, as quoted in Gregor Klapczynski, *Katholischer Historismus? Zum historischen Denken in der deutschsprachigen*

---

*Kirchengeschichte um 1900: Heinrich Schrörs, Albert Ehrhard, Joseph Schnitzer* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2013), pp. 22-23 n. 58.

<sup>76</sup> Bernd Mütter, *Die Geschichtswissenschaft in Münster zwischen Aufklärung und Historismus unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der historischen Disziplin an der Münsterschen Hochschule* (Munster: Aschendorff, 1980), p. 262.

<sup>77</sup> [Lindau], 'Literarische Parlament', 230.

<sup>78</sup> German Federal Archives Berlin, Georg Waitz papers, inv. no. 14, City of Jever to Georg Waitz, 13 January 1875; inv. no. 64, daily notes, January 1875.

<sup>79</sup> G. Waitz, *Die historischen Übungen zu Göttingen: Glückwunschsreiben an Leopold von Ranke zum Tage der Feier seines fünfzigjährigen Doctorjubiläums, 20. Februar 1867* (Göttingen: W. Fr. Kästner, 1867), p. 4.

<sup>80</sup> 'Schlosser-Denkmal in Jever', 462.

<sup>81</sup> Whereas 'parties' used to have a bad reputation as expressions of discord that were supposed to disappear in Germany's move towards national unity, by the 1870s, increasing support had emerged for Treitschke's view that parties were indispensable agents of political struggle to the extent that they defended 'the interests of societal classes' (Heinrich von Treitschke, 'Parteien und Fractionen', *Preußische Jahrbücher*, 27 [1871], 175-208, 347-367, at 190). Although Lindau did not remotely share Treitschke's increasingly conservative political agenda, his portrayal of parties as interest groups closely resembled this Treitschkean view.

<sup>82</sup> Drafts of this chapter were presented in London (February 2016), Leiden (January 2017), and Lund (April 2017). Thanks to Taru Haapala, Kari Palonen, Maria Karlsson, and Johan Östling for their kind invitations, to the audiences at all three occasions for their perceptive feedback, and to Andreas Biefang and Henk te Velde for useful suggestions. Funding was generously provided by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).