

Foundations of the 19th
Century

chamberlain

1977

FOUNDATIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

BY HOUSTON STEWART CHAMBERLAIN

Translated from the German by John Lees

With an Introduction
by
GEORGE L. MOSSE

VOLUME I

NEW YORK
Howard Fertig

1977

Wagnerian nonsense"¹² which Cosima cultivated so carefully and which, in turn, became a part of the mainstream of Germanic nationalism. The *Foundations* is, without doubt, the most important work that reflected this dubious inspiration. As Chamberlain put it on another occasion: eventually the ideals of Bayreuth will show their strength in a way hardly dreamt of at present—the strongest will win and the strongest is he whose thought is "mythical."¹³

Nothing Chamberlain undertook during the rest of his life could rival the influence of this book. He was now accepted as a Germanic prophet and corresponded with the young Emperor William II who, admiring Bayreuth, was himself attracted to Chamberlain's work. During the First World War he became a busy propagandist for the German cause, until his delicate health finally collapsed. From then until his death in 1927, he remained a semi-paralyzed invalid. Others of his persuasion became pessimists as Germany lost the war and a republic seemed to endanger the very existence of the Aryan race, but not Chamberlain, for he had always been optimistic about the Aryans' future. Once Chamberlain had found a resting place in his ideology, there was little that could sap the strength of his convictions. This the more so since in the midst of German collapse he discovered the prophet who would lead the Aryans to victory. At the Bayreuth Festival of 1923 he had been introduced to Adolf Hitler.

Hitler met Chamberlain at Wagner's house and was

¹² The phrase is Ernst Newman's, from *A Study of Wagner* (London, 1899), p. 241.

¹³ Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *Richard Wagner* (London and Philadelphia, 1900), p. 374.

greatly impressed.¹⁴ There is little doubt that Hitler knew the *Foundations*, but Chamberlain did not play an essential role in the formation of his thought. Hitler later criticized Chamberlain for believing that Christianity could have any reality on a spiritual level—even as an Aryan religion.¹⁵ It is interesting to note that the one major criticism which Cosima Wagner made to her friend about the *Foundations* concerned Chamberlain's apparent denial that Christ could be known through prayer.¹⁶ Nor, as a matter of fact, was Chamberlain quite as single-minded on the Jewish question as the future Führer. Chamberlain belonged to a school of racial thought that distinguished between the evil of "Judaism" and the individual Jew. He wrote to Leopold von Schroeder about his friendship for many "wonderful" Jews. Yet Jews must be eradicated from German cultural life because in the last analysis their Jewishness is bound to the evil and materialistic principles of Judaism. We must neither hate the Jew nor apply humanitarian principles in order to allow his participation in German life: the Jewish question can only be solved through meeting the Jew as a foreigner.¹⁷

Many others made such a differentiation between the individual Jew and Judaism as an evil principle, but there is no evidence that Hitler ever permitted himself such fine distinctions. Hitler hailed Chamberlain as a famous Ger-

¹⁴ He is only mentioned once in *Mein Kampf* (Munich, 1934), p. 296, to the effect that the German government then and now was "unfortunately" not interested in Chamberlain's insights.

¹⁵ *Hitler's Secret Conversations, 1941-1944* (New York, 1953), p. 119.

¹⁶ *Cosima Wagner und Houston Stewart Chamberlain*, p. 564.

¹⁷ Chamberlain, *Briefe, 1882-1924*, Vol. I, pp. 169-71.

rightly admired had this attitude as one of its byproducts. Men saw the prestige of this scholarship and greedily grasped the meta-history that was put before them, but they failed to separate true from pseudo learning.

If the meeting at Bayreuth did not markedly influence the development of Hitler's own thought, it acted as a catalyst upon Chamberlain. Here, Chamberlain wrote, was a man who was all heart, who loved his people and who showed a courage reminiscent of Martin Luther.²⁰ Chamberlain described the future Führer as "the true awakener [of souls] and at the same time the giver of rest."²¹

This phrase can symbolize the trend of the whole Germanic ideology, that national mystique which was to be so fateful to the world and so attractive to many in the German-speaking regions of Europe. The Aryan and his religion were to be awakened by a messiah who would purge their nation of its ills and reconquer its rightful place in the world. But at the same time, this awakening meant a new restfulness: for the Aryan had now discovered his own inner nature and his soul. This concept of life echoes throughout the *Foundations*, and Adolf Hitler, who gave this feeling of restfulness to the aged and infirm Chamberlain, would eventually provide it to the nation itself.

This appeal was common to both National Socialists and to those conservatives who regarded the Nazis as a dangerous mass movement. Chamberlain's influence

²⁰ Houston Stewart Chamberlain, "Adolf Hitler zu seinem Geburtstag am 20. April, 1924," *Auswahl aus seinen Werken* (Breslau, 1934), pp. 65-6.

²¹ "Ein Brief Chamberlains an Adolf Hitler" (October 7, 1923), *Auswahl*, p. 68.

such as Alfred the Great, Charlemagne, Scotus Erigena and others had long ago proved their Teutonic individuality by their civilising activity. It is, however, not individuals, but communities, that make history; these individuals had been only pioneers. In order to become a civilising power the Teuton had to awaken and grow strong in the exercise far and wide of his individual will in opposition to the will of others forced upon him from outside. This did not take place all at once, neither did it happen at the same time in all the spheres of life; the choice of the year 1200 as turning-point is therefore arbitrary, but I hope, in what follows, to be able to justify it, and my purpose will be gained if I in this way succeed in doing away with those two absurdities—the idea of Middle Ages and that of a Renaissance—by which more than by anything else an understanding of our present age is not only obscured, but rendered directly impossible.

Abandoning these formulæ which have but served to give rise to endless errors, we are left with the simple and clear view that our whole civilisation and culture of to-day is the work of one definite race of men, the Teutonic.* It is untrue that the Teutonic barbarian conjured up the so-called "Night of the Middle Ages"; this night followed rather upon the intellectual and moral bankruptcy of the raceless chaos of humanity which the dying Roman Empire had nurtured; but for the Teuton everlasting night would have settled upon the world; but for the unceasing opposition of the non-Teutonic peoples, but for that unrelenting hostility to everything Teutonic which has not yet died down among the racial chaos which has never been exterminated, we should have reached a stage of culture quite different

from that witnessed by the 19th century.

* Under this designation I embrace the various portions of the one great North European race, whether "Teutonic" in the narrower Tacitean meaning of the word, or Celts or genuine Slavs—see chap. vi. for further particulars.

have not pleaded the cause of any particularism whatever. I have, on the other hand, vigorously attacked whatever is un-Teutonic, but—as I hope—nowhere in an unchivalrous manner.

The fact that the chapter on the entry of the Jews into western history has been made so long may perhaps demand explanation. For the subject of this book, so diffuse a treatment would not have been indispensable; but the prominent position of the Jews in the nineteenth century, as also the great importance for the history of our time of the philo- and anti-semitic currents and controversies, made an answer to the question, "Who is the Jew?" absolutely imperative. Nowhere could I find a clear and exhaustive answer to this question, so I was compelled to seek and to give it myself. The essential point here is the question of religion; and so I have treated this very point at considerable length, not merely in the fifth, but also in the third and in the seventh chapters. For I have become convinced that the usual treatment of the "Jewish question" is altogether and always superficial; the Jew is no enemy of Teutonic civilisation and culture; Herder may be right in his assertion that the Jew is always alien to us, and consequently we to him, and no one will deny that this is to the detriment of our work of culture; yet I think that we are inclined to under-estimate our own powers in this respect and, on the other hand, to exaggerate the importance of the Jewish influence. Hand in hand with this goes the perfectly ridiculous and revolting tendency to make the Jew the general scapegoat for all the vices of our time. In reality the "Jewish peril" lies much deeper; the Jew is not responsible for it; we have given rise to it ourselves and must overcome it ourselves. No souls thirst more after religion than the Slavs, the Celts and the Teutons: their history proves it; it is because of the lack of a true religion that

our whole Teutonic culture is sick unto death (as I show in the ninth chapter), and this will mean its ruin if timely help does not come. We have stopped up the spring that welled up in our own hearts and made ourselves dependent upon the scanty, brackish water which the Bedouins of the desert draw from their wells. No people in the world is so beggarly-poor in religion as the Semites and their half-brothers the Jews; and we, who were chosen to develop the profoundest and sublimest religious conception of the world as the light, life and vitalising force of our whole culture, have with our own hands firmly tied up the veins of life and limp along like crippled Jewish slaves behind Jehovah's Ark of the Covenant! Hence my exhaustive treatment of the Jewish question: my object was to find a broad and strong foundation for so important a judgment.

The second part—the gradual rise of a new world—has in these "Foundations" only one chapter devoted to it, "from the year 1200 to the year 1800." Here I found myself in a sphere which is pretty familiar even to the unlearned reader, and it would have been altogether superfluous to copy from histories of politics and of culture which are within the reach of all. My task was accordingly limited to shaping and bringing into clearer range than is usually the case the too abundant material which I could presume to be known—as material; and here again my one consideration was of course the nineteenth century, the subject of my work. This chapter stands on the border-line between the two parts, that now published and what is to follow; many things which in the preceding chapters could only be alluded to, not fully and systematically discussed, such for instance as the fundamental importance of Teutonicism for our new world and the value of our conceptions of progress and degeneration for the understanding of history, find complete treatment here; on the other hand, the short

DIVISION I

THE LEGACY OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

Das Edelste, was wir besitzen, haben wir nicht von uns selbst; unser Verstand mit seinen Kräften, die Form in welcher wir denken, handeln und sind, ist auf uns gleichsam herabgeerbet.—HERDER.

INTRODUCTORY

HISTORICAL PRINCIPLES

THE WORLD," says Dr. Martin Luther, "is ruled by God through a few heroes and pre-eminent persons." The mightiest of these ruling heroes are the princes of intellect, men who without sanction of diplomacy or force of arms, without the constraining power of law and police, exercise a defining and transforming influence upon the thought and feeling of many generations, men who may be said to be all the more powerful the less power they have, but who seldom, perhaps never, ascend their throne during their lifetime; their sway lasts long, but begins late, often very late, especially when we leave out of account the influence which they exercise upon individuals and consider the moment when that which filled their life begins to affect and mould the life of whole peoples. More than two centuries elapsed before

A. H. + H.

struggle for existence and other such things; great fortunes are unknown and pauperism is literally non-existent; all form a single harmonious family, and no one strives after wealth at the expense of his neighbour. I am not simply repeating what I have read in newspapers and books, I am testifying to what I have seen with my own eyes. If the Mohammedan had not practised tolerance at a time when this idea was unknown to the rest of Europe, there would now be idyllic peace in the Balkan States and in Asia Minor. Here it is the Christian who throws in the leaven of discord; and with the cruelty of a ruthlessly reacting power of nature, the otherwise humane Moslem rises and destroys the disturber of his peace. In fact, the Christian likes neither the wise fatalism of the Mohammedan nor the prudent indifferentism of the Chinese. "I come not to bring peace, but a sword," Christ himself said. The Christian idea can, in a certain sense, be said to be positively anti-social. Now that the Christian has become conscious of a personal dignity otherwise never dreamt of, he is no longer satisfied with the simple animal instinct of living with others; the happiness of the bees and the ants has now no charm for him. If Christianity be curtly characterised as the religion of love, its importance for the history of mankind is but superficially touched upon. The essential thing is rather this: by Christianity each individual has received an inestimable, hitherto unanticipated value—even the "hairs on his head are all numbered by God" (Matthew x. 30); his outward lot does not correspond to this inner worth; and thus it is that life has become tragic, and only by tragedy does history receive a purely human purport. For no event is in itself historically tragic; it is only rendered tragic by the mind of those who experience it; otherwise what affects mankind remains as sublimely indifferent as all other natural phenomena. I shall return soon to

74 *

* Yes, and it could even be
anti-social in its reflex from Darwin.

worlds, worlds above us in the firmament of heaven and worlds within ourselves, in the depths of our silent hearts), so the glorious positive work of the Greeks and Romans demanded a negative completion; and this was provided by Israel. To enable us to see the stars, the light of day must be extinguished; in order to become truly great, to attain that tragic greatness which, as I have said, alone gives vivid purport to history, man had to become conscious not only of his strength but also of his weakness. It was only by clear recognition and unsparing accentuation of the triviality of all human action, the pitiableness of reason in its heavenward flight, the general baseness of human feelings and political motives, that thought was able to take its stand upon a totally new foundation, from which it was to discover in the heart of man capacities and talents, that guided it to the knowledge of something that was sublimer than all else; Greeks and Romans would never by their methods have reached this sublimest goal; it would never have occurred to them to attach so great importance to the life of the single individual. If we contemplate the outward history of the people of Israel, it certainly offers at the first glance little that is attractive; with the exception of some few pleasing features, all the meanness of which men are capable seems concentrated in this one small nation; not that the Jews were essentially baser than other men, but the grinning mask of vice stares at us from out their history in unveiled nakedness; in their case no great political sense excuses injustice, no art, no philosophy reconciles us to the horrors of the struggle for existence. Here it was that the negation of the things of this world arose, and with it the vague idea of a higher extra-mundane vocation of mankind. Here men of the people ventured to brand the princes of this earth as "companions of thieves," and to cry out upon the rich, "Woe unto

them that join house to house, that lay field to field till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth." That was a different conception of right from that of the Romans, to whom nothing seemed more sacred than property. But the curse extended not merely to the mighty, but also to "them that are wise in their own eyes and prudent in their own sight," and likewise to the joyous heroes, who "drink wine," and have chosen the world as their sporting place. So speaks an Isaiah already in the eighth century before the birth of Christ.* But this first outcry against what is radically evil in man and in human society rings louder and louder in the course of the following centuries from the soul of this strange people: it grows in earnestness, until Jeremiah cries out, "Woe unto me, O mother, that thou hast given me birth!" Finally the negation becomes a positive principle of life, and the sublimest of prophets suffers on the cross out of love. Now it matters not whether we adopt the attitude of a believing Christian or simply that of the objective historian; one thing is certain, that in order to understand the figure of Christ, we must know the people who crucified Him. One point of course must be kept in mind: in the case of the Greeks and Romans their deeds were their positive and permanent achievement; in the case of the Jews, on the other hand, it was the negation of the deeds of this people that was the only positive achievement for mankind. But this negation is likewise an historical fact, a fact indeed that has "grown historically." Even if Jesus Christ, as is extremely probable, was not descended from the Jewish people,† nothing but the most superficial partisanship

* See Isaiah, chaps. i. and v.

† For the proof that Christ was no Jew (in the sense of Jew by race) and also for the exposition of his close relation to the moral life of the real Jewish people, see chap. iii.; chap. v. then deals more fully with the Jewish people.

FIRST CHAPTER

HELLENIC ART AND PHILOSOPHY

Nur durch den Menschen tritt der Mensch in das Tageslicht
des Lebens ein.—JEAN PAUL FRIEDRICH RICHTER.

MAN BECOMING MAN

MUCH wit has been spent in defining the difference between man and beast, but the distinction between man and man seems to me to be even more important, preparing the way, as it does, for the recognition of a fact of greater significance. The moment a man awakens to a consciousness of freely creative power, he crosses a definite boundary and breaks the spell which showed how closely, in spite of all his talent and all his achievements, he was related even in mind to other living creatures. Through art a new element, a new form of existence, enters into the cosmos.

In expressing this as my conviction, I put myself on the same footing as some of Germany's greatest sons. This view of the importance of art corresponds, too, if I am not mistaken, to a specific tendency of the German mind; at any rate so clear and precise a formulation of this thought, as we find in Lessing and Winckelmann, Schiller and Goethe, Hölderlin, Jean Paul and Novalis, in Beethoven and Richard Wagner, would hardly be met with among the other members of the related Indo-Teutonic group. In order to do justice to this view, we must in the first place know exactly what is here meant

by "art." When Schiller writes, "Nature has formed creatures only, art has made men," we surely cannot believe that he was thinking here of flute-playing or verse-writing? Whoever reads Schiller's writings (especially of course his *Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*) carefully and repeatedly, will recognise more and more that the idea "art" means to the poet-philosopher something very vivid, something glowing in him, as it were, and yet a very subtle thing, which can scarcely be confined within a brief definition. A man must have misunderstood him if he believes himself free of such a belief. Let us hear what Schiller says, for an understanding of this fundamental idea is indispensable not merely for the purpose of this chapter, but also for that of the whole book. He writes: "Nature does not make a better beginning with man than with her other works: she acts for him, while he cannot yet act for himself as a free intelligent being. But what precisely makes him a man is the fact that he does not stand still as mere nature made him, but is endowed with the capacity of retracing with the aid of reason the steps which nature anticipated with him, of transforming the work of necessity into a work of his free choice and of raising the physical necessity to a moral one." First and foremost then it is the eager struggle for freedom which, according to Schiller, betokens the artistic temperament. Man cannot escape necessity, but he "transforms" it, and, in so doing, shows himself to be an artist. As such he employs the elements, which nature offers him, to create for himself a new world of semblance; but a second consideration follows from this, which must not on any account be overlooked: by placing himself "on his æsthetic standpoint," as it were, "outside the world and contemplating it," man for the first time clearly sees this world, the world outside himself! The desire to tear himself away from nature had indeed been a

science and philosophy are not directly concerned. Or, to present this relation to ourselves from a different side, we can also—and indeed here too with Schiller*—say, "From being a successful instrument, man became an unsuccessful artist." That is the tragedy of which I spoke in the introductory remarks.

We must, I think, admit that this German conception of "man becoming man" goes deeper, embraces more, and throws a brighter light upon that future of mankind after which we have to strive than any narrowly scientific or purely utilitarian one. However that may be, one thing is certain: whether such a view is to have unconditional or merely conditional validity, it is of the very greatest service for a study of the Hellenic world and the sure revelation of its principle of life; for though in this subjective formulation it may be a characteristically German conception, it leads back in the main to Hellenic art and to Hellenic philosophy, which embraced natural science, and proves that Hellenism lived on in the nineteenth century not merely outwardly and historically, but also as an inherent force that has helped to mould the future.†

ANIMAL AND MAN

Not every artistic activity is art. Numerous animals evince extraordinary skill in the construction of dwellings; the song of the nightingale vies successfully with the natural song of the savage; capricious imitation we find

* Cf. *Etwas über die erste Menschengesellschaft*, div. 1.

† To avoid misunderstanding, I wish to mention that here at the beginning of my book I have without further criticism joined hands with Schiller, to ensure that what follows may be more easily understood; only in my final chapter can I establish my view that in the case of the Teutonic peoples, in contrast to the Hellenes, the turning-point in "man becoming man" is to be sought not in art, but in religion—this however does not mean a deviation from Schiller's conception of "art" but purely and simply a particular gradation.

Dr
* of
could
he did not
perceive that
this new
Teutonic religion
would be necessary.

to be; it is only when an observer of nature, like Democritus, from free creative power invents the conception of the atom; when a pensive seer, like Plato, with the wilfulness of the genius superior to the world throws overboard all visible nature and puts in its place the realm of ideas that man has created; it is only when a most Sublime Teacher proclaims, "Behold the kingdom of Heaven is within you"—it is only then that a completely new creature is born, that being of whom Plato says, "He has generative power in his soul rather than in his body." it is only then that the macrocosm contains a microcosm. The only thing that deserves to be called culture is the daughter of such "creative freedom," or in a word "art," and with art philosophy—genuine, creative philosophy and science—is so closely related that both must be recognised as two sides of the same being; every great poet has been a philosopher, every philosopher of genius a poet. That which lies outside this microcosmic life of culture is nothing more than "civilisation," that is, a more and more highly potentiated, increasingly more industrious, easier and less free ant-like state-existence, certainly rich in blessing and in so far desirable, nevertheless a gift of the ages, in the case of which it frequently remains exceedingly questionable whether the human race does not pay more for it than it receives from it. Civilisation is in itself nothing, for it denotes something merely relative; a higher civilisation could be regarded as a positive gain (i.e., an "advance") only when it led to an increasingly intensive intellectual and artistic shaping of life and to an inner moral enlightenment. Because this seemed to him not to be the case with us, Goethe, as the most competent judge, could make the melancholy confession, "These times are worse than one thinks." On the other hand, the undying importance of Hellenism lies in this, that it understood how to create for itself an age better than any that we can conceive,

D. T. ~~and we must~~ and let
us not forget that who
generate such exceptional
power in order to destroy
deadly and confirm evil

an age incomparably better, if I may so express it, than its own backward civilisation deserved. To-day all ethnographers and anthropologists distinguish clearly between morals and religion, and recognise that both in a certain sense are independent of each other; it would be just as useful to learn to distinguish clearly between culture and civilisation. A highly developed civilisation is compatible with a rudimentary culture: Rome, for example, exemplifies a wonderful civilisation with very insignificant and quite unoriginal culture. Athens, on the other hand (with its free citizens) reveals a stage of culture in comparison with which we Europeans of the nineteenth century are in many respects still barbarians, and this is united with a civilisation which—in comparison with ours—may with perfect justice be termed really barbaric.* Compared with all other phenomena of history, Hellenism represents an exuberantly rich blossoming of the human intellect, and the reason of this is that its whole culture rests on an artistic basis. The freely creative work of human imagination was the starting-point of the infinitely rich life of the Hellenes. Their language, religion, politics, philosophy, science (even mathematics), history and geography, all forms of imaginative invention in words and sounds, their whole public life and the whole inner life of the individual—everything radiates from this work, and everything finds itself in it once more as in a figurative and at the same time organic centre, a centre which reduces the greatest divergencies in characters,

* We have an excellent example of this in the case of the Indo-Aryans in their original home, where the formation of a language, "which surpassed all others, was completely uniform and wonderfully perfect," apart from other intellectual achievements, pointed to a high culture. These men were nevertheless a race of shepherds who walked abroad almost naked and knew neither cities nor metals. (See in particular Jhering, *Vorgeschichte der Indoeuropäer*, p. 2.) For a definite distinction between knowledge, civilisation and culture I refer readers to vol. ii. chap. ix. of this book and the synopsis contained in it.

ARTISTIC CULTURE

I have felt bound to prove this, even at the cost of some detail; not because it is of importance for the subject treated in this book, whether one man named Homer wrote the *Iliad*, or in how far the poem, which to-day is so entitled, may correspond to the original poem; the special proof is a side issue. It is, on the other hand, essential for my whole work that I should emphasise the incomparable importance of personality in general: it is likewise essential to recognise the fact that every work of art always and without exception presupposes a strong individual personality,—a great work of art a personality of the first rank, a Genius; it is, finally, imperative that we should grasp the fact, that the secret of the magic power of Hellenism lies locked in this idea "personality." For indeed if we would understand what Hellenic art and Hellenic thought have meant for the nineteenth century, if we would know the secret of so lasting a power, we must realise especially that it is the power of great personalities that, coming down from that vanished world, still influences us with the freshness of youth.

Höchstes Glück der Erdenkinder
Ist nur die Persönlichkeit:

says Goethe; this greatest gift—*höchstes Glück*—the Greeks possessed as no other people ever did, and it is this very thing that surrounds them with that sunny halo which is peculiarly theirs. Their great poems and their great thoughts are not the work of anonymous commercial companies, as are the so-called art and wisdom of the Egyptians, Assyrians, Chinese, *e tutti quanti*; the life-principle of this people is heroism; the individual steps forward alone: boldly crossing the boundary

enough to prove—a few poets more or less make really no difference—how all culture is linked to art? What is one to say to a history which embraces more than 1200 years and does not show a single philosopher, not even a philosopher in miniature? What to a people which has to conceal its own modest claims in this respect by the importation of the latter-day persecuted, anæmic Greeks, who, however, are not philosophers at all but merely very commonplace moralists? How low must the quality of genius have sunk when a good Emperor, who wrote maxims in his leisure hours, is commended to the reverence of coming generations as a thinker! * Where is there a great, creative natural scientist among the Romans? Surely not the industrious encyclopædist, Pliny? Where is there a mathematician

* Lucretius might be named as a man certainly worthy of admiration both as a thinker and as a poet; but his thoughts are, as he admits, always Greek thoughts, and his poetical apparatus is predominantly Greek. And withal there lies over his great poem the deadly shadow of that scepticism, which sooner or later leads to unproductivity, and which must be carefully distinguished from the deep insight of truly religious minds, which become aware of the figurative element in their conceptions, without for that reason doubting the sublime truth of what they vaguely feel in their hearts but cannot fathom, as when, for example, the Vedish seer suddenly exclaims:

From what it has arisen, this creation
Whether created it has been or not—
Whoever in the heavens watches o'er it,
He knows it well! Or does he too not know?

Rigveda, x. 129.

or as Herodotus in the passage quoted a few pages previously, where he expresses the opinion that the poet created the gods. And Epicurus himself, the "atheist," the man whom Lucretius describes as the greatest of all mortals, the man from whom he takes his whole system—do we not learn that in his case "religious feeling must have been so to speak inborn?" (See the sketch of Epicurus' life by K. L. von Knebel, which Goethe recommends.) "Never," exclaimed Diocles when he found Epicurus in the temple, "never have I seen Zeus greater than when Epicurus lay at his feet!" The Latin fancied he had spoken the last word of wisdom with his *Primus in orbe deos fecit timor*; the Greek, on the other hand, as an enlightened being, knelt more fervently than ever before the glorious god-image, which heroism had freely created for itself, and in so doing testified to his own genius.

Useful
for
D.T. *

* We regard the perceptions
of men ^{and women} as carefully as we
listen to the admonitions
of our own higher authorities.

creators of actions, sounds, words, figures) have in the nineteenth century as in former ages felt themselves drawn to Greece as to a home. Among us the man of the people has only an indirect knowledge of Greek art; for him the gods have not, as for Epicurus, ascended a still higher Olympus; they have been hurled down and dashed to pieces by rude Asiatic scepticism and rude Asiatic superstition; but he meets them on our fountains and theatre curtains, in the park, whither he resorts on Sundays for fresh air, and in the museums, where sculpture has always had a greater attraction for the masses than painting. The "man of culture" carries fragments of this art in his head as the undigested material of education: names rather than living conceptions; yet he meets it too frequently at every step, to be able ever to lose sight of it completely; it has a greater share in the building of his intellect than he himself is aware of. The artist, on the other hand—and here I mean every artistic mind—cannot help turning eyes of longing to Greece, not merely because of the individual works which arose there—for among us too many a glorious thing has been created since the year 1200: Dante stands alone, Shakespeare is greater and richer than Sophocles, the art of a Bach would have been a complete novelty for a Greek—no, what the artist finds there and misses here is the artistic element, artistic culture. Since the time of the Romans, European life has had a political basis: and now it is gradually becoming economic. Whereas among the Greeks no free man could venture to be a merchant, among us every artist is a born slave: art is for us a luxury, a realm of caprice; it is not a State necessity, and it does not lay down for our public life the law that the feeling for beauty should pervade everything. Even in Rome it was the caprice of a single Mæcenas that called poetry into life, and

* Reading this at Landsberg, A. H.
 has tears in his eyes — his fate is
 to be a politician and he should
 have been an artist.

It is not lack of inner strength or of originality that draws the heart of the artist of to-day to Greece, but the consciousness and the experience that the individual, by himself, cannot be really original. For originality is quite different from caprice; originality is the free pursuit of the path involuntarily marked out for itself by the particular nature of the personality in question; but the artist can only find this freedom where he is surrounded by a thoroughly artistic culture; such a culture he cannot find to-day. It would of course be absolutely unjust to deny to our European world of to-day artistic impulses: the interest in music shows that men's minds are in a mighty ferment, and modern painting is laying hold upon well-defined but at the same time extensive circles, and rousing an enthusiasm which amounts to an almost uncanny passion, but all this remains outside the life of the nations, it is a supplement—for hours of leisure and men of leisure; and so fashion and caprice and manifold hypocrisy are predominant, and the atmosphere in which the genuine artist lives lacks all elasticity. Even the most powerful genius is now bound, hemmed in, repelled on many sides. And so Hellenic art lives in our midst as a lost ideal, which we must strive to recover.

at
Candebay
He himself
is bound
to find
his freedom
in a
thoroughly
political
culture.

SHAPING

Under a happier star Hellenic philosophy and natural science enjoy with us children of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries a hospitality gladly and gratefully bestowed. Here too it is not a question of mere lares, or worship of ancestry; on the contrary, Hellenic philosophy is very much alive among us, and Hellenic science, so helpless on the one hand, and so incredibly powerful in intuition on the other, compels

to past and contemporary poets. Homer, too, probably "invented" nothing, just as little as Shakespeare did later on; but from various sources he laid hold of that which suited his purpose and welded it into a new whole, something thoroughly individual, endowed with the incomparable qualities of the living individual and burthened with the limitations, failings, and peculiarities inseparably bound up with his nature—for every individual says with the God of the Egyptian mysteries: "I am who I am," and stands before us a new, inscrutable, unfathomable thing.* Similar is Plato's philosophy. Professor Zeller, the famous historian of Greek philosophy, expresses the opinion that "Plato is too much of a poet to be quite a philosopher." It would probably be difficult to extract any definite sense out of this criticism. Heaven knows what a philosopher *in abstracto* may be. Plato was himself, and no one else, and his example shows us how a mind had to be fashioned in order that Greek thought might yield its *Landberg* highest fruit. He is the Homer of this thought. If a competent man were to analyse the doctrine of Plato in such a way that we could clearly see what portions are the original property of the great thinker, not merely by the process of reproduction through genius but as entirely new inventions, then the poetical element in his work would certainly become specially clear. For Montesquieu, too (in his *Pensées*), calls Plato one of the four great poets of mankind. Especially that which is blamed as inconsistent and contradictory would reveal itself as an artistic necessity. Life is in itself a contradiction: *la vie est l'ensemble des fonctions qui résistent à la mort*, said the great Bichat; each living thing has therefore something fragmentary about it, something

* "A genuine work of art is, like a work of nature, always infinite to our mind; it is seen, felt; it produces its effect, but it cannot really be known, much less can its essence, its merit, be expressed in words." (Goethe.)

time to become the founders of scientific mechanics. As in the case of everything Hellenic so here too the meditation of many minds received shape and living power in the life-work of one single all-powerful genius: the "century of mechanics" has, I think, every reason to venerate Archimedes as its father.

PUBLIC LIFE

Inasmuch as I am only concerned here with the achievements and the individuality of the Greeks in so far as they were important factors in our modern culture and living elements of the nineteenth century, much must be omitted, though in connection with what has been said, one would be tempted to go into more detail. Rohde told us above that creative art was the unifying force for all Greece. Then we saw art—widening gradually to philosophy and science—laying the foundations of a harmony of thinking, feeling and knowing. This next spread to the sphere of public life. The endless care devoted to the development of beautiful, powerful human frames followed artistic rules; the poet had created the ideals, which people henceforth strove to realise. Every one knows how great importance was attached to music in Greek education; even in rough Sparta it was highly honoured and cultivated. The great statesmen have all a direct connection with art or philosophy: Thales, the politician, the practical man, is at the same time lauded as the first philosopher and the first mathematician and astronomer; Empedocles, the daring rebel, who deals the death-blow to the supremacy of the aristocracy in his native city, the inventor of public oratory (as Aristotle tells us), is ~~also poet, mystic, philosopher~~, natural investigator and evolutionist. Solon is essentially a poet and a singer, Lycurgus was the first to collect the Homeric

* A. H. "I, the artist, will
create such people

for this, as the same tendency * has manifested and still manifests itself among all other nations. However, if Hellenic history is really to mould the intellect and the judgment, it would need, one would fancy, to be a true, just history, grasping events by their deepest roots and revealing organic connections, not the immortalisation of half-invented anecdotes and views, which could only be excused by the bitterness of the struggle for existence, and the crass ignorance and infatuation of the Greeks. Glorious indeed is the poetic power by which gifted men in that land sought to inspire with patriotic heroism a tickle, faithless, corruptible people inclined to panic, and—where the discipline was firm enough, as in Sparta—actually succeeded in doing so. Here too we see art as the animating and moving power. But that we should impose as truth upon our children the patriotic lies of the Greeks, and not merely on our children, but also—in works like Grote's—should force them as dogmas upon the judgment of healthy men and let them become an influential factor in the politics of the nineteenth century, is surely an extreme abuse of our Hellenic legacy, after Juvenal 1800 years ago mockingly had said :

creditur quidquid Græcia mendax audet in historia.

Still worse does it seem to me to force us to admire

* The principal thing is clearly not what is found in learned books, but what is taught in school, and here I can speak from experience, for I was first in a French "Lycée," then in an English "college," afterwards I received instruction from the teachers of a Swiss private school, and last of all from a learned Prussian. I testify that in these various countries even the best certified history, that of the last three centuries (since the Reformation), is represented in so absolutely different ways that without exaggerating I may affirm that the principle of historical instruction is still everywhere in Europe systematic misrepresentation. While the achievements of our own country are always emphasised, those of others passed over or suppressed, certain things put always in the brightest light, others left in the deepest shadow, there is formed a general picture which in many parts differs only for the subtlest eye from naked lies. The foundation of all genuine truth : the absolutely disinterested love of justice is almost everywhere absent ; a proof that we are still barbarians !

free-thinkers, enemies of all metaphysics and proclaimers of a new "religion of reason," like John Stuart Mill and David Strauss, &c., based their theories on Aristotle. Here, as is evident, we have to deal with a legacy of real living force, and it reminds us that we should speak with humility of the advances made in our time.

The matter is an exceedingly complicated one; if in this whole chapter I have had to be satisfied with mere allusions, I shall here have to confine myself to hinting at allusions. And yet in this very matter relations have to be pointed out, which, so far as I know, have never been revealed in their proper connection. I wish to do this with all modesty, and yet with the utmost precision.

It is the common practice to represent the religious development of the Hellenes as a popular superstitious polytheism, which in the consciousness of some pre-eminent men had gradually transformed itself into a purer and more spiritualised faith in a single God;—the human spirit thus advancing from darkness to ever brighter light. Our reason loves simplifications: this gradual soaring of the Greek spirit, till it was ripe for a higher revelation, is very much in tune with our inborn sluggishness of thought. But this conception is in reality utterly false and proved to be false: the faith in gods, as we meet it in Homer, is the most elevated and pure feature of Greek religion. This religious philosophy, though, like all things human, compassed and limited in many ways, was suited to the knowledge, thought and feeling of a definite stage of civilisation, and yet it was in all probability as beautiful, noble and free as any of which we have knowledge. The distinguishing-mark of the Homeric creed was its intellectual and moral freedom—indeed, as Rohde says, "almost free-thinking"; this religion is the faith acquired through artistic intuition and

Handwritten:

In the mad Bacchantic dance the soul for the first time [among the Greek people] separated itself from the body—that same soul about which Aristotle from the stillness of his study had so much that was edifying to tell us; in the Dionysian ecstasy man felt himself one with the immortal gods and concluded that his individual human soul must also be immortal, a conclusion which Aristotle and others at a later time attempted ingeniously to justify.* It seems to me that we are still suffering from something of this vertigo! And for that reason let us attempt to come to a sensible conclusion regarding this legacy which clings so firmly to us.

To this belief in a soul Hellenic poetry as such has contributed nothing; it reverently adapted itself to the conventional—the ceremonious burial of Patroclus, for instance, who otherwise could not enter on his last rest—the performance of the necessary acts of consecration by Antigone beside the corpse of her brother—and nothing more. It did unconsciously help to promote the belief in immortality, by maintaining that the gods must be conceived not indeed as uncreated but, for their greater glorification, as undying—an idea quite foreign to the Aryan Indians.† The idea of sempiternity, that is, the immortality to support and hold him" (Letter to Goethe, August 9, 1796). Whether or not the Getae were Goths and so belonged to the Teutonic peoples, as Jacob Grimm asserted, does not here much matter; however, a full discussion of this interesting question is to be found in Wietersheim-Dahn, *Geschichte der Völkerwanderung*, I, 597; the result of the investigation is against Grimm's view. The story that the Getic King Zalmoxis learned the doctrine of immortality from Pythagoras is characterised by Rohde as an "absurd pragmatic tale" (*Psyche*, p. 320).

* On this very important point, the genesis of the belief in immortality among the Greeks, see especially Rohde, *Psyche*, p. 296.

† In an old Vedic hymn, which I quoted on p. 35, a verse runs, "The Gods have arisen on this side of creation"; in their capacity as individuals, however, they too cannot, according to the Indian conviction, possess "sempiternity," and Çankara says in the *Vedānta Sūtra's*, when speaking of the individual gods, "Such words as Indra, &c., signify, like the word 'General,' only occupation of a definite post. Whoever therefore occupies the post in question bears the title Indra." (I. 3, 28, p. 170 of Deussen's translation).

immortality of an individual who at some time had come into being, was in consequence familiar to the Greeks as an attribute of their gods; poetry probably found it already existing, but at any rate it was first raised to a definite reality by the power of poetical imagination. Art had no greater share in it than this. Art rather endeavours as far as possible to remove, to temper, to minimise that "belief in dæmons which has everywhere to be taken as primeval," * the conception of a "lower world," the story of "islands of the blest"—in short, all those elements which, growing up out of the subsoil of superstition, force themselves on the human imagination—and all this in order to gain a free, open field for the given facts of the world and of life, and for their poetically religious, imaginative treatment. Unlike art, popular belief, not being satisfied with a religion so lofty and poetic, preferred the teaching of the barbarous Thracians. Neither was it accepted by philosophy, which held a position inferior to such poetical conceptions, until the day came when it felt itself strong enough to set history against fable, and detailed knowledge against symbol; but the stimulus in this direction was not drawn by philosophy from itself nor from the results of empiric science, which had nowhere dealt with the doctrines of souls, the entelechies of Aristotle, immortality and the rest; it was received from the people, partly from Asia (through Pythagoras), partly from Northern Europe (as Orphic or Dionysian cult). The theory of a soul separable from the living body and more or less independent; the theory easily deduced therefrom of bodiless and yet living souls—those, for example, of the dead, which live on as mere souls, as also of a "soul-possessed" divine principle (quite analogous to the *Nous* of Anaxagoras, that is, of power distinct from matter)—furthermore, the theory of

* Deussen, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, I. 39. See also Tylor.

the immortality of this soul—all these are, to begin with, not results of quickened philosophical thought, nor do they form in any sense an evolutionary development, a glorification of that Hellenic national religion which had found its highest expression in the poets; it is rather that people and thinker here put themselves in opposition to poet and religion. And though obeying different impulses, people and thinker played into each other's hands, and together caused the decline and fall of poetry and religion. And when the crisis thus brought about was past, the result was that philosophers had taken the place of artists as the heralds of religion. To begin with, both poets and philosophers had of course derived their material from the people; but which of the two, I ask, has employed it the better and more wisely? Which has pointed the way to freedom and beauty, and which to bondage and ugliness? Which has paved the way for healthy empiric science and which has checked it for almost twenty centuries? In the meantime, from quite another direction, from the midst of a people that possessed neither art nor philosophy, a religious force had entered the world, so strong that it could bear, without breaking down, the madness of the whirling dance that had been elevated to a system of reason—so full of light that even the dark power of purely abstract logic could never dim its radiance—a religious power, qualified by its very origin to promote civilisation rather than culture; had that power not arisen, then this supposed elevation to higher ideals would have ended miserably in ignominy, or rather its actual wretchedness would never have remained concealed. If any one doubts this, let him read the literature of the first centuries of our era, when the State-paid, anti-Christian philosophers entitled their theory of knowledge "Theology" (Plotinus, Proclus, &c.), let him see how these worthies in the leisure hours which remained to

for politics were complete. It is only necessary to read over again the letters of Cicero to see from his simple confessions, hopelessly entrammelled as he was in the ideas of his time, and unable to look beyond his own nose, how mighty Rome and its destinies became the play-ball of idle dawdlers and how much truth there is in the assertion that Rome was not made but unmade by its politicians. Politics have their peculiarities in other countries as well as in Rome. From Alexander to Napoleon, one can hardly over-estimate the power of criminal obstinacy in purely political heroes. A brief discussion of this point is all the more appropriate in this chapter, as Rome in particular is rightly regarded as a specifically political State and we may therefore hope to learn from it how and by whom great and successful politics are achieved.

*P. 4.
decides
to write
against
high
opponents*

What Gibbon says about kings in general, that "their power is most effective in destruction," is true of almost all politicians—as soon as they possess sufficient power. I am not sure that it was not the wise Solon who made a prosperous development of the Athenian State impossible for all time, by doing away with the historically given composition of the population from various tribes and introducing an artificial class-division according to property. This so-called timocracy (honour to him who has money) comes in, it is true, of its own accord almost everywhere to a smaller or greater extent, and Solon at least took the precaution of making duties increase with increase of wealth; nevertheless he it was with his constitution that laid the axe to the root, from which—however painfully—the Athenian State had grown.* A less

* Many will think, but unjustly so, that the constitution of Lycurgus is still more arbitrary. For Lycurgus does not undermine the foundations provided by historical development; on the contrary, he strengthens them. The peoples that had migrated, one after another, into Lacedæmonia, formed layers above each other, the latest comers at the top—and Lycurgus allowed this to remain so. Though the

informed of it, and because we know the issue which Cæsar brought about. I for my part consider the interpretation which the philosophy of history gives to these events a pure abstraction. Neither the rough hand of the impetuous, passionate Plebeian Marius nor the tiger-like cruelty of the coolly calculating Patrician Sulla would have inflicted fatal wounds upon the Roman constitution. Even the most critical danger—the freeing of many thousands of slaves and the bestowing of citizenship on many thousands of those freed-men (and that for political, immoral reasons)—Rome would soon have surmounted. Rome possessed the vitality to ennoble slavery, that is, to give it the definite Roman character. Only a mighty personality, one of those abnormal heroes of will, such as the world scarcely produces once in a thousand years, could ruin such a State. It is said that Cæsar was a saviour of Rome, snatched away too soon, before he could finish his work: this is false. When the great man arrived with his army on the banks of the Rubicon, he is said to have hesitatingly commanded a halt and reflected once more on the far-reaching consequences of his action; if he did not cross, he himself would be in danger, if he did cross the boundary marked by sacred law, he would involve the whole world (i.e., the Roman State) in danger: he decided for ambition and against Rome. The anecdote may be invented, Cæsar at least lets us see no such inner struggle of conscience in his *Civil War*; but the situation is exactly described thereby. No matter how great a man may be, he is never free, his past imperatively prescribes the direction of his present; if once he has chosen the worse part, he must henceforth do harm, whether he wills it or not, and though he raise himself to an autocracy, in the fond hope that he henceforth has it in his power to devote himself wholly to doing what is good, he will experience in himself that “the might of Kings is most effective in destruction.” Cæsar had written

A. H.
Converts
these remarks
By saying
he had
permitted
that
the subject
before
he was
abnormal.

to Pompey even from Ariminum to the effect that the interests of the republic were nearer his heart than his own life;* and yet Cæsar had not long been all-powerful to do good, when his faithful friend Sallust had to ask him whether he had really saved or despoiled the republic?† At the best he had saved it as Virginius did his daughter. Pompey, as several contemporary writers tell us, would allow no one beside him, Cæsar no one over him. Imagine what might have been the result for Rome if two such men, instead of being politicians, had acted as the servants of the Fatherland, as had been Roman custom hitherto!

It is not my business to enter more fully into the subject briefly sketched here; my only object has been to show what a superficial knowledge we have of a people, if we study only the history of its politicians and generals. This is particularly the case with Rome. Whoever studies Rome merely from this point of view, no matter how industriously he may examine its history, can certainly arrive at no other result than did Herder, whose interpretation therefore will remain classic. To this man of genius Roman history is "the history of demons," Rome a "robbers' cave," what the Romans give to the world "devastating night," their "great noble souls, Cæsars and Scipios," spend their life in murdering, the more men they have slaughtered in their campaigns, the warmer the praise that is paid them.‡ This is from a certain point of view correct; but the investigations of Niebuhr, Duruy and Mommsen (especially the last), as well as those of the brilliant historians of law in our century—Savigny, Jhering and many others—have brought to light another Rome, to the existence of which Montesquieu had been the first

* *Civil War*, i. 9. Thoroughly Roman, by the way, to use such a commonplace expression at such a time!

† Second Letter to Cæsar.

‡ *Ideen zur Geschichte der Menschheit*, Bk. XIV.

Dr. H. J. Fowler
1880

to call attention. Here the important thing was to discover and put in its right light what the old Roman historians, intent on celebrating battles, describing conspiracies, slandering enemies and flattering politicians who paid well, had passed by unnoticed or at any rate had never duly appreciated. A people does not become

what the Romans have become in the history of mankind by means of murder and robbery, but in spite of it; no people produces statesmen and warriors of such admirably strong character as Rome did, if it does not itself supply a broad, firm and sound basis for strength of character.

What Herder and so many after him call Rome can therefore be only a part of Rome, and indeed not the most important part. The exposition of Augustine in the fifth book of his *De civitate Dei* is, in my judgment, far happier; he calls attention particularly to the absence of greed and selfishness among the Romans and says that their whole will proclaimed itself in the one resolution, "either to live free or die bravely" (*aut fortiter emori aut liberos vivere*); and the greatness of the Roman power, as well as its durability, he ascribes to this moral greatness.

In the general introduction to this book I spoke of "anonymous" powers, which shape the life of peoples; we have a brilliant example of this in Rome. I believe we might say without exaggeration that all Rome's true greatness was such an anonymous "national greatness." If in the case of the Athenians genius unfolded itself in the blossom, here it did so in the trunk and the roots; Rome was of all nations that with the strongest roots. Hence it was that it defied so many storms, and the history of the world required almost five hundred years to uproot the rotten trunk. Hence too, however, the peculiar grisaille of its history. In the case of the Roman tree everything went to wood, as the gardeners say; it bore few leaves, still fewer blossoms, but

A. H. —
Dwell
succeed
making
that

the trunk was incomparably strong; by its support later nations raised themselves aloft. The poet and the philosopher could not prosper in this atmosphere, this people loved only those personalities in whom it recognised itself, everything unusual aroused its distrust; "whoever wished to be other than his comrades passed in Rome for a bad citizen."* The people were right; the best statesman for Rome was he who did not move one hair's-breadth from what the people as a whole wished, a man who understood how to open the safety-valve now here, now there, to meet the growing forces by the lengthening of pistons and by suitably arranged centrifugal balls and throttles, till the machine of State had quasi-automatically increased its size and perfected its administrative power; he must be, in short, a reliable mechanician: that was the ideal politician for this strong, conscious people whose interests lay entirely in the practical things of life. As soon as any one overstepped this limit, he necessarily committed a crime against the common weal.

Rome, I repeat—for this is the chief point to grasp, and everything else follows from it—Rome is not the creation of individual men, but of a whole people; in contrast to Hellas everything really great is here "anonymous"; none of its great men approaches the greatness of the Roman people as a whole. And so what Cicero says in his *Republic* (ii. 1) is very correct and worth taking to heart: "The constitution of our State is superior to that of others for the following reason: in other places it was individual men who by laws and institutions founded the constitution, as, for example, Minos in Crete, Lycurgus in Lacedæmonia, in Athens (where change was frequent) at one time Theseus, at another Draco, then Solon, Clisthenes and many others; on the other hand, our Roman Commonwealth is founded

* Mommsen: *Römische Geschichte*, 8th ed., I. 241

P.T. on
the U.S.

outcome of a compulsion. Even to-day might is the most important factor in international law, and we have seen how in our century the most peaceful of nations, like Germany, have had unceasingly to increase their military power, but only in the interests of their independence. How much more difficult was the position of Rome, surrounded by a confused chaos of peoples great and small—close at hand masses of related races constantly warring against each other, farther afield an ever-threatening unexplored chaos of barbarians, Asiatics and Africans! Defence did not suffice; if Rome wished to enjoy peace, she had to spread the work of organisation and administration from one land to the other. Observe the contemporaries of Rome and see what a failure those small Hellenic States were owing to the lack of political foresight; Rome, however, had this quality as no people before or after. Its leaders did not act according to theoretical conceptions, as we might almost be inclined to believe to-day when we see so strictly logical a development; they rather followed an almost unerring instinct; this, however, is the surest of all compasses—happy he who possesses it! We hear much of Roman hardness, Roman selfishness, Roman greed; yes! but was it possible to struggle for independence and freedom amid such a world without being hard? Can we maintain our place in the struggle for existence without first and foremost thinking of self? Is possession not power? But one fact has been practically disregarded, viz., that the unexampled success of the Romans is not to be looked upon as a result of hardness, selfishness, greed—these raged all around in at least as high a degree as among the Romans, and even to-day no great change has taken place—no, the successes of the Romans are based on intellectual and moral superiority. In truth a one-sided superiority; but what is not one-sided in this world? And it cannot be denied that in certain respects the Romans felt more

A. H.
D. Porcius
It.

intensity and thought more acutely than any other men at any time, and they were in addition peculiar in this, that in their case feeling and thinking worked together and supplemented each other.

I have already mentioned their love of home. That was a fundamental trait of the old Roman character. It was not the purely intellectual love of the Hellenes, bubbling over and rejoicing in song, yet ever prone to yield to the treacherous suggestions of selfishness; nor was it the verbose love of the Jews: we know how very pathetically the Jews sing of the "Babylonian captivity," but, when sent home full-handed by the magnanimous Cyrus, prefer to submit to fines and force only the poorest to return, rather than leave the foreign land where they are so prosperous; no, in the case of the Romans it was a true, thoroughly unsentimental love that knew few words, but was ready for any sacrifice; no man and no woman among them ever hesitated to sacrifice their lives for the Fatherland. How can we explain so unmeasured an affection? Rome was (in olden times) not a wealthy city; without crossing the boundaries of Italy one could see much more fruitful regions. But what Rome gave and securely established was a life morally worthy of man. The Romans did not invent marriage, they did not invent law, they did not invent the constitutional freedom-giving State; all that grows out of human nature and is found everywhere in some form and to some degree; but what the Aryan races had conceived under these notions as the bases of all morality and culture had nowhere been firmly established till the Romans established it.* Had the Hellenes got too

high
off a
paragon
of hatred
for the
Jews.
the strength
and
balance
of their
nature
defended
upon them
man-
ipulative
acts of
rage.
including
his hatred
of the Jews
was also
well for
man - better
by far than
an organ.

* For the Aryan peoples in particular, see Leist's excellent *Gräco-italienische Rechtsgeschichte* (1884) and his *Altarisches Jus civile* (1896), also Jhering's *Vorgeschichte der Indoeuropäer*. The ethnical investigations of the last years have, however, shown more and more that marriage, law and State exist in some form everywhere, even among the savages of least mental development. And this must be strongly emphasised, for the evolution mania and the pseudo-scientific dogma-

For, let us not savage the wild N. A. that they were not
 never able to consider anything, to organize anything.

[Lately Heinrich Schurtz, in his *Altersklassen und Männerbünde, eine Darstellung der Grundformen der Gesellschaft*, 1902, has fully shown that the arguments for promiscuity in early times, which are wont to be drawn from phenomena of "free love" to-day, are to be interpreted quite differently, and that, on the contrary, "with the most primitive races marriage, and in connection with it the formation of society on a purely sexual basis, is more strongly developed" (p. 200).] As this subject is essentially of the greatest importance and throws a peculiar and very noteworthy sidelight upon scientific modes of thought and power of thought in our century, I should like to add one more instructive example. The original inhabitants of central Australia are, as is well known, supposed to belong to the most backward, intellectually, of all peoples; Lubbock calls them "wretched savages, who cannot count their own fingers, not even the fingers of one hand" (*The Prehistoric Age*, Germ. trans., ii, 151). One can imagine with what contempt the traveller Eyre wrote of the "remarkably peculiar cases where marriage is forbidden" in this wretched race, "where a man may not marry a woman who has the same name as he, even though she be by no means related to him." Strange! And how could these people come to have such inexplicable caprices when it would have been their duty, according to the theory of evolution, to have lived in absolute promiscuity? Since that time two English officials, who lived for years among these savages and gained their confidence, have given us a detailed account of them (*Royal Society of Victoria*, April 1897, summary in *Nature*, June 10, 1897), and it appears that their whole intellectual life, their "conceptive life" (if I may say so) is so incredibly complicated that it is almost impossible for one of us to comprehend it. These people, for example, who are supposed not to be able to count up to five, have a more complicated belief than Plato with regard to the transmigration of souls, and this faith forms the basis of their religion. Now as to their marriage laws. In the particular district spoken of here there lives an ethnically uniform race, the Aruntas. Every marriage union with strange races is forbidden; thereby the race is kept pure. But the extremely baneful effects of long-continued inbreeding (Lamprecht's Teutons would long have become Cretins before ever they entered into history!) are prevented by the Australian blacks by the following ingenious system: they divide (mentally) the whole race into four groups; for simplicity I designate them *a b c d*. A youth from the group *a* may only marry a girl from group *d*, the male *b* only the female *c*, the male *c* only the female *b*, the male *d* only the female *a*. The children of *a* and *d* form once more the group *b*, those of *b* and *c* the group *a*, those of *c* and *b* the group *d*, those of *d* and *a* the group *c*. I simplify very much and give only the skeleton, for I fear my European reader would otherwise soon reach the stage of likewise not being able to count up to five. That such a system imposes important restrictions on the rights of the heart cannot be denied, but I ask, how could a scientifically trained selector have hit upon a more ingenious expedient to satisfy the two laws of breeding

HH
 plain
 the
 nature
 race

mixtures within the common mother race, and at the same time the artificial selection necessitated by geographical and historical conditions tended to produce abnormal gifts (naturally with accompanying phenomena of reversion) ?† I do not know. Certain it is, however, that previous to the Romans there was no sacred, worthy and at the same time practical regulation of matters

which are established by strict observation, namely, (1) the race must be kept pure, (2) continuous inbreeding is to be avoided? (see chap. iv.). Such a phenomenon calls for reverence and silence. When contemplating it one gladly keeps silent regarding such systems as those already mentioned as belonging to the end of the nineteenth century. But what must we feel when we turn our glance from the extremely laboured efforts of these worthy Australian Aruntas to Rome and behold here, in the middle of a frightful world, the sacredness of marriage, the legal status of the family, the freedom of the head of the household rising up out of the heart of the people, for it was at a much later period that it was engraved on bronze tables?

* Thierry, Mommsen, &c.

† Till a short time ago it was a favourite practice to represent the population of Rome as a kind of medley of peoples living side by side: it was supposed to have borrowed its traditions from Hellenic units, its administration from Etruscan ones, its law from Sabines, and its intellect from Samnites, &c. Thus Rome would have in a way been a mere word, a name, the common designation of an international trysting-place. This soap-bubble, too, which rose from the brain foam of pale professors, has burst, like so many others, in Mommsen's hands. Facts and reason both prove the absurdity of such a hypothesis, "which attempts to change the people, which, as few others, has developed its language, state, and religion purely and popularly, into a confused rubble of Etruscan, Sabine, Hellenic, and unfortunately even Pelasgic ruins" (*Röm. Gesch.*, i. 43). The fact, however, that this thoroughly uniform and peculiar people originated from a crossing of various related races is undeniable, and Mommsen himself clearly shows this; he admits two Latin and one Sabellian race; at a later time all kinds of elements were added, but only after the Roman national character was firmly developed so that it assimilated the foreign portion. It would, however, be ridiculous to "assign Rome to the number of mixed peoples" (see p. 44). It is quite a different thing to establish the fact that the most extraordinary and most individual talents and the sturdiest power are produced by crossing. Athens was a brilliant example, Rome another, Italy and Spain in the Middle Ages equally so, just as Prussia and England prove it at the present day (more details in chap. 4). In this respect the Hellenic myth that the Latins were descended from Hercules and a Hyperborean maiden is very noteworthy as one of those incomprehensible traits of innate wisdom; whereas the desperate efforts of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (who lived at the time of the

in this world unless a purely ideal power is at work. The idea alone will of course not suffice; there must also be a tangible interest, even should it be, as in the case of the martyrs, an interest pertaining to the other world; without an additional ideal element the struggle for gain alone possesses little power of resistance; higher power of achievement is supplied only by a "faith," and that is what I call an "ideal impulse" in contrast to the direct interest of the moment—be that last possession or anything else whatever. As Dionysius says of the ancient Romans, "they thought highly of themselves and could not therefore venture to do anything unworthy of their ancestors" (i. 6); in other words, they kept before their eyes an ideal of themselves. I do not mean the word "ideal" in the degenerate, vague sense of the "blue flower" of Romance, but in the sense of that power which impelled the Hellenic sculptor to form the god from out the stone, and which taught the Roman to look upon his freedom, his rights, his union with a woman in marriage, his union with other men for the common weal, as something sacred, as the most valuable gift that life can give. A rock, as I said, not an Aristophanic Cloud-cuckoo-land. As a dream, the same feeling existed more or less among all Indo-Europeans: we meet with a certain holy awe and earnestness in various forms among all the members of this family; the persevering power to realise things practically was, however, given to no one so much as to the Roman. Do not believe that "robbers" can achieve results such as the Roman State, to the salvation of the world, achieved. And when once you have recognised the absurdity of such a view, search deeper and you will see that these Romans were unsurpassed as a civilising power, and that they could only be that because, though they had great faults and glaring intellectual deficiencies, they yet possessed high mental and moral qualities.

at hand by.

but also by our Roman legislation that we won our far-reaching influence."

It is clear that the commonly accepted view of Rome as the conquering nation above all others is very one-sided. Indeed even after Rome had broken with its own traditions, or rather when the Roman people had in fact disappeared from the earth, and only the idea of it still hovered over its grave, even then it could not depart far from this great principle of its life: even the rough soldier-emperors were unable to break this tradition. And thus it is that the real military hero—as individual phenomenon—does not occur at all among the Romans. I will not make any comparisons with Alexander, Charles XII. or Napoleon; I ask, however, whether the one man Hannibal, as an inventive, audacious, arbitrary prince of war, has not displayed more real genius than all the Roman emperors taken together.

A.H.
Candley

It need scarcely be stated that Rome fought neither for a Europe of the future nor in the interests of a far-reaching mission of culture, but simply for itself; but thanks to this very fact, that it fought for its own interests with the reckless energy of a morally strong people, it has preserved from sure destruction that "intellectual development of mankind which depends upon the Indo-Teutonic race." This is best seen clearly in the most decisive of all its struggles, that with Carthage. If Rome's political development had not been so strictly logical up till then, if it had not betimes subdued and disciplined the rest of Italy, the deadly blow to freedom and civilisation mentioned above would assuredly have been dealt by the allied Asiatics and Carthaginians. And how little a single hero can do in the face of such situations of world-wide historical moment, although he alone, it may be, has taken a comprehensive view of them, is shown by the fate of Alexander, who having destroyed

At the
only
was
the
second
half

creation, Mohammedanism, is the greatest of all hindrances to every progress of civilisation, hanging like a sword of Damocles over our slowly and laboriously rising culture in Europe, Asia and Africa; the Jews stand morally so high above all other Semites that one may hardly name them in conjunction with these (their ancestral enemies in any case from time immemorial), and yet we should need to be blind or dishonest, not to confess that the problem of Judaism in our midst is one of the most difficult and dangerous questions of the day. Now imagine in addition a Phœnician nation, holding from the earliest times all harbours in their possession, monopolising all trade, in possession of the richest capitals in the world and of an ancestral national religion (Jews so to speak who had never known Prophets) . . . ! It is no fantastic philosophising on history but an objectively demonstrable fact that, under such conditions, that which we to-day call Europe could never have arisen. Once more I refer to the learned works on the Phœnicians, but above all, because available to every one, to the splendid summary in Mommsen's *Römische Geschichte*, Book III. chap. i., "Carthage."

straight across all Africa with a breadth of about 20 degrees. Countless tribes which Livingstone in his time found happy and peace-loving have since then in some cases been destroyed entirely—since the slave-trade to foreign parts is the chief occupation of the Arabs and never, in the history of mankind, was carried on to such an extent as in the second half of the nineteenth century—in other cases the natives have undergone a remarkable moral change by contact with Semitic masters; they have become cannibals, great stupid children changed to wild beasts. It is, however, noteworthy that the Arabs, where they found it paid them, have revealed their culture, knowledge and shrewdness in laying out magnificent stretches of cultivated land, so that parts of the Congo river district are almost as beautifully farmed as an Alsatian estate. In Kassongo, the capital of this rich country, the Belgian troops found magnificent Arabian houses with silk curtains, bed-covers of satin, splendidly carved furniture, silver ware, &c.; but the aboriginal inhabitants of this district had in the meantime degenerated into slaves and cannibals. A real tangible instance of the difference between civilising and spreading culture. (See especially Dr. Hinde: *The Fall of the Congo Arabs*, 1897, p. 66 ff., 184 ff., &c.)

...the right of the religious idea, however, would have prevailed in the end; as to that there can be no question: the enormous and increasing spread of the Jewish Diaspora * before the time of Christ proves it;

* Diaspora is the name given to the widened Jewish community. Originally the term was applied to those Jews who had preferred not to return from the Babylonian captivity, because they were better off there than in their home. Soon there was no prosperous city in the world without a Jewish community; nothing is more erroneous than the widespread belief that it was the destruction of Jerusalem that first scattered the Jews over the world. In Alexandria and its neighbourhood alone there were reckoned to be under the first Roman emperors a million Jews, and Tiberius already recognised the great danger of this theocratic State in the midst of the legal State. The men of the Diaspora were keen and successful propagandists, and their considerate adoption of men as "half Jews" under remission of the painful initiatory ceremony, helped them greatly; in addition, material advantages contributed to their success, since the Jews pleaded their religion as an excuse for exemption from military service and a series of other burdensome civic duties; but the Hebrew missionaries had the greatest success with women. (Now it is a noteworthy fact that this international community, which contained Hebrews and non-Hebrews, and in which all shades of faith were represented, from the most bigoted Pharisaism to open scoffing irreligion, held together like one man as soon as it was a question of the privileges and interests of the common Jewry; the Jewish freethinker would not for the world have omitted to send in his yearly contribution to Jerusalem for the temple-offerings; Philo, the famous Neoplatonist, who believed in Jahve as little as in Jupiter, nevertheless represented the Jewish community of Alexandria in Rome in favour of the synagogues threatened by Caligula; Poppæa Sabina, the mistress and later the wife of Nero, though no Hebrew but a keen member of the Jewish Diaspora, supported the prayers of the Jewish actor Alityrus, the favourite of Nero, to root out the sect of the Christians, and thereby became very probably morally responsible for that frightful persecution of the year 64, in which it is said that the apostles Peter and Paul met their death. The fact that the Romans, who otherwise at that time could not distinguish Christians from orthodox Jews, were on this occasion able to do so accurately, is regarded by Renan as conclusive proof of this charge, which was made against the Diaspora even in the first century (in Tertullian's *Apologeticus*, chap. xxi., for example, somewhat reserved but yet clear; see also Renan, *L'Antéchrist*, chap. vii.). Newer convincing proofs that up to Domitian's time, and so till long after Nero's death, the Romans regarded the Christians as a Jewish sect, are to be found in Neumann; *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche* (1890), pp. 5 ff. and 14 ff. That Tacitus distinguished clearly between Jews and Christians manifestly proves nothing in this matter, as he wrote fifty years after Nero's persecu-

the Christian Church
the shadow of the cross, what is that
angelical, bloodstained, fanaticism which runs through
all the ages down to our own nineteenth century, that
curse of hatred that has clung to the religion of love
from the beginning and from which Greeks and Romans,
Indians and Chinese, Persians and Teutonic peoples turn
with horror? What is it, if not the shadow of that temple,
in which sacrifices were offered to the god of anger and ven-
geance, a dark shadow cast over the youth of the heroic race
"that from out the darkness strives to reach the light"?

Without Rome it is certain that Europe would have
remained a mere continuation of the Asiatic chaos.
Greece always gravitated towards Asia, till Rome tore
it away. It is the work of Rome that the centre of
gravity of culture has been once and for all removed to
the west, that the Semitic-Asiatic spell has been broken
and at least partly cast aside, that the predominantly
Indo-Teutonic Europe became henceforth the beating
heart and thinking brain of all mankind. While this
State fought for its own practical (but, as we saw, not
unideal) interests without the least regard for others—
often cruelly, always sternly, but seldom ignobly—it has
put the house in readiness, the strong citadel in which
our race, after long aimless wanderings, was to settle down
and organise itself for the salvation of mankind.

For the accomplishment of Rome's work so many cen-
turies were necessary, and in addition so high a degree of
that unerring, self-willed instinct, which hits the mark,
even where it seems to be going senselessly astray,
doing good even where its will is baneful, that it was
not the fleeting existence of pre-eminent individuals but

disappeared from the world; the flatly materialistic view of God would have been our religion, pettifoggery our philosophy. This too is no imaginary picture, only too many facts speak for it; for what is that rigid, illiberal, intellectually narrow dogmatising of the Christian Church—a thing undreamt of by the Aryan—what is that disgraceful, bloodthirsty fanaticism which runs through all the ages down to our own nineteenth century, that curse of hatred that has clung to the religion of love from the beginning and from which Greeks and Romans, Indians and Chinese, Persians and Teutonic peoples turn with horror? What is it, if not the shadow of that temple, in which sacrifices were offered to the god of anger and vengeance, a dark shadow cast over the youth of the heroic race “that from out the darkness strives to reach the light”?

Without Rome it is certain that Europe would have remained a mere continuation of the Asiatic chaos. Greece always gravitated towards Asia, till Rome tore it away. It is the work of Rome that the centre of gravity of culture has been once and for all removed to the west, that the Semitic-Asiatic spell has been broken and at least partly cast aside, that the predominantly Indo-Teutonic Europe became henceforth the beating heart and thinking brain of all mankind. While this State fought for its own practical (but, as we saw, not unideal) interests without the least regard for others—often cruelly, always sternly, but seldom ignobly—it has put the house in readiness, the strong citadel in which our race, after long aimless wanderings, was to settle down and organise itself for the salvation of mankind.

For the accomplishment of Rome's work so many centuries were necessary, and in addition so high a degree of that unerring, self-willed instinct, which hits the mark, even where it seems to be going senselessly astray, doing good even where its will is baneful, that it was not the fleeting existence of pre-eminent individuals but

times and conditions. Similarly everything in this State was elastic, everything remained in touch with the needs of life. But exactly as the poetical inspirations of the Greek philosophers and their mystical interpretations of the Inscrutable had been transformed in Helleno-Semitic Alexandria to dogmas of faith, so here State and law were changed to dogmas, and pretty much by the same people. We have inherited these dogmas, and it is important that we should know whence they come and how they arose.

For example, our idea of the monarch is derived neither from the Teutonic nations, nor from the Oriental despots, but from the learned Jurists who were in the service of the Illyrian shepherd Diocletian, of the Illyrian cowboy Galerius and of the Illyrian swineherd Maximinus, and is a direct parody—if the truth must be told—of the greatest State-ideas of Rome. "The State-idea among the Romans," writes Mommsen, "rests upon the ideal transmission of the individual's capacity for action to the whole body of citizens, the *populus*, and upon the submission on the part of each physical member of the community of his individual will to this universal will.

The repression of individual independence in favour of the collective will is the criterion of a constitutional community."*

To picture to oneself what is implied by this "transmission," this "repression of individual independence," one must recall to memory the uncontrollable, individual love of freedom characteristic of each Roman. Of the oldest legal monument of the Romans, the famous twelve bronze tables (450 B.C.), Esmarch says, "The most pregnant expressions in these tables are the guarantees of the autocracy of the private rights of Roman citizens,"† and when three hundred and fifty years later the first detailed system of law was

* I quote from the abridged edition of his Roman Constitutional Law in Binding's *Systematisches Handbuch der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft*, p. 81 ff.

† *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, 3rd ed., p. 218.

A. H.
at Law

times and conditions. Similarly everything in this State was elastic, everything remained in touch with the needs of life. But exactly as the poetical inspirations of the Greek philosophers and their mystical interpretations of the Inscrutable had been transformed in Helleno-Semitic Alexandria to dogmas of faith, so here State and law were changed to dogmas, and pretty much by the same people. We have inherited these dogmas, and it is important that we should know whence they come and how they arose.

For example, our idea of the monarch is derived neither from the Teutonic nations, nor from the Oriental despots, but from the learned Jurists who were in the service of the Illyrian shepherd Diocletian, of the Illyrian cowboy Galerius and of the Illyrian swineherd Maximinus, and is a direct parody—if the truth must be told—of the greatest State-ideas of Rome. "The State-idea among the Romans," writes Mommsen, "rests upon the ideal transmission of the individual's capacity for action to the whole body of citizens, the *populus*, and upon the submission on the part of each physical member of the community of his individual will to this universal will.

The repression of individual independence in favour of the collective will is the criterion of a constitutional community."*

To picture to oneself what is implied by this "transmission," this "repression of individual independence," one must recall to memory the uncontrollable, individual love of freedom characteristic of each Roman. Of the oldest legal monument of the Romans, the famous twelve bronze tables (450 B.C.), Esmarch says, "The most pregnant expressions in these tables are the guarantees of the autocracy of the private rights of Roman citizens,"† and when three hundred and fifty years later the first detailed system of law was

* I quote from the abridged edition of his Roman Constitutional Law in Binding's *Systematisches Handbuch der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft*, p. 81 ff.

† *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, 3rd ed., p. 218.

A. H.
at Cambridge

face." * Here we have a decidedly artistic instinct, the outcome of specifically Indo-European tendencies. In this artistic element too lies the magic power of the Roman legacy; that is the indestructible and ever incomparable part of it.

On one point indeed we must be quite clear;—Roman law is just as incomparable and inimitable as Hellenic art. Our ridiculous Germanomania will make no change in that. People tell marvels about a "German law," supposed to have been stolen from us by the introduction of the Roman; but there never was a German law, but merely a chaos of rude contradictory laws, a special one for each tribe. It is also absolutely inaccurate to speak of "adopting" Roman law between the thirteenth and the sixteenth centuries; for the Teutonic peoples have "adopted" continuously from the time when they first came into contact with the Roman Empire. Burgundians and East Goths as early as the fifth century of the Christian era (or at the very beginning of the sixth) introduced modified (corrupted) forms of Roman law,† and the oldest sources of Saxon, Frankish, Bavarian and Alemannic law, &c., are so interlarded with Latin words and half-understood principles, that the need of a reasoned codification of law is only too apparent. One might well relegate German law as an ideal to the future, but to seek it in the past is hypocritical twaddle.‡ Another hindrance

* For examples, read the splendid chapter *Plastik des Rechtes* in Jhering's *Geist des römischen Rechtes*, § 23. Of the modern undramatic life of law, Jhering says: "One would have liked to give law, instead of a sword, a quill as its attribute, for the feathers were scarcely more necessary to the bird than to it, except that in the case of law the attribute produced the opposite effects and speed stood in converse relation to the amount of feathers employed."

† Savigny, *Geschichte des römischen Rechtes im Mittelalter*, chap. i.

‡ I know no more conclusive proof of the original incapacity of the Teutonic peoples to judge acutely in questions of law than that such a man as Otto the Great could not decide, otherwise than by a duel, the fundamental question whether descendants should inherit or not;

branch nothing was done to suppress the frightful exaction of usury, and as for safeguarding personal rights, that of freedom, for instance, no one ever even thought of it.* But even under more favourable circumstances, for instance, among the Jews, there is not even the beginning of a genuine formation of law; strange as that may appear, a single glance at the legal clauses of the greatest Jewish thinker, Spinoza, solves the riddle. In his *Political Tractate* (ii. 4 and 8) we read, "The right of each one is in proportion to his power." Here we might of course imagine that it was merely a question of establishing actual relations, for this second chapter bears the title "On Natural Law."† However, in his *Ethics* (Part IV., Supplement, 8) we find in black and white: "According to the highest law of nature every man has unlimited power to do that which in his opinion will be in his interest"; and in the treatise *On True Freedom* we find the words: "To obtain that which we demand for our salvation and our peace, we need no other principle than this, to lay to heart what is for our own interests."‡ That it does not disconcert so honest a man to build up a pure theory of morals upon such foundations is the finest testimony to his inborn casuistical gifts; but it proves that Roman law could never have grown on Jewish soil. No, there

* Compare the very minute information in Jhering's *Vorgeschichte der Indoeuropäer*, p. 233 ff. The usual rate of interest in Babylon was 20 to 25 per cent. Jhering asserts that interest was a Babylonian, a Semitic (not a Sumarian) invention; he says, "all other peoples owe their acquaintance with it to the Babylonians." Honour to whom honour is due! Also the subtlest form of interest, for instance, the favourite plan of lending money without interest, by immediately taking it from the capital, was well known in ancient Babylon, even before Homer had begun to write verses. When, then, shall we be spared the old fiction that it was only in recent centuries that the Semites were forced by the persecution of Christians to become usurers?

† How astonished Cicero and Seneca, Scaevola and Papinian would have been at such a conception of natural law!

‡ The resemblance between the principles (not the conclusions) of Spinoza and of Nietzsche is striking enough to claim our attention.

would have been at the most a simplified code, such as King Tippu Tib, for instance, may use on the Congo.* It was only on the foundation of a law invented and worked out in detail by Indo-Europeans that the Jew could display his astonishing juristical abilities.—The drawbacks in the case of the German lie in quite a different direction. Self-sacrifice, the impulse "to build from within outwards," the emphasising of the ethical moment, the unswerving love of freedom, in short, all the requisite moral qualities they would have possessed in abundance;—not the intellectual ones. Acumen was never a national possession of the Teutons; that is so manifest that it requires no proof. Schopenhauer asserts that "the real national characteristic of the German is dull-wittedness (*Schwerfälligkeit*)."[•] Moreover, the peculiar gifts of the Germans are a hindrance in the formation of law—his incomparable fancy (in contrast to the flat empiricism of the Roman imagination), the creative passion of his mind (in contrast to the cool sobriety of the Roman), his scientific depth (in contrast to the practical political tendencies of the born legal race), his lively sense of fairness (in social relations always a weak reed in comparison with the strictly legal attitude of the Roman). No, this people could never have brought the applied art

* A few years ago I met in society an educated Jew, an owner of petroleum wells and a member of the notorious petroleum-ring. No argument could convince the honest man, who would not have harmed a fly, how morally condemnable such a ring was; his constant answer was, "I can, and therefore I may!" Spinoza word for word, as one can see.—This brings up the grave question as to whether in Teutonic countries men of Jewish race should be appointed judges. Without any passion or prejudice, without doubting the knowledge and the spotless honour of these in question, one ought to ask oneself, on the ground of historical and ethical data, whether it should be taken for granted that these men are capable of completely assimilating a conception of law which is so thoroughly in opposition to their natural tendencies; whether they really understand and feel this law which they use so masterfully. Whoever has come to recognise the clearly marked individuality of the various races of mankind can bring up such a question in all seriousness and without any ill-will.

Christ from all the supernatural significance which dwells in it as it must be to treat Physics upon a purely material basis without imagining that in so doing we have dethroned Metaphysics.

Christ indeed can hardly be spoken of without now and again crossing the boundary; still belief, as such, need not be touched, and if I as historian proceed logically and convincingly, I can bear with any refutation which the reader may bring forward as a question of feeling, as apart from understanding. With this consciousness I shall speak as frankly in the following chapters as I have done in those which have gone before.

THE RELIGION OF EXPERIENCE

* The religious faith of more than two-thirds of all the inhabitants of the earth to-day starts from the life on earth of two men, Christ and Buddha, men who lived only a few centuries ago. We have historical proofs of their having actually existed, and that the traditions regarding them, though containing much that is fabulous and uncertain, obscure and contradictory, nevertheless give us a faithful picture of the main features of their real lives. Even apart from this sure result of the scientific investigations of the nineteenth century,* men of acute and sound judgment will never have doubted the actual existence of these great moral heroes: for although the historical and chronological material regarding them is extremely scanty and imperfect, yet their moral and intellectual individuality stands out so clearly and brilliantly before our eyes, and this individuality is so incomparable, that it could not be

* The existence of Christ was denied even in the second century of our era, and Buddha till twenty-five years ago was regarded by many theologians as a mythical figure. See, for example, the books of Séart and Kern.

* A. H. on thinking of this sentence
wonders whether 2/3 of mankind
will some day meet their
religious faith in him

ness. Many a man may never have seen the Crucified One with his eyes; many a man may constantly have passed this revelation carelessly by; thousands of men, even among ourselves, lack what one might call the inner sense to perceive Christ at all; on the other hand, having once seen Jesus Christ—even if it be with half-veiled eyes—we cannot forget Him; it does not lie within our power to remove the object of experience from our minds. We are not Christians because we were brought up in this or in that Church, because we want to be Christians; if we are Christians, it is because we cannot help it, because neither the chaotic bustle of life nor the delirium of selfishness, nor artificial training of thought can dispel the vision of the Man of Sorrow when once it has been seen. On the evening before His death, when His Apostles were questioning Him as to the significance of one of His actions, He replied, "I have given you an example." That is the meaning not only of the one action but of His whole life and death. Even so strict an ecclesiastic as Martin Luther writes: "The example of our Lord Jesus Christ is at the same time a sacrament, it is strong in us, it does not, like the examples of the fathers, merely teach, no, it also effects what it teaches, it gives life, resurrection and redemption from death." The power of Buddha over the world rests on similar foundations. The true source of all religion is, I repeat, in the case of the great majority of living people not a doctrine, but a life. It is a different question, of course, how far we, with our weak capability, can or cannot follow the example; the ideal is there, clear, unmistakable, and for centuries it has been moulding with incomparable power the thoughts and actions of men, even of unbelievers.

I shall return to this point later in another connection. If I have introduced Buddha here, where only the figure of Christ concerns me, I have done so for this reason, that nothing shows up a figure so well as comparison.

peculiar to mankind—Reason with the power of combination : so it came to pass that connection with the surrounding world—childlike observation with its practical adaptation to business—languished, at any rate among the men of higher culture. Everything was systematically directed to the development of the power of thought : every educated youth knew by heart, word for word, a whole literature charged with matter so subtle that even to this day few Europeans are capable of following it : even geometry, the most abstract of all methods of representing the concrete world, was too obvious for the Indians, and so they came instead to revel in an arithmetic which goes beyond all possibility of presentation: the man who questioned himself as to his aim in life, the man who had been gifted by nature with the desire to strive for some highest goal, found on the one side a religious system in which symbolism had grown to such mad dimensions that it needed some thirty years to find oneself at home in it, and on the other side a philosophy leading up to heights so giddy that whoso wished to climb the last rungs of this heavenly ladder must take refuge from the world for ever in the deep silence of the primeval forest. Clearly here the eye and the heart had lost their rights. Like the scorching simoom of the desert, the spirit of abstraction had swept with withering force over all other gifts of this rich human nature. The senses indeed still lived—desires of tropical heat : but on the other side was the negation of the whole world of sense : between these nothing, no compromise, only war, war between human perception and human nature, between thought and being. And so Buddha must hate what he loved ; children, parents, wife, all that is beautiful and joyous—for what were these but veils darkening perception, bonds chaining him to a dream-life of lies and desire ? and what had he to do with all the wisdom of the Brahmins ? Sacrificial ceremonies which no

human being understood, and which the priests themselves explained as being purely symbolical and to the initiated futile:—beyond this a redemption by perception accessible to scarcely one man in a hundred thousand. Thus it was that Buddha not only cast away from him his kingdom and his knowledge, but tore from his heart all that bound him as man to man, all love, all hope: at one blow he destroyed the religion of his fathers, drove their gods from the temple of the world, and rejected as a vain phantom even that most sublime conception of Indian metaphysics, that of a one and only God, indescribable, unthinkable, having no part in space or time, and therefore inaccessible to thought, and yet by thought dimly imagined. There is nothing in life but suffering, this was Buddha's experience and consequently his teaching. The one object worth striving for is "redemption from suffering." This redemption is death, the entering into annihilation. But to every Indian the transmigration of souls, that is the eternal reincarnation of the same individual, was believed in as a manifest fact, not even to be called in question. Death then, in its ordinary shape, cannot give redemption: it is the gift of that death only upon which no reincarnation follows: and this redeeming death can only be attained in one way, namely, that man shall have died during his life and therefore of his own free will: that is to say, that he shall have cut off and annihilated all that ties him to life, all love, all hope, all desire, all possession: in short, as we should say with Schopenhauer, that he shall have denied the will to live. If man lives in this wise, if while yet alive he makes himself into a moving corpse, then can the reaper Death harvest no seed for a reincarnation. A living Death! that is the essence of Buddhism! We may describe Buddhism as the lived suicide. It is suicide in its highest potentiality: for Buddha lives solely and only to die, to be

* P.T. Buddha saw and could not bear the struggle between Christ and Anti-Christ. So, he looked for removal to another sphere of existence and

dead definitely and beyond recall, to enter into Nirvana—extinction.*

CHRIST

What greater contrast could there be to this figure than that of Christ, whose death signifies entrance into eternal life? Christ perceives divine Providence in the whole world; not a sparrow falls to the ground, not a hair on the head of a man can be injured, without the permission of the Heavenly Father. And far from hating this earthly existence, which is lived by the will and under the eye of God, Christ praises it as the entry into eternity, as the narrow gate through which we pass into the Kingdom of God. And this Kingdom of God, what is it? A Nirvana? a Dream-Paradise? a future reward for deeds done here below? Christ gives the answer in one word, which has undoubtedly been authentically handed down to us, for it had never been uttered before, and no one of His disciples evidently understood it, much less invented it; indeed, this eagle thought flashed so far in front of the slow unfolding of human knowledge that even to the present day few have seen the meaning of it—as I said before, Christianity is still in its infancy—Christ's answer was, "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here or lo there. For behold, the Kingdom of God is within you." This is what Christ himself calls the "mystery"; it cannot be expressed in words, it cannot be defined; and ever and ever again the Saviour endeavours to bring home

* I have translated *das nichts* by *extinction*, which is the rendering of Nirvana by Rhys Davids. He says: "What then is Nirvana, which means simply *going out, extinction*"; and then he goes on to say that it ought to be translated "Holiness." But that will not do here, nor is it altogether incapable of being argued. Extinction gives Chamberlain's meaning better than "nothingness," which is not quite satisfactory. Perhaps "Holy Extinction" comes near to the Buddhist conception. The idea of Rhys Davids would thus not be lost. (Translator's Note.)

D.T. takes up this sentence
from point of view of A.G. — as
the ideal to be followed in mind
for our own powers, and
D.T. to visit up concerning the

* P.T.

Christ. Here we do not find a doctrine like that of Buddha with a logical arithmetical development; nor is there, as has so frequently been asserted by the superficial, any organic connection with Jewish wisdom: read the words of Jesus Sirach, who is most frequently compared with Christ, and ask yourselves whether that is "Spirit of the same Spirit"? Sirach speaks like a Jewish Marcus Aurelius and even his finest sayings, such as "Seek wisdom until death, and God will fight for you," or, "The heart of the fool lies upon his tongue, but the tongue of the wise man dwells within his heart," are as a sound from another world when put beside the sayings of Christ: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth; blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God; take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and you will find rest unto your souls, for my yoke is easy and my burden is light." No one had ever spoken like that before, and no one has spoken so since. These words of Christ have, however, as we can see, never the character of a doctrine, but just as the tone of a voice supplements by a mysterious inexpressible something—which is the most personal element in the personality—what we already know about a man from his features and his actions, so do we seem to hear in them his voice; what he exactly said we do not know, but an unmistakable, unforgettable tone strikes our ear and from our ear enters our heart. And then we open our eyes and see this figure, this life. Down through the ages we hear the words, "Learn of me," and we understand what they mean: to be as Christ was, to live as Christ lived, to die as Christ died, that is the Kingdom of God, that is eternal life.

In the nineteenth century, the ideas of pessimism and negation of the will, which have become so common, have been frequently applied to Christ; but though they fit Buddha and certain features of the Christian churches

* The Virginian Jew who says,
 "I am ready to give
 up all that I have in this world
 what is left of my soul. For
 not much is left. The greater part
 has been burned in the innermost staff
 of the human constitution."

and bidding them "weep not," consoled them with words of life. From inner Asia came the idea of flight from the world to the cloister. Buddhism had not in truth invented it, but gave it its greatest impulse. Christianity, too, imitated it later, closely following the Egyptian example. This idea had already advanced to the very neighbourhood of the Galilean; yet where does one find Christ preaching monastic doctrines of seclusion from the world? Many founders of religion have imposed penance in respect of food upon themselves and their disciples; not so Christ; He emphasises particularly that He had not fasted like John, but had so lived that men called Him a "glutton and a winebibber." All the following expressions which we know so well from the Bible—that the thoughts of men are vain, that the life of man is vanity, he passes away like a shadow, the work of man is vain, all is vanity—come from the Old, not from the New Testament. Indeed such words as those, for example, of the preacher Solomon, "One generation passeth away and another generation cometh, but the earth abideth for ever," are derived from a view of life which is directly contrary to that of Christ; because according to the latter Heaven and earth pass away, while the human breast conceals in its depths the only thing that is everlasting. It is true that Jesus Christ offers the example of an absolute renunciation of much that makes up the life of the greater proportion of mankind; but it is done for the sake of life; this renunciation is the "conversion" which, we are told, leads to the Kingdom of Heaven, and it is not outward but purely inward. What Buddha teaches is, so to speak, a physical process, it is the actual extinction of the physical and intellectual being; whoever wishes to be redeemed must take the three vows of chastity, poverty and obedience. In the case of Christ we find nothing similar: He attends marriages, He declares wedlock to be a holy

D. I.
 renders
 A.C.'s
 intention
 of the
 latter is
 true, then
 as to
 A.C.'s
 benefit
 that
 human
 life
 goes on
 for ever.

exact parallels in the sayings of Buddha ; but they spring from quite a different motive. For Buddha every injustice endured is an extinction, for Christ it is a means of advancing the new view of life : "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of God." (that kingdom which lies hidden like a treasure in the field of life). But if we pass to the inner being, if that one fundamental question of the direction of will is brought up, then we hear words of quite a different kind : "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth ? I tell you, Nay, but rather division ! For from henceforth there shall be five in one house divided, two against three, and three against two. . . . For I am come to stir up the son against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law ; and the man's enemies shall be they of his own household." Not peace but the sword : that is a voice to which we cannot shut our ears, if we wish to understand the revelation of Christ. The life of Jesus Christ is an open declaration of war, not against the forms of civilisation, culture and religion, which He found around Him—He observes the Jewish law of religion and teaches us to give to Cæsar what is Cæsar's—but certainly against the inner spirit of mankind, against the motives which underlie their actions, against the goal which they set for themselves in the future life and in the present. The coming of Christ signifies, from the point of view of the world's history, the coming of a new human species. Linnæus distinguished as many human species as there are colours of skin ; but a new colouring of the will goes really deeper into the organism than a difference in the pigment of the epidermis ! And the Lord of this new human species, the "new Adam," as the Scripture so well describes Him, will have no compromise ; He puts the choice : God or mammon. Whoever chooses

A. H.
thinks
of them
of this

A. H.

conversion, whoever obeys the warning of Christ, "Follow me!" must also when necessary leave father and mother, wife and child: but he does not leave them, like the disciples of Buddha, to find death, but to find life. Here is no room for pity: whom we have lost we have lost, and with the ancient hardness of the heroic spirit not a tear is shed over those who are gone: "Let the dead bury their dead." Not every one is capable of understanding the word of Christ, He in fact tells us, "Many are called but few are chosen," and here again Paul has given drastic expression to this fact: "The preaching of the Cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." So far as outward forms go Christ has no preferences, but where the direction of the will is concerned, whether it is directed to the Eternal or the Temporal, whether it advances or hinders the unfolding of that immeasurable power of life in the heart of man, whether it aims at the quickening of that "Kingdom of God within us" or, on the other hand, scatters for ever the one treasure of "them that are chosen"—there is with Him no question of tolerance and never can be. In this very connection much has been done since the eighteenth century to rob the sublime countenance of the Son of Man of all its mighty features. We have had represented to us as Christianity a strange delusive picture of boundless tolerance, of universally gentle passivity, a kind of milk-and-water religion; in the last few years we have actually witnessed "interconfessional religious congresses," where all the priests of the world shake hands as brothers, and many Christians welcome this as particularly "Christlike." It may be ecclesiastical, it may be right and good, but Christ would never have sent an apostle to such a congress. Either the word of the Cross is "foolishness" or it is "a divine power"; between the two Christ himself has torn open the yawning

* A. H. substitutes "exaltation"
for life.

† The angels were working for
D.K. on that one.

gulf of "division," and, to prevent any possibility of its being bridged, has drawn the flaming "sword." Whoever understands the revelation of Christ cannot be surprised. The tolerance of Christ is that of a spirit which soars high as Heaven above all forms that divide the world; a combination of these forms could not have the slightest importance for Him—that would mean only the rise of a new form; He, on the other hand, considers only the "spirit and the truth." And when Christ teaches, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek turn to him the other also, and if any man will take away thy coat let him have thy cloak also"—a doctrine to which His example on the Cross gave everlasting significance—who does not understand that this is closely related to what follows, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you," and that here that inner "conversion" is expressed, not passively, but in the highest possible form of living action? If I offer the impudent striker my left cheek, I do not do so for his sake; if I love my enemy and show him kindness, it is not for his sake; after the conversion of the will it is simply inevitable and therefore I do it. The old law, an eye for an eye, hatred for hatred, is just as natural a reflex action as that which causes the legs of a dead frog to kick when the nerves are stimulated. In sooth it must be a "new Adam" who has gained such complete mastery over his "old Adam" that he does not obey this impulse. However, it is not merely self-control—for if Buddha forms the one opposite pole to Christ, the Stoic forms the other; but that conversion of the will, that entry into the hidden kingdom of God, that being born again, which makes up the sum of Christ's example, demands a complete conversion of the feelings. This, in fact, is the new thing. Till Christ blood-vengeance was the sacred law of all men of the most different races; but from the Cross there

against
not
peace
hate
sacred.
D.T. #

D.T. and
that too
we have
used

* D.T. It will come as no
surprise that we infiltrated
the message. Christianity
threw it thru the centuries for
it expressed ~~some~~ many of the
ideas of J.C. and A.C.

*V. I. ...
 the Son was wrong, they know
 what they do. * (bottom of page.)*

came the cry, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do!" Whoever takes the divine voice of pity for weak humanitarianism has not understood a single feature of the advent of Christ. The voice which here speaks comes from that Kingdom of God which is within us; pain and death have lost their power over it; they affect him who is born again just as little as the stroke on the cheek or the theft of the coat; everything that drives, constrains and compels the human half-ape — selfishness, superstition, prejudice, envy, hatred—breaks on such a will as this like sea-foam on a granite cliff; in face of death Christ scarcely notices His own pain and tribulation, He sees only that men are crucifying what is divine in them, and they are treading under foot the seed of the Kingdom of God and scattering the "treasure in the field," and thus it is that, full of pity, He calls out, "They know not what they do!" Search the history of the world and you will not find a word to equal this for sublime pride. Here speaks a discernment that has penetrated farther than the Indian mind, here speaks at the same time the strongest will, the surest consciousness of self.

Just as we children of a modern age have discovered in the whole world a power which before only from time to time flashed forth in fleeting clouds as the lightning, a power hidden, invisible, perceived by no sense, to be explained by no hypothesis, but all-present and almighty, and in the same way as we are driven to trace the complete transformation of our outward conditions of life to this power—so Christ pointed to a hidden power in the unfathomed and unfathomable depths of the human heart, a power capable of completely transforming man, capable of making a sorrow-trodden wretch mighty and blessed. The lightning had hitherto been only a destroyer; the power which it taught us to discover is

** a description follows of
 the police battalion (Goldberger)
 shooting up Jews in front of a
 frequent Dayi for who
 enjoy what she does for it
 h. p. b. i. her baby*

now the servant of peaceful work and comfort; in like manner the human will, from the beginning of time the seed of all the misfortune and misery that descended upon the human race, was henceforth to minister to the new birth of this race, to the rise of a new human species. Hence, as I have pointed out in the introduction to this book, the incomparable significance of the life of Christ for the world's history. No political revolution can compare with it.

From the point of view of universal history we have every reason to put the achievement of Christ on a parallel with the achievements of the Hellenes. In the first chapter I have described in how far Homer, Democritus, Plato, &c. &c. are to be considered as real "creators," and I added, "then and then only is a new creature born, then only does the macrocosm contain a microcosm. The only thing that deserves to be called culture is the daughter of such creative freedom."* What Greece did for the intellect, Christ did for the moral life: man had not a moral culture till He gave it. I should rather say, the possibility of a moral culture; for the motive power of culture is that inner, creative process, the voluntary masterful conversion of the will, and this very motive power was with rare exceptions quite overlooked; Christianity became an essentially historical religion, and at the altars of its churches all the superstitions of antiquity and of Judaism found a consecrated place of refuge. Yet we have in the revelation of Christ the one foundation of all moral culture, and the moral culture of our nations is greater or smaller in proportion to the extent to which his personality is able more or less clearly to prevail.

It is in this connection that we can with truth assert that the appearance of Christ upon earth has divided

*D.T.'s
reaction?*

See p. 251

mankind into two classes. It created for the first time true nobility, and indeed true nobility of birth, for only he who is chosen can be a Christian. But at the same time it sowed in the hearts of the chosen the seed of new and bitter suffering: it separated them from father and mother, it made them lonely wanderers among men who did not understand them, it stamped them as martyrs. And who after all is really master? Who has entirely conquered his slavish instincts? Discord from now onward rent the individual soul. And now that the individual, who hitherto in the tumultuous struggle of life had scarcely attained to a consciousness of his "Ego," was awakened to an unexpectedly high conception of his dignity, inner significance and power, how often was his heart bound to fail him in the consciousness of his weakness and unworthiness? Now and now only did life become truly tragical. This was brought about by man's own free act in rising against his animal nature.

"From a perfect pupil of nature man became an imperfect moral being, from a good instrument a bad artist," says Schiller. But man will no longer be an instrument; and as Homer had created gods such as he wished them, so now man rebelled against the moral tyranny of nature and created a sublime morality such as he desired; he would no longer obey blind impulses, beautifully constrained and restricted as they might be by legal paragraphs; his own law of morals would henceforth be his only standard. In Christ man awakens to consciousness of his moral calling, but thereby at the same time to the necessity of an inner struggle that is reckoned in tens of centuries. Under the heading Philosophy in the ninth chapter (vol. ii.), I shall show that after an anti-Christian reaction lasting for many centuries we have with Kant returned again to exactly the same path. The humanitarian Deists of the eighteenth century who turned

Landsberg
A. H. at
"In those
two
centuries
do I
find
my
true
soul."

away from Christ thought the proper course was a "return to nature": on the contrary, it is emancipation from nature, without which we can achieve nothing, but which we are determined to make subject to ourselves. In Art and Philosophy man becomes conscious of himself, in contrast to nature, as an intellectual being; in marriage and law he becomes conscious of himself as a social being, in Christ as a moral being. He throws down the gauntlet for a fight in which there is no place for humility; whoever will follow Christ requires above all courage, courage in its purest form, that inner courage, which is steeled and hardened anew every day, which proves itself not merely in the intoxicating clash of battle, but in bearing and enduring, and in the silent, soundless struggle of every hour in the individual breast. The example is given. For in the advent of Christ we find the grandest example of heroism. Moral heroism is in Him so sublime that the much-extolled physical courage of heroes seems as nothing; certain it is that only heroic souls—only "masters"—can in the true sense of the word be Christians. And when Christ says, "I am meek," we well understand that this is the meekness of the hero sure of victory; and when He says, "I am lowly of heart," we know that this is not the humility of the slave, but the humility of the master, who from the fulness of his power bows down to the weak.

On one occasion when Jesus was addressed not simply as Lord or Master, but as "good master," He rejected the appellation: "Why callest thou Me good: there is none good." This should make us think, and should convince us that it is a mistaken view of Christ which forces His heavenly goodness, His humility and long-suffering, into the foreground of His character; they do not form its basis, but are like fragrant flowers on a strong stem. What was the basis of the world-power of

That was before
we got to Him.

and then gave
him the great
dignity of the great
Lion, "forgive them for
they know not what they do,"
and then after Christianity
and then after Christianity
and then after Christianity.

* D. T.
How
they
regard
his
virtues,
will
none of
them
admit
that
he
was
on the
cross?
Indeed,
in the
room
he lost
it, yet
entered
him, as

merely was so sublime a figure not easy for any one to comprehend and to contemplate in its organic relations to the contemporary world, but everything concurred to dim and falsify its true features: Jewish religious idiosyncrasy, Syrian mysticism, Egyptian asceticism, Hellenic metaphysics, soon too Roman traditions of State and Pontifex, as also the superstitions of the barbarians; every form of misunderstanding and stupidity had a share in the work. In the nineteenth century many have devoted themselves to the unravelling of this tangle, but, so far as I know, no one has succeeded in separating from the mass of facts the few essential points and putting them clearly before the eyes of all. In fact even honest learning does not protect us against prejudice and partiality. We shall here try, unfortunately indeed without the specialist's knowledge, but also without prejudice, to find out how far Christ belonged to His surroundings and employed their forms for viewing things, how far He differed from them and rose high as the heavens above them; only in this way can we free His personality from all accidental circumstances and show its full autonomous dignity.

Let us therefore first ask ourselves, was Christ a Jew by race?

The question seems at the first glance somewhat childish. In the presence of such a personality peculiarities of race shrink into nothingness. An Isaiah, however much he may tower above his contemporaries, remains a thorough Jew; not a word did he utter that did not spring from the history and spirit of his people; even where he mercilessly exposes and condemns what is characteristically Jewish, he proves himself—especially in this—the Jew; in the case of Christ there is not a trace of this. Take again Homer! He awakens the Hellenic people for the first time to consciousness of itself; to be able to do that, he had to harbour in his

D.T. When A. H. read this sentence
he threw the book across the
room. Chamberlain was so weak
as afraid of giving offence. (Hess and
I understood that passage)

the investigating understanding. And exactly as the possible forms of a building are determined and limited in essential points by the nature of the building material, so the possible form of a human being, his inner and his outer, are defined in decisively essential points by the inherited material of which this new personality is composed. It certainly may happen that too much importance is attached to the idea of race: we detract thereby from the autonomy of personality and run the risk of undervaluing the great power of ideas; besides, this whole question of race is infinitely more complicated than the layman imagines; it belongs wholly to the sphere of anthropological anatomy and cannot be solved by any dicta of the authorities on language and history. Yet it will not do simply to put race aside as a negligible quantity; still less will it do to proclaim anything directly false about race and to let such an historical lie crystallise into an indisputable dogma. Whoever makes the assertion that Christ was a Jew is either ignorant or insincere: ignorant when he confuses religion and race, insincere when he knows the history of Galilee and partly conceals, partly distorts the very entangled facts in favour of his religious prejudices or, it may be, to curry favour with the Jews.* The probability that Christ was no Jew, that He had not a drop of genuinely Jewish

* How is one, for example, to explain the fact that Renan, who in his *Vie de Jésus*, published in 1863, says it is impossible even to make suppositions about the race to which Christ by blood belonged (see chap. ii.), in the fifth volume of his *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, finished in 1891, makes the categorical assertion, "Jésus était un Juif," and attacks with unwonted bitterness those who dare doubt the fact? Is it to be supposed that the *Alliance Israélite*, with which Renan was so closely connected in the last years of his life, had not had something to do with this? In the nineteenth century we have heard so much fine talk about the freedom of speech, the freedom of science, &c.; in reality, however, we have been worse enslaved than in the eighteenth century: for in addition to the tyrants who have really never been disarmed, new and worse ones have arisen. The former tyranny could, with all its bitter injustice, strengthen the character: the new, which is a tyranny proceeding from and aiming at money, degrades to the lowest depth of bondage.

blood in his veins, is so great that it is almost equivalent to a certainty. To what race did He belong? This is a question that cannot be answered at all. Since the land lay between Phoenicia and Syria, which in its southwestern portion was strongly imbued with Semitic blood, and in addition had never been quite cleared of its former mixed-Israelitish (but at no time Jewish) population, the probability of a descent principally Semitic is very great. But whoever has even casually glanced at the race-babel of the Assyrian empire* and then learns that colonists from all parts of this empire settled in that former home of Israel, will be baffled by the question. It is indeed possible that in some of these groups of colonists there prevailed a tradition of marrying among themselves, whereby a tribe would have kept itself pure; that this, however, should have been kept up more than five hundred years is almost unthinkable; the very conversion to the Jewish faith had gradually obliterated those tribal differences which at first had been maintained by religious customs brought from their old homes (2 Kings, xvii. 29). We hear that in later times Greeks too migrated thither; in any case they belonged to the poorest classes, and accepted immediately the "god of the country"! Only one assertion can therefore be made on a sound historical basis: in that whole region there was only one single pure race, a race which by painfully scrupulous measures protected itself from all mingling with other nations—the Jewish; that Jesus Christ did not belong to it can be regarded as certain. Every further statement is hypothetical.

This result, though essentially negative, is of great value; it means an important contribution to the right knowledge of the personality of Christ, and at the same time to the understanding of its effectiveness up to the present day as well as to the disentanglement of the

* Cf. Hugo Winckler: *Die Völker Vorderasiens*, 1900.

* D.T. A.H. inscribed this paragraph into the book of his certainties. Christianity was still an enemy to be overcome, kept at bay, to be overcome by its power, order, and magnitude when it came.

See *
this
page

to defend itself
first it stumbled in our life.

*

wildly confused clue of contradictory ideas and false conceptions, which has wound itself around the simple, transparent truth. It is time to go deeper. The outward connection is less important than the inner; now and now only do we come to the decisive question: how far does Christ as a moral fact belong to Judaism and how far does He not? To fix this once for all, we shall have to make a series of important distinctions, for which I beg the fullest attention of the reader.

RELIGION

Christ is, quite generally—indeed, perhaps universally—represented as the perfecter of Judaism, that is to say, of the religious ideas of the Jews.* Even the orthodox Jews, though they cannot exactly honour Him as the perfecter, behold in Him an offshoot from their tree and proudly regard all Christianity as an appendix to Judaism. That, I am firmly convinced, is a mistake; it is an inherited delusion, one of those opinions that we drink in with our mother's milk and about which in consequence the free-thinker never comes to his senses any more than the strictly orthodox Churchman. Certainly Christ stood in direct relation to Judaism, and the influence of Judaism, in the first place upon the moulding of His personality and in a still higher degree upon the development and history of Christianity is so great, definite and essential, that every attempt to deny it must lead to nonsensical results; but this influence is only in the smallest degree a religious one. Therein lies the heart of the error.

We are accustomed to regard the Jewish people as the religious people above all others: as a matter of fact in

* The great legal authority Jhering is a praiseworthy exception. In his *Vorgeschichte der Indoeuropäer*, p. 300, he says: "The doctrine of Christ did not spring from his native soil, Christianity is rather an overcoming of Judaism; there is even in his origin something of the Aryan in Christ."

never again lost, and more than all that fundamental truth which the Rigveda centuries and centuries before Christ tried thus to express, "The root of existence, the wise found in the heart"—a conviction which in the nineteenth century has been almost identically expressed by Goethe:

• Ist nicht der Kern der Natur
Menschen im Herzen?

That is religion!—Now this very tendency, this state of mind, this instinct, "to seek the core of nature in the heart," the Jews lack to a startling degree. They are born rationalists. Reason is strong in them, the will enormously developed, their imaginative and creative powers, on the other hand, peculiarly limited. Their scanty mythically religious conceptions, indeed even their commandments, customs and ordinances of worship, they borrowed without exception from abroad, they reduced everything to a minimum † which they kept rigidly unaltered; the creative element, the real inner life is almost totally wanting in them; at the best it bears, in relation to the infinitely rich religious life of the Aryans, which includes all the highest thought and poetical invention of these peoples, like the lingual sounds referred to above, a ratio of 2 to 7. Consider what a luxuriant growth of magnificent religious conceptions and ideas, and in addition, what art and philosophy, thanks to the Greeks and Teutonic races, sprang up upon the soil of Christianity and then ask with what images and thoughts the so-called religious nation of the Jews has in the same space of time enriched mankind! Spinoza's *Geometric Ethics* (a false, still-born adaptation of a brilliant and pregnant thought of Descartes) seems to me in reality the most cruel mockery of the Talmud

• Is not the core of nature
In the heart of man?

† For details, see chap. v.

A possible
title

A. H.
D. T. H.
was no
much a
Jew,
except
that he had
no
comparable
fear of
deceit
to
restrain
him.

CHRIST NOT A JEW

Whoever wishes to see the revelation of Christ must passionately tear this darkest of veils from his eyes. His advent is not the perfecting of the Jewish religion but its negation. * It was in the very place where feelings played the least part in religious conceptions that a new religious ideal appeared, which—unlike the other great attempts further to explain the inner life, by thoughts or by images—laid the whole burthen of this "life in spirit and in truth" upon the feelings. The relation to the Jewish religion could at most be regarded as a reaction; the feelings are, as we have said, the fountain head of all genuine religion; this spring which the Jews had well-nigh choked with their formalism and hard-hearted rationalism Christ opened up. Few things let us see so deeply into the divine heart of Christ as His attitude towards the Jewish religious ordinances. He observed them, but without zeal and without laying any stress upon them; at best they are but a vessel, which, holding nothing, would remain empty; and as soon as an ordinance bars His road, He breaks it without the least scruple, but at the same time calmly and without anger: for what has all this to do with religion? "Man* is Lord

just imagine the "wealth" of these crassly ignorant unimaginative scribes and the "emptiness" of the Hellenes! Graetz has not much regard for the personality of Christ; the highest appreciation to which he deigns to rise is as follows: "Jesus may also have possessed a sympathetic nature that won hearts, whereby His words could make an impression" (i. 576). The learned Professor of Breslau regards the crucifixion as the result of a "misunderstanding." With regard to the Jews who afterwards went over to Christianity Graetz is of opinion that it was done for their material advantages and because the belief in the Crucified One "was taken into the bargain as something unessential" (ii. 30). Is that still true? We knew from the Old Testament that the covenant with Jehovah was a contract with obligations on both sides, but what can be "bargained" in regard to Christ I cannot understand.

* The following information about the expression "son of man" is important: "The Messianic interpretation of the expression 'son

* Rosenburg underlines this for A. H. with the addition — "tactically this is imperfect. Fundamentally we must be able to dispense w Christianity & really that that is a ... nature."

of God, which has become the common property of all civilised mankind. For on this foundation Christ built ; He could do so, thanks to that "abstract materialism " which He found around Him. Elsewhere religions were choked by the richness of their mythologies ; here there was no mythology at all. Elsewhere every god possessed so distinct a physiognomy, had been made by poetry and the plastic arts so thoroughly individual, that no one could have changed him over night ; or, on the other hand (as is the case with Brahman in India) the conception of him had been gradually so sublimated that nothing remained from which to create a new living form. Neither of these two things had happened with the Jews : Jehovah was in truth a remarkably concrete, indeed an altogether historical conception, and in so far a much more tangible figure than the imaginative Aryan had ever possessed ; at the same time it was forbidden to represent Him either by image or word.* Hence the religious genius of mankind found here a *tabula rasa*. Christ required to destroy the historical Jehovah just as little as the Jewish "law" ; neither the one nor the other has an immediate relation to real religion ; but just as He in point of fact by that inner "conversion" transformed the so-called law into a fundamentally new law, so He used the concrete abstraction of the Jewish God in order to give the world a quite new conception of God. We speak of anthropomorphism ! Can then man act and think otherwise than as an anthropos ? This new conception of the Godhead differed, however, from other sublime intuitions in this, that the image was created not with the brilliant colours of symbolism nor with the etching-needle of thought, but was caught as it were on a mirror

* When at a very late period the Jews could not quite resist the impulse to presentation, they sought to conceal the want of imaginative power by Oriental verbiage. We can see an example of it in chap. i. of *Ezekiel*.

in the innermost mind, and became henceforth a direct individual experience to every one that had eyes to see.— Certain it is that this new ideal could not have been set up in any other place than where the conception of God had been fanatically clung to, and yet left totally undeveloped.

Hitherto we have directed our attention to what separates or at least distinguishes Christ from Judaism; it would be one-sided to leave it at that alone. His fate and the main tendency of His thought are both closely connected with genuine Jewish life and character. He towers above His surroundings, but yet He belongs to them. Here we have to consider especially two fundamental features of the Jewish national character: the historical view of religion and the predominance of the will. These two features are, as we shall immediately see, genetically related. The former has strongly influenced Christ's life and His memory after death; in the latter is rooted His doctrine of morals. A study of these two points will throw light on many of the deepest and most difficult questions in the history of Christianity, as well as on many of the inexplicable inner contradictions of our religious tendencies up to the present day.

HISTORICAL RELIGION

Of the many Semitic peoples one only, and that one politically one of the smallest and weakest, has maintained itself as a national unity; this small nation has defied all storms and stands to-day a unique fact among men—without fatherland, without a supreme head, scattered all over the world, enrolled among the most different nationalities, and yet united and conscious of unity. This miracle is the work of a book, the *Thora*, with all that has been added to it by way of supplement up to the present day. But this book must be regarded as evidence of a peculiar national soul, which at a critical

A. H.

A. H. Only a pact made with the devil could enable them to survive for so long. "Am I brave enough," he asks, "to go to war against the devil?" But to hear his answer.

moment was guided in this direction by individual eminent and far-seeing men. In the next chapter but one I shall have to enter more fully into the origin and importance of these canonical writings. In the meantime, I shall merely call attention to the fact that the Old Testament is a purely historical work. If we leave out of account a few late and altogether unessential additions (like the so-called *Proverbs of Solomon*), every sentence of these books is historical; the whole legislation too which they contain is based on history, or has at least a chronological connection with the events described: "The Lord spake unto Moses," Aaron's burnt-offering is accepted by the Lord, Aaron's sons are killed during the proclamation of the law, &c. &c.; and if it is a question of inventing something, the narrator either links it on to a fictitious story, as in the book of *Job*, or to a daring falsification of history, as in the book of *Esther*. By this predominance of the chronological element the Bible differs from all other known sacred books. The religion it contains is an element in the historical narrative and not *vice versâ*; its moral commandments do not grow with inherent necessity out of the depths of the human heart, they are "laws," which were promulgated under definite conditions on fixed days, and which can be repealed at any time. Compare for a moment the Aryan Indians; they often stumbled upon questions concerning the origin of the world, the whence and the whither, but these were not essential to the uplifting of their souls to God; this question concerning causes has nothing to do with their religion: indeed, far from attaching importance to it, the hymnists exclaim almost ironically:

Who hath perceived from whence creation comes?
 He who in Heaven's light upon it looks,
 He who has made or has not made it all,
 He knows it! Or does he too know it not? *

Goethe, who is often called the "great Heathen," but

* *Rigveda*, x. 129, 7.

the Jew constructed a whole history of the world of which he made himself the centre; and from this moment, that is, the moment when Jehovah makes the covenant with Abraham, the fate of Israel forms the history of the world, indeed, the history of the whole cosmos, the one thing about which the Creator of the world troubles himself. It is as if the circles always became narrower; at last only the central point remains—the "Ego," the will has prevailed. That indeed was not the work of a day; it came about gradually; genuine Judaism, that is, the Old Testament in its present form, shaped and established itself only after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity.* And now what formerly had been effected with unconscious genius was applied and perfected consciously: the union of the past and the future with the present in such a way that each individual moment formed a centre on the perfectly straight path, which the Jewish people had to follow and from which it henceforth could not deviate either to right or to left. In the past divine miracles in favour of the Jews and in the future expectation of the Messiah and world-empire: these were the two mutually complementary elements of this view of history. The passing moment received a peculiarly living importance from the fact that it was seen growing out of the past, as reward or punishment, and that it was believed to have been exactly foretold in prophecies. By this the future itself acquired unexampled reality: it seemed to be something tangible. Even should countless promises and prophecies not come true,† that could always be easily explained. Will looks not too close, but what it holds it does not let go,

* See chap. v. In order to give a fixed point and to reveal drastically the differences of mental tendencies, I may mention that this was about three hundred years after Homer, scarcely a century before Herodotus.

† For example, the promise to Abraham in reference to Canaan, "To thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever."

A. H. looks upon his own broken promises as parallel to Jehovah's broken promises. God had the right to break

Every few years each of us throws a voting-paper into the box ; otherwise we do not know or hardly know that our life is of national importance ; but the Jew could never forget that. His God had promised him, " No people shall withstand thee, till thou destroyest it," but immediately added, " All the commandments which I command thee, thou shalt keep ! " God was thus always present to consciousness. Practically everything but material possession was forbidden to the Jew ; his mind therefore was directed to property alone ; and it was to God that he had to look for the possession of that property.—The man who has never brought home to himself the conditions here hastily sketched will have difficulty in realising what unanticipated vividness the conception of God acquired under these conditions. The Jew could not indeed represent Jehovah by images ; but His working, His daily intervention in the destiny of the world was, so to speak, a matter of experience ; the whole nation indeed lived upon it ; to meditate upon it was their one intellectual occupation (if not in the Diaspora, at least in Palestine).

It was in these surroundings that Christ grew up ; beyond them He never stepped. Thanks to this peculiar historical sense of the Jews He awoke to consciousness as far as possible from the all-embracing Aryan cult of nature and its confession *tal-tvam-asi* (that thou art also), in the focus of real anthropomorphism, where all creation was but for man, and all men but for this one chosen people, that is, He awoke in the direct presence of God and Divine Providence. He found here what He would have found nowhere else in the world : a complete scaffolding ready for Him, within which His entirely new conception of God and of religion could be built up. After Jesus had lived, nothing remained of the genuinely Jewish laws, obedience to which is divine command ! (See Dr. Emanuel Schreiber : *Der Talmud vom Standpunkte des modernen Judentums*.)

idea; now that the temple was built the scaffolding could be removed. But it had served its purpose, and the building would have been unthinkable without it. The God to whom we pray to give us our daily bread could only be thought of where a God had promised to man the things of this world; men could only pray for forgiveness of sins to Him who had issued definite commandments.—I almost fear, however, that if I here enter into details I may be misunderstood; it is enough if I have succeeded in giving a general conception of the very peculiar atmosphere of Judea, for that will enable us to discern that this most ideal religion would not possess the same life-power if it had not been built upon the most real, the most materialistic—yes, assuredly the most materialistic—religion in the world. It is this and not its supposed higher religiosity that has made Judaism a religious power of world-wide importance.

The matter becomes still clearer whenever we consider the influence of this historical faith upon the fate of Christ.

The most powerful personality can be influential only when it is understood. This understanding may be very incomplete, it may indeed frequently be direct misunderstanding, but some community of feeling and thought must form the link of connection between the lonely genius and the masses. The thousands that listened to the Sermon on the Mount certainly did not understand Christ; how could that have been possible? They were a poor people, downtrodden and oppressed by continual war and discord, systematically stupefied by their priests; but the power of his word awakened in the heart of the more gifted among them an echo which it would have been impossible to awaken in any other part of the world: was this to be the Messiah, the promised redeemer from their misery and wretchedness? What immeasurable power lay in the possibility of such

* This sentence gave A. H. all he needed from the Foundations of the XIXth Century.

a conception! At once the homely, fleeting present was linked to the remotest past and the most indubitable future, and thereby the present received everlasting importance. It does not matter that the Messiah, whom the Jews expected, had not the character which we Indo-Europeans attach to this conception*; the idea

* Even so orthodox an investigator as Stanton admits that the Jewish idea of the Messiah was altogether political (see *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, 1886, pp. 122 f., 128, &c.). It is well known that theology has occupied itself much of late years with the history of the conceptions of the Messiah. The principal result of the investigation for us laymen is the proof that the Christians, misled by what were specifically Galilean and Samaritan heterodoxies, supplanted the Jewish conception of the coming of the Messiah by a view which the Jews never really held. The Jews who were learned in Scripture were always indignant at the strained interpretations of the Old Prophets; now even the Christians admit that the Prophets before the exile (and these are the greatest) knew nothing of the expectation of a Messiah (see, for example, the latest summary account, that of Paul Volz: *Die vorexilische Jahvesprophetie und der Messias*, 1897); the Old Testament does not even know the word, and one of the most important theologians of our time, Paul de Lagarde (*Deutsche Schriften*, p. 53), calls attention to the fact that the expression *maschiach* is not of Hebrew origin at all, but was borrowed at a late time from Assyria or Babylon. It is particularly noteworthy also that this expectation of the Messiah wherever it existed was constantly taking different forms; in one case a second King David was to come, in another the idea was one only of Jewish world-empire in general, then again it is God himself with his heavenly judgment "who will put an end at once to those who have hitherto held sway and give the people of Israel power for ever, an all-embracing empire, in which the just of former times who rise again shall take part, while the rebellious are condemned to everlasting shame" (cf. Karl Müller; *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 15); other Jews again dispute whether the Messiah will be a Ben-David or a Ben-Joseph; many believe there would be two of them, others are of the opinion that he would be born in the Roman Diaspora; but nowhere and at no time do we find the idea of a suffering Messiah, who by his death redeems us (see Stanton, pp. 122-124). The best, the most cultured and pious Jews have never entertained such apocalyptic delusions. In the Talmud (*Sabbath*, Part 6) we read, "Between the present time and the Messianic there is no difference except that the pressure, under which Israel pines till then, will cease." (Contrast with this the frightful confusion and complete perversity of the Messianic conceptions in the *Sanhedin* of the Babylonian Talmud.) I think that with these remarks I have touched the root of the matter: in the case of an absolutely historical religion, like the Jewish, the sure possession of the future is just as imperative a necessity as the sure possession of the

These
are
also
immensely
important
to A. th.
To possess the
future is
crucial to
keeping power.

was there, the belief founded on history that at any moment a saviour could and must appear from Heaven. In no other part of the earth could a single man have this conception, full of misunderstandings as it was, of the world-wide importance of Christ. The Saviour would have remained a man among men. And in so far I think that the thousands who soon afterwards cried, "Crucify him, crucify him," showed just as much understanding as those who had piously listened to the Sermon on the Mount. Pilate, at other times a hard, cruel judge, could find no fault in Christ; * in Hellas and in Rome He would have been honoured as a holy man. But the Jew lived only in history, to him the "heathen" idea of morality and sanctity was strange, since he knew only a "law," and moreover obeyed this law for quite practical reasons, namely, to stay the wrath of God and to make sure of his future, and so he judged a phenomenon like the revelation of Christ from a purely historical standpoint, and became justly filled with fury, when the promised kingdom, to win which he had suffered and endured for centuries—for the sake of possessing which he had separated himself from all people upon the earth, and had become hated and despised of all—when this kingdom, in which he hoped to see all nations in fetters and all princes upon their knees "licking the dust," was all at once transformed from an earthly kingdom into one "not of this world." Jehovah had often promised his people that he would "not betray" them; but to the Jews this was bound to appear be-

past; from the earliest times we see this thought of the future inspiring the Jews and it still inspires them; this unimaginative people gave its expectations various forms, according to the varying influences of surroundings, essential only is the firm ineradicable conviction that the Jews should one day rule the world. This is in fact an element of their character, the visible bodying-forth of their innermost nature. It is their substitute for mythology.

* Tertullian makes the charmingly simple remark: "Pilate was already at heart a Christian" (*Apologeticus* xxi.).

in quite freeing the revelation of Christ from this Jewish groundwork; it was tried in the first centuries of the Christian era, but without success, since the thousand features in which the personality had revealed its individuality became thereby blurred, and nothing but an abstraction remained behind.*

WILL IN THE SEMITIC RACE

Still profounder is the influence of the second trait of character.

We have seen that what I call the historical instinct of the Jews rests above all upon the possession of an abnormally developed will. The will in the case of the Jew attains such superiority that it enthrals and tyrannises over all other faculties. And so it is that we find on the one hand extraordinary achievements, which would be almost impossible for other men, and on the other, peculiar limitations. However that may be, it is certain that we see this very predominance of will in Christ at all times: frequently un-Jewish in His individual utterances, quite Jewish, in so far as the will is almost solely emphasised. This feature is like a branching of veins that goes deep and spreads far: we find it in every word, in every

understood it and did not employ it in their system. He who does not transgress the law is, in their eyes, free from sin. Just as little has their expectation of a Messiah to do with our conception of redemption. See, further, chap. v. and vol ii. chap. vii.

* That is the tendency of gnosticism as a whole; this movement finds its most carefully pondered and noblest expression, as far as I can venture to express an opinion, in Marcion (middle of the second century), who was more filled with the absolutely new in the Christian ideal than perhaps any religious teacher since his time; but in just such a case one sees how fatal it is to ignore historical data. (See any Church History. On the other hand I must warn the student that the three lines which Professor Ranke devotes to this really great man (*Weltgeschichte*, ii. 171) contain not a single word of what should have been said on this point.) [For a knowledge of Marcion and gnosticism as a whole Mead's *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten* may be recommended.]

single conception. By a comparison I hope to make my meaning clear and comprehensible.

Consider the Hellenic conception of the Divine and the Human and of their relation to one another. Some Gods fight for Troy, others for the Achæans; while I propitiate one part of the Divine I estrange the other; life is a battle, a game, the noblest may fall, the most miserable gain the victory; morality is in a way a personal affair, man is lord of his own heart but not of his destiny; there is no Providence that protects, punishes and rewards. The Gods themselves are in fact not free; Zeus himself must yield to fate. Herodotus says, "Even a God cannot escape what is destined for him." A nation which produces the *Iliad* will in a later age produce great investigators of nature and great thinkers. For he who looks at nature with open eyes which are not blinded by selfishness will discover everywhere in it the rule of law; the presence of law in the moral sphere is fate for the artist—predestination for the philosopher. For the faithful observer of nature the idea of arbitrariness is, to begin with, simply impossible; do what he will, he cannot make up his mind to impute it even to a God. This philosophical view has been beautifully expressed by Here in Goethe's fragment, *Achilleis*:

Willkür bleibet ewig verhasst den Göttern und Menschen,
Wenn sie in Thaten sich zeigt, auch nur in Worten sich kundgiebt;
Denn so hoch wir auch stehen, so ist der ewigen Götter
Ewigste Themis * allein, und diese muss dauern und walten.†

* Themis has degenerated in modern times to an allegory of impartial jurisdiction, that is, of an altogether arbitrary agreement, and she is appropriately represented with veiled eyes; while mythology lived, she represented the rule of law in all nature, and the old artists gave her particularly large, wide-open eyes.

† Arbitrariness remains ever hateful to gods and men, when it reveals itself in deeds or even in words only. For however high we may stand, the eternal Themis of the eternal Gods alone is, and she must lastingly hold sway.

On the other hand, the Jewish Jehovah can be described as the incarnation of arbitrariness. Certainly this divine conception appears to us in the *Psalms* and in *Isaiah* in altogether sublime form; it is also—for the chosen people—a source of high and serious morality. But what Jehovah is, He is, because He wills to be so; He stands above all nature, above every law, the absolute, unlimited autocrat. If it pleases Him to choose out from mankind a small people and to show His favour to it alone, He does so; if He wishes to vex it, He sends it into slavery; if he, on the other hand, wishes to give it houses which it has not built and vineyards which it has not planted, He does so and destroys the innocent possessors; there is no Themis. So too the divine legislation. Beside moral commands which breathe to some extent high morality and humanity, there stand commands which are directly immoral and inhuman; * others again determine most trivial points: what one may eat and may not eat, how one shall wash, &c., in short, everywhere absolute arbitrariness. He who sees deeper will not fail to note in this the relationship between the old Semitic idolatry and the belief in Jehovah. Considered from the Indo-European standpoint, Jehovah would in reality be called rather an idealised idol, or, if we prefer it, an anti-idol, than a god. And yet this conception of God contains something which could not, any more than arbitrariness, be derived from observation of nature, namely, the idea of a Providence. According to Renan, "the exaggerated belief in a special Providence is the basis of the whole Jewish religion."† Moreover, with

* Besides the countless raids involving wholesale slaughter divinely commanded, in which "~~the heads of the children~~" are to be "dashed against the stones," note the cases where command is given to attack with felonious intent "the brother, companion, and neighbour" (*Exodus xxxii. 27*), and the disgusting commands such as in *Ezekiel vi. 12-15*.

† *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, II. p. 31

as the Nazis in effect did. Coleridge

this freedom of God another freedom is closely connected, that of the human will. The *liberum arbitrium* is decidedly a Semitic conception and in its full development a specifically Jewish one; it is inseparably bound up with the particular idea of God.* Freedom of will implies nothing less than "ever repeated acts of creation"; carefully considered it will be clear that this supposition (as soon as it has to do with the world of phenomena) contradicts not merely all physical science, but also all metaphysics, and means a negation of every transcendent religion. Here cognition and will stand in strict opposition. Now wherever we find limitations of this idea of freedom—in Augustine, Luther, Voltaire, Kant, Goethe—we can be sure that an Indo-European reaction against the Semitic spirit is taking place. So, for example, when Calderon in the *Great Zenobia* lets the wild autocratic Aurelián mock him

who called the will free

For—though one must certainly be on one's guard against misusing such formulae simplifications—one can still make the assertion that the idea of necessity is in all Indo-European races particularly strongly marked, and is met with again and again in the most different spheres; it points to high power of cognition free from passion; on the other hand, the idea of arbitrariness, that is, of an

* We can trace in every history of Judaism with what very logical fanaticism the Rabbis still champion the unconditioned and not merely metaphysically meant freedom of will. Diderot says: "*Les Juifs sont si jaloux de cette liberté d'indifférence, qu'ils s'imaginent qu'il est impossible de penser sur cette matière autrement qu'eux.*" And how closely this idea is connected with the freedom of God and with Providence becomes clear from the commotion which arose when Maimonides wished to limit divine Providence to mankind and maintained that every leaf was not moved by it nor every worm created by its will.—Of the so-called "fundamental doctrines" of the famous Talmudist Rabbi Akiba the two first are as follow: (1) Everything is supervised by the Providence of God; (2) Freedom of will is stipulated (Hirsch Graetz; *Gnosticismus und Judentum*, 1846, p. 91).

but here again the basis is solely and characteristically Jewish.

CHRIST A JEW

Whatever one may be inclined to think of these various Jewish conceptions, no one will deny their greatness, or their capacity to exercise an almost inestimable influence upon the moulding of the life of mankind. Nor will any one deny that the belief in divine almightiness, in divine Providence and in the freedom of the human will,* as well as the almost exclusive emphasising of the moral nature of men and their equality before God ("the last shall be first") are essential elements of the personality of Christ. Far more than the fact that He starts from the Prophets, far more than His respect for Jewish legal enactments, do these fundamental views show us that Christ belonged morally to the Jews. Indeed, when we penetrate farther to that central point in Christ's teaching, to that "conversion of the will," then we must recognise—as I have already hinted at the beginning of this chapter in the comparison with Buddha—that here is something Jewish in contrast to the Aryan negation of the will. The latter is a fruit of perception, of too great perception; Christ, on the other hand, addresses Himself to men, in whom the will—not the thought, is supreme; what He sees around Him is the insatiable, ever-covetous Jewish will that is always stretching out both hands; He recognises the might of this will and commands it—not to be silent, but to take a new direction. Here we must say, Christ is a Jew, and He can only be understood when we have learned to grasp critically these peculiarly Jewish views which He found and made His own.

* The latter, however, as it appears, with important limitations, since the Aryan idea of grace more than once clearly appears in Christ's words.

* again, the relation to A. H.

fathers actually belonged. The same may be said of the *corpus juris*; here, too, it was the Chaos (according to Hellenic ideas the mother of Erebus and Nox, of darkness and night), to which the task fell of perfecting and transforming the living work of a living people to an international dogma. Under the same influence, art ever more and more lost its personal, freely creative power and became transformed into an hieratically formulary exercise, while the lofty, philosophical speculation of the Hellenes was displaced by its caricature, the cabalistic phantoms of demiurges, angels and daemons—conceptions which could not be designated by a higher name than “airy materialism.”* We must therefore, to begin with, turn our attention to this Chaos of Peoples.

THE JEWS

Out of the midst of the chaos towers, like a sharply defined rock amid the formless ocean, one single people, a numerically insignificant people—the Jews. This one race has established as its guiding principle the purity of the blood; it alone possesses, therefore, physiognomy and character. If we contemplate the southern and eastern centres of culture in the world-empire in its down-

cluded from that that its chief end was not the enjoyment of a god-given happiness but the prevention of an evil (compare Christ's chief doctrine, that of the “conversion of will,” cf. p. 188). Augustine, the African mestizo, found it easy to refute him; he appealed to the first chapter of the first book of the Jewish *Thora*, to prove beyond dispute that everything is good and that “the world exists for no other reason than because it has been pleasing to a good God to create the absolutely good.” (See the very instructive discussion in the *De civitate Dei*, xi. 23.) Augustine triumphantly introduces another argument in this place: if Origenes were right, then the most sinful creatures would have the heaviest bodies and devils would be visible, but devils have airy, invisible shapes, and so, &c. Thus thoughts that arose in the Chaos prevailed over metaphysical religion. (The same arguments are to be found, word for word, in the *Führer der Irrenden* of the Jew Maimuni.)

* Bürger calls it *Luftiges Gesindel* (airy rabble) in his *Lenore*.

fall, and let no sympathies or antipathies pervert our judgment, we must confess that the Jews were at that time the only people deserving respect. We may well apply to them the words of Goethe, "the faith broad, narrow the thought." In comparison with Rome and still

more so with Hellas their intellectual horizon appears so narrow, their mental capacities so limited, that we seem to have before us an entirely new type of being; but the narrowness and want of originality in thought are fully counterbalanced by the power of faith, a faith which might be very simply defined as "faith in self." And since this faith in self included faith in a higher being, it did not lack ethical significance. However poor the Jewish "law" may appear, when compared with the religious creations of the various Indo-European peoples, it possessed a unique advantage in the fallen Roman Empire of that time: it was, in fact, a law; a law which men humbly obeyed, and this very obedience was bound to be of great ethical import in a world of such lawlessness. Here, as everywhere, we shall find that the influence of the Jews—for good and for evil—lies in their character, not in their intellectual achievements.* Certain historians of the nineteenth century, even men so intellectually pre-eminent as Count Gobineau, have supported the view that Judaism has always had merely a disintegrating influence upon all peoples. I cannot share this conviction. In truth, where the Jews become very numerous in a strange land, they may make it their object to fulfil the promises of their Prophets and with the best will and conscience to "consume the strange peoples"; did they not say of themselves, even in the lifetime of Moses, that they were "like locusts"? However, we must distinguish between Judaism and the Jews and admit that Judaism as an idea is one of the most conservative ideas in the world. The idea of physical race-unity and race-purity, which is the very

* See p. 238 ff

A. H.
wells
this →

↓
Here, the
back
and
forth
talking
him
into
new
thoughts.

D. T.
arises
him

that
true danger
consists
of
converting
one's
enemies
into one's
own.

fall, and let no sympathies or antipathies pervert our judgment, we must confess that the Jews were at that time the only people deserving respect. We may well apply to them the words of Goethe, "the faith broad, narrow the thought." In comparison with Rome and still more so with Hellas their intellectual horizon appears so narrow, their mental capacities so limited, that we seem to have before us an entirely new type of being; but the narrowness and want of originality in thought are fully counterbalanced by the power of faith, a faith which might be very simply defined as "faith in self." And since this faith in self included faith in a higher being, it did not lack ethical significance. However poor the Jewish "law" may appear, when compared with the religious creations of the various Indo-European peoples, it possessed a unique advantage in the fallen Roman Empire of that time: it was, in fact, a law; a law which men humbly obeyed, and this very obedience was bound to be of great ethical import in a world of such lawlessness. Here, as everywhere, we shall find that the influence of the Jews—for good and for evil—lies in their character, not in their intellectual achievements.* Certain historians of the nineteenth century, even men so intellectually pre-eminent as Count Gobineau, have supported the view that Judaism has always had merely a disintegrating influence upon all peoples. I cannot share this conviction. In truth, where the Jews become very numerous in a strange land, they may make it their object to fulfil the promises of their Prophets and with the best will and conscience to "consume the strange peoples"; did they not say of themselves, even in the lifetime of Moses, that they were "like locusts"? However, we must distinguish between Judaism and the Jews and admit that Judaism as an idea is one of the most conservative ideas in the world. The idea of physical race-unity and race-purity, which is the very

* See p. 238 ff

A. H.
wells
this →

↓
Here, the
back
and
forth
tumbling
him
into
new
thoughts.

D. T.
argues
him
that
time & space
conscious
of
converting
one's
everyday
thoughts
into one's
own.

essence of Judaism, signifies the recognition of a fundamental physiological fact of life; wherever we observe life, from the hyphomycetes to the noble horse, we see the importance of "race"; Judaism made this law of nature sacred. And this is the reason why it triumphantly prevailed at that critical moment in the history of the world, when a rich legacy was waiting in vain for worthy heirs. It did not further, but rather put a stop to, universal disintegration. The Jewish dogma was like a sharp acid which is poured into a liquid which is being decomposed in order to clear it and keep it from further decomposition. Though this acid may not be to the taste of every one, yet it has played so decisive a part in the history of the epoch of culture to which we belong that we ought to be grateful to the giver: instead of being indignant about it, we shall do better to inform ourselves thoroughly concerning the significance of this "entrance of the Jews into the history of the West," an event which in any case exercised inestimable influence upon our whole culture, and which has not yet reached its full growth.

Another word of explanation. I am speaking of Jews, not of Semites in general; not because I fail to recognise the part played by the latter in the history of the world, but because my task is limited both in respect of time and space. Indeed for many centuries other branches of the Semitic race had founded powerful kingdoms on the South and East coasts of the Mediterranean and had established commercial depots as far as the coasts of the Atlantic Ocean; doubtless they had also been stimulative in other ways, and had spread knowledge and accomplishments of many kinds; but nowhere had there been a close intellectual connection between them and the other inhabitants of future Europe. The Jews first brought this about, not by the millions of Jews who lived in the Diaspora, but first and foremost by the Christian idea. It was only when the Jews crucified Christ that they

Here
A. H.
~~Prothos~~
Prothos
at the
mouth.

rac~~es~~—stand, wherever the recent spread of the Chaos has not blurred their features, now as friendly, now as hostile, but always as alien forces face to face.

In this book I understand by "Teutonic peoples" the different North-European races, which appear in history as Celts, Teutons (Germanen) and Slavs, and from whom—mostly by indeterminable mingling—the peoples of modern Europe are descended. It is certain that they belonged originally to a single family, as I shall prove in the sixth chapter; but the Teuton in the narrower Tacitean sense of the word has proved himself so intellectually, morally and physically pre-eminent among his kinsmen, that we are entitled to make his name summarily represent the whole family. The Teuton is the soul of our culture. Europe of to-day, with its many branches over the whole world, represents the chequered result of an infinitely manifold mingling of races: what binds us all together and makes an organic unity of us is "Teutonic" blood. If we look around, we see that the importance of each nation as a living power to-day is dependent upon the proportion of genuinely Teutonic blood in its population. Only Teutons sit on the thrones of Europe.—What preceded in the history of the world we may regard as Prolegomena; true history, the history which still controls the rhythm of our hearts and circulates in our veins, inspiring us to new hope and new creation, begins at the moment when the Teuton with his masterful hand lays his grip upon the legacy of antiquity.

*D.H.:
Saulke
is saying
something
useful.*

dogs, produced by chance and promiscuity? Do we get them by giving the animals equality of rights, by throwing the same food to them and whipping them with the same whip? No, they are produced by artificial selection and strict maintenance of the purity of the race. Horses and especially dogs give us every chance of observing that the intellectual gifts go hand in hand with the physical; this is specially true of the moral qualities: a mongrel is frequently very clever, but never reliable; morally he is always a weed. Continual promiscuity between two pre-eminent animal races leads without exception to the destruction of the pre-eminent characteristics of both.* Why should the human race form an exception? A father of the Church might imagine that it does, but is it becoming in a renowned natural investigator to throw the weight of his great influence into the scale of mediæval ignorance and superstition? Truly one could wish that these scientific authorities of ours, who are so utterly lacking in philosophy, had followed a course of logic under Thomas Aquinas; it could only be beneficial to them. In spite of the broad common foundation, the human races are, in reality, as different from one another in character, qualities, and above all, in the degree of their individual capacities, as greyhound, bulldog, poodle and Newfoundland dog. Inequality is a state towards which nature inclines in all spheres; nothing extraordinary is produced without "specialisation"; in the case of men, as of animals, it is this specialisation that produces noble races; history and ethnology reveal this secret to the dumbest eye. Has not every genuine race its own glorious, incomparable physiognomy? How could Hellenic art have arisen without Hellenes?

* See especially Darwin's *Plants and Animals under Domestication*, chaps. xv. xix. "Free crossing obliterates characters." For the "superstitious care with which the Arabs keep their horses pure bred" see interesting details in Gibbon's *Roman Empire*, chap. 50. See also Burton's *Mecca*, chap. xxix.

nations pays great and direct attention to this question. But in what a maze of contradiction, errors and delusions public opinion moves! Notice how Gobineau bases his account—so astonishingly rich in intuitive ideas which have later been verified and in historical knowledge—upon the dogmatic supposition that the world was peopled by Shem, Ham and Japhet. Such a gaping void in capacity of judgment in the author suffices, in spite of all his documentary support, to relegate his work to the hybrid class of scientific phantasmagorias. With this is connected Gobineau's further fantastic idea, that the originally "pure" noble races crossed with each other in the course of history, and with every crossing became irrevocably less pure and less noble. From this we must of necessity derive a hopelessly pessimistic view of the future of the human race. But this supposition rests upon total ignorance of the physiological importance of what we have to understand by "race." A noble race does not fall from Heaven, it becomes noble gradually, just like fruit-trees, and this gradual process can begin anew at any moment, as soon as accident of geography and history or a fixed plan (as in the case of the Jews) creates the conditions. We meet similar absurdities at every step. We have, for example, a powerful Anti-Semitic movement: are we to consider the Jews as identical with the rest of the Semites? Have not the Jews by their very development made themselves a peculiar, pure race profoundly different from the others? Is it certain that an important crossing did not precede the birth of this people? And what is an Aryan? We hear so many and so definite pronouncements on this head. We contrast the Aryan with the "Semite," by whom we ordinarily understand "the Jew" and nothing more, and that is at least a thoroughly concrete conception based upon experience. But what kind of man is the Aryan? What concrete conception does he correspond to? Only

*A. H. like
the thought
of crossing
this.*

of a colonisation of India from Europe there are not the slightest grounds . . . in short, this question is what miners call "swimming land"; he who knows the danger sets foot on it as little as possible. The more we study the specialists, the less certain we become. It was originally the philologists who established the collective idea "Aryans." Then came the anatomical anthropologists; the inadmissibility of conclusions drawn from mere philology was demonstrated, and now skull-measuring began; craniometry became a profession, and it did provide a mass of extremely interesting material; lately, however, the same fate is overtaking this so-called "somatic anthropology" that formerly overtook philology: ethnographers have begun to travel and to make scientifically systematic observations from living man, and in this way have been able to prove that the measuring of bones by no means deserves the importance that was wont to be attached to it; one of the greatest of Virchow's pupils has become convinced that the idea of solving problems of ethnology by the measurement of skulls is fruitless.* All these advances have been made in the second half of the nineteenth century; who knows what will be taught about "Aryans"† in the year 1950? At present, at any rate, the layman can say nothing on the subject. If he turns up one of the well-known authorities, he will be told that the Aryans "are an invention of the study and not a

unlike Huxley and many others, builds no Darwinian castles in the air, says that from anatomical discoveries one may assert that "the oldest troglodytes of Europe were of Aryan descent!" (quoted from Ranke, *Der Mensch*, ii. 578).

* Ehrenreich: *Anthropologische Studien über die Urbewohner Brasiliens*, 1897.

† When I use the word Aryan in this book, I take it in the sense of the original Sanscrit "ārya," which means "belonging to the friends," without binding myself to any hypothesis. The relationship in thought and feeling signifies in any case an homogeneity. Cf. the note on p. 93.

animals. It shows itself in the whole habit of the beast, and proclaims itself in a hundred peculiarities which defy analysis: nay more, it proves itself by achievements, for its possession invariably leads to something excessive and out of the common—even, to that which is exaggerated and not free from bias. Goethe's dictum, "only that which is extravagant (*überschwänglich*) makes greatness," is well known.* That is the very quality which a thoroughbred race reared from superior materials bestows upon its individual descendants—something "extravagant"—and, indeed, what we learn from every race-horse, every thoroughbred fox-terrier, every Cochin China fowl, is the very lesson which the history of mankind so eloquently teaches us! Is not the Greek in the fulness of his glory an unparalleled example of this "extravagance"? And do we not see this "extravagance" first make its appearance when immigration from the North has ceased, and the various strong breeds of men, isolated on the peninsula once for all, begin to fuse into a new race, brighter and more brilliant, where, as in Athens, the racial blood flows from many sources—simpler and more resisting where, as in Lacedæmon, even this mixture of blood had been barred out. Is the race not as it were extinguished, as soon as fate wrests the land from its proud exclusiveness and incorporates it in a greater whole? † Does not Rome teach us the same

* *Materialien zur Geschichte der Farbenlehre*, the part dealing with Newton's personality.

† It is well known that it was but gradually extinguished, and that in spite of a political situation, which must assuredly have brought speedy destruction on everything Hellenic, had not race qualities here had a decisive influence. Till late in the Christian era Athens remained the centre of intellectual life for mankind; Alexandria was more talked of, the strong Semitic contingent saw to that; but any one who wished to study in earnest travelled to Athens, till Christian narrow-mindedness for ever closed the schools there in the year 529, and we learn that as late as this even the man of the people was distinguished in Athens "by the liveliness of his intellect, the correctness of his language and the sureness of his taste" (Gibbon,

It uses
this
the SS
infused
is
developed
on
this
notion

Adolf Bastian, testifies that, "what we see in history is not a transformation, a passing of one race into another, but entirely new and perfect creations, which the ever-youthful productivity of nature sends forth from the invisible realm of Hades." * Whoever travels the short distance between Calais and Dover, feels almost as if he had reached a different planet, so great is the difference between the English and French, despite their many points of relationship. The observer can also see from this instance the value of purer "inbreeding." England is practically cut off by its insular position: the last (not very extensive) invasion took place 800 years ago; since then only a few thousands from the Netherlands, and later a few thousand Huguenots have crossed over (all of the same origin), and thus has been reared that race which at the present moment is unquestionably the strongest in Europe.†

Direct experience, however, offers us a series of quite different observations on race, all of which may gradually contribute to the extension of our knowledge as well as to its definiteness. In contrast to the new, growing, Anglo-Saxon race, look, for instance, at the Sephardim, the so-called "Spanish Jews"; here we find how a genuine race can by purity keep itself noble for centuries and tens of centuries, but at the same time how very necessary it is to distinguish between the nobly reared portions of a nation and the rest. In England, Holland and Italy there are still genuine Sephardim but very few, since

* Das Beständige in den Menschenrassen und die Spielweite ihrer Veränderlichkeit, 1868, p. 26.

† Mention should also be made of Japan, where likewise a felicitous crossing and afterwards insular isolation have contributed to the production of a very remarkable race, much stronger and (within the Mongoloid sphere of possibility) much more profoundly endowed than most Europeans imagine. Perhaps the only books in which one gets to know the Japanese soul are those of Lafcadio Hearn: *Kokoro*, *Hints and Echoes of Japanese Inner Life*; *Gleanings in Buddha Fields*, and others.

H +
the SS.

Hear he
suffern
over
great
Lafcadio
the Waffen
SS. how

he develops
an idea of
the multiple marriage.

Adolf Bastian, testifies that, "what we see in history is not a transformation, a passing of one race into another, but entirely new and perfect creations, which the ever-youthful productivity of nature sends forth from the invisible realm of Hades." * Whoever travels the short distance between Calais and Dover, feels almost as if he had reached a different planet, so great is the difference between the English and French, despite their many points of relationship. The observer can also see from this instance the value of purer "inbreeding." England is practically cut off by its insular position: the last (not very extensive) invasion took place 800 years ago; since then only a few thousands from the Netherlands, and later a few thousand Huguenots have crossed over (all of the same origin), and thus has been reared that race which at the present moment is unquestionably the strongest in Europe.†

Direct experience, however, offers us a series of quite different observations on race, all of which may gradually contribute to the extension of our knowledge as well as to its definiteness. In contrast to the new, growing, Anglo-Saxon race, look, for instance, at the Sephardim, the so-called "Spanish Jews"; here we find how a genuine race can by purity keep itself noble for centuries and tens of centuries, but at the same time how very necessary it is to distinguish between the nobly reared portions of a nation and the rest. In England, Holland and Italy there are still genuine Sephardim but very few, since

* *Das Beständige in den Menschenrassen und die Spielweite ihrer Veränderlichkeit*, 1868, p. 26.

† Mention should also be made of Japan, where likewise a felicitous crossing and afterwards insular isolation have contributed to the production of a very remarkable race, much stronger and (within the Mongoloid sphere of possibility) much more profoundly endowed than most Europeans imagine. Perhaps the only books in which one gets to know the Japanese soul are those of Lafcadio Hearn: *Kokoro, Hints and Echoes of Japanese Inner Life; Gleanings in Buddha's Fields*, and others.

H +
the SS-

How he
suffers
over
great
losses
the Waffen
SS. How

he develops
his ideal
the multiple marriage.

64

course of Jewish history has provided for a peculiar artificial selection of the morally higher section: by banishments, by continual withdrawals to the Diaspora—a result of the poverty and oppressed condition of the land—only the most faithful (of the better classes) remained behind, and these abhorred every marriage contract—even with Jews!—in which both parties could not show an absolutely pure descent from one of the tribes of Israel and prove their strict orthodoxy beyond all doubt.* There remained then no great choice; for the nearest neighbours, the Samaritans, were heterodox, and in the remoter parts of the land, except in the case of the Levites who kept apart, the population was to a large extent much mixed. In this way race was here produced. And when at last the final dispersion of the Jews came, all or almost all of these sole genuine Jews were taken to Spain. The shrewd Romans in fact knew well how to draw distinctions, and so they removed these dangerous fanatics, these proud men, whose very glance made the masses obey, from their Eastern home to the farthest West,† while, on the other hand, they did not disturb the Jewish people outside of the narrower Judea more than the Jews of the Diaspora.‡—Here, again, we have a most interesting object-lesson on the origin and worth of "race"! For of all the men whom we are wont to characterise as Jews, relatively few are descended from these great genuine Hebrews, they are rather the descendants of the Jews of the Diaspora,

* Natural children are not at all taken into the community by orthodox Jews. Among the Sephardim of East Europe to-day, a girl who is known to have gone wrong is immediately taken by the plenipotentiaries of the community to a strange land and provided for there; neither she nor her child can venture ever to let anything be heard of them, they are regarded as dead. Thus they provide against blind love introducing strange blood into the tribe.

† See Grätz, as above, chap. ix., on *The Period of the Diaspora*.

‡ In Tiberias, for example, there was a Rabbi's school which for centuries set the fashion. (Regarding the ennobling of the Sephardim by Gothic blood, see below.)

others, but is easily pre-eminent among them because there is something beyond the common in its gifts and capabilities. That this is due to racial breeding I have tried to illustrate graphically by the preceding examples. The results deducible from these examples (and they can be multiplied to any extent) enable us to affirm that the origin of such noble races is dependent upon five natural laws.

(1) The first and fundamental condition is undoubtedly the presence of excellent material. Where there is nothing, the king has no rights. But if I am asked, Whence comes this material? I must answer, I know not, I am as ignorant in this matter as if I were the greatest of all scholars and I refer the questioner to the words of the great world-seer of the nineteenth century, Goethe, "What no longer originates, we cannot conceive as originating. What has originated we do not comprehend." As far back as our glance can reach, we see human beings, we see that they differ essentially in their gifts and that some show more vigorous powers of growth than others. Only one thing can be asserted without leaving the basis of historical observation: a high state of excellence is only attained gradually and under particular circumstances, it is only forced activity that can bring it about; under other circumstances it may completely degenerate. The struggle which means destruction for the fundamentally weak race steels the strong; the same struggle, moreover, by eliminating the weaker elements, tends still further to strengthen the strong. Around the childhood of great races, as we observe, even in the case of the metaphysical Indians, the storm of war always rages.

(2) But the presence of excellent human material is not enough to give birth to the "extravagant"; such races as the Greeks, the Romans, the Franks, the Swabians, the Italians and Spaniards in the period of their splendour,

the Moors, the English, such abnormal phenomena as the Aryan Indians and the Jews only spring from continued inbreeding. They arise and they pass away before our eyes. Inbreeding means the producing of descendants exclusively in the circle of the related tribesmen, with the avoidance of all foreign mixture of blood. Of this I have already given striking examples.

(3) But inbreeding *pur et simple* does not suffice: along with it there must be selection, or, as the specialists say, "artificial selection." We understand this law best when we study the principles of artificial breeding in the animal and vegetable worlds; I should recommend every one to do so, for there are few things which so enrich our conceptions of the plastic possibilities of life.* When one has come to understand what miracles are performed by selection, how a racehorse or a Dachshund or a choice chrysanthemum is gradually produced by the careful elimination of everything that is of indifferent quality, one will recognise that the same phenomenon is found in the human race, although of course it can never be seen with the same clearness and definiteness as in the other spheres. I have already advanced the example of the Jews; the exposure of weak infants is another point and was in any case one of the most beneficial laws of the Greeks, Romans and Teutonic peoples; hard times, which only the strong man and the hardy woman can survive, have a similar effect.†

(4) There is another fundamental law hitherto little heeded, which seems to me quite clear from history, just as it is a fact of experience in the breeding of animals:

* The literature is very great: for simplicity, comprehensibility and many-sidedness I recommend to every layman especially Darwin's *Animals and Plants under Domestication*. In the *Origin of Species* the same subject is treated rather briefly and with too much bias.

† Jhering demonstrates with particular clearness that the epoch of the migrations, which lasted for many centuries, necessarily had upon the Teutonic peoples the effect of an ever more and more ennobling artificial selection (*Vorgeschichte*, p. 462 f.).

the origin of extraordinary races is, without exception, preceded by a mixture of blood. As that acute thinker, Emerson, says: "we are piqued with pure descent, but nature loves inoculation." Of the Aryan Indians of course we can say nothing as regards this, their previous history being hidden in the misty distance of time; on the other hand, with regard to the Jews, Hellenes and Romans the facts are perfectly clear, and they are no less so in regard to all the nations of Europe which have distinguished themselves by their national achievements and by the production of a great number of individuals of "extravagant" endowments. With regard to the Jews I refer the reader to the following chapter, as regards the Hellenes, Romans and English I have often pointed to this fact; * nevertheless, I would urge the reader not to grudge the labour of carefully reading in Curtius and Mommsen those chapters at the beginning which, on account of the many names and the confusion of detail, are usually rather glanced through than studied. There has never been so thorough and successful a mixture as in Greece: with the old common stock as basis there have gradually sprung up in the valleys, separated by mountains or seas, characteristically different tribes, composed here of huntsmen, there of peaceful farmers, in other parts of seafarers, &c.; among these differentiated elements we find a mixing and crossing, so fine that a human brain selecting artificially could not have reasoned the matter out more perfectly. In the first place we have migrations from East to West, later from West to East over the Ægean Sea; in the meantime, however, the tribes of the extreme North (in the first place the Dorians) advanced to the extreme South, forcing many of the noblest who would not submit to bondage from the South to that North from which they themselves had just come, or over the sea to

* See especially pp. 109, 272, 286 and 293.

mixture of blood was still more thorough, has raised itself by its pre-eminent power to become the leader of the whole German Empire?—It cannot of course be my task to give a detailed proof of what is here simply pointed out; but as I am advocating especially the great importance of purely-bred races, I desire particularly to emphasise the necessity, or at least the advantage, of mixture of blood and that not merely to meet the objection of one-sidedness and bias *a priori*, but because it is my conviction that the advocates of this theory have injured it very much by disregarding the important law of crossing. They get then to the mystical conception of a race pure in itself, which is an airy abstraction that retards instead of furthering. Neither history nor experimental biology has anything to say for such a view. The race of English thoroughbreds has been produced by the crossing of Arabian stallions with ordinary, but of course specially chosen, English mares, followed by inbreeding, yet in such a way that later crossing between varieties not far removed, or even with Arabians, is advisable from time to time; one of the noblest creatures that nature possesses, the so-called "genuine" Newfoundland dog, originated from the crossing of the Eskimo dog and a French hound; in consequence of the isolated position of Newfoundland, it became by constant inbreeding fixed and "pure," it was then brought to Europe by fanciers and raised to the highest perfection by artificial selection.—Many of my readers may be amused at my constant references to the breeding of animals. But it is certain that the laws of life are great simple laws, embracing and moulding everything that lives; we have no reason to look upon the human race as an exception; and as we are unfortunately not in a position to make experiments in this matter with human beings, we must seek counsel from the experiments made with plants and animals —But I cannot

HH

what is so evidently a fundamental law of nature, we are led to suppose that it is not by mere chance that pre-eminent races have sprung from an original fusing of different stems, such as we have observed in history; the historical facts rather provide still further proof for the view that mixture of blood supplies particularly favourable physiological conditions for the origin of noble races.*

(5) A fifth law must also be mentioned, although it is restrictive and explanatory rather than contributive of any new element to the question of race. Only quite definite, limited mixtures of blood contribute towards the ennoblement of a race, or, it may be, the origin of a new one. Here again the clearest and least ambiguous examples are furnished by animal breeding. The mixture of blood must be strictly limited as regards time, and it must, in addition, be appropriate; not all and any crossings, but only definite ones can form the basis of ennoblement. By time-limitation I mean that the influx of new blood must take place as quickly as possible and then cease; continual crossing ruins the strongest race. To take an extreme example, the most famous

ung der Blumen, 1793. The whole German nation ought to be proud of this work: since 1893 there has been a facsimile reprint of it (Mayer and Müller, Berlin) and it can be read by any layman. Of more recent publications Hermann Müller's *Alpenblumen, ihre Befruchtung durch Insekten und ihre Anpassungen an dieselben* (Engelmann, 1881) is specially stimulating, clear by reason of the many illustrations, and complete. A summary account, which includes plants other than European, is found in the same author's *Blumen und Insekten* in Trewendt's *Encyklopädie der Naturwissenschaften*. There are certainly few speculations that introduce us so directly to the most mysterious wonders of nature as this revelation of the mutual relations of the plant and animal worlds. What are all our knowledge and hypotheses in comparison with such phenomena? They teach us to observe faithfully and to be satisfied with the circle of things attainable. (During the printing of this book Knuth's *Handbuch der Blütenbiologie*, published by Engelmann, began to appear.)

* For this question of the mixture of blood indispensable to the origin of pre-eminent races Reibmayr's book, *Inzucht und Vermischung beim Menschen*, 1897, should be consulted.

pack of greyhounds in England was crossed once only with bulldogs, whereby it gained in courage and endurance, but further experiments prove that when such a crossing is continued, the characters of both races disappear and quite characterless mongrels remain behind.* *Crossing obliterates characters.* The limitation to definitely appropriate crossings means that only certain crossings, not all, ennoble. There are crossings which, far from having an ennobling influence, ruin both races, and moreover, it frequently happens that the definite, valuable characters of two different types cannot fuse at all; in the latter case some of the descendants take after the one parent, others after the other, but naturally with mingled characteristics, or again, genuine real mongrels may appear, creatures whose bodies give the impression of being screwed together from parts that do not fit, and whose intellectual qualities correspond exactly to the physical.† Here too it should be remarked that the union of mongrel with mongrel brings about with startling rapidity the total destruction of all and every pre-eminent quality of race. It is therefore an entirely mistaken idea that mixture of blood between different stems invariably ennoble the race, and adds new qualities to the old. It does so only with the strictest limitations and under rare and definite conditions; as a rule mixture of blood leads to degeneration. One thing is perfectly clear: that the crossing of two very different types contributes to the formation of a noble race only when it takes place very seldom and is followed by strict inbreeding (as in the case of the English thoroughbred and the Newfoundland dog); in all other cases crossing is a success only when it takes place between those closely related, *i.e.*, between those that belong to the same funda-

* Darwin, *Animals and Plants*, chap. xv.

† For this too there are numerous examples in Darwin. As regards dogs in particular, examples will occur to every one.

mental type.—Here too no one who knows the detailed results of animal breeding can doubt that the history of mankind before us and around us obeys the same law. Naturally, it does not appear with the same clearness in the one case as in the other; we are not in a position to shut in a number of human beings and make experiments with them for several generations; moreover, while the horse excels in swiftness, the dog in remarkable and plastic flexibility of body, man excels in mind: here all his vigour is concentrated, here too, therefore, is concentrated all his variability, and it is just these differences in character and intelligence that are not visible to the eye.* But history has carried out experiments on a large scale, and every one whose eye is not blinded by details, but has learned to survey great complexes, every one who studies the soul-life of nations, will discover any amount of proofs of the law here mentioned. While, for example, the "extravagantly" gifted Attics and the uniquely shrewd and strong Roman race are produced by the fusion of several stems, they are nevertheless nearly related and noble, pure stems, and these elements are then, by the formation of States, isolated for centuries, so that they have time to amalgamate into a new solid unity; when, on the other hand, these States are thrown open to every stranger, the race is ruined, in Athens slowly, because owing to the political situation there was not much to get there, and the mixing in consequence only took place gradually

HH: But
we are.

* We must, however, not overlook the fact that, if we could make experiments in breeding with men, very great differences in physique also could certainly be achieved in regard to size, hair, proportions, &c. Place a dwarf from the primeval forest of the Middle Congo, little more than 3 feet high, the whole body covered with hair, beside a Prussian Grenadier of the Guards: one will see what plastic possibilities slumber in the human body.—As far as the dog is concerned, we must remember also that the various breeds "certainly originate from more than one wild species" (Claus, *Zoologie*, 4th edit. ii. 458); hence its almost alarming polymorphism.

barbarism—not human, but bestial barbarism. All these States are moving towards a similar fate.*—Here too I leave it to the reader to think over the matter and to collect evidence with regard to this fifth law, which shows us that every crossing is a dangerous matter and can only help to ennoble the race when definite conditions are observed, as also that many possible crossings are absolutely detrimental and destructive; once the eyes of the reader are opened, he will find everywhere both in the past and in the present proofs of this law as well as of the other four.†

These then are the five principles which seem to me to be fundamental: the quality of the material, in-breeding, artificial selection, the necessity of crossings, the necessity of strictly limiting these crossings both in respect of choice and of time. From these principles we further deduce the conclusion that the origin of a very noble human race depends among other things upon definite historical and geographical conditions; it is these that unconsciously bring about the ennobling of the original material, the in-breeding and the artificial selection, it is these too—when a happy star shines over the birthplace of a new people—that produce happy tribal marriages and prevent the prostitution of the noble in the arms of the ignoble. The fact that there was a time in the nineteenth century when learned investigators, with Buckle at their head, could assert that geographical conditions produced the races, we may now appropriately

* As is well known, very similar conditions prevail in the Spanish colonies. The island of Porto Rico forms the sole exception: here the native Caribbees were exterminated, and the result is a pure Indo-European population, distinguished for industry, shrewdness and love of order: a striking example of the significance of race!

† In his book *Altersklassen und Männerbünde* (p. 23), Heinrich Schurtz comes to the conclusion that, "Successful crossings are possible and advantageous only within a certain sphere of relationship. If the relationship is too close, really near blood-relationship, sickly tendencies are not counterbalanced but increased; if it is too remote, no felicitous mixing of the qualities is possible."

For 44

place I have called attention to the most important conditions which scientific observation has pointed out as laying the foundation for the origin of noble races. That the introduction of contrary conditions must be followed by degeneration, or at any rate by the retarding of the development of noble qualities, seems to be in the highest degree probable, and might be proved in many ways by reference both to the past and the present. I have purposely exercised caution and self-restraint. In such labyrinthine tangles the narrowest path is the safest. The only task which I have proposed to myself has been to call into being a really vivid representation of what Race is, of what it has meant for mankind in the past and still means in the present.

THE NATION

There is one point which I have not expressly formulated, but it is self-evident from all that I have said; the conception of Race has nothing in it unless we take it in the narrowest and not in the widest sense: if we follow the usual custom and use the word to denote far remote hypothetical races, it ends by becoming little more than a colourless synonym for "mankind"—possibly including the long-tailed and short-tailed apes: Race only has a meaning when it relates to the experiences of the past and the events of the present.

Here we begin to understand what nation signifies for race. It is almost always the nation, as a political structure, that creates the conditions for the formation of race or at least leads to the highest and most individual activities of race. Wherever, as in India, nations are not formed, the stock of strength that has been gathered by race decays. But the confusion which prevails with regard to the idea of race hinders even the most learned from understanding this great significance of

* A. H. reads favorably to this.

quarrel about names in such a case—what the Germans are to-day Renan has been able to learn in the year 1870; he has been taught it too by the German specialists, to whose industry he owes nine-tenths of his knowledge. That is the valuable result of the creation of race by nation-building. And since race is not a mere word, but an organic living thing, it follows as a matter of course that it never remains stationary; it is ennobled or it degenerates, it develops in this or that direction and lets this or that quality decay. This is a law of all individual life. But the firm national union is the surest protection against going astray: it signifies common memory, common hope, common intellectual nourishment; it fixes firmly the existing bond of blood and impels us to make it ever closer.

HH *

THE HERO

Just as important as the clear comprehension of the organic relation of race to nation is that of the organic relation of race to its quintessence, the hero or genius. We are apt to fancy we must choose between hero-worship and the opposite. But the one as well as the other testifies to poverty of insight. What I have said in the general introduction need not be repeated; but here, where the question of race is in the forefront, this problem takes a particularly clear form, and with some power of intuition we must surely perceive that the influence of intellectually pre-eminent units in a race, like the human, the individuality of which depends upon the development of its intellectual faculties, is immeasurable, for good and for evil; these units are the feet that carry and the hands that mould, they are the countenance on which we others gaze, they are the eye which beholds the rest of the world in a definite way and then communicates what it has seen to the rest of the organism.

* There, with all else, a child-like simplicity to HH. He is so convinced that his motives are good that he even believes at the end that the critically well understood him o h. has to deal with him

what he had learned in the societies of the fasting and self-chastising ascetics of Serapis.* Any one who still possessed a spark of noble impulse in that world of the unnational chaos was bound in fact to be disgusted with himself. Nowhere, where sound conditions prevailed, has unconditional asceticism been preached; on the contrary, the ancient peoples—Aryans, Semites, Mongolians—led by a marvellous instinct, are at one in regarding the begetting of children as one of the most sacred duties; whoever died without a son was laden with a curse. In Ancient India, of course, there were ascetics; but they might not disappear into the solitude of the forest till the son of their son was born; here the intention and fundamental idea are almost diametrically opposed to the asceticism of the Syrian Christians. To-day we understand this; for we see that only one thing contributes to the ennobling of man: the begetting of pure races, the founding of definite nations. To beget sons, sons of the right kind, is without question the most sacred duty of the individual towards society; whatever else he may achieve, nothing will have such a lasting and indelible influence as the contribution to the increasing ennoblement of the race. From the limited, false standpoint of Gobineau it certainly does not much matter, for we can only decline and fall sooner or later; still less correct are they who appear to contradict him, but adopt the same hypothetical acceptation of aboriginal pure nations; but any one who understands how noble races are in reality produced, knows that they can arise again at any moment; that depends on us; here nature has clearly pointed out to us a great duty. Those men of the chaos therefore, who considered begetting a sin, and complete abstinence therefrom the highest of all virtues, committed a crime against the most sacred law of nature, they tried to prevent all good, noble men

* Cf. Otto Zöckler: *skese und Mönchtum*, 1897. I. 193 ff.

HH

*Hegel's
unspoken
comment
on all this.*

race, a genuine nation, is distinguished from a mere congeries of men. The character of the race becoming more and more pronounced by pure breeding is like the approach of the magnet. The individual members of the nation may have ever so different qualities, the direction of their activities may be utterly divergent, yet together they form a moulded unity, and the power—or let us say rather the importance—of every individual is multiplied a thousandfold by his organic connection with countless others.

I have shown above how Lucian with all his gifts absolutely squandered his life; I have shown Augustine helplessly swaying to and fro like a pendulum between the loftiest thoughts and the crassest and silliest superstition: such men as these, cut off from all racial belongings; mongrels among mongrels, are in a position almost as unnatural as a hapless ant, carried and set down ten miles from its own nest. The ant, however, would suffer at least only through outward circumstances, but these men are by their own inner constitution barred from all genuine community of life.

The consideration of these facts teaches us that whatever may be our opinion as to the *causa finalis* of existence, man cannot fulfil his highest destiny as an isolated individual, as a mere exchangeable pawn, but only as a portion of an organic whole, as a member of a specific race.*

THE TEUTONIC PEOPLES

There is no doubt about it! The raceless and nationless chaos of the late Roman Empire was a pernicious and fatal condition, a sin against nature. Only one ray of light shone over that degenerate world. It came from the north. *Ex septentrione Lux!* If we take up a map, the Europe of the fourth century certainly seems at the

* "The individuals and the whole are identical," the Indian thinkers had taught (see Garbe's *Sāṃkhya-Philosophie*, p. 158).

man, every teacher and student, every physician and professor of jurisprudence belonged to the clergy: but this was a matter of pure formality, founded exclusively upon certain legal conditions; and it was out of this very class, that is, out of the men who best knew the Church, that every revolution against her arose—it was the Universities that became the high-schools of national emancipation. The Princes protected the Church, the learned clerics on the contrary attacked her. That is the reason why the Church waged unceasing war against the great intellects which, that they might work in peace, had sought refuge with her; had she had her way, science and culture would never again have been fledged. But the same Princes who protected the Church also protected the scholars whom she persecuted. No later than the ninth century there arose in the far north (out of the schools of England, which even in those early days were rich in important men) the great Scotus Erigena: the Church did all that she could to extinguish this brilliant light, but Charles the Bald, the same man who was supposed to have sent great tribute to the Pope of Rome, stretched his princely hand over Scotus; when this became insufficient, Alfred bade him to England where he raised the school of Oxford to a pinnacle of success, till he was stabbed to death by monks at the bidding of the central government of the Church. From the ninth century to the nineteenth, from the murder of Scotus to the issue of the Syllabus, it has been the same story. | A final judgment shows the intellectual renaissance to be the work of Race in opposition to the universal Church which knows no Race, the work of the Teuton's thirst for knowledge, of the Teuton's national struggle for freedom. < Great men in uninterrupted succession have arisen from the bosom of the Catholic Church; men to whom, as we must acknowledge, the peculiar catholic order of thought with its all-embracing

HH

to-day in a "Jewish age";* we may think what we like about the past history of the Jews, their present history actually takes up so much room in our own history that we cannot possibly refuse to notice them. Herder in spite of his outspoken humanism had expressed the opinion that "the Jewish people is and remains in Europe an Asiatic people alien to our part of the world, bound to that old law which it received in a distant climate, and which according to its own confession it cannot do away with."† Quite correct. But this alien people, everlastingly alien, because—as Herder well remarks—it is indissolubly bound to an alien law that is hostile to all other peoples—this alien people has become precisely in the course of the nineteenth century a disproportionately important and in many spheres actually dominant constituent of our life. Even a hundred years ago that same witness had sadly to confess, that the "ruder nations of Europe" were "willing slaves of Jewish usury"; to-day he could say the same of by far the greatest part of the civilised world. The possession of money in itself is, however, of least account; our governments, our law, our science, our commerce, our literature, our art . . . practically all branches of our life have become more or less willing slaves of the Jews, and drag the feudal fetter if not yet on two, at least on one leg. In the meantime the "alien" element emphasised by Herder has become more and more prominent; a hundred years ago it was rather indistinctly and vaguely felt; now it has asserted and proved itself, and so forced itself on the attention of even the most inattentive. The Indo-European, moved by ideal motives, opened the gates in

* *Gedanken über Goethe*, 3rd ed. p. 40. The passage as it stands reads, "From the day of Goethe's death, the 22nd March, 1832, Borne dated the freedom of Germany. In reality, however, one epoch was with that day closed and the Jewish age in which we live began."

† *Bekehrung der Juden*. Abschnitt 7 of the *Untersuchungen des vergangenen Jahrhunderts zur Beförderung eines geistigen Reiches*.

friendship: the Jew rushed in like an enemy, stormed all positions and planted the flag of his, to us, alien nature—I will not say on the ruins, but on the breaches of our genuine individuality.

Are we for that reason to revile the Jews? That would be as ignoble as it is unworthy and senseless. The Jews deserve admiration, for they have acted with absolute consistency according to the logic and truth of their own individuality, and never for a moment have they allowed themselves to forget the sacredness of physical laws because of foolish humanitarian day-dreams which they shared only when such a policy was to their advantage. Consider with what mastery they use the law of blood to extend their power: the principal stem remains spotless, not a drop of strange blood comes in; as it stands in the *Thora*, "A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the Lord" (*Deuteronomy* xxiii. 2); in the meantime, however, thousands of side branches are cut off and employed to infect the Indo-Europeans with Jewish blood. If that were to go on for a few centuries, there would be in Europe only one single people of pure race, that of the Jews, all the rest would be a herd of pseudo-Hebraic mestizos, a people beyond all doubt degenerate physically, mentally and morally. For even the great friend of the Jews, Ernest Renan, admits, "*Je suis le premier à reconnaître que la race sémitique, comparée à la race indo-européenne, représente réellement une combinaison inférieure de la nature humaine.*"* And in one of his best but unfortunately little-known writings he says again, "*L'épouvantable simplicité de l'esprit sémitique rétrécit le cerveau humain, le ferme à toute idée délicate, à tout sentiment fin, à toute*

* *Histoire générale et système comparé des langues sémitiques*, 5^e éd. p. 4. It will make little difference to this view when I show, as I shall do immediately, that the Jews are not pure Semites but half Syrians.

this hope. The Jewish faith in God, that which can and may be called "religion" in their case, for it has become since the source of a fine morality, is a part of this national idea, not *vice versa*. To assert that there is a Jewish religion but no Jewish nation is simply nonsense.*

The entry of the Jews into the history of the West signifies therefore beyond doubt the entrance of a definite element, quite different from and in a way opposed to all European races, an element which remained essentially the same, while the nations of Europe went through the most various phases; in the course of a hard and often cruel history it never had the weakness to entertain proposals of fraternity, but, possessed as it was of its national idea, its national past, and its national future, felt and still feels all contact with others as a pollution; thanks also to the certainty of its instinct, which springs from strict uniformity of national feeling, it has always been able to

* At the Jewish congress held in Basle in 1898, Dr. Mandelstam, Professor in the University of Kiev, said in the chief speech of the sitting of August 29, "The Jews energetically reject the idea of fusion with the other nationalities and cling firmly to their historical hope, i.e., of world empire" (from a report of one who took part in the congress in *Le Temps*, Sept. 2, 1898). The Vienna newspapers of July 30 and 31, 1901, report a speech on Zionism which the Vienna Rabbi, Dr. Leopold Kahn, delivered in a room of the orthodox Jewish school in Pressburg. In this speech Dr. Kahn made the following admission: "the Jew will never be able to assimilate himself; he will never adopt the customs and ways of other peoples. The Jew remains Jew under all circumstances. Every assimilation is purely exterior." Words well worth laying to heart! In the *Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag A. Berliner's*, 1903, Dr. B. Felsenthal publishes a series of *Jewish Theses* in which he supports with all his energy the thesis that Jewry is a people, not a religion, "Judaism is a special stem, and every Jew is born into this stem." This stem is, according to him, "one of the ethnically purest peoples that exist." Felsenthal reckons that from Theodosius to the year 1800, "perhaps not quite 300 non-Semites were adopted into the Jewish race," and it is characteristic that he denies proselytes the right of looking upon themselves as full-blooded Jews. "The Jewish people, the Jewish stem is the given fact, the constant thing, the necessary substratum, the substantial kernel. The Jewish religion is something attached to this kernel, a quality—an accident, as it is called in the language of the philosophical schools." I quote from the special impression, made by Itzkowski, Berlin.

A. H. was
this in
a speech.

Divine One, and makes us feel that the Christian religion is the only religion in the world. "*Quelle profonde sagesse il y a dans ce que l'aveugle philosophie appelle la folie de la croix ! Dans l'état où j'étais, de quoi m'aurait servi l'image d'un législateur heureux et comblé de gloire ? Je voyais l'innocent, le flanc percé, le front couronné d'épines, les mains et les pieds percés de clous, et expirant dans les souffrances ; et je me disais : Voilà mon Dieu, et j'ose me plaindre !*" I have searched through a whole library of Jewish books in the expectation of finding similar words—naturally not belief in the divinity of Christ, nor the idea of redemption, but the purely human feeling for the greatness of a suffering saviour—but in vain. A Jew who feels that is in fact no longer a Jew, but a denier of Judaism. And while we find even in Mohammed's *Koran* at least a vague conception of the importance of Christ and profound reverence for His personality, a cultured, leading Jew of the nineteenth century calls Christ "the new birth with the death-mask," which inflicted new and painful wounds upon the Jewish people ; he cannot see anything else in Him.* In view of the cross he assures us that "the Jews do not require this convulsive emotion for their spiritual improvement," and adds, "particularly not among the middle classes of the inhabitants of the cities." His comprehension goes no further. In a book, republished in 1880 (!), by a Spanish Jew (Mose de Leon) Jesus Christ is called a "dead dog" that lies "buried in a dung-hill." Besides, the Jews have taken care to issue in the latter part of the nineteenth century several editions (naturally in Hebrew) of the so-called "censured passages" from the *Talmud*, those passages usually omitted in which Christ is exposed to our scorn and hatred as a "fool," "sorcerer," "profane person," "idolater," "dog," "bastard," "child of lust," &c. ; so, too, his sublime

* Graetz: *Volkstümliche Geschichte der Juden*, i. 591

together in their own hands"; the prosperous Moorish State was, it is true, thereby intellectually and materially ruined: but this was a matter of indifference to the Jews, as they had already obtained as firm a footing in the Christian State of the Spaniards which was destined to take the place of the Moorish one. "The movable wealth of the land was here absolutely in their power; the heritable property they made gradually theirs by usury and the purchase of mortgaged estates of nobles. From the offices of Secretary of State and Minister of Finance downwards all the offices which had to do with taxes and money were in Jewish hands. Through usury almost all Aragon was mortgaged to them. In the cities they formed the majority of the wealthy population." * But here, as elsewhere, they were not always shrewd; they had employed their power to obtain all kinds of privileges; for example, the oath of a single Jew sufficed to prove debt claims against Christians (the same was the case in the Archduchy of Austria and in many places), while the testimony of a Christian against a Jew had no weight before a tribunal, and so on; these privileges they abused so outrageously that the people finally revolted. The same would probably have happened in Germany if the Church and intelligent statesmen had not put a stop to the evil in time. Charlemagne had written to Italy for Jews to manage his finances; soon, as farmers of taxes, they secured for themselves wealth and influence in every direction, and used these to get important concessions for their people, such as commercial privileges, less severe punishment for crime and the like; the whole population was even forced to make Sunday their market day, as Saturday, the customary market day, did not suit the Jews because it was

* Heman: *Die historische Weltstellung der Juden*, 1882, p. 24 ff. For a somewhat differently tinged account which, however, in actual facts is entirely at one with this, see Graetz: *Volksth. Gesch. d. Juden*, ii. 344 ff.

their Sabbath ; it was at that time fashionable for courtiers to visit the synagogues ! But the reaction set in soon and strongly, and not only, as the historians are wont to represent it, as the result of priestly agitation—such things belong to the shell, not to the kernel of history—but in the first place because the Teuton is in fact just as much a born merchant and industrialist as he is a born warrior, and because, as soon as the growth of cities awakened these instincts in him, he saw the game of his unfair rival, and, full of violent indignation, demanded his removal. And so, if such were the purpose of this chapter, we could trace the ebb and flow of Jewish influence to the present day, when all the wars of the nineteenth century are so peculiarly connected with Jewish financial operations, from Napoleon's Russian campaign and Nathan Rothschild's rôle of spectator at the Battle of Waterloo to the consulting of the Bleichröders on the German side and of Alphonse Rothschild on the French side at the peace transactions of the year 1871, and to the "Commune," which from the beginning was looked upon by all intelligent people as a Jewish-Napoleonic machination.

CONSENSUS INGENIORUM

Now this political and social influence of the Jews has been very variously judged, but the greatest politicians of all times have regarded it as pernicious. Cicero, for example (no great politician but an experienced statesman), displays a genuine fear of the Jews ; where a legal transaction encroaches on their interest, he speaks so low that only the judges hear him, for he is well aware, as he says, that all the Jews hold together and that they know how to ruin the one who opposes them ; while he thunders the most vehement charges against Greeks, against Romans, against the most powerful men of his time, he advises caution in dealing with the Jews ; they are to him an

uncanny power and he passes with the greatest haste over that city of "suspicion and slander," Jerusalem: such was the opinion of a Cicero during the consulate of a Julius Cæsar! * Even before the destruction of Jerusalem the Emperor Tiberius, who was, according to many historians, the best ruler that the Roman Imperium ever possessed, recognised a national danger in the immigration of the Jews. Even Frederick the Second, the Hohenstauffen, certainly one of the most brilliant men that ever wore a crown or carried a sword, a more free-thinking man than any monarch of the nineteenth century, an enthusiastic admirer of the East and a generous supporter of Hebrew scholars, nevertheless held it to be his duty, contrary to the custom of his contemporaries, to debar the Jews from all public offices, and pointed warningly to the fact that wherever the Jews are admitted to power, they abuse it; the very same doctrine was taught by the other great Frederick the Second, the Hohenzollern, who gave universal freedom, but not to the Jews; similar were the words of Bismarck, while he still could speak openly, in the Landtag (1847) and the great historian Mommsen speaks of Judaism as of a "State inside the State."—As regards the social influence in particular, I will only quote two wise and fair authorities, whose judgment cannot be suspected even by the Jews, namely, Herder and Goethe. The former says, "A ministry, in which the Jew is supreme, a household, in which a Jew has the key of the wardrobe and the management of the finances, a department or commissariat, in which Jews do the principal business . . . are Pontine marshes that cannot be drained"; and he expresses the opinion that the presence of an indefinite number of Jews is so pernicious to the welfare of a European State, that we "dare not be influenced by general humane principles"; it is a national question,

* See the *Defence of Lucius Flaccus*, xxviii.

among us than the Saracen or the other wrecks of half-Semitic peoples who saved their existence—but not their individuality—by unconditional amalgamation with the nations of South Europe. The Jew, however, was proof against this; though now and then one of them might be dragged to the stake, the very fact that they had crucified Jesus Christ surrounded them with a solemn, awe-inspiring nimbus. And while the people were thus fascinated, the scholars and holy men spent their days and nights in studying the books of the Hebrews: struck down by the commands of Jewish shepherds like Amos and Micah, the monuments of an art, whose like the world has never since seen, fell to the ground; through the scorn of Jewish priests science sank into contempt; Olympus and Walhalla became depopulated, because the Jews so wished it; Jehovah, who had said to the Israelites, "Ye are my people and I am your God," now became the God of the Indo-Europeans; from the Jews we adopted the fatal doctrine of unconditional religious intolerance. But at the same time we adopted very great and sublime spiritual impulses; we were taught by prophets, who preached such strict and pure morals as could have been found nowhere else save on the distant shores of India; we became acquainted with such a living and life-moulding faith in a higher divine power that it inevitably changed our spirit and gave it a new direction. Though Christ was the master-builder, we got the architecture from the Jews. Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Psalmists became, and still are, living powers in our spiritual life.

WHO IS THE JEW?

And now, when this inner contact is beginning to grow weaker, while the outer friction referred to above is being daily more felt, now, when he cannot any longer

* He appropriates this, he understands
—no one is so respectful as a keller.

were the sons of Shem; now the answer becomes more and more vague; it was thought that the criterion of language was decisive: a very great error! The idea "Semite" indeed remains indispensable because it embraces collectively a many-sided complex of historical phenomena; but there is absolutely no sure boundary-line; at the periphery this ethnographical conception merges into others. Finally "Semite" remains as the name of an original race, like "Aryan," one of those counters without which one could not make oneself understood, but which one must beware of accepting as good coin. The real genuine coins are those empirically given, historically developed national individualities, of which I have spoken in the former chapter, such individualities as the Jews for example. Race is not an original phenomenon, it is produced; physiologically by characteristic mixture of blood, followed by inbreeding; psychically by the influence which long-lasting historical and geographical conditions exercise upon that special, specific, physiological foundation.* If we wish then (and I think that must be the principal task of this chapter) to ask the Jew: Who art thou? we must first try to discover whether there was not a definite mixture of blood underlying the fact of this so clearly marked race, and then—if the answer is in the affirmative—trace how the peculiar soul, which thus was produced, differentiated itself more and more. Nowhere can we trace this process as we can in the Jew: for the whole national history of the Jews is like a continuous process of elimination; the character of the Jewish people ever becomes more individual, more outspoken, more simple; finally there remains in a way nothing of the whole being but the central skeleton; the slowly ripened fruit is robbed of its downy, fresh-coloured covering and of its juicy flesh, for these

* Cf. p. 288. For the Semites, see also p. 361.

the active intervention of certain far-sighted and clear-headed men.

These three facts form the essential basis of all knowledge of the Jewish character ; they must not remain the possession of a learned minority but must be incorporated in the consciousness of all educated people. I repeat them in preciser form :

(1) The Israelite people has arisen from the crossing of quite different human types ;

(2) The Semitic element may well have been the stronger morally, but physically it contributed scarcely one-half to the composition of the new ethnological individuality ; it is therefore wrong shortly to call the Israelites "Semites," for the part played by the various human types in the formation of the Israelite race demands a quantitative and qualitative analysis ;

(3) The real Jew only developed in the course of centuries by gradual physical separation from the rest of the Israelite family, as also by progressive development of certain mental qualities and systematic starving of others ; he is not the result of a normal national life, but in a way an artificial product, produced by a priestly caste, which forced, with the help of alien rulers, a priestly legislation and a priestly faith upon a people that did not want them.

This furnishes us with the arrangement of the following discussion. I shall first of all consult history and anthropology, in order that we may learn from what races the new Israelite race (as the foundation of the Jewish) was descended ; then the part played by these various human types must be analysed with regard to their physical and particularly their moral significance, and here our attention must be directed especially to their religious views : for the basis of Judaism is the faith which it teaches and we cannot judge the Jew correctly either in history or in our midst, if we are not quite clear about

A. G.
was
den.

there is the individuality of the whole people; and numbers can be much better applied to this more abstract personality. I cannot tell simply from the race of an individual what he will do in a definite case; but I can, for example, with great certainty prophesy how a large number of Italians, as a collective body, or an equal number of Norwegians will act in a definite case. For our knowledge of the character of a people anthropological figures are therefore of real value. Now these figures give the following results with regard to the Jews (of former times and to-day, in east and in west); 50 per cent. show clear evidence of belonging to the type *homo syriacus* (short heads, characteristic, so-called "Jewish" noses, inclination to stoutness, &c.); only 5 per cent. have the features and the anatomical structure of the genuine Semite (the Bedouin of the desert); in the case of 10 per cent. we find a colour of skin and hair, often too of complexion, which points to the Amorite of Indo-European descent; 35 per cent. represent indefinable mixed forms, something of the nature of Lombroso's "combined photographs," where countenances occur in which the one feature contradicts the other: skulls which are neither long like those of the genuine Semite, nor half-long like those of the Amorite, nor round like those of the Syrian, noses which are neither Hittite, nor Aryan, nor Semitic, or, again, the Syrian nose, but without the head that belongs to it, and so on *ad infinitum*. The chief result of this anatomical survey is that the Jewish race is in truth a permanent but at the same time a mongrel race which always retains this mongrel character. In the former chapter I have tried to make clear the difference between mixed and mongrel races. All historically great races and nations have been produced by mixing; but wherever the difference of type is too great to be bridged over, then we have mongrels. That is the case here. The crossing between Bedouin and Syrian

A. H.
takes
this up.

was—from an anatomical point of view—probably worse than that between Spaniard and South American Indian. And to this was added later the ferment of a European-Aryan element.

CONSCIOUSNESS OF SIN AGAINST RACE

It is very proper to lay strong emphasis on this; for such a process, however unconsciously it may go on, is an incestuous crime against nature; it can only be followed by a miserable or a tragical fate. The rest of the Hebrews, and with them the Josephites, had a wretched end; like the families of the more important pseudo-Semitic mestizos (the Phoenicians, Babylonians, &c.) they disappeared and left no trace behind; the Jew, on the other hand, chose the tragic fate; that proves his greatness, and that is his greatness. I shall soon return to this theme, since this resolve on his part means the founding of Judaism; I shall only add one remark, for it is appropriate here and has never yet, so far as I know, been made, namely, that this deep consciousness of sin, which weighed upon * the Jewish nation in its heroic days, and which has found pathetic expression in the words of its chosen men, is rooted in these physical relations. Naturally the intelligence, and the vanity which is common to us all, explained it quite differently, but the instinct went deeper than the understanding, and as soon as the destruction of the Israelites and their own captivity had awakened the conscience of the Jew, his first act was to put an end to that incest (as I called it above, using the very word of Ezekiel) by the strict prohibition of every crossing, even with nearly related tribes. An inexplicable contradiction has been found in the fact that it was the Jews who brought into our

* "Since the exile the consciousness of sin was (in the case of the Jews), so to say, permanent," says Wellhausen in his *Prolegomena*, 4th ed p. 431.

A. H.
ignores
this

sin, their existence is a crime against the holy laws of life; this, at any rate, is felt by the Jew himself in the moments when destiny knocks heavily at his door. Not the individual but the whole people had to be washed clean, and not of a conscious but of an unconscious crime; and that is impossible, "though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap," as Jeremiah (ii. 22) says to his people. And in order to wipe out the irretrievable past, in order to fuse that past with the present, in which wisdom and the power of will should set a limit to sin and make a place for purity—the whole Jewish history from the beginning had to be falsified, and the Jews represented as a people chosen above all other peoples by God and of stainlessly pure race, protected by Draconian laws against every crossing. Those who brought that about were not liars, as has probably been supposed, but men who acted under the pressure of that necessity which alone raises us above ourselves and makes us ignorant instruments of mighty dispensations of fate.* If anything is calculated to free us from the blindness of our times and the phrase-making of our authorities †

* The words of Jeremiah, "The pen of the Scribes is in vain" (viii. 8), have been applied to the then recent introduction of *Deuteronomy* and to the recasting and extension of the so-called Law of Moses (of the existence of which none of the Prophets had known anything). This is the view of the orthodox Jew Montefiore (*Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*, 201, 202), and is probably correct.

† Herr von Luschan also, as one can perceive from the conclusion of his work on the ethnographical position of the Jews which is so valuable from a statistical point of view, sees our salvation in the complete amalgamation and fusion of the various human races. One cannot believe one's eyes and ears when these men of the school of Virchow pass from facts to thoughts. The whole history of mankind shows us that progress is conditioned by differentiation and individualisation; we find life and activity only where clearly marked national personalities stand side by side opposed to each other (as in Europe to-day), the best qualities degenerate under the influence of uniformity of race (as in China), the crossing of incompatible types leads, as we see in all organic spheres, to sterility and monstrosity . . . and yet "amalgamation" is to be our ideal! Do they not see that uniformity and chaos are the same?

"Ich liebte mir dafür das Ewigleere!"

and to open our eyes to the law of nature, that great peoples result only from the ennoblement of the race and that this can only take place under definite conditions, the neglect of which brings in its train degeneration and sterility, it is the sight of this sublimely planned and desperate struggle of the Jews who had become conscious of their racial sin.

HOMO SYRIACUS

If we now return to racial statistics, we find ourselves face to face with a difficult theme; we may measure skulls and count noses, but how do these results reveal themselves in the inner nature of the Jew? We hold the bone of the skull in the hand, it is what Carlyle calls "a hard fact." This skull, indeed, symbolises a whole world; any one with the skill to weigh the mass of it rightly, and to interpret its lines in their mutual relations, could tell us much about the individual: he would see possibilities of which the race in question becomes conscious only after generations, and recognise limitations which separate one man from the other from the very first. On looking at the two skulls on p. 374, the long one and the round one, we seem to see two microcosms. But the power of interpretation is denied us; we judge men by their deeds, that is really indirectly and according to a fragmentary method, for these deeds are determined only by definite circumstances. Everything remains piecework here. Now the protoplasm of a one-celled alga is such an extremely complicated structure that the chemists do not yet know how many atoms they must suppose in the molecule, and how they can unite them under a symbolical formula that is at all acceptable; who would presume to find the formula for a human being or a whole people? The following characterisation of the Hittites, the Amorites and the Semites can only serve to give a very general conception.

*A. H.
reflects
this. They
never
overcame
the
mongrel
quality.
For A. H.
meeting
Chamberlain
infused
his
thought
w. new
stimulation
on the
part of
the Jew.*

mediocrity with great vitality rather than of any special capacity for extraordinary achievements, they possess more endurance than power. Goethe says somewhere that there is no greatness without something extravagant; according to this definition of Goethe the Hittites can hardly lay claim to greatness.

HOMO EUROPÆUS

On the other hand, in the Amorites—"tall as cedars and strong as oaks" (*Amos* ii. 9), with their bold challenges, their unbridled love of adventure, their insane loyalty even to death towards alien, self-imposed masters, their thick city walls, from which they loved to make forays in the mountains,—the element of extravagance seems to me to be peculiarly characteristic. It was a wild, cruel extravagance, but capable of the very highest things. We seem to catch a glimpse of quite another being when on the Egyptian monuments among the countless number of physiognomies we suddenly see before us this free, frank, open countenance so full of character and intelligence. Like the eye of genius amid the common throng of men, so these features appear to us amid the mass of cunning and bad, stupid and evil countenances, amid this whole riffraff of Babylonians, Hebrews, Hittites, Nubians and all the rest of them. *O homo europæus!* how couldst thou stray among such company? Yes, thou seemst to me like an eye that looks into a divine transcendental world. And fain would I call to thee: follow not the advice of the learned anthropologists, do not amalgamate with that crowd, mingle not with the Asiatic rabble, obey the great poet of thy race, remain true to thyself . . . but I am 3000 years too late. The Hittite remained, the Amorite disappeared. This is one among the many differences between noble and ignoble: nobility is more difficult to

maintain. Though giants in form these men are nevertheless very delicate in their inner organisation. No people degenerates so quickly as Lapouge's *homo europæus*: how rapidly, for instance, the Greeks became barbarians, in *Syros, Parthos, Ægyptos degenerarunt*, as Livy himself testifies (38, 17, 11). He completely loses his peculiar qualities, that which is his alone he seems incapable of giving to others, the others do not possess the vessel to hold it; he, on the other hand, possesses a fatal capacity of assimilating all that is alien. People, it is true, talk to-day of the fair-haired Syrians, we hear too that 10 per cent. of the Jews are fair; but Virchow has told us that skin and hair endure longer than the skull, and it is probable that the skull would last longer than the brain; I do not know, but I really believe that the Indo-European left in Asia, as elsewhere, beyond the memory of his deeds, little more than skin and hair. I have looked for him in the Talmud, but in vain.*

A. H.
reacting
to H.C.
(Huxton
Chamberlain)
Good
on the
difficultly
officiating
at
maintaining
good
Anglo
standards.

HOMO ARABICUS

It seems to me very difficult to say anything about the third of this group, the genuine Semite; for it is characteristic of this *homo arabicus* not to enter into or influence human history until he has ceased to be a genuine Semite. So long as he remains in his wilderness (and for his peace and greatness of soul he should always remain there), he really does not belong to history at all; it is also very difficult, indeed wellnigh impossible, to get definite

* Yet one Teuton actually occurs there (Tractate *Schabbeth*, vi. 8, fol. 23a of the *Jerusalem Talmud*). He is the slave of a Jew. Ordered to accompany home Rabbi Hila, a friend of his master, he saved him from death by inducing a mad dog that rushed at the latter to attack himself, and he was fatally bitten. But this loyalty does not induce the pious Jew to utter one word of admiration or thanks. He merely quotes *Isaiah* xliii. 4: "Since thou wast precious, O Israel, in my sight, thou hast been honourable, and I have loved thee: therefore I will give men for thee and people for thy life."

particulars concerning him there; we merely hear that he is brave, hospitable, pious, also revengeful and cruel—these are mere elements of character, there is nothing to give us a clue to his intellectual gifts. Burckhardt, who travelled for years in Arabia, represents the Bedouin as absolutely dormant intellectually, so long as love or war does not stretch the slack bow—and then he at once goes to extremes.* But if he breaks into the civilised world, it is to murder and burn, as under Abu Bekr and Omar, or to-day in Central Africa.† As soon as he has laid waste everything far and wide, the genuine Semite disappears, we hear nothing more of him; wherever he appears in the history of civilisation crossing has in the meantime taken place—for no type seems to mix more quickly and more successfully than that which has sprung from a compulsory inbreeding of thousands of years' duration. The noble Moor of Spain is anything but a pure Arab of the desert, he is half a Berber (from the Aryan family) and his veins are so full of Gothic blood that even at the present day noble inhabitants of Morocco can trace their descent back to Teutonic ancestors. That is why Harun-al-Raschid's reign is such a bright moment in a dark, sad history, because the pure Persian family of the Barmecides, which remained true to the Iranian religion of Zarathustra.‡ stands by the side of the Khalif as a civilising and refining influence. Not a single one of the so-called "Semitic" civilised States of antiquity is purely Semitic,—no, not one: neither

* *Beduinen und Wahaby*, Weimar, 1831.

† Note how the famous Moorish historian of the fourteenth century, Mohammed Ibn Khaldun, considered by many the founder of scientific history and himself half Arab, speaks: "Cast your eyes around, look at all lands, which have been conquered by the inhabitants of Arabia since the earliest times! The civilisation and population disappeared, the soil itself seemed to change and become unfruitful at their touch" (*Prolegomena zur Weltgeschichte*) 2nd Part; I quote from Robert Flint: *History of the Philosophy of History*, 1893, p. 166.

‡ Renan: *L'islamisme et la science (Discours et Conférences)*, 3^e éd., p. 382].

have, the philosophy of the Indo-Teutons. Their views and conceptions occupy their minds too much to allow them to rise sufficiently out of themselves to grasp pure thought, and to separate the more general and the necessary from their own individuality and its contingencies.* "In his religion the Semite is selfish and exclusive; Jehovah is merely the God of the Hebrews, and they acknowledge no other than him: all other Gods are absolutely false and have neither share nor part in the truth; Allah wishes to be not only the God of the Arabs, but to conquer the whole world, and his nature is as egoistic as that of Jehovah; he, too, denies every iota of truth to all other Gods, but it is of no use to acknowledge Allah, unless you serve him under the exclusive form which proclaims Mohammed his prophet. According to their doctrine the Semites were bound to be intolerant and inclined to fanaticism, as also to stubborn clinging to their religious law. Tolerance appears most pronounced in the case of the Indo-Teutonic peoples; this tolerance is the result of greater freedom of thought, which does not bind itself exclusively to mere form. . . . The qualities of the Semitic spirit, the passionate temperament, the stubborn will, the firm belief in exclusive justification, their whole egoistical nature—were bound to make their possessors in the highest degree capable of great and daring deeds." † Lassen then proceeds to discuss the pseudo-Semitic States, with regard to which he says that these magnificently planned structures all went to ruin because "here, too, the intractable arbitrariness of the

* Concerning science in particular, Grau writes in his well-known philo-Semitic work, *Semiten und Indogermanen* (2nd ed. p. 33): "The Hebrews, like all Semites, are much too subjective to allow the pure impulse of knowledge to become a power in them. Natural science, in the objective sense which it has among the Indo-Teutons, viz., that nature should retain her own essence and character, while man is merely her interpreter, is unknown to the Hebrew." On p. 50 Grau says: "Everything objective is strange to the Hebrew."

† *Indische Altertumskunde* (ed. 1847), i. 414-416.

A. H.
take
off
the

we were not still living in the dense mist of inherited historical prejudices and superstition; it is certain at any rate that wherever Semitic influence penetrated, the conception of religion underwent a great change.* For everywhere else in the whole world, even among savage peoples, religion is interwoven with the mysterious. Plato says that in the other world the soul "will be initiated into a mystery, which one may name the perfect bliss." † Jesus Christ says of the doctrine which is the essence of His religion, that it is a "mystery." ‡ What here has been most sublimely expressed, we find in all stages of the human hierarchy except among the Semites. Schopenhauer calls this, from his standpoint as a philosopher, "metaphysics"; we may, I think, simply say that in the world of feeling as of thought man everywhere meets inexplicable contradictions; this attracts his attention, and he begins to have a feeling that his understanding is only adequate to a portion of existence, that what his five senses convey to him and what his combinative logic constructs therefrom neither exhaust the essence of the world outside himself nor his own being; he conjectures that besides the perceptible cosmos there is an imperceptible, besides the thinkable an unthinkable; the simple world extends and becomes a "double kingdom." § The sight of death itself points to an unknown world, and birth seems to him like a message from the same realm. At every step we see only "miracles"; the greatest wonders for us are ourselves. How simply the savage wonders and everywhere suspects the existence of another world is from travellers' accounts well known to us; of Goethe, on the other hand, perhaps the most finely organised brain that humanity has produced, Carlyle says: "Before his eye lies the whole world extended and transparent, as though melted

* See p. 213 ff. † *Phædrus*, 250. ‡ See p. 187.

§ *Faust*, Second Part, Act i., last words of Faust.

dedicated to the "future of the Israelite religion," we find, as one of the three "distinguishing features" of this religion, the sentence, "The Israelite religion has and knows no secrets, no mysteries" (i. 34). Renan, too, in a moment of reckless honesty, admits that "the Semitic faith (monotheism) is in reality the product of a human race whose religious needs are very few. It signifies a minimum of religion." * An important and true remark which has only failed to have effect because Renan did not show in how far and for what compelling reasons the Semite, who is famed for the glow of his faith, yet possesses a minimum of true religion. The explanation is easy for us: where understanding and imagination are under the yoke of blind will, there cannot and must not be any miracle, anything unreachable, any "path into the untrodden, and the not-to-be-trodden," † nothing which the hand cannot grasp and the moment (even if it be but as a clearly conceivable hope) cannot possess. Even such a great mind as the second Isaiah looks upon religious faith as something which is based on empiric foundation and which can be tested, as it were, by a legal process: "Let the people bring forth their witnesses that they may be justified; or let them hear and say, It is truth" (xliii. 9). We read exactly the same in the second Sura of the *Koran*: "Call your witnesses if you speak the truth." The Jewish teacher Philippson, mentioned above, tells in detail how the Jew "believes solely what he has seen with his eyes," a "blind faith" being unknown to him; and in a long note he quotes all the passages in the Bible where "faith in God" is mentioned, and asserts that this expression occurs without exception only where

* *Nouvelles considérations sur les peuples sémitiques* (*Journal asiatique*, 1859, p. 254). Also Robertson Smith (*The Prophets of Israel*, p. 33) testifies that the genuine Semite has "little religion."

† Or as the *Bṛihadāranyaka-Upanishad* renders the same conception, "the path of the universe, which one has to follow, to get from the part into the whole universe" (i. 4. 7).

"visible proofs have gone before."* It is always, therefore, a question of outward experience, not of inner; the conceptions are always thoroughly concrete, material; as Montefiore assures us, even in the advanced Jewish religion there is nothing which the dumbest might not immediately understand and fathom to its uttermost depth; as soon as a man has a feeling of a mystery, as soon as he, for instance, supposes that there can be anything symbolical in the history of the creation, he is a heretic and a gallows-bird.† Even the utterly materialised history of creation given in the book of *Genesis* is so manifestly alien and borrowed that it remains totally isolated amid the Israelitish tradition and without actual connection with it.‡ The will in fact gives little rope to the understanding and the imagination. So it is that the Semite who has begun to doubt at once becomes an atheist; there is in any case no secret, no mystery: if Allah is not the creator, then must matter be; as an explanation of the world there is scarcely the shadow of a difference between the two views, for in the case of neither does the Semite feel himself in the presence of an inexplicable riddle, a superhuman mystery.

But if we wish to appreciate the influence of Semiticism upon religion, it will not suffice to speak of understanding and non-understanding, of feeling and non-feeling of the mystery; we must remember also the creative influence of the imagination, that "all-uniting heavenly companion," as Novalis calls it. Imagination is the hand-maid of religion, she is the great mediator; born, as Shakespeare says, of the wedlock of head and heart, she moves on the frontier of the "double kingdom" of

* Philippson: *Israelitische Religionslehre*, i. 35 ff.

† See, for example, in Graetz, *Gnosticismus und Judentum*, the passage on Ben Soma.

‡ Fully discussed by Renan: *Langues sémitiques*, p. 482 ff. See, too, the note on p. 485 and my quotation from Darmesteter, p. 421, note, *Ct.*, too, the introduction to the 4th ed. of this book.

philosophy seems in many ways related to religion, has as metaphysician given this definition: "matter is the mere visibility of will . . . what in appearance, that is, for the conception, is matter, is in itself will." * I shall not enter into metaphysics here, nor shall I champion Schopenhauer's speculative symbolism; but it is striking that in the sphere of purely empiric psychology an analogous relation unavoidably asserts itself. Where the will has enslaved the questioning understanding and the imagination, there can be no other view of life and no other philosophy than the materialistic. I do not use the word in a depreciatory sense. I do not deny the advantages of materialism, I do not dispute that it can be harmonised with morals; I simply state a fact. Pure materialism is the religious doctrine of the Arab Mohammed, as are also the transitory processes of his revelations from God, and his paradise with eating and drinking and beautiful houris; pure materialism is the bargain which Jacob enters into with Jehovah (*Genesis* xxviii. 20-22), in which he makes five conditions, or, as the Jurist would say, stipulations, and then concludes: as thou doest this, so thou shalt be my God. The whole history of creation in *Genesis*—which, it appears, all Hebrews, all Syrian and Babylonian Semites possessed in similar form †—is pure materialism; it was not so originally; it was the mythical and symbolical conception of an imaginative people (probably the Sumero-Accadians), but, as Renan has taught us, the myth becomes in the hands of the Semite an historical chronicle. ‡

* *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, a vol., Book II. chap. xxiv. In no connection with this, but nevertheless interesting as a reflection of the same discernment is the doctrine of the Sāmkhya philosophy (the rationalistic system of the Brahman Indians), according to which willing is not a mental but a physical function. (Cf. Garbe: *Die Sāmkhya-Philosophie*, p. 251.)

† Cf. Gunkel: *Handkommentar zur Genesis*, p. xli. ff.

‡ The pre-eminent imagination of the Sumero-Accadians is obvious from their scientific achievements, moreover their language is said to

conception was still strange to the real Isaiah, as also to Jeremiah.* The fantastically scientific ideas in *Genesis* concerning the origin of the organic world, the profound myth of the fall of man, the theory of the development of man up to the first organisation of society . . . all that became "history," and thereby it at the same time lost all significance as religious myth; for the myth is elastic, inexhaustible, whereas here a simple chronicle of facts, an enumeration of events, lies before us.† That is materialism. Wherever the Semitic spirit has breathed, we shall meet with this materialism. Elsewhere in the whole world religion is an idealistic impulse; Schopenhauer called it "popular metaphysics"; I should rather call it popular idealism; in the case of the Semites, too, we observe this wistful awakening of a feeling of the superhuman (read the life of Mohammed), but the imperious will immediately lays hold of every symbol, every profound divination of reflective thought, and transforms them into hard empirical facts. And thus it is that with this view of religion only practical ends are pursued, no ideal ones. It is to provide for prosperity in this world, and aims particularly at power and wealth, it is moreover to provide for happiness in the future world (where the idea of immortality is present—an idea introduced into the Israelite faith from the Persian and into the Arabian from Christianity). Downright materialism! as the comparison with the Saveasiuleo of the Samoans and the great world-spirit of the Yorubas has shown.

This then would be a negative influence of Judaism upon all religion: infection with fundamental views of a materialistic kind. Now we must consider the positive influence, which usually is the only one to be taken into

* Even the Jewish scholar Montefiore explicitly admits this: *Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*, p. 269. Further detail on p. 425.

† For further details concerning the Bible as an historical work and its significance as such for the Jewish people, see the chapter on "The Revelation of Christ," p. 228 f. and further on, p. 486.

an avaricious hand—a faith that will and must give to the believer the whole world as his own, but to him personally and alone, to the exclusion of all others. It is characteristic of the absolutism of this “faith-will” (if I may coin the phrase) that originally every tribe, every little group of the Semites has its own God. The Semite would never wish to share with another; his will is unconditional, he alone must possess all; and his faith is as boundless as his will: these two expressions are for him almost synonymous. Religion does not appear to be present, so to speak, for its own sake, but as a means to an end, as an instrument, to widen as much as possible the sphere of what can be attained by Will.* The view that the Semite from the first was monotheist, to which Renan’s famous phrase “*le désert est monothéiste*” † had contributed a good deal, has long ago been proved erroneous; ‡ we see each little tribe of the Hebrews in possession of its own God, who exercises power only over this tribe and inside this stretch of land. If any one leaves the circle of the family and enters a new region, he comes under the jurisdiction of another God; that is surely not monotheism. § I consider the idea of divine unity

* Many authors testify that even to-day the genuine Bedouins do not in reality acknowledge the cosmopolitical God of the Koran. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, p. 71, hints that Mohammedanism is in a way a religion of the cities in contrast to the religion of the desert. Similarly Burckhardt: *Bedouinen*, p. 156.

† *Langues sémitiques*, ed. 1878, p. 6. These words were originally uttered by Renan in 1855.

‡ Cf. Robertson Smith: *Religion of the Semites*, ed. 1894, p. 75 f. It is well known what zealous polytheists many pseudo-Semitic nations were; of course, that does not justify one in drawing conclusions in regard to the pure Semites. In the introduction to the first edition of his *Langues sémitiques* Renan has laid great stress on this reservation, which is scarcely ever observed.

§ David, when driven by Saul from Palestine, cannot do otherwise than serve strange gods on strange soil (1 Samuel xxvi. 19); cf. with this particularly Robertson Smith, *Prophets of Israel* (ed. 1895, p. 44) and the list of characteristic passages, which reveal the same conception, in Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 4th ed. p. 22. The polytheism appears in a particularly simple fashion in Moses’ song of praise, “Who is like

D.C.
virtually
a
descendant
of A.H.

On the other hand, this consideration teaches us what peculiar and important truth lay in the over-generalised remarks of Renan; as so often, he had seen rightly, but analysed most superficially. He wrote: "The desert is monotheistic; the sublimity of its immeasurable monotony first revealed to man the conception of the Infinite." How false everything is that follows the semicolon in this sentence is proved by Renan's own remarks in another passage, where he shows that the Semitic languages are "incapable of expressing the feeling of the Infinite" (see p. 299). In the dark primeval woods of India the feeling of the Infinite had attained such an intensity that man felt his own Ego merge into the All, whereas the inhabitant of the sun-parched desert, blinded by the excess of light, lost the power of his eyes and saw nothing but himself; far from feeling the Infinite that reveals itself to us only in the night or in the million voices of thronging life, he felt lonely—lonely and yet endangered, lonely yet hardly capable of finding the barest subsistence, utterly incapable of doing so if a second family should desire to join his own. This life was a struggle, a struggle in which only unfeeling egoism could exist. While the Indian, quite lost in thought, had only to stretch out his hand to the trees to still his hunger, the Bedouin was day and night on the alert, and had

ruled over you shall be destroyed with the sword" (quoted from Stanton, *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, p. 316). We see how merely national this supposed creator of Heaven and earth has remained. Montefiore also admits this when he writes, "Jehovah had certainly gradually come to be the one God of the world, but this God remained still Jehovah. Though he had become the absolute ruler of the universe, he did not cease to be the God of Israel" (p. 422). Robertson Smith, one of the first authorities of the day in these questions, interprets *Isaiah* ii. as a prophecy that Jehovah will gradually make himself God of all humanity through the acknowledgment of his virtues as a ruler. Hence we find even in the most sublime phases of the Semitic conception of religion, even where God is spoken of, the predominance of the purely historical, flagrantly anthropomorphic, unconditionally materialistic standpoint.

D. I. on
this.

something else to do than to think of the Infinite—for which he was, moreover, so absolutely devoid of capacity and gifts that his language did not offer him the least help in that direction. On the other hand, we can understand perfectly well how the monotonous poverty of the surroundings could lead to unexampled poverty of mythological conceptions; for man is quite incapable of feeding his imagination from his own resources; it is, as Shakespeare says, "born in the eye"; where the eye is offered nothing but monotony, the imagination fades and withers.* And we can also easily understand how such surroundings would tend to develop that absolutely egoistic monotheism, where the one God is not the great spirit that presides over the world, as in the case of the poor negroes of the slave-coast, but a hard task-master, who is there only for me the one—that is, for me and my children—who, when I blindly devote myself to him, gives me lands which I have not planted, full of oil and wine, houses which I have not built, and wells which I have not sunk—all those glorious things which I have seen only occasionally from a distance, when, impelled by hunger, I have left the desert and gone on a foray; and all these men who revel there in work and wealth—and with joyful song and dance and fat offerings worship Gods who give them all these riches, I will sacrifice to my God of the desert and overturn their altars; only my God shall henceforth be God, I alone will be master in the world! This is the monotheism of the desert; it arises not from the idea of the Infinite but from the poverty of ideas of a poor, hungry, greedy man whose range for thought hardly rises above the conception that possession and power would be the highest bliss.

To make quite clear the very profound change of

* Burckhardt, who lived for years in Arabia, testifies that the monotony of the desert life and the lack of all occupation lie like an unbearable burden upon the mind and finally quite paralyse it (*Bedouins und Wahaby*, p. 286).

D.T.
So did
they never
see their
altars
to A. th. the
one God.

sentiment that is wrought in the human mind by this Semitic view of faith, I cannot do better than quote Goethe. His words are cited everywhere: "The real and only and most profound theme in the history of the world and of men, to which all other themes are subordinate, is the conflict between belief and unbelief." * But more important is the following passage in the fourth book of *Wahrheit und Dichtung*: "The universal, natural religion really requires no faith; for the conviction that a great, creative, ordering and guiding Being is, as it were, concealed behind nature, in order to make itself comprehensible to us, forces itself upon every one, and even should a man occasionally let go the thread of this faith which guides him through life, he will nevertheless be able to pick it up again at any time and place. It is quite a different matter with the particular religion which tells us that this great Being takes under his care, by preference and choice, a single individual, a tribe, a people, a country. This religion is founded on faith, which must be unshakeable if it is not to be destroyed altogether. Every doubt about such a religion is fatal to it. We may return to conviction but not to faith." This process of reasoning brings us on to the right track; it enables us to say exactly what the Semite has in this case given to the world, or, if we will, forced upon it. An important question, for in this is contained his world-affecting significance as an influence upon others, and in this, too, lies at the present day the particular strength of Judaism, which Herder and so many other great minds felt as "alien." Goethe has clearly recognised the essential point and also hinted, but unfortunately not in such detail that every one may see it as he does; for he distinguishes between a natural religion and another which is therefore unnatural. Now according to Goethe's way of thinking, the contrast to the natural is the arbi-

* *Noten zum Westöstlichen Divan* (Israel in the Desert).

Quote
for
S. 2.
A
spring
wood

trary, that in which Will is the "arbiter," that in which Will—not pure understanding, and not the undimmed natural instinct—has decisive influence. And hereby he not only points out to us that there are essential differences between religions, so essential that the same word can mean two different things, but he tells us at the same time how this difference is fundamentally explicable—that the religion which he contrasts with the natural is, in fact, the religion of Will. On the other hand, the use of the word *Glaube* (faith) by him is vague and confusing; he has tried to simplify too much. Goethe says, "The natural religion really needs no faith," but in the non-Semitic religions there is really more of that which is *believed* than in the Semitic; the material of faith is richer; and *Glaube* is expressly demanded by them. What is the truth in this matter? The nature of faith is in the two cases just as different as the nature of religion; to the word "religion" Goethe in the passage quoted gives two significations, to the word *Glaube* only one, hence the misunderstanding. In reality we nowhere find religion without faith; certainly without faith in the specifically Semitic sense, but not without faith of some kind. Faith is everywhere the invisible soul, religion the visible body. We must therefore proceed further if we wish to develop Goethe's utterance until it becomes quite clear. I shall take an illustration.

So far as I know, dogmatism and the idea of revelation are nowhere so developed as among the Aryan Brahmins; yet the result in their case is quite other than in that of the Semites. The sacred Vedas of the Indians were looked upon as divine revelation; every word of theirs was for all matters of faith authoritative and indisputable—and in spite of this, from this one complex of scripts, everywhere recognised as infallible, there sprang no fewer than six entirely different systems of philo-

sophy,*—systems in which (as is characteristic of the Indian spirit) philosophy and religion grow up inseparably connected, so that the view of the nature of the Godhead, of the relation of the individual to it, of the importance of redemption, &c., is very different in the different systems; whereby, of course, not only the philosophy, but above all the religion of the believer is influenced. And all these doctrines, which frequently contradict each other in important points, were, nevertheless, regarded as orthodox, the one as much as the other. They all were based on the same scripts, originated in other words from the same fundamental mythological images of the hymns, and all gave evidence of the same reverence for the deep speculations in the precepts of the cult and in the Upanishads. That was sufficient. There were no historical dates, no chronicle of the creation and of generations, in which men should blindly believe; for anything of that kind was meant from the first merely as an image, a symbol. Thus, for example, the strictly orthodox commentator of the sacred writings, Sankara, says in regard to various images and speculations applied to the Creation: "The script has no intention to instruct us in regard to the extension of the world which began with Creation, because it is neither visible, nor anywhere said, or even thinkable, that anything that is of importance for man depends upon this." † In the same way, each one was free to think as he pleased of the relation between spirit and matter. The monist was just as orthodox as the dualist, the idealist as the materialist. One comprehends how, with such a conception of religion and faith, "in India at all times the most absolute

* There were more, but the others can be classified under the six great systems.

† The *Sūtra's des Vedānta*. (Deussen's translation). Who does not here think of the great remark of Goethe: "Animated inquiry into cause goes great harm!" (see pp. 230 and 267). Carlyle in his essay on Diderot well remarks, "Every religious faith, which goes back to origins, is fruitless, inefficient and impossible."

facts, which the people regard as authenticated, and never does it rise above the level of the ordinary eye. As Montefiore has taught us, there are no mysteries in the Jewish religion (*see* p. 413 f.). When we, therefore, speak of the incomparable power of the Semitic faith, we must not overlook the fact that this faith refers to an extremely scanty and limited material, that it intentionally leaves out of account the great wonder of the world, and that by the imposition of a law (in the juristical sense of the word), it also reduces the inner life of the heart to a minimum—whoever obeys the law is without sin, he need trouble his head no further; regeneration, grace, redemption, &c., do not exist. Thus we begin to see that this strong faith presupposes as counter-condition a minimum of the first condition of faith, a minimum of religion. Moses Mendelssohn has expressed this truth intelligently and honestly: "Judaism is not revealed religion, but revealed legislation." *

"The Semite has really little religion," Robertson Smith, the greatest authority on the Semitic religion, says with a sigh. "Yes, but much faith," answers Goethe. And Renan supplies the commentary: "The mind of the Semite can embrace extremely little, but this little it embraces with great power." † I think, however, that we are beginning to distinguish better between faith and faith, between religion and religion, than did Smith, Goethe and Renan; we shall soon get to the root of the matter. To make the matter thoroughly clear, I must once more contrast the Semite and the Indian.

The Aryan Indian can stand as an example of the extreme contrast to the Semite—a contrast, however, which clearly reveals itself in all peoples that are devoid of Semite blood, even in the Australian negroes, and which

* *Rettung der Juden*, 1872. (I quote from Graetz: *Volks. Gesch.* III. 578).

† *Langues sémitiques*, p. 11

ance which this power and these limitations attained is well known. One would almost be inclined to risk the paradox ; religion and faith mutually exclude each other, or at least, when the one increases the other decreases. But that would be playing with words, since religion and faith manifestly have for the Semite a different meaning from that which they have for other men. The matter becomes especially intricate where we meet not the pure Semite or, as in the case of the Jews, the strong one-sided predominance of the Semitic will, but merely an infiltration of the Semitic spirit as in our own European history since the beginning of the Christian era. That gives rise to an almost inextricable confusion of ideas, and for that reason I have had to discuss the theme in considerable detail ; for the entrance of the Jews into Western history derived its chief significance from the fact that the Christian Church was founded on a Semitic basis, and that the ideas of "faith" and "religion" were introduced in their Semitic sense into a religion which was fundamentally and also through the life of Christ the direct unconditional negation of the Semitic view, and which besides by its further mythological and philosophical development became altogether Indo-European and un-Semitic. It is impossible to calculate the influence of Judaism upon our whole history from its beginnings to the present day unless we are quite clear in regard to these fundamental ideas "religion" and "faith." I confess that I have not seen a work, no matter of what kind, which has succeeded in making this even approximately plain ; in most cases the problem is not even felt as such. An abstract definition of religion is of little use, it does not clear our judgment ; nor are the learned and extremely interesting researches on the origin of religion and its evolution of any value for our present purpose. It is of more importance to see with our eyes what Semitic ; especially Jewish, religion is, and what are its

P.T. +
A. 4
on this.

distinguishing marks; we shall then realise how much of the Semitic has entered our own thought. For the character of this religion at once reveals to us the nature of its influence; and as, on the other hand, force of will is peculiarly characteristic of the Semite, we may expect that this influence will be great. Materialism in philosophy, prominence given to the historical motive power as opposed to the ideal, strong emphasis laid upon "justice" in the secular sense of the word, that is, of legal and moral conduct and justification by works, in contrast to every attempt at spiritual conversion and to redemption by metaphysical perception or divine grace,* the limitation of the imagination, the forbidding of freedom of thought, deep-rooted intolerance towards other religions, red-hot fanaticism—these are things that we must expect to meet everywhere to a greater or less extent where Semitic blood or Semitic ideas have gained a footing. We shall meet them frequently in the course of this book, even in the most modern and advanced views of the nineteenth century; for instance, in the teaching of Socialism. As far as intolerance in particular is concerned—this absolutely new element in the life of the Indo-European peoples—I shall postpone what I have to say about the "entrance of the Jews" in this connection to the next chapter but one, where we shall see that the earliest Christians in eloquent language demanded unconditional religious freedom, while those of a later period took from the Old Testament the divine commandment of intolerance.

* Zoroaster gives powerful expression to the Indo-European view in contrast to the Semitic in the following passage: "Secular justice, you miser! you form the whole religion of evil spirits and are the destruction of the religion of God" (*Dinkard* VII.

D.T.
Yes, it
described
A.H. +
Saying
so well.

ISRAEL AND JUDAH

And now I again take up the thread where we left off our discussion of the relation of the various types in the blood of the Israelites and the possible influence of these mixtures upon their character (omitting the religious question just discussed). After all that I have said, it is clear that so far as religion was concerned the Semitic element was bound in time to prevail over the Hittite; but this victory was gained slowly and with difficulty, and, in fact, only in the south, *i.e.*, in Judea (Judah and Benjamin), where a frequent influx of fresh Arabian (*i.e.*, pure Semitic) blood may also have been of some influence.* In Israel (*i.e.*, in the north of the land) the old Syrian cult remained in honour till the last—the feasts on the heights, the pilgrimages to sacred places, the images of Baal, &c.; † even Elijah, who as a prophet was so strict in regard to “strange Gods,” had not the slightest objection to the worship of the golden calves; he defended only the “God in Israel” against the strange Gods imported by the daughters of Phœnician kings. From Israel itself Judaism would never have sprung. All the more necessary is it that we should now become acquainted with the Jewish idea—the specifically Jewish in contrast to that of the people of Israel. And so I now pass to the third point, namely, that the real Jew only developed in the course of centuries by gradual physical separation from the rest of the Israelite family, as also by progressive development of some mental qualities and systematic starving of others; he is not the result of a normal national life, but, so to speak, an artificial product—the product of a priestly caste which, with the help of alien priests, forced

* Robertson Smith (*The Prophets of Israel*) lays great stress on this (p. 281; see also Wellhausen: *Prolegomena*).

† For details see Wellhausen and Robertson Smith (e.g., *The Prophets of Israel*, pp. 63, 96).

upon the people against its will a priestly legislation and a priestly faith as having been given by God (359).

Hurried as my sketch has been, and although for the sake of simplification I have passed over many facts in silence, I think that the reader has received a fairly vivid, and in its essential elements accurate conception of the *mixtum compositum* from which the Israelite people sprang; he has also noticed that the mixed blood in the south of the country, where Judah and Benjamin lay,* was, from the very first moment of the arrival in Palestine, partly subject to exceptional modifying influences, that is to say, the Semitic element in the south was constantly reinforced by new arrivals. Probably this difference was of older standing. From the beginning we see the great strong tribes of the Josephites, Ephraim and Manasseh, round which most of the other tribes grouped themselves like a family, looking upon Judah† with a certain contempt, or even with distrust. The emigration to Egypt and the conquest of Palestine take place under the leadership of the Josephites; Moses belongs to them, not to Judah (if he was not altogether an un-Semitic Egyptian); ‡ Joshua belongs to them,

* The borders of Judah and Judea (to which since David's time Benjamin also belonged) have changed very much in the course of time: the whole southern part was joined to Idumea after the exile; on the other hand, the district was, later, extended somewhat towards the north into the former Ephraimite territory by the annexations of Judas Maccabeus.

† Even in the Old Testament in the later time there is a clear distinction between Judah and Israel: "Then I cut asunder mine other staff, even Bands, that I might break the brotherhood between Judah and Israel" (*Zechariah* xi. 14; see, too, *1 Sam.* xviii. 16); frequently Israel (that is, the ten tribes besides Judah and Benjamin) is simply called "the house of Joseph" in contrast to the "house of Judah" (thus *Zechariah* x. 6).

‡ Renan says: "*Il faut considérer Moïse presque comme un Égyptien*" (*Israel*, i. 220); his name is said to be of Egyptian and not Hebrew origin (p. 160). So too Kuenen: *National Religions and Universal Religions*, 1882, p. 315. According to Egyptian tradition he is a renegade priest from Heliopolis, called Osarsyph (see Maspero: *Histoire ancienne* ii. 449). To-day, as a reaction from former exaggerations,

surrounding land and beginning the siege of Jerusalem, suddenly had to retire, then the Prophets were in the right; a pestilence had broken out in the camp, said the one; inner dissension, said the other, caused the retreat; * it did not matter, on that morning of the year 702 B.C. upon which the inhabitants of Jerusalem no longer saw the host of Sennacherib underneath their walls, the Jew was born, and with him the Jehovah whom we know from the Bible. That day was the turning-point in the history of Judah. Even the foreign peoples saw in the saving of Jerusalem a divine miracle. All at once the Prophets who had hitherto been despised and persecuted—Isaiah and Micah—became the heroes of the day; the king had to join their party and begin to purify the land from strange gods. The faith in the providence of Jehovah, the confident belief that all prosperity depended upon passive obedience to his commands, that every national calamity came as a trial or punishment, the unshakeable conviction that Judah was the chosen people of God, while the other nations stood far below it—in fact, the whole complex of conceptions which was to form the soul of Judaism—now came into existence, developed rapidly from germs which under normal circumstances would never have produced such results, giving great power of resistance but on the other hand choking much that was sensible, sound and natural until it became a fixed idea. Now for the first time were written the momentous words: "Only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day" (Deut. x. 15). From the year 701 to the year 586, when Jerusalem was destroyed, the Jews

*D. T. Ever
as the
Germans
were the
chosen
people
of
Jehovah
in
Bible
or whole.*

* Cf. Cheyne: *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, p. 231 f. It is interesting to learn from Assyrian accounts that Jerusalem was defended by an army of Arabian mercenaries; Judah had been distinguished from time immemorial for its lack of military capacity.

was all done, not with an evil intention to deceive, but in order henceforth to keep pure the cult of the Saviour God Jehovah, and at the same time as the beginning of a moral regeneration. There, for example, appears for the first time, shyly and guardedly, the commandment that we should love God the Lord; at the same time this book contained the fanatically dogmatic assertion that the Jews alone were the people of God, and along with this came for the first time the prohibition of mixed marriages, as also the commandment to "destroy" all "heathens" wherever Jews dwell, and to stone to death every Jew, man or woman, who is not orthodox (xvii. 5); two witnesses were to be sufficient to justify the death sentence: the world was richer by the idea of religious intolerance. How new this course of thought was to the people, and under what particular circumstance alone it could obtain a hold—namely, amidst hourly danger and after the wonderful saving of Jerusalem from the hands of Sennacherib—is shown by the ever-repeated formula: "The Lord hath commanded that we should fear him, that it may be well with us all the days of our life, as it is to-day." Frightful punishments on the one hand, boundless promises on the other

and, in addition, the constant enumeration of the wonders which Jehovah had done on behalf of Israel—these are the methods of conviction employed by the book of *Deuteronomy*, the first independent work of the Judeans in the sphere of religion.* Sublime this religious motive is not; this I must assert in spite of all Jewish and Christian commentators; yet when grasped by a fanatical have any prospect of rightly understanding the rest," said Reuss many years ago in his fundamental *Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, § 286.

* Chapter xxviii. (which is certainly postexilic) contains the blessings, "and thou shalt not go aside from any of the words which I command thee this day," and then the curses, more than a hundred in number, containing all the horrors which a sickly imagination can picture to itself, "for God will rejoice over you to destroy you."

it is
as
Jehovah.

an age when he could form his own judgment, ever came back. When a single individual leaves his fatherland for fifty years—aye, even for twenty—he returns home to relations and friends as a stranger among strangers; he is unable to accommodate himself once more to the special organic law of the individual growth of this particular people, especially if he has left his fatherland in early youth. In this case a whole nation left its historical home; those who returned later had been born and brought up, almost without exception, in the foreign land; there was, perhaps, not one who consciously remembered Judea. And meanwhile, in Babylon, while the blessed connection with the past (the relation of child to mother) was broken off, the embittered zealots among the exiled were brooding over their fate and making resolves which they could never have thought of in the land of their home.* It was in the captivity that specific Judaism had its foundation, and this was brought about by Ezekiel, a priest of the family of the High Priest; hence it is that Judaism has from the very beginning borne the stamp of the Captivity. Its faith is not the faith of a healthy, free people that is fighting for its existence in honest rivalry; it breathes impotence and thirst for vengeance, and seeks to blind men to the misery of the moment by forecasting an impossible future. The book of Ezekiel is the most frightful in the Bible; by its employment of extreme means—horrible threats and the most atrocious promises—this narrow-minded, abstractly formalistic, but noble and patriotic spirit † wished to save the much-

* With regard to the incalculably great influence of Babylon upon all Jewish thought from the first one finds the fullest information in Eberhard Schrader's book, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3rd ed., revised by Zimmern and Winckler, 1903; a short summary is found in Winckler's *Die politische Entwicklung Babylonien und Assyriens*, p. 17 f.

† Splendidly described in chap. xii. of Duhm's *Theologie der Propheten*. Eduard Meyer says in the *Entstehung des Judentums*, p. 219, "Ezekiel

shaken faith of his brothers, and with it the nation.

Up to his time in Israel religion had been, as in Rome, Greece, Egypt, a fact among other facts of the national life, and a priesthood a part of the national organisation. Ezekiel said: "No, Israel is not in the world, to toil and wage war like other peoples, to do work and to think, but to be the sanctuary of Jehovah; let it observe Jehovah's law, and all will be given to it." The State was now to be replaced by the rule of the religious law, the so-called nomocracy. Even *Deuteronomy* had admitted that other peoples had other gods; Amos, as an isolated great mind, had had a vague feeling of the existence of a cosmic god, who was something more than the political *deus ex machina* of a special little nation: Ezekiel now united both views and invented therefrom the Jehovah of Judaism, monotheism in a frightful, distorted form.

Of a surety Jehovah is the only and almighty God, but He lives merely for His own glory; sympathetically gracious towards the Jews (for through them He will proclaim His glory and show His power under the condition that they devote themselves solely to His service), but to all other peoples of the earth He is a cruel God, who will visit them with "pestilence and blood," in order that "He may become glorious, sacred and known"! All these other peoples are to be destroyed, and Jehovah commands His prophets to call together the birds and the animals of the world "that they may eat the flesh of the strong and drink the blood of princes." Besides this, the book contains the sketch of the organisation of a hierarchy and of a new straight-jacket of worship—just the things in regard to which a prophet living in exile could indulge his imagination,

was manifestly quite an honest nature, but narrow-minded, and moreover he had grown up in the narrow views of the priesthood, not to be named in the same breath with the great figures, with whom he, by the donning of a very threadbare prophet's mantle, ventured to put himself side by side."

A. H.
as
Jehovah

as he could not have done had he stood in the midst of a national life, where every new statute would have had to contend with custom and tradition. But not long after Ezekiel's death the noble Persian king Cyrus conquered the Babylonian Empire. With the simplicity of the inexperienced Indo-European he permitted the return of the Jews and gave them a subsidy for the rebuilding of the temple. Under the protection of Arvan tolerance the hearth was erected from which, for tens of centuries a curse to all that is noblest and an everlasting disgrace to Christianity, Semitic intolerance was to spread like a poison over the whole earth. Whoever wishes to give a clear answer to the question, Who is the Jew? must never forget the one fact, that the Jew, thanks to Ezekiel, is the teacher of all intolerance, of all fanaticism in faith, and of all murder for the sake of religion; that he only appealed to toleration where he felt himself oppressed, that he himself, on the other hand, never practised it nor dared to practise it, for his law forbade it as it forbids it to-day and will forbid it to-morrow.

(4) Ezekiel had dreamt, but by the return from captivity his dream became a reality; his book—not the history of Israel, not the voices of the great prophets—was henceforth the ideal according to which Judaism was organised. And this again could only take place thanks to the circumstance that the historical process began with a new generation, in which even the language of the fathers was forgotten and only the Priests still understood it.* It was simply due to the coincidence

* Soon after this, more than four hundred years before Christ, the Hebrew language died out altogether (Paschal: *Völkerkunde*, 2nd ed. p. 532); its adoption once more many centuries later was artificial and with the object of separating the Jews from their hosts in Europe. In consequence we find such strange things happen, as for instance that the French citizens of "Jewish belief" can only fill their voting papers in Hebrew, an achievement of which Judas Maccabeus would have been incapable! The absolute lack of feeling for language among

Prophets; still later some freely invented didactic poems were added, as *Esther*, *Job*, *Daniel*, also the *Psalms*, &c. Still, long after the time of Ezra, according to Jewish tradition, a collegium of a hundred and twenty scribes, the "great synagogue," worked at the completion and revision of the canon; the two books of *Chronicles*, for instance, were written two hundred years later, "after the fall of the Persian Empire, out of the midst of Judaism." * I shall have to return immediately to this religion of Ezekiel; but first I shall discuss the fifth and last historical condition, without which it would never have been able, in spite of all that had gone before, to obtain a footing.

(5) After the Babylonian captivity the Jews never again formed an independent nation. Herder has rightly dwelt upon one profound influence that this fact must have exercised upon the character of the people: "The Jewish people was spoiled in its education because it never attained to the ripeness of political culture on its own soil, and consequently never to the real feeling of honour and freedom."† It is impossible to assert that at first the Jew was organically wanting in the sense of honour and freedom; his fate, too, would perhaps not have sufficed to produce such a complete atrophy of these precious qualities had not that faith been added which robbed the individual of every freedom and also completely rooted out the "true feeling of honour" by refusing to concede honour to other and higher nations. But the people of the tribe of Judah would never have

* Wellhausen: *Prolegomena*, p. 170. A simple exposition of the growth of the Old Testament, after the manner of Wellhausen's *Israel und jüd. Geschichte*, is unknown to me. The fundamental work of Eduard Reuss, *Gesch. der hl. Schriften alten Testaments*, is planned and written for scholars, and Zittel, *Die Entstehung der Bibel* in Reclam's series does not at all correspond to the title and does not satisfy even modest claims, however much interesting matter the book otherwise contains.

† *Ideen zur Geschichte der Menschheit*, P. III. Bk. 12, Div. 3.

A. H.
user chi

under such conditions could the faith, as Ezekiel taught it, have been imparted and the new law with its countless prescriptions have become the rule of life? The unnatural product of an overheated priestly brain would within a generation have been consigned *ad patres*. But the Jews did not form an independent State. They had returned to Jerusalem under the leadership of a half-Persian agent, who undoubtedly had definite instructions to support the priests and on the other hand to put down every movement of political ambition. As soon as the religious party saw the work which had just begun endangered by the events just mentioned, they sent to Babylon for help. In the first place reinforcements consisting of priests and scribes were sent; those were chosen who, with Ezra—"the clever scribe"—at their head, wished to set up the Thora; they brought with them also kingly edicts and money.* But even this did not suffice; a man of action was needed, and so the cup-bearer of King Artaxerxes, Nehemiah, was despatched to Jerusalem, armed with dictatorial power. Energetic measures were at once taken. Those worshippers of Jehovah who did not belong officially to the Jewish people were rejected "with horror"; not faith but genealogy was henceforth to be the decisive thing; all Jews who had married non-Jewesses must get a divorce or emigrate; in the book of *Leviticus* the law was inserted: "I have severed you from other people that ye should be mine" (xx. 26). Henceforth no Jew was

* Ezra brought from the king in money alone £250,000! The authenticity, or at least essential authenticity, of the Persian documents quoted by Ezra has in spite of the views of Wellhausen and others finally been proved by Eduard Meyer: *Die Entstehung des Judentums* (1896), pp. 1-71. This settles one of the most important questions in history. Any one who has read the little but very complete book of Meyer will understand his conclusions: "Judaism originated in the name of the Persian king and by the authority of his Empire, and thus the effects of the Empire of the Achemenides extend with great power, as almost nothing else, directly into our present age."

Daylin

A. H.

to marry outside his people, under penalty of death; every man who married a foreign woman committed a sin against God.^{*} Nehemiah also built high walls round Jerusalem and put strong gates at the entrances; then he forbade the stranger to enter, that the people "might be purified from everything foreign." Wellhausen rightly says: "Ezra and Nehemiah became, by the grace of King Artaxerxes, the definite constructors of Judaism."[†] What Ezekiel founded they completed; they forced Judaism on the Jew.

Germany
1818-7the loss
of the
Army
+ the
inflation

These, then, are in my opinion the five historical motive powers by which Judaism was rendered possible and furthered. I shall summarise them once more, to impress them on the memory; the unexpected, sudden separation from the more gifted Israel; the continuance for a hundred years of the tiny State threatened on all sides, which could hope for help only from a superhuman power; the rending of the historical thread and of all local traditions by the carrying-off of the whole people from their home into a foreign land; the reviving of these associations under a generation which was born abroad and hardly understood the language of their fathers; the condition of political dependence which henceforth existed, and to which the priesthood owed its dominating power.

When Ezra for the first time read to the assembled people from the new law, which was to be the "law of Moses," then "all the people wept when they heard the words of the law"; this is the account of Nehemiah, and we can believe it. But it did not help them, for great Jehovah, "powerful and fearful," had commanded it; ‡ and now the so-called "Old Covenant" was renewed,

* Nehemiah xiii. 27. Cf. the beginning of this chapter, p. 333.

† *Israel. u. jüd. Gesch.*, 3rd ed. p. 173.

‡ According to the Talmud, Jehovah occupies himself on Sunday with reading the Thorah (Wellhausen: *Jer. Gesch.*, p. 297; Montefiore, p. 461).

but this time in writing, like a notary's contract. Every priest, Levite, and influential man in the country put his seal under it, also every scribe; they and all other men, "with their wives, sons and daughters," had to "bind themselves by oath to walk in the law of God that is given by Moses, the servant of God." (*) This was now the "New Covenant." It is probably the first and last time that in this way a religion originated in the world! Fortunately, religious instinct still lived among the people, from the midst of which a short time before a Jeremiah and a second Isaiah had arisen. Human nature does not permit itself to be stamped out and distorted without leaving a trace behind, but in this case all that was possible in that way had been done; and if in consequence the Jews became generally unpopular, the reason is solely to be sought in this artificially constructed and mechanically enforced faith, which gradually grew into an ineradicable national idea and destroyed in the Jewish heart the purely human legacy which is common to us all. In the Canaanite-Israelite nature-cult, quickened by Semitic seriousness and Amorite idealism, there must have been many germs promising the finest blossoms; how otherwise should we be able to trace such a development as that which, starting from the orgiastic dance around the image of the calf, still common in all Israel and Judah before the Captivity, leads up to the God of Amos, who "despises feast-days" and "has no pleasure in burnt-offerings" (v. 21, 22), and to the second Isaiah, who considered every temple building unworthy of God, to whom sacrifice and incense are "a horror," and who writes the almost Hindoo words: "He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man" (Isaiah lxvi. 1-3). But henceforth all development was broken off. And as I must a thousand times repeat—for no one says it, and it is the only thing that has to be said—the only thing that makes

*Facilitate
Nazis
for Jews*

* See Nehemiah, chaps. viii.-xi

the position of the Jews among us children of the nineteenth century comprehensible—this so-called reform of Ezra, which in reality signifies the foundation of Judaism, this reform which became only possible through the coincidence of the five historical conditions enumerated, does not betoken a stage in religious development, but is a violent reaction from every development; it leaves the tree standing, but cuts away all roots from below it; now it may stand and wither, supported by the 13,600 neatly cut stakes of the law, that it may not fall. When, therefore, so important a scholar as Delitzsch writes, "The Thora shows how the Mosaic law continued for a thousand years to develop in the consciousness and practice of Israel," we must offer the objection that the Thora on the contrary does everything which it can to mask the process of development which had hitherto taken place; that it does not hesitate to utter any lie in order to represent the law as absolutely stationary, and fixed since time immemorial, that it gives even such manifest absurdities as the story of the Tabernacle and its arrangement; and we must assert that the Thora is directed not only against the so-called "idolatry" (from which the whole Israelite cult proceeded), but just as much against the free spirit of genuine religion which had begun to stir in the Prophets. Not one of these great men—neither Elijah nor Amos, nor Hosea, nor Micah, nor Isaiah, nor Jeremiah, nor the second Isaiah—would have put his seal on that document of the New Covenant—otherwise he would have had to deny his own words.

THE PROPHETS

I must pause a moment to discuss the Prophets just mentioned. For it is particularly from the contrast between what they aimed at and sought and the teachings of the Jerusalemite hierocrats that it becomes clear to

what an extent the Jew was made Jew, artificially made (so to speak) by the conscious, calculated religious politics of individual men and individual associations, and in opposition to all organic development. It is necessary to emphasise this in order to judge aright the Israelite character, which in a way was founded in Judaism. In the New Covenant the observances of the cult have the first place; the word "sanctity," which occurs so often, signifies in the first place absolutely nothing but the strict observance of all ordinances; * purity of heart is hardly considered, † "purity of skin and cleanness of vessels are more important," as Reuss says with some exaggeration, ‡ and in the midst of these observances stands as the most sacred of all—an extraordinarily complicated sacrificial ritual. § A more flagrant departure from the prophetic teaching is scarcely thinkable. Let us see. Hosea had represented God as saying, "I desired mercy and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings" (vi. 6). Amos I have just quoted (p. 465). Micah writes: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? (vi. 6). He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?" (vi. 8). Isaiah expresses exactly the same thing, but in greater detail, and as if by a miracle we have a saying of his preserved, in which he

* Montefiore: *Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*, p. 236.

† Robertson Smith: *Prophets of Israel*, p. 424.

‡ *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Allen Testaments*, § 379.

§ Whoever wishes to form an idea of this should read, in addition to the books of *Leviticus*, *Numbers*, &c., the eleven tractates of the sacrificial ordinances (Kodaschim) in the *Babylonian Talmud* (the Haggadian portions form the fourth volume of the only reliable translation, that of Wünsche). One cannot assert that the Jews have got rid of this ritual since the destruction of Jerusalem, for they still study it, and certain things, as killing according to their rites, belong to it, for which reason an animal killed by a non-Jew is carrion to the Jew (see *Treatise Chullin*, fol. 13b).

is my throne and the earth is my footstool ; where is the house that ye build unto me ? Or what is the place of my rest ? . . . but to this man will I look, even to him who is poor and of a contrite spirit and trembleth at my word " (lxvi. 1, 2). The contrast to the commandments of the Thora which were soon afterwards introduced could hardly be greater. The whole tendency of the Prophets, as we see, is directed to inculcating the piety of the heart ; not he who sacrifices, but he who does good, not he who observes the Sabbath, but he who protects the oppressed, is in their opinion good. One must also notice that in the case of the Prophets nationalism nowhere (except in the later interpolations) has the dogmatic and inhuman character of the later official faith. Amos, a noble man whom the great synagogue has cruelly used, makes perhaps the only humorous remark which the whole literature of the Bible contains : " Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel ? said the Lord " (ix. 7). And he expresses the opinion that just as God led the Israelites out of Egypt, so He brought the Philistines out of Caphthor and the Syrians out of Kir. Micah writes with the same tolerance : " For all people will walk, every one, in the name of his God, and we will walk in the name of our God " (iv. 5). The second Isaiah, the only real and conscious monotheist, simply says : " God of the whole earth He shall be called " (liv. 5). Here too, therefore, a direction is clearly marked out, which later was violently departed from. But at the same time that promising tendency, those longings and attempts to find a less historical and more genuine

Book of Isaiah, usually designated the Second Isaiah or Deutero-Isaiah, the only one who now and again reminds one of Christ and whose name the Jews, in characteristic fashion, forgot as soon as he died, though in all other cases they follow genealogy till the hundredth generation. The second Isaiah wrote during the second half of the exile, hence a century and a half later than the historical Isaiah. Cheyne is of opinion that chapts. lvi.-lxvii., which are mostly ascribed to the second Isaiah, were really written by a still later author.

religion—a religion of the individual soul in contrast to faith in national destinies—were nipped in the bud; naturally this tendency sprang up anew again and again in many individual hearts, but it could not inspire with life the organism which the priestly code had paralysed, there was no longer room for development. And yet Jeremiah had made important steps in this direction; he (or some other in his name) had represented God as saying, “I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give to every man according to his ways” (xvii. 10). Yes, in absolute contrast to the Judaic justification by works, which the Roman Catholic Church adopted from the Jews, we seem to see a faint glimmer of the conception of grace when Jeremiah fervently cries out, “Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed! Save me, and I shall be saved!” (xvii. 14.) And with the second Isaiah’s beautiful verse, in which God says, “My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,” we stand on the threshold of a transcendental mystery where the true religion of the Indian and of Jesus Christ begins. With what justice does the theologian Duhm say that the writers of *Deuteronomy* and *Ezekiel*, and with them Judaism, to the present day, stand “in point of religion and morals far beneath Jeremiah!” *

But it seems to me more than doubtful whether the common Semitic qualities, which reveal themselves in

* Duhm: *Die Theologie des Propheten*, p. 251. Jeremiah’s divination of grace disappeared immediately, never to return again; even the noblest, most talented Jews, like Jesus Sirach, teach that “whoever knows the law is virtuous”; God has created man and then “left him to his own counsel”; from this we can logically draw as conclusion the doctrine of absolute freedom of will, destitute of all divine assistance: “Before man stand life and death, he can choose what he will . . . if thou wilt, thou canst keep the law” (see, for example, *Ecclesiasticus* xv. 12–15). The Essenes alone form an exception, for according to Josephus they taught the doctrine of predestination (*Jud. Antiquities*, 520); this sect, however, was never recognised but persecuted, and presumably counted few real Jews among its number; it is an ephemeral thing without influence.

these pre-eminent men, would have produced much religion in our sense of the word; for as these quotations (with the exception of the two last) prove, it is always morals that the Prophets oppose to cult, not a new or reformed ideal of religion.* The Israelite prophets (in addition to whom we must reckon some Psalmists) are great by their moral greatness, not by creative power; in this they reveal themselves as essentially Semites—in whom the will is always supreme—and their influence in the purely religious sphere is to a great extent merely a reaction from the Canaanite cult ascribed to Moses, and introduced nothing in its place. But to believe that one can take from the people one cult without replacing it by another shows but little insight into the human character; just as little as it testifies to religious understanding, when the Prophets imagined that faith in a God who had never been conceived and never represented, who revealed himself only in political events, and who must be served with good deeds and humility alone, could satisfy even the most modest demands of the imagination. It was in fact through the sublimity of prophetic feeling, through the passionate glow of prophetic words, that one of those materialistic Syro-Semitic peoples, poor in religious conceptions, first received the revelation of the gulf between God and man, and now this gulf yawned threateningly, and not the slightest attempt was made to bridge it over. And yet what constitutes the essence of religion if not the bridging over of this gulf? All else is philosophy or morals. We are consequently justified in calling the

* This is still truer of such later phenomena as Jesus Sirach, who, generally speaking, are content with giving very wise, noble rules of life: one must not strive after riches, but generosity, not knowledge, but wisdom, &c. (xcix, xcxi., &c.). The only attempt (and it was owing to Greek influence) on the part of the Jewish spirit to attain to the metaphysical, had a poor ending: the so-called "preacher Solomon" has no better advice to give than that we should think of to-day and enjoy our works—"all is vanity!"

mythology of Greece a religion, for by furnishing conceptions it brings us nearer the Divine.* Not the thought of a God, who has created heaven and earth, but the paraclete hovering between Him and me, represents the essential purport of all religion. Mohammed is scarcely less than Allah, and Christ is God himself, descended upon the earth. And here we must admit that Isaiah, who placarded his prophecies at the street corners; Jeremiah, the acutest politician of his time; the second Isaiah, the venerable, lovable figure from the Babylonian captivity; and Amos, the landed proprietor, who saw a national danger in the corruption of the leading grades of society; Hosea, who considered the priests even more dangerous; Micah, the Socialist Democratic peasant, who wishes to wipe out cities (except Jerusalem) from the face of the earth;—these are splendid men, in whom we note with delight how strong in faith and at the same time generous, how noble, how vigorously the Israelite spirit moved before it was bound hand and foot, yet they are by no means religious geniuses. If they had had that power which they did not possess, their people would have been spared their bitter fate; the people would not have needed to weep “when it heard the words of the law.”

THE RABBIS

What the Prophets had failed to accomplish was achieved by the priests and scribes. They arranged the connection between God and man by fixing an invented but exact historical tradition, by the retention and further development of the sacrificial service and above all by the so-called “law,” that is, by hundreds of

* It is not unimportant to note here how much more insight into the essence of religious need is shown by a Socrates, who taught that not the sacrifice and its costliness pleased the gods, but the innermost feelings of the sacrificer, though he at the same time considered the offering of the usual sacrifices as a duty (Xenophon: *Memorabilia* i. 3). Similarly Jesus Christ.

directions which hedged in every step of a man the whole day long, and continually accompanied him through all seasons—in the field, at home, asleep and awake, eating and drinking. According to the Talmud tradition, in the days of mourning for the death of Moses three thousand such ordinances were forgotten; * that marks the tendency. The manifest purpose was to keep the thought of God continually alive among the people, and at the same time the thought that they were the chosen of God and of faith in their own future. The object was noble enough, as every one who judges impartially must admit, and it may well be that this Draconian rule had a more moral life as its result, and that thousands of good souls lived contented and happy in the fulfilment of the law; and yet what happened here was a stroke of violence against nature. It is contrary to nature to hem in every step of a man; contrary to nature to plague a whole people with priestly subtleties,† and to forbid it all healthy, free, intellectual nourishment; contrary to nature to teach pride, hatred and isolation as the bases of our moral relations to our fellow-men; contrary to nature to transfer all our efforts from the present to the future. To establish Judaism, a religion was killed, and then mummified.

Ambrosius praises in the religious doctrine of the Jews especially "the victory of reason over feeling."‡ The word reason is perhaps not very happily chosen, Will would be nearer the point; but he is quite right in regard to the subjection of the feelings, and he here says in simple form something of so great significance that his

* Treatise *Themura*, fol. 16a (Wünsche).

† According to the testimony of a contemporary Jew, Rubens, *Der alte und der neue Glaube* (Zürich, 1878, p. 79), the Jew who lives according to the ordinances needs "about half the day for religion alone." God wished, says Rabbi Chania ben Akasiah, to give Israel opportunity to do good service, therefore he imposed on it a mass of rules and observances.

‡ In his work *Von den Pflichten der Kirchendiener* i. 119.

A. H.
uses
this.

of this condition he will put his foot upon the neck of all the nations of the world and be Lord and possessor of the whole earth.* This one basis of Jewish religion includes, therefore, a direct criminal attempt upon all the peoples of the earth, and the crime cannot be disavowed because hitherto the power has been lacking to carry it out; for it is the hope itself which is criminal and which poisons the heart of the Jew †. To the misunderstanding and intentional falsification of the Prophets were added other dreams of the future, which, however, were no better. From the Persians the Jews had during their captivity for the first time heard vague tales of an immortality and a future life; they had also heard of angels and devils, heaven and hell. ‡ On this basis there was now produced an enormous apocalyptic literature of which the book of *Daniel*, in spite of its senseless mystery-mongering, would give a much too favourable idea, which dealt with the end of the world, the resurrection of the just, &c., without in any way idealising the Messianic hopes; at the best it is a case of a resurrection of the body, which shall give support to the dubious

* The absurdity of the idea, that this religion is the stem of Christianity, Christianity its blossom, must be manifest to the most prejudiced.

† The Jewish apologists reply that they obey the law, not "because it is by these means that they are to attain to empire, but because Jehovah commands it; that Jehovah gives the world to the Jews as one sacred people is done to his own honour not theirs." But this seems to me pure contemptible casuistry. A reliable author, Montefiore, says literally, "Beyond question the argument—'obey the law, for it will pay you'—forms the chief and fundamental motive in *Deuteronomy*" (p. 531). That countless Jews are pious men who fulfil the law and lead a pure noble life, without thinking of reward, only proves that here as elsewhere morals and religion do not go together and that in the whole world there are men who are very much better than their faith. But even to-day fairly free-thinking Jews still write: "The existence of Judaism depends upon the clinging to the Messianic hope"—the definite expectation of world empire thus still forms the soul of Judaism (cf. above, p. 334).

‡ In connection with the borrowing of Zoroastrian (half-understood) conceptions by the founders of Judaism, see Montefiore: *Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*, pp. 373, 429, 453, &c.

assurance "to-day you must obey the law and later you will receive your reward" (Talmud, *Treatise Erubin*, Div. 2), and this Jewish "Kingdom of God" will, as one of the most eminent of Israelite thinkers, Saadia (tenth century), assures us, "be a kingdom on earth." The quotation from the *Apok. of Baruch*, on p. 425, shows what was the Jewish idea of this future world; it differed from the world of to-day almost solely in the predominant position of the Jewish nation. An interesting trace of this view has by mistake found its way even into the New Testament. According to Matthew the twelve apostles, seated on twelve thrones, will judge the twelve tribes of Israel, which of course assumes that no others than Jews enter into heaven.*

Thus the invented and utterly falsified past is completed by an equally fictitious, Utopian future, and so the Jew, in spite of the materialism of his religion, hovers between dreams and delusions. The mirage of the desert of their fathers conjures up by magic for these half-Semites sweet consolation for their tragic destiny—an airy, empty and delusive consolation; but by the strength of their will—called faith—it is a sufficiently vigorous living power, and indeed often a dangerous one for others. The power of the idea triumphs here in an alarming fashion; in a people with good capacities but not pre-eminent physically or mentally it produces the delusive idea of a particular selectness, of a special pleasantness in the sight of God, of an incomparable future; it isolates them in an insane pride from all the nations of the earth; forces upon them, as laid

* *Matthew* xix. 28; *Luke* xxii. 30. This utterance put in the mouth of Christ directly contradicts what is said in *Matthew* xx. 23. The clinging to the twelve tribes also, although for more than five hundred years there were only two, is genuinely Rabbinical. The Rabbis, too, expressly teach the doctrine: "The non-Jews are as such precluded from admission to a future world" (cf. Laible: *Jesus Christus im Talmud*, p. 53). Concerning the Messianic expectations, see chap. iii. p. 235 note.

down by God, a law which is senseless, unreasonable, and impossible in practice; it nourishes them with lying memories and lulls them with criminal hopes;—and, while it thus raises this people in its own conceit to giddy Babel-like heights, it in truth depresses their souls deeply, weighing so heavily upon their best qualities, isolating them from suffering, striving and creating humanity, confirming them hopelessly in the most unfortunate fixed ideas, and making them in every form (from the extremest orthodoxy to outspoken free-thinking) so inevitably the enemy, open or secret, of every other human being, and a danger to every culture, that at all times and places it has inspired the deepest mistrust in the most highly gifted, and horror in the unerring instincts of the common people. I said just now that orthodoxy and free-thinking could be regarded by us as equivalents here, in fact the question to-day is not so much what a Jew believes as what, to use a paradoxical antithesis, he can believe or is capable of believing. Intellectual endowments and morality are individual qualities. The Jew is, like other men, shrewd or stupid, good or bad; whoever denies that is not worth talking to; but there is something which is not individual, namely, *les plis de la pensée*, as the Frenchman says, the inborn tendencies of thought and action, the definite bent, which the mind takes from the habits of generations.* And thus we see to-day Jewish atheists of the most modern type who, by their tendency to regard senseless hypotheses or mere makeshift conceptions of science as material, actual facts, by their total incapacity to rise above the narrow historical standpoint, by their talent for planning impossible

* If we reckon twenty-four years as a generation, which is not exaggerated considering how soon the Jews are mature, the Jew of to-day belongs on an average to the hundredth generation since the return from Babylon and the founding of Judaism. That holds of the male line of descent; an unbroken female line would be in about the one hundred and fiftieth generation.

socialistic and economic Messianic empires without inquiring whether they thereby destroy the whole of the civilisation and culture which we have so slowly acquired, by their childish belief that with decrees and laws the souls of the people can be changed from to-day to to-morrow, by their lack of understanding for everything genuinely great outside the narrow limits of their own circle of thought, and by their ridiculous over-estimation of every Lilliputian intellectual work which has a Jew for its author—we see, I say, such so-called free-thinkers who prove themselves to be genuine children of the religion of the Thora and the Talmud in a much more thorough and striking fashion than many a pious Rabbi who exercises the lofty virtues of humility and obedience to the law, united with love to neighbour, sympathy with the poor, tolerance towards the Gentiles, and lives in such a way that he would be an honour to any nation and a glory to any religion.

THE LAW

Now in spite of all, there is greatness in the specifically Jewish theory of life, and I have already hinted in a former part of the chapter what makes this greatness (*see* p. 390 f.). Even if, as Robertson Smith assures us, the purely pecuniary interests of the priestly noble caste and their political ambition may have weighed in the momentous decision to centralise the cult in the one city Jerusalem,* yet I am convinced that barren, critical minds always attach far too much importance to such considerations. We cannot, by purely egoistic consideration of interests, found a nation which survives being scattered; such a belief is an error of judgment.†

* *Prophets of Israel*, p. 365.

† A really classical example of this so-called critical but in reality just as uncritical as inappreciative method is seen in Professor Hermann Oldenberg's *Religion des Veda*, where the symbolism and the mysticism of the Hindoos are represented continuously as priestly swindle!

thought so purely and unselfishly, that they raised their eyes to a God, was the source of their strength. The idea of isolating the nation by forbidding mixed marriages, and of rearing a noble race from the hopelessly mongrel Israelite, is nothing if not brilliant; equally so the idea of representing the purity of the race as an historical legacy, as the special, characteristic feature of the Jew. In this connection the whole law should be mentioned; for it was by this law that they succeeded in banishing every thought but the thought of Jehovah in making the people really "sacred" in the Semitic sense. A Jewish writer informs us that "for the Sabbath alone there are thirty-nine chapters of forbidden occupations, and every chapter had sub-divisions *ad infinitum*." * Moses is said to have been taught three hundred and sixty-five prohibitions and two hundred and sixty-four commands on Mount Sinai,† and this only provides the preliminary scaffolding for the detailed "law." Montefiore asserts also that the obeying of the law had soon become with the Jew the ruling thought to such an extent that it was for him the *summum bonum*, the best, noblest and sweetest occupation in the world.‡ While memory and taste were thus paralysed, the faculty of judgment was simply broken by the law; a poor woman who on the Sabbath gathered dry wood for her fire committed, by this transgression of the law, as great a

racism
began
w the
Jews.

* Montefiore: *Religion of the Ancient Hebrews*, pl 504!

† Talmud, Treatise *Maccoth*, Div. 3 (according to Grünwald!)

‡ Montefiore, p. 530. "The huge number of ceremonial prescriptions is the high privilege of Israel," says the Talmud (Montefiore, p. 535), and in *Lamentations* (falsely ascribed to Jeremiah) we read: "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth. He putteth his mouth in the dust; if so be there may be hope" (iii. 27, 29). For the opposite view one should read the beautiful remarks in *Kant's Anthropologie* § 102 concerning religious obligations, in which the great thinker expresses the opinion that nothing is more difficult for a sensible man than "the commands of a bustling do-nothingness (*Nichts-thueren*), such as those which Judaism established."

crime as if she had broken her marriage vow.* . . . I say, therefore, that the men who founded Judaism were not impelled by evil, selfish motives, but goaded on by a demoniacal power, such as only honest fanatics can possess; for the terrible work which they completed is perfect in every point.

THE THORA

The everlasting monument of this perfection is their Thora, the books of the Old Testament. Here history again shapes history! What scientific work could ever hope to exercise such an influence upon the life of humanity? It has frequently been asserted that the Jew lacks imaginative power; the study of this remarkable book must teach us something different. At least they acquired this power in their direst need and created a true work of art, for in this history of the world, which begins with the creation of heaven and earth, to end with the future kingdom of God upon earth, all perspective relations serve to emphasise especially the one central thing—the Jewish people. And wherein lies the strength of this people—that vigour which so far has successfully defied every destiny—wherein, if not in this book? We have learned that the Israelites in former times were in no way distinguished from the neighbouring Hebrew races; we saw in the Syrian-Hittites an exceedingly hardy but remarkably “anonymous” human type without physiognomy, the nose being more prominent than anything else. And the Judeans? They were so unwarlike, so unreliable as soldiers, that their king had to entrust the country and his person to the protection of mercenary troops; they had so little enterprise that the mere sight of the sea, on which their kinsmen,

* According to the law [see Num. xv, 32-36] she must be punished with death.

D. T.
Chamberlain
did not
understand
that demoniacal
power is
there and
available
for all
realms
of thought.

Testament principally from the fact that "it satisfied the human craving for knowledge by furnishing for such questions as the age and the creation of the world, the origin of evil, &c., popular answers that every one understands and can easily grasp." Thus we see how this book meets the demands of the educated mind and of the man of the people—of the one, because it admires the daring arbitrariness in the "delusive whole"; of the other, because the mystery of existence is, like Jehovah behind the temple curtain, concealed from his gaze, and he receives to every question "popular answers." This book marks the triumph of materialistic philosophy. In truth no small achievement! It signifies the victory of will over understanding and every further effort of creative imagination. Such a work could be created only by pious sentiment and demoniacal power.

We cannot understand Judaism and its power, as well as its ineradicable tenacity, we cannot form a just and proper estimate of the Jew among ourselves, his character and way of thinking, until we have recognised his demoniacal genius and can explain its growth. Here it is a struggle of one against all; this one has taken upon himself every sacrifice and every shame, in order at some time, no matter when, to enter into the Messianic empire of supreme power, to the eternal glory of Jehovah. The Talmud thus expresses it: "Just as thy oppression will follow from transgressing the law, so obedience to it will be rewarded by the fact that thou thyself wilt one day command" (*Aboth* iv. 5; after Montefiore).

JUDAISM

One more word in conclusion. My reply to the question, Who is the Jew? has been, in the first place, to point out whence he came, what was his physical foundation, and secondly, to reveal the leading idea of Judaism in its origin

The V. S.
thinking
of A. H.

The
Weltanschauung

that nationality, which is composed and held together by a complex of conceptions, by a "faith." With the apostle Paul we must learn that "he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly" (*Rom. ii. 28-29*).

Now such national or religious ideals can exercise their revolutionising influence in two ways, positive or negative. I have shown in the case of the Jews how a handful of men forced a definite national idea upon a people not at all inclined to accept it, and so impressed the stamp of this idea upon it that it would seem impossible for that people to efface it; but consanguinity and congeniality were necessary for the accomplishment of this. In this case, then, the idea exercised a positively creative influence. Just as remarkable a case is the sudden conversion of the bloodthirsty, wild Mongolians by the adoption of the Buddhist faith to mild, pious men, a third of whom have become monks.* But an idea can also have a purely negative result; it can lead a man out of his own course without opening up another which is suited to his race. A well-known example is the way in which Mohammedanism has affected the Turkomans: by adopting the fatalistic view of the world this wildly energetic people has gradually sunk into complete passivity. If the Jewish influence were to gain the upper hand in Europe in the intellectual and cultural sphere, we should have one more example of negative, destructive power. *

I have thus pointed out the method adopted by me and its chief results; I cannot otherwise summarise this chapter. Formulæ are mere phrases in respect of organic phenomena. The anecdote *Le voilà, le chameau!* is well known. Such a pretension is ridiculous even in respect of the camel, and it would never occur to me to close this sketch with generalisations and formulæ, as

* Cf. Döllinger; *Akademische Vorträge* I. 84

V.S. — but it has, and in a powerful nation ready in every cell of its flesh, its organs, its power, and its language to take power — and then its destructive power — over

SIXTH CHAPTER

THE ENTRANCE OF THE GERMANIC PEOPLE INTO THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD

Mon devoir est mon Dieu suprême.—FREDERICK THE GREAT,
(Letter to Voltaire on June 12, 1740.)

THE entrance of the Jew into European history had, as Herder said, signified the entrance of an alien element—alien to that which Europe had already achieved, alien to all it was still to accomplish ; but it was the very reverse with the Germanic peoples. This barbarian, who would rush naked to battle, this savage, who suddenly sprang out of woods and marshes to inspire into a civilised and cultivated world the terrors of a violent conquest won by the strong hand alone, was nevertheless the lawful heir of the Hellene and the Roman, blood of their blood and spirit of their spirit. It was his own property which he, unwitting, snatched from the alien hand. But for him the sun of the Indo-European must have set. The Asiatic and African slave had by assassination wormed his way to the very throne of the Roman Empire, the Syrian mongrel had made himself master of the law, the Jew was using the library at Alexandria to adapt Hellenic philosophy to the Mosaic law, the Egyptian to embalm and bury for boundless ages the fresh bloom of natural science in the ostentatious pyramids of scientific systematisation ; soon, too, the beautiful flowers of old Aryan life—Indian thought, Indian poetry—were to be trodden

under foot by the savage bloodthirsty Mongolian, and the Bedouin, with his mad delusions bred of the desert, was to reduce to an everlasting wilderness that garden of Eden, Erania, in which for centuries all the symbolism of the world had grown; art had long since vanished; there were nothing but replicas for the rich, and for the poor the circus: accordingly, to use that expression of Schiller which I quoted at the beginning of the first chapter, there were no longer men but only creatures. It was high time for the Saviour to appear. He certainly did not enter into history in the form in which combining, constructive reason, if consulted, would have chosen for the guardian angel, the harbinger of a new day of humanity; but to-day, when a glance back over past centuries teaches us wisdom, we have only one thing to regret, that the Teuton did not destroy with more thoroughness, wherever his victorious arm penetrated, and that as a consequence of his moderation the so-called "Latinising," that is, the fusion with the chaos of peoples, once more gradually robbed wide districts of the one quickening influence of pure blood and unbroken youthful vigour, and at the same time deprived them of the rule of those who possessed the highest talents. At any rate it is only shameful indolence of thought, or disgraceful historical falsehood, that can fail to see in the entrance of the Germanic tribes into the history of the world the rescuing of agonising humanity from the clutches of the everlastingly bestial.

If I here use the word "Germanic," I do so, as I have already remarked in the introduction to this division, for the sake of simplification—a simplification which expresses the truth, which must otherwise remain veiled. But this expression, whether taken in the wide or the narrow sense, seems somewhat elastic, perhaps inadmissible, particularly so because it was late before any people, at any rate we ourselves, became conscious of such

A.H:
 This, I
 will
 bring to
 your
 mind.
 I will
 show
 them who
 their true
 enemy
 is.

a thing as the specifically "Germanic" character. There never has been a people that called itself "Germanic," and never—from their first appearance on the stage of history to the present day—have the whole of the Germanic peoples unitedly opposed themselves to the non-Germanic; on the contrary, from the beginning we find them continually at feud with one another, displaying towards no one such hostility as towards their own blood. During Christ's lifetime Inguiomer betrays his nearest relative, the great Hermann, to the Marcomanni, and thereby hinders the process of union among the northern tribes and the total destruction of the Roman; Tiberius already could recommend no safer policy to adopt with the Germans than to "leave them to their own internal quarrels"; all the great wars of the following age, with the exception of the Crusades, were wars between Germanic princes; the same thing holds in the main for the nineteenth century. But a foreigner had at once recognised the uniformity of the various tribes, and instead of the indistinguishable babel of names, Chatti, Chanki, Cheruski, Gambrivii, Suevi, Vendales, Goti, Marcomanni, Lugii, Langobardi, Sachsi, Frisii, Hermunduri, &c., he had created for the luxuriant offshoots of this strong race the uniform comprehensive term "Germanic," and that because his eye had at the first glance discerned their common stock. Tacitus, after growing tired of enumerating names, says, "the physical characteristics of all these men are the same"; this was the correct empiric basis for the second and correct judgment, "I am convinced that the various tribes of Germania, unpolluted by marriages with alien peoples, have from time immemorial been a special, unmixed people, resembling itself alone" (*Germania* 4). It is peculiar how much more clearly the stranger, who is not biased by details, sees the great connection of phenomena, than the man who is directly interested in them!

EXTENSION OF THE IDEA

I have said that we must give the expression "Germanic" a wider and at the same time a narrower signification than that of Tacitus. Both the extension and the narrowing are the results of historical and anthropological considerations.

The expression is widened by the knowledge that no clear distinction can be drawn physically and mentally between the "German" of Tacitus and his predecessor in history, the "Celt," or his successor whom we are wont even more audaciously to sum up as the "Slav." In view of their physical characteristics the scientist would not hesitate to look upon these three races as varieties of a common stock. The Gauls who in the year 389 B.C. conquered Rome answer exactly to the description which Tacitus gives of the Germanic race: "bright blue eyes, reddish hair, tall figures"; and, on the other hand, the skulls which have been found in the graves of the oldest heroic Slavonic ages have shown to the astonishment of the whole scientific world that the Slavs from the time of the migrations were just as distinctly dolichocephalous (*i.e.*, long-skulled) and as tall as the other Germanic tribes of that time and those of pure race to-day.* Moreover, Virchow's comprehensive investigations into the colour of hair and of eyes have revealed the fact that the Slavs were originally and still are in certain districts just as fair as the Germanic races. Quite apart, therefore, from the general conception "Indo-European," which is a mere theoretical and hypothetical term, it appears that we have every reason for considerably extending the idea "Germanic" which we

* Cf. the summary in Ranke: *Der Mensch*, 2nd ed. ii. 297. It is not possible that these excavations revealed facts limited to the Norman Waregians, since the investigations embrace subjects from the most various places, not only in Russia, but also in Germany.

An
expert
from
Rigbiantops
office
is brought
in to
describe
this for
the teacher
who gets
more and
more
defused
the longer
he listens.
Call the
expert
Prof. ~~Hol~~
Vilnius ~~Hol~~

Weltstein
Weltdecken

have got from Tacitus and which we have hitherto for philological reasons been inclined to make narrower and narrower.*

THE CELT

Let us speak first of the Celts.

Misled chiefly by philological considerations, the Celtic languages being supposed to be more nearly related to the Italian and Greek than to the Germanic, we have been used to overlook the very decisive physical, and still more decisive moral influence.† We group the Celt with the Græco-Italians, with whom he is manifestly only distantly connected, while he is intimately related to the Germanic peoples. Though the completely Romanised Gaul may have presented a direct contrast to his conqueror, the Burgundian or Frank, yet that original conqueror of Rome, indeed even the later Gaul who had been settled for centuries in Northern Italy,

* In consequence the anthropologists of to-day use the expression *homo europæus* (see p. 373) in a much more definite sense than Linnæus had done; but such a nomenclature is much too abstract for the historian, who has therefore hitherto taken no notice of it. In order to awaken intelligent interest in wide circles, one must employ the existing, well-known terminology and suit it to new needs. This is here done by widening the idea "Germanic," a procedure which will justify itself step by step in the course of this work; it is only by this that the history of the last two thousand years and especially of the nineteenth century becomes intelligible. That Celts, Slavs and Teutons are descended from a single pure stock may to-day be regarded as certain in the light of anthropology and ancient history. (Cf. the final summary of Dr. G. Beck: *Der Urmensch*, Basel, 1899, p. 46 f.). In addition we have historical evidence of the mutual mixing of these different stems. Thus, for instance, H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, Professor at the Collège de France, arrives in his book *Les Celtes*, 1904, at the conclusion: *Il y a probablement en Allemagne plus de sang Gaulois qu'en France.*

† Schleicher, for instance, in his famous, universally copied genealogy of the Indo-Germanic languages (cf. *Die Deutsche Sprache*, 1861, p. 82) makes one group of the Italo-Celtic languages, which he thinks branched off in very early times from the "North European mother tongue"; also such divergent views as the well-known "wave-theory" of Johannes Schmidt continue to represent the Celt as if he were the furthest removed of all Indo-Europeans from the Germanic peoples.

Prof. V. W.
W. Schleicher

and whom Florus still describes as "superhuman" (*corpora plus quam humana erant*, ii. 4) clearly resembles the Teuton physically; but not only physically, for his love of wandering, his delight in war, which leads him (as the Goths at a later time) even to Asia in the service of any master who gives him an opportunity of fighting, his love of song . . . all these things are essential features of this same relationship, whereas one would be at a loss to prove the points of connection with the Græco-Italians. The Germanic peoples in the narrower, Tacitean sense of the word enter history for the first time* mixed with Celts and led by Celts; the word "Germanic" is Celtic. Do we not still meet those tall figures with blue eyes and reddish hair in North-West Scotland, in Wales, &c., and are they not more like a Teuton than a Southern European? Do we not yet see how the Bretons as daring mariners rival the feats of the old Norsemen? But no less an authority than Julius Cæsar has told us, in the first chapter of the first book of his Gallic War, how this wild Celto-Germanic mind becomes everywhere gradually effeminate through contact with Roman civilisation.†

More striking and more decisive for my theory is the relationship of Celt and Teuton in the deeper mental qualities. History gives us ample proof of this, of the relationship of those finer features that make up individuality. Are we to believe—to dive deeply into the subject—that it is an accident that St. Paul's epistle on redemption by faith, on the gospel of freedom (in contrast to the

* At the invasion of the Cimbri and Teutons, 114 B.C.

† Regarding the physical identity of Celts and Germanic peoples Professor Gabriel de Mortillet has lately collected such comprehensive material, anthropological facts, as well as the testimonies of old Roman writers, that it is sufficient if I refer to his *Formation de la nation française*, 1897 (p. 114 f.). His final words are: "*La caractéristique des deux groupes est donc exactement la même et s'applique aussi bien au groupe qui a reçu le nom de Gaulois (synonymous with Celts, see p. 92) qu'au groupe qui depuis les invasions des Cimbres a pris le nom de Germains.*"

VW

St Paul's epistle on redemption is by faith.

ENTRANCE OF THE GERMANIC PEOPLE 501

"slavish yoke" of the Church law), on the importance of religion as not consisting in works but in regeneration "to a new creature"—was addressed to the Galatians, those "Gallic Greeks" of Asia Minor who had remained almost pure Celts—an epistle in which we seem to hear a Martin Luther speaking to Germans credulous indeed but yet incomparably gifted for understanding the deepest mysteries? * I for my part do not believe that there is any room for chance in such matters; I believe it all the less in this case, because I notice in what a different way the same man speaks, what endless roundabout paths he chooses when teaching the same truths to a community of Jews and the children of the chaos of peoples, as in the *Epistle to the Romans*. But our judgment does not rest merely on such a hypothetical basis, nor does it rest solely upon the relationship between old Celtic and old Germanic mythical religion, but upon observation of the relationship between the mental qualities generally, to which the whole cultured history of Europe up to the present day testifies—wherever the Celt has kept his blood pure. Thus, for example, we find in the genuinely Celtic parts of Ireland in former times—taking the five hundred years from the Celt Scotus Erigena to the Celt Duns Scotus—splendid theologians with high philosophical gifts, whose independence of thought and keen desire to investigate brought upon them the persecution of the Roman Church; in the heart of Bretagne was born that intellectual pioneer Peter Abelard, and let it be carefully noted that what distinguishes him, like those others, is not merely independent thought and striving after freedom, but above all the holy earnestness of his life, a thoroughly "Germanic quality." These Celtic minds of former centuries, teeming

* Mommsen testifies that Galatia was "a Celtic island amidst the floods of the Eastern peoples," in which even the Celtic language maintained itself for a long time: *Roman History*, 3rd ed. v. 311 f.

with strength, are not merely free, and not merely pious, any more than the Breton seaman of to-day, but they are both free and pious, and it is this very combination that expresses what is specifically "Germanic," as we observe it from Charlemagne and King Alfred to Cromwell and Queen Louise, from the daring anti-Roman troubadours and the Minnesingers so politically independent, to Schiller and Richard Wagner. And when we see, for example, Abelard contending from profound religious conviction against the sale of indulgences (*Theologia Christiana*), and at the same time putting the Hellenes in every respect far above the Jews, declaring the morals of their philosophers to be superior to the Jewish sanctity of law, Plato's view of life more sublime than that of Moses—yes, when we actually find him in his *Dialogus inter philosophum, Judæum et Christianum*, making the recognition of the transcendental ideality of the conception of space the basis of religious thought, so that man stands directly before God's countenance not by entering into an empirical heaven but solely by an inner conversion of mind: are we not forced to recognise that this mind is characteristically Indo-European in contrast to the Semitic and the late Roman, and that, moreover, an individuality here reveals itself, which in every single one of those *plis de la pensée* (of which I spoke in the previous chapter) betrays the specifically Germanic character? I do not say German but Germanic character, and I am not speaking of to-day, when differentiation has led to the formation of very clearly defined national characters, but of a man who lived almost a thousand years ago; and I assert that so far as the whole tendency of his thought and feeling is concerned this Breton might right well have been born in the heart of Germania. A typical Celt in the gloomy passionateness of his nature, a new Tristan in his love, he is flesh of our flesh and blood of our Teutonic blood; he is Germanic. Just as Germanic

as these so-called "pure German" populations of Swabia and the Black Forest, the home of Schiller, Mozart and many others of the greatest of Germany's sons, who owe their peculiar character and uncommon poetical gifts to the strong admixture of Celtic blood.* We recognise this same spirit of Abelard at work wherever it can be proved that the Celts were present in large numbers, as in the home of the unfortunate Albigenses in the South of France, or as they still are in the homeland of the Methodists, Wales. We recognise it also in the so-called typically Catholic country Bretagne, for Catholicism and Protestantism are, after all, mere words; the religiosity of the Breton is genuine, but in its colour it is really "heathen" rather than Christian; primeval popular religion lived on here under the mask of Catholicism; moreover, who would not see in the ineradicable loyalty of this people to the throne a Germanic characteristic which is just as common as the love of war and loyalty to the flag among the Irish, who in politics agitate against England, but at the same time voluntarily furnish a large proportion of the English Army, and go abroad to die for the same alien king, to whom they are so hostile at home? But the close relationship between Celts and Germanic peoples (in the narrower sense of the word) reveals itself most strikingly in their poetry. From the first Frankish, German and English poetry were closely allied to genuine Celtic, not that the former people did not possess motives of their own, but they adopted the Celtic ones as being originally akin to them, and in these there is a something strange, something not quite understood, because half-forgotten, which lends them increased piquancy and charm. Celtic poetry is incomparably profound, inexhaustibly rich in symbolical meaning; it was manifestly in its far distant origin intimately connected

* Wilhelm Henke: *Der Typus des germanischen Menschen* (Tübingen, 1895). Similarly Treitschke: *Politik* i. 279.

the west, a younger in the east who was not so very unlike himself. But on the other hand it is exceedingly difficult to unravel the confused skein of what was originally Slavonic, owing to the manifest fact that this branch of the Germanic family was at a very early time almost completely destroyed by other tribes, much earlier and more thoroughly and more mysteriously than the Celts; but this fact should not deter us from recognising and admitting the related features and attempting to sift them out from the mass of what is alien.

But here again our best help will lie in searching the depths of the soul. If I may judge from the one Slavonic language of which I have a slight knowledge, the Servian, I should be inclined to think that a strong family resemblance in poetical gifts to the Celts and Germanic peoples could be proved. The heroic cycle which celebrates the great battle of Kossovopolje (1383), but which beyond doubt goes further back in its poetical motives, reminds one of Celtic and Germanic lyric and epic poetry by the sentiments to which it gives utterance—loyalty unto death, heroic courage, heroic women, as well as the high respect which these enjoy, the contempt for all possessions in comparison with personal honour. I read in histories of literature that such poems, and heroic figures like Marco Kraljevič are common to all popular poetry; but this is not true, and can only appear so to one whose excess of learning has blinded him to the fine features of individuality. Rama is an essentially different hero from Achilles, and he, again, quite different from Siegfried; while on the other hand the Celtic Tristan betrays in many features direct relationship to the German Siegfried, and that not merely in the external ornaments of the knightly romance (fights with dragons, &c.), which may to some extent be a later addition, but rather in those old, popular creations where Tristan is still a shepherd and Siegfried

not yet a hero at the Burgundian Court. It is here that we see clearly that, apart from extraordinary strength and the magic charm of invincibility and more such general attributes of heroes, definite ideals form the basis of the poems; and it is in these, not in the former, that the character of a people is reflected. So it is in the case of Tristan and Siegfried: loyalty as the basis of the idea of honour, the significance of maidenhood, victory in downfall (in other words, the true heroism centred in the inner motive, not in the outward success). Such features distinguish a Siegfried, a Tristan, a Parzival not only from a Semitic Samson whose heroism lies in his hair, but equally from the more closely related Achilles. Purity is strange to the Hellenes; faith is not a principle of honour, but only of love (Patroclus); the hero defies death; he does not overcome it, as we can say of the heroes of whom we have spoken. These are just the traits of true relationship which, in spite of all divergences of form, I find in Servian poetry. The fact alone that their heroic cycle groups itself around, not a victory, but a great defeat, the fatal battle of Kossovo, is of great significance; for the Servians have won victories enough and had been under Stephan Dusan a powerful State. Here, then, beyond question we find a special tendency of character, and we may with certainty conclude that the rich store of such poetical motives—all referring to destruction, death, everlasting separation of lovers—did not spring up only after that unfortunate battle and under the brutalising rule of Mohammedanism, but is an old legacy, exactly as the Fate of the Nibelungs, "aller Leid Ende," and not the Fortune of the Nibelungs, was the German legacy, and exactly as Celtic and Frankish poets neglected a hundred famous victors to sing of the obscure conquered Roland, and to let primitive poetical inspiration once more live through him, in a half-historical new youth. Such things tell their tale. And just as decisive

grants it. And thus in the first half of the tenth century is founded the first Christian Church which has an independent constitution.* The immense importance of such an event must be immediately manifest to every one. With Michael of Bulgaria it was no question of divergences of faith; he was a Christian, and ready to believe everything that the priests proclaimed as Christian truth. In his case it was solely a question of constitution; he wanted to see his Bulgarian Church managed by a Bulgarian Patriarch with complete independence; no Prince of the Church in Rome or Byzantium should interfere. This may seem to many to be merely an administrative question, but in reality it is the rising of the Germanic spirit of free individuality against the last incorporation of the imperium which was born of the chaos, and represented the anti-national, anti-individual and levelling principle. This is not the place to enter more fully into this subject; that can be done only in the two following chapters. But when we encounter the same process everywhere among the Slavs, we cannot deny its significance as a symptom to aid our judgment of their original character. No sooner had the Servians established their kingdom than they made for themselves an autonomous Church; and the great Czar Stephan Duschane defended his patriarch against the suzerain pretensions of the Byzantine Church and forced the latter to recognise him legally. There, too, it was not a matter of faith; for at that time (the middle of the fourteenth century) the schism between Rome and Constantinople was a fact of long standing and the Servians were already as they are to-day, fanatically orthodox members of the Greek Church; but just as the Bulgarians resisted the interference of Rome, so the Servians resisted that of Constantinople. The principle is the same—the maintenance of nationality. The Russian Church certainly took much

* Cf. Hergenröther: *Photius* ii. 614.

* A.H. I, too, shall create the imperium which is born of the chaos.

sale of indulgences, &c. ; and in exactly the same way such lights of the Catholic Church as Döllinger and Reusch in the nineteenth century are reformers ; not a single dogmatic question separated them from Rome, except the one question, freedom. In this momentous movement not only the Germanic peoples in the narrower sense of the word, not only the Celts, but also the Slavs distinguished themselves. What I said in the last paragraph about their refusing to permit alien interference in their Church administration, and their regarding the mother tongue as their most sacred legacy, should be repeated here ; both signify the denial of the essential principles of Rome. But these endeavours were more deeply rooted ; in the depth of their hearts it was a question of religion, not merely of nation. And as soon as the Reformation had gained a strong hold—which happened first in distant England—the Slavonic Catholics crowded to Oxford, drawn thither by the affinity of the most sacred feelings. It is quite certain that without the great Martin Luther the Reformation would never have become what it did—our most modern historians may say what they like, nature knows no greater power than that of one great strong man—but the soil on which this German could develop his full strength, the atmosphere in which alone his cause could prosper, were primarily the creations of Bohemia and of England.* Even a hundred years before the birth of Luther every third man in England was an anti-Papist, and Wyclif's translation of the Bible was known throughout the whole land. Bohemia did not lag behind ; already in the thirteenth century the New Testament was read in the Czech language, and at the beginning of the fifteenth century Hus edited the complete Bible in the language of the people. But the most quickening influence was

* Luther writes to Spalatín, February 1520 : " *Vide monstra, quæso in qua venimus sine duce et doctore Bohemico.*"

on the other ; but fundamentally these two things are really manifestations of the same thing.

The physical consideration must not be undervalued ; indeed it would perhaps be difficult to over-estimate it. I have tried to show the reason, in the discussion of the race question in the previous chapter but one ; besides this fact is one of those which were instinct—that thin silken thread of connection with the tissue of nature—lets us directly feel, without learned proof. For just as the dissimilarity of human individuals can be read in their physiognomy, so the dissimilarity of human races can be read in the structure of their bones, the colour of their skin, their muscular system and the formation of their skull ; there is perhaps not a single anatomical fact upon which race has not impressed its special distinguishing stamp. As is well known, even our nose, this organ of ours which has grown rigid and frostily motionless and which, according to certain followers of Darwin, is on the way to even greater monumentalisation by complete ossification—even our nose, which in city life to-day is a dispenser of discomforts rather than of joys, a mere burdensome appendage, stands from the cradle to the grave in the centre of our countenance as a witness to our race ! We must therefore, in the first place, strongly emphasise the fact that these North Europeans—the Celts, Teutons and Slavs—were physically different from the other Indo-Europeans, distinguished from the Southern Europeans in stature, “ and like to themselves only,”* but we must at once make the first limitation here, namely, that whoever does not possess these physical characteristics, no matter though he were born in the very heart of Germania

* During the last years the conviction is growing among the learned that the Germanic peoples did not emigrate from Asia to Europe, but were settled in Europe from earliest times (see Wilser : *Stammbaum der arischen Völker*, 1889 (Naturw. Wochenschr.) ; Schrader : *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*, 2. Auflage, 1890 ; Taylor : *The Origin of the Aryans*, 1890 ; Beck : *Der Urmensch*, 1899, &c.).

speaking a Germanic tongue from childhood, cannot be regarded as genuinely Germanic. The importance of this physical motive power is easier to prove in the case of great national phenomena than in individuals, for it may happen that an especially gifted individual assimilates an alien culture and then, just because of his different nature, achieves something new and profitable; on the other hand, the particular value of race becomes clear as soon as it is a question of collective achievements, as I can impress at once upon the German reader when I tell him in the words of a recognised authority that "the privileged great statesmen and military leaders of the time of the founding of the new empire are mostly of the purest Germanic descent," like the "storm-trying seamen of the North Sea coast and the keen chamois-hunters of the Alps." * These are facts which should be pondered long and carefully. In their presence the senselessness of the well-known phrases of natural scientists, Parliamentarians, &c., concerning the equality of the human races † becomes so plain that one is almost ashamed of having listened to them even with one ear. They let us also see in what definitely conditional sense the well-known remark of that thorough Teuton, Paul de Lagarde, may claim validity, namely, that "Germanism does not lie in the blood, but in the mind." In the case of the individual, the mind may indeed rule the blood, and the idea conquer, but it is not so with the great mass. And in order to measure the importance of the physical element, as well as its limitation, one should remember further that that which may be called the Germanic idea is a very delicately constructed, many-jointed organism. One requires only to look at the Jewish idea by way of comparison, this infancy of art, the whole cunning of which lies in binding the human

So does
Jewishness.

* Henke: *Der Typus des germanischen Menschen*, p. 33.

† See pp. 259 ff., 392 note 2, 531.

with Arabs and Jews, they lost all that the Germanic people had brought with them: their military superiority, their unconditional loyalty (see Calderon !), their high religious ideal, their capacity for organising, their rich artistic creative power; we see to-day what remained over, when the Germanic "blood," as the physical substratum, was destroyed.* Let us therefore not be in too great a hurry to assert that Germanicism does not lie in blood; it does lie in it; not in the sense that this blood guarantees Germanic sentiment and capacity, but that it makes these possible.

This limitation is therefore a very clear one: as a rule that man only is Germanic who is descended from Germanic ancestors.

I must, however, immediately call attention to the necessity of the previous extension of the idea, in order that this limitation may be intelligibly applied. Otherwise we must arrive at such comical conclusions as even Henke is guilty of in the pamphlet already quoted, when he says that Luther was not genuinely Germanic or that the Swabians, who are rightly regarded in the whole world as the finest representatives of pure Germanicism, are likewise not genuinely Germanic! A man whose descent and countenance prove him to be the product of a mixture

* Cf. Savigny's *Geschichte des römischen Rechtes im Mittelalter*, i., chaps. iii, v. This keeping of the Germanic race pure for centuries, in the midst of an inferior population, is seen not only in Spain but also in Northern Italy, where the Teutons lived under separate laws into the fourteenth century. See details below and in vol. ii: chap. ix. When criticising this book, Professor Dr. Paul Barth wrote in the *Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie*, 1901, p. 75, "Chamberlain might have gone further than he does into the influence of Semitic blood in Spain. By the addition of Semitic blood the Spaniards have become fanatical, they have carried every idea to its extreme, so that it loses all its reason and sense: religious devotion even to "cadaver-obedience" towards their superiors, politeness which is painful, ceremonious etiquette, honour which has become the most insane sensitiveness, pride which is ridiculous grandezza, so that Spanish in popular speech among us has become almost equivalent to absurd."

characteristics can one recognise the Teuton? Is, for example, fairness really a characteristic feature of all Germanic peoples? This seems to form a fundamental dogma, not only for the old historians, but also for the most modern anthropologists, and yet certain facts make me doubt it very much. In the first place there is the fact, which naturally is ignored by Virchow and his colleagues, blinded as they are by political prejudice; I mean the prevalence of dark colour among the members of the most genuine old Germanic nobility. In England this is quite striking. Tall, spare-built figures, long skulls, long countenances, the well-known Moltke type with the large nose and the clean-cut profile (which Henke too considers characteristically "pure Germanic"), genealogies which go back to the Norman period, in short, beyond doubt genuine Teutons in physique and history

~~—but black hair~~ Eckermann was struck by the brown eyes of Wellington.* In Germany I have noted the same in various families of old hereditary nobility. Moreover it has appeared to me remarkable that poets from the extreme north of Germany pretty frequently speak of dark hair as a characteristic feature not only of the nobility but also of the people; thus, for example, in Theodor Storm's story, *Hans und Heinz Kirch*, those genuine defiant Germanic seamen have both "dark brown hair," and of another daring figure, Hasselfritz, the poet says that he has brown eyes and brown hair; those genuine Teutons therefore resemble Achilles with his "brown hair." How often, too, in the folksongs do "dark brown eyes" occur! Burns, too, the Scottish peasant-poet, loves the "nut-brown maidens" of his home.† Once while on a voyage in Norway north of the 70th degree I was driven out of my course to a group of islands rarely visited by strangers, and to my astonishment

* *Gespräche mit Goethe*, 16.2.1826.

† Goethe, too, makes "black hair" and "black eyes" heroic attributes.

A. H.
this
passage

the Basques to-day, and though the majority of the men died perhaps by the sword of the enemy, yet one seldom finds complete extinction of the poor and helpless; they are kept as slaves, and the women become the property of the victors. In the Alps the same or perhaps a different race, but at any rate an Un-Germanic and non-Indo-European one had its abode, or at least fled thither as to a last place of security; one is forced to this supposition by the fact that to-day the Alps are the centre of the Un-Germanic, short-skulled, dark type, and that from here they radiate to north and south; the Rætian race, which anthropology has shown to be distinct, is perhaps a fairly genuine remnant of those former lake-dwellers and perhaps identical with Virchow's pre-Celts. In the wide districts of Eastern Europe we must also presuppose a special, probably Mongoloid race, to account for the specific deformation which so rapidly transforms the majority of the Germanic Slavs into inferior "Slavonics." How could we then bring ourselves to regard those Europeans who are descended from this altogether Un-Germanic type as "Germanic," simply because they speak an Indo-European language and have assimilated Indo-European culture? I consider it, on the contrary, a most important duty to make a clear distinction here, if we wish to understand past and present history. It is by distinguishing between peoples that we come to recognise the ideas in their special individuality. This is all the more necessary, as we have among us men who are half, a quarter, or perhaps a sixth Germanic, &c., and in consequence we have a mass of ideas and ways of thinking which are Germanic to the extent of a half, a fourth, a sixth, &c., or on the other hand are directly Anti-Germanic. And only by practice in distinguishing between the pure Germanic and the absolutely Un-Germanic can we find our way out of the confusion of this growing chaos. Chaos is everywhere the most dangerous enemy. In

facing it thought must develop into action ; towards this, clearness of conception is the first necessary step ; and in the sphere in which we are at present, clearness consists in the recognition that Germanicism to-day contains a large number of Un-Germanic elements, and in the endeavour to separate what is pure from that which contains alien, and in no sense Germanic, ingredients.

Yet, justifiable as it may be to emphasise anatomical research, I am afraid that anatomy alone will not suffice here ; on the contrary, it is just on this point that science is at present like a helpless barque tossing to and fro on a troubled sea ; whoever is led away by its illusions is doomed sooner or later to sink. For that which I have just demonstrated concerning the various races who survived in Europe from pre-Aryan times, the Iberians, Rhætians, &c., although indeed essentially correct, represents only the most elementary simplification of the innumerable hypotheses which, at the present moment, are afloat in the air, and every day the matter becomes more complicated. Thus—to give the layman only one example—long and careful researches have led to the conclusion that in Scotland, in the earliest stone age, there existed a long-skulled race, but that in the stone age there appeared another exceedingly broad-headed race, which after fusion with the former and with mixed forms was typical of the bronze age ; all this took place in the remote past, long before the arrival of the Celts ; when these appeared as the vanguard of the Germanic peoples, it can scarcely be doubted that they underwent changes through contact with the race settled there before them, since even to-day, after so many and so strong waves of immigration have swept over that land, we find in many individuals characteristics which, an authority tells us, point back directly and unmistakably to that prehistoric race of the bronze age which sprang

This applies to the high and low countenances just as well as to the long and short skulls ; everywhere it is a question of relations which merge by degrees into each other. But it is the nature of life to be plastically mutable ; the living principle of creation is fundamentally different from the crystalline principle in this, that it does not shape according to unchangeable relations of numbers but that it in a way freely creates, while observing the harmony of parts and retaining the fundamental scheme which is given by the nature of the thing itself. No two individuals are like each other. To survey the physical structure of a race at any given moment, I should require to have before me all the representatives of that race and seek out in this crowd the uniform and uniting idea, the predominant specific tendency of physical conformation, which is peculiar to this race as race ; I should see it with my eyes. If I had had, say at the time of Tacitus, all the Germanic peoples before my eyes : the still unmixed Celts, the Teutons and the Germanic Slavs, I should certainly have seen a harmonious whole, in which a certain law of structure predominated, and round it the most manifold and varying conformations would have grouped themselves. Probably there would not have been a single individual who united in himself all the specific characteristics of this plastic idea of race (in the way in which it would have appeared to my thinking brain) in the highest potentiality and in perfect harmony : the great radiant heavenly eyes, the golden hair, the gigantic stature, the symmetrical muscular development, the lengthened skull (which an ever-active brain, tortured by longing, had changed from the round lines of animal contentedness and extended towards the front), the lofty countenance, required by an elevated spiritual life as the seat of its expression—certainly no single individual would have possessed all these features. Were one feature perfect the other would be merely

A. H.
 speaking
 for in
 Landsberg

indicated. Here and there, too, nature, which is ever experimenting and never repeating itself, would have broken the law of harmony, an overgrown giant would swing his club over dull eyes, under too long a skull would be seen a face proportionately too short, glorious eyes would beam from beneath a fine lofty forehead, but in comparison, the body would be strikingly small, &c. &c., *ad infinitum*. In other groups again secret laws of the correlation of growth must have manifested themselves; here, for example, families with black hair, but at the same time with particularly large daring aquiline noses and more slender build, there red hair with remarkably white freckled skin and countenance somewhat broader in the upper part . . . for the slightest change in the conformation causes other changes. Still more numerous must those figures have been from which in their average commonplaceness no specific law of structure could have been derived, if they had not appeared as portions of a large whole, in which their place was definitely fixed, so that we could see from the way in which they fitted in that organically they did belong to it. Darwin himself, who worked all his life with compass, ruler and weighing machine, is always in his studies on artificial breeding calling attention to the fact that the eye of the born and experienced breeder discovers things of which figures give not the slightest confirmation, and which the breeder himself can hardly ever express in words; he notices that this and that distinguishes the one organism from the other, and makes his selection for breeding accordingly; this is an intuition born of ceaseless observation. This power of observation we can acquire only by practice; the survey of the Germanic peoples in the time of Tacitus would have served our purpose. We should certainly not have found that in the case of all these men the breadth of the head bore to the length the proportion of 75 : 100; nature knows

Goethe, for example, might be the child of any Germanic stem judging by the cast of his face, as might also Johann Sebastian Bach and Immanuel Kant.

FREEDOM AND LOYALTY

Let us attempt a glance into the depths of the soul. What are the specific intellectual and moral characteristics of this Germanic race? Certain anthropologists would fain teach us that all races are equally gifted; we point to history and answer: that is a lie! The races of mankind are markedly different in the nature and also in the extent of their gifts, and the Germanic races belong to the most highly gifted group, the group usually termed Aryan. Is this human family united and uniform by bonds of blood? Do these stems really all spring from the same root? I do not know and I do not much care; no affinity binds more closely than elective affinity, and in this sense the Indo-European Aryans certainly form a family. In his *Politics* Aristotle writes (i. 5): "If there were men who in physical stature alone were so pre-eminent as the representatives of the Gods, then every one would admit that other men by right must be subject unto them. If this, however, is true in reference to the body, then there is still greater justification for distinguishing between pre-eminent and commonplace souls." Physically and mentally the Aryans are pre-eminent among all peoples; for that reason they are by right, as the Stagirite expresses it, the lords of the world. Aristotle puts the matter still more concisely when he says, "Some men are by nature free, others slaves"; this perfectly expresses the moral aspect. For freedom is by no means an abstract thing, to which every human being has fundamentally a claim; a right to freedom must evidently depend upon capacity for it, and this again presupposes

physical and intellectual power. One may make the assertion, that even the mere conception of freedom is quite unknown to most men. Do we not see the *homo syriacus* develop just as well and as happily in the position of slave as of master? Do the Chinese not show us another example of the same nature? (Do not all historians tell us that the Semites and half-Semites, in spite of their great intelligence, never succeeded in founding a State that lasted, and that because every one always endeavoured to grasp all power for himself, thus showing that their capabilities were limited to despotism and anarchy, the two opposites of freedom? * And here we see at once what great gifts a man must have in order that one may say of him, he is "by nature free," for the first condition of this is the power of creating. Only a State-building race can be free; the gifts which make the individual an artist and philosopher are essentially the same as those which, spread through the whole mass as instinct, found States and give to the individual that which hitherto had remained unknown to all nature: the idea of freedom. † As soon as we understand this, the near affinity of the Germanic peoples to the Greeks and Romans strikes us, and at the same time we recognise what separates them. In the case of the Greeks the individualistic creative character predominates, even in the forming of constitutions; in the case of the Romans it is communistic legislation and military authority that predominate; the Germanic races, on the other hand, have individually and collectively perhaps less creative power, but they possess a harmony of qualities, maintaining the balance between the instinct of individual freedom, which finds its highest expression in creative art, ‡ and the instinct of public freedom which creates the State; and in this way they prove themselves to be the equals of their great predecessors. Art more perfect in its creations,

* Cf. p. 404.

† See pp. 14, 25, 33, &c.

D. G.
I, as an
artist, will
accomplish
this.

and hired from among them as many cavalrymen as he could possibly get. In the battle of Pharsalus, which was so decisive for the history of the world, they fought for him; the Romanised Gauls had abandoned their commander in the hour of need, the Germanic troops proved themselves as faithful as they were brave. This loyalty to a master chosen of their own free will is the most prominent feature in the Germanic character; from it we can tell whether pure Germanic blood flows in the veins or not. The German mercenary troops have often been made the object of ridicule, but it is in them that the genuine costly metal of this race reveals itself. The very first autocratic Emperor, Augustus, formed his personal bodyguard of Teutons; where else could he have found unconditional loyalty? During the whole time that the Roman Empire in the east and the west lasted, this same post of honour was filled by the same people, but they were always brought from farther and farther north, because with the so-called "Latin culture" the plague of disloyalty had crept more deeply into the country; finally, a thousand years after Augustus, we find Anglo-Saxons and Normans in this post, standing on guard around the throne of Byzantium. Hapless Germanic Lifeguardsman! Of the political principles, which forcibly held together the chaotic world in a semblance of order, he understood just as little as he did of the quarrels concerning the nature of the Trinity, which cost him many a drop of blood: but one thing he understood: to be loyal to the master he had himself chosen. When in the time of Nero the Frisian delegates left the back seats which had been assigned to them in the Circus and proudly sat down on the front benches of the senators among the richly adorned foreign delegates, what was it that gave these poor men, who came to Rome to beg for land to cultivate, such a bold spirit of independence? Of what alone could they boast?

A.H.
usa
the

"That no one in the world surpassed the Teuton in loyalty."* Karl Lamprecht has written so beautifully about this great fundamental characteristic of loyalty in its historical significance that I should reproach myself if I did not quote him here. He has just spoken of the "retainers" who in the old German State pledge themselves to their chief to be true unto death and prove so, and then he adds: "In the formation of this body of retainers we see one of the most magnificent features of the specifically Germanic view of life, the feature of loyalty. Not understood by the Roman but indispensable to the Teuton, the need of loyalty existed even at that time, that ever-recurring German need of closest personal attachment, of complete devotion to each other, perfect community of hopes, efforts and destinies. Loyalty never was to our ancestors a special virtue, it was the breath of life of everything good and great; upon it rested the feudal State of the Early and the co-operative system of the Later Middle Ages, and who could conceive the military monarchy of the present day without loyalty? . . . Not only were songs sung about loyalty, men lived in it. The retinue of the King of the Franks, the courtiers of the great Karolingians, the civil and military ministers of our mediæval Emperors, the officials of the centres of administration under our Princes since the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries are merely new forms of the old Germanic conception. For the wonderful vitality of such institutions consisted in this, that they were not rooted in changing political or even moral conditions, but in the primary source of Germanicism itself, the need of loyalty."†

However true and beautiful every word that Lamprecht has here written, I do not think that he has made quite clear the "primary source." Loyalty, though distinguish-

* Tacitus: *Annals* xiii. 54.

† Lamprecht: *Deut. Gesch.*, 2nd ed. i. 136.

P. 11-
usq
lter

harmony of character in the Teuton; hence we may say that no one in the world, not even the greatest, has surpassed him. One thing is certain: if we wish to sum up, in a single word the historic greatness of the Teuton— always a perilous undertaking, since everything living is of Protean nature—we must name his loyalty. That is the central point from which we can survey his whole character, or better, his personality. But we must remember that this loyalty is not the primary source, as Lamprecht thinks, not the root but the blossom—the fruit by which we recognise the tree. Hence it is that this loyalty is the finest touchstone for distinguishing between genuine and false Germanicism; for it is not by the roots but by the fruit that we distinguish the species; we should not forget that with unfavourable weather many a tree has no blossoms or only poor ones, and this often happens in the case of hard-pressed Teutons. The root of their particular character is beyond all doubt that power of imagination which is common to all Aryans and peculiar to them alone and which appeared in greatest luxuriance among the Hellenes. I spoke of this in the beginning of the chapter on Hellenic art and philosophy (see p. 14 f.); from that root everything springs, art, philosophy, politics, science; hence, too, comes the peculiar sap which tinges the flower of loyalty. The stem then is formed by the positive strength—the physical and the intellectual, which can never be separated; in the case of the Romans, to whom we owe the firm bases of family and State, this stem was powerfully developed. But the real blossoms of such a tree are those which mind and sentiment bring to maturity. Freedom is an expansive power which scatters men, Germanic loyalty is the bond which by its inner power binds men more closely than the fear of the tyrant's sword. Freedom signifies thirst after direct self-discovered truth, loyalty the reverence for that which has appeared to our an-

A. H.
was
thus

A. H.
notes

* A. H. when Mussolini
quotes Chamberlain as if that
were his own words

cestors to be true ; freedom decides its own destiny and loyalty holds that decision unswervingly and for ever. Loyalty to the loved one, to friend, parents, and fatherland we find in many places ; but here, in the case of the Teuton, something is added, which makes the great instinct become a profoundly deep spiritual power, a principle of life. Shakespeare represents the father giving his son as the best advice for his path through life, as the one admonition which includes all others, these words :

This above all: to thine own self be true!

The principle of Germanic loyalty is evidently not the necessity of attachment, as Lamprecht thinks, but on the contrary the necessity of constancy within a man's own autonomous circle ; self-determination testifies to it ; in it freedom proves itself ; by it the vassal, the member of the guild, the official, the officer asserts his independence. For the free man, to serve means to command himself. "It was the Germanic races who first introduced into the world the idea of personal freedom," says Goethe. What in the case of the Hindoos was metaphysics and in so far necessarily negative, seclusive, has been here transferred to life as an ideal of mind, it is the "breath of life of everything great and good," a star in the night, to the weary a spur, to the storm-tossed an anchor of safety.* In the construction of the Germanic character loyalty is the necessary perfection of the personality, which without it falls to pieces. Immanuel Kant has given a daring, genuinely Germanic definition of personality : it is, he says, "freedom and independence of the mechanism of all nature" ; and what it achieves he has summed up as follows : "That which elevates man above himself (as part of the world of sense), attaches him to an order of things which only the understanding can conceive,

* But quite analogous to Indian sentiment, in so far as here the regulative principle is transferred to our inmost hearts.

and which has the whole world of sense subject to it, is Personality." But without loyalty this elevation would be fatal: thanks to it alone the impulse of freedom can develop and bring blessing instead of a curse. Loyalty in this Germanic sense cannot originate without freedom, but it is impossible to see how an unlimited, creative impulse to freedom could exist without loyalty. Childish attachment to nature is a proof of loyalty: it enables man to raise himself above nature, without falling shattered to the ground, like the Hellenic Phaethon. Therefore it is that Goethe writes: "Loyalty preserves personality!" Germanic loyalty is the girdle that gives immortal beauty to the ephemeral individual, it is the sun without which no knowledge can ripen to wisdom, the charm which alone bestows upon the free individual's passionate action the blessing of permanent achievement.

A. H.
uses
this

IDEAL AND PRACTICE

These few simplified remarks should, I think, enable us to understand the essential characteristics, intellectual and moral, of the Germanic races. Simplification might easily fill a whole book and it would only be amplification. If we wish clearly to distinguish the Teuton from his nearest kinsmen we should study the inmost being of both and compare a Kant as an ethical teacher with an Aristotle. For Kant "the autonomy of the will is the highest principle of morality"; a "moral personality" exists for him only from the moment when "a man is subject to no other laws than those which he gives to himself." And according to what principles shall this autonomous personality give itself laws? We must suppose that there is an unprovable "realm of impulses—certainly only an ideal!" An ideal is therefore to determine life! And in a note to the same book (*Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*) Kant in a

few words contrasts this new, specifically Germanic philosophy with the Hellenic: "There the realm of impulses is a theoretical idea, to explain that which is; here (in the case of the Teutons) it is a practical idea to bring about by our active and passive attitude that which is not, but yet may be." What daring, to create by our will a moral realm which is not, to cause it "actually" to come into existence! What a dangerous piece of daring if loyalty were not at work, which is so thoroughly characteristic of Kant's own mental physiognomy! And we should carefully note this contrast: here (in the case of the Teuton) Ideal and at the same time Practice, there (in the case of the Hellene) sober Reality and, as its associate, Theory. The great captain of the powers of the chaos laughed at the German "ideologists," as he called them: a proof of ignorance, for they were more practical men than he himself. It is not the ideal that is in the clouds but theory. The Ideal is, as Kant here wishes it to be understood, a practical idea as distinguished from a theoretical one. And that which we see here, on the heights of metaphysics, in clear-cut outlines, we find again everywhere: the Teuton is the most ideal, but at the same time the most practical, man in the world, and that because here we have not dissimilarity, but on the contrary identity. A Teuton writes a Critique of Pure Reason, but at the same time a Teuton invents the railway; the century of Bessemer and of Edison is at the same time the century of Beethoven and of Richard Wagner. Whoever does not feel the unity of the impulse here, whoever considers it a riddle that the astronomer Newton should interrupt his mathematical investigations to write a commentary to the Revelation of St. John, that Crompton invented the spinning machine merely to give himself more leisure for his beloved music, and that Bismarck, the statesman of blood and iron, caused Beethoven's sonatas to be played

A. H.
uses
this



to him in the decisive moments of his life, understands nothing at all of the nature of the Teuton, and cannot in consequence rightly judge the part he plays in the history of the world in the past and at the present time.

TEUTON AND ANTI-TEUTON

So much for this important subject. We have seen who the Teuton is; * let us now see how he entered into history.

I am not qualified and do not wish in this work to give a history of the Germanic races; but we cannot understand and value the nineteenth century either in so far as it is a product of the preceding ones nor in its own gigantic expansive power, if we do not possess clear conceptions, not only concerning the nature of the Teuton, but also concerning the conflict which has been raging between him and the non-Teuton for fifteen hundred years.

To-day is the child of yesterday: what we have is partly the legacy of pre-Germanic antiquity, what we are is altogether the work of the early Teuton, who is wont to be represented to us as a "barbarian," as if barbarism were a question of relative civilisation and did not simply denote a rudeness of mind. One hundred and fifty years ago Montesquieu brilliantly cleared up this confusion of ideas. After showing that all the States that make up Europe to-day (America, Africa and Australia were then out of the question) were the work of Germanic barbarians who suddenly appeared from unknown wilds, he continues, "But in reality these peoples were not barbarians, since they were free: they became barbarians later when, dominated by the absolute power, they lost their liberty."† In these words we read not only the character

* The whole ninth chapter, which tries to describe Germanic civilisation and culture in its principal lines, forms a supplement to what is as briefly as possible sketched here.

† *Lettres persanes*, chap. cxxvii.

Look up Ch IX in the German book

of the Teutons, but also the fate against which they were destined continually to struggle. For it is not possible to say what uniform and independent culture might have arisen on a purely Germanic soil ; instead of this the Teuton entered into a history which was already perfectly shaped, a history with which he had hitherto not come in contact. As soon as the bare struggle for existence gave him leisure, he grasped with the fervour of passion the two constructive ideas which the "old world" now tumbling to pieces had tried in its last agony to develop : imperialism and Christianity. Was this a piece of luck ? Who will venture to affirm it ? He received no great thoughts of antiquity in pure form, all were transmitted by the sterile, shallow spirits of the chaos that shunned the light and hated freedom. But the Teuton had no choice. In order to live, he had in the first place to assimilate alien customs and thoughts as they were presented to him ; he had to be apprenticed to a civilisation which in truth was no longer worthy to loosen the latchet of his shoes ; the Hellenic creative impulse, Roman legislation, the sublime simple doctrine of Christ, which would have had the greatest affinity to his nature, were completely removed from his eyes, to be dug up centuries later by his own diligence. In his adoption of the alien he was greatly aided by his perilous power of assimilation, and also by that "modesty" which Luther praises as "the sure sign of a pious god-fearing heart," but which in its extravagant estimation of the merit of others leads to many a foolish delusion. Hence it is that a sharp critical eye is needed to separate in the motives and thoughts of those old heroic generations what is genuinely Germanic from that which has been deflected from its natural course, sometimes for ever. Take, for example, the absolute religious toleration of the Goths, when they had become masters of that Roman empire where the principle of intolerance had long

element sufficiently strengthened, that dogma solemnly declared to be law and to the everlasting disgrace of humanity was put in practice for five hundred years, in the midst of a civilisation which otherwise was advancing everywhere. How does one of the most eminent Catholics of the nineteenth century judge this remarkable event, this brutalisation of men, who had formerly shown themselves so humane, in the days when they were supposed to be barbarians? "It was," he says, "a victory which the old Roman Imperial law gained over the Germanic spirit."*

If we wish to carry out the necessary limitation of the expression "Germanic," that is, separate the Germanic from the Un-Germanic, we must in the first place endeavour, as I did in the beginning of this chapter, to realise the fundamental qualities of mind and character of the Teutons, and then, as has just been shown by an example, we must with a critical eye follow the course of history. Such "victories over the Germanic spirit" were frequently won, many of them with only temporary success, many so thorough that noble races falling into a progressive degeneracy disappeared for ever from the German family. For this Teuton who entered into history under such complex, contradictory and absolutely obsolete conditions had become estranged from himself. Every power was set in motion to delude him: not only the passions, the greed, the lust of power, all the evil vices, which he had in common with others, even his better qualities were played upon to serve this purpose: his mystical tendencies, his thirst for knowledge, his force of faith, his impulse to create, his high organising abilities, his noble ambition, his need of ideals—everything possible was used against himself. The Teuton had entered history not as a barbarian but as a child—as a

* Döllinger: *Die Geschichte der religiösen Freiheit* (in his Academic Lectures, iii. 278).

child that falls into the hands of old experienced libertines. Hence it is that we find Un-Germanic qualities nestling in the heart of the best Teutons, where, thanks to Germanic earnestness and loyalty, they often took firmer root than anywhere else ; hence, too, the great difficulty of solving the riddle of our history. Montesquieu told us that the Teuton had become barbarian through the loss of his freedom : but who robbed him of it ? The chaos of races in conjunction with himself. Dietrich of Berne had rejected the title and the crown of Imperator ; he was too proud to wish to be more than King of the East Goths. Later Teutons, on the other hand, imbued as they were by Un-Germanic ideas, were dazzled by the Imperial purple with the power of a magic talisman. For in the meantime the Jurisconsults of the late degenerate Roman law had come and whispered in the ear of the German Princes wonders concerning the kingly prerogatives ; and the Roman Church, which was the most powerful disseminator of Justinian law,* taught that this law was sacred and given by God ; † and down came the Pope declaring himself to be lord and master of all crowns ; he alone, as Christ's representative on earth, could grant or remove, ‡ and the emperor as mere *rex regum* was subject to the *servus servorum*. But if the Pope bestowed or ratified regal power, every King was King by the grace of God, and when the legal authorities declared that the bearer of the crown was the rightful owner of the whole land, and had unlimited authority over his subjects, the transformation was complete, and in place of a nation of free men there now stood a nation of slaves. This is what Montesquieu rightly calls barbarism. The Germanic Princes, who had made this

* Savigny : *Geschichte des römischen Rechts* i. chap. iii.

† "The Middle Ages put Roman Law as revealed reason in matters of justice (*ratio scripta*) side by side with Christianity as revealed religion" (Jhering : *Vorgeschichte der Indo-europäer*, p. 302).

‡ Phillips : *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechtes*, 1881 (I), § 102, &c.

FOUNDATIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

BY HOUSTON STEWART CHAMBERLAIN

Translated from the German by John Lees

With an Introduction
by
GEORGE L. MOSSE

VOLUME II

NEW YORK
Howard Fertig

1977

8-11, 13-15, 21-22,
24-26, 30-31, 34-35, ~~36-37~~
40, 42-46, 93, 106-109,
121-124, 128-130, 134-138, ~~139~~
154, 159, 173-177, 179-182, ~~183~~
189, 191, 194, 201, 212-213, 217, 222-229,
238, 241, 246-247, 259, 267, ~~270~~ 275,
277, 348, 371, 383, 390, 394, 413, 415-417,
431, 449, 468, 482-483, 485, 488-491,
495, 564.

8 FOUNDATIONS OF THE XIXTH CENTURY

Kant—is incalculably great. But I return to this in the second part of these "Foundations," which discusses the rise of a new Germanic world; this section has to deal solely with the struggle of the great powers for possession and supremacy.

RELIGION AND THE STATE

If I were to follow the usual custom and, as I had originally planned, contrast State and Church, not State and Religion, we should be in danger of dealing with mere forms. For the Roman Church is first and foremost a political, *i.e.*, a national power; it inherited the Roman idea of imperium, and, in league with the Emperor it represented the rights of an absolute universal empire, supposed to be established by God. It thus conflicted with Germanic tradition and the Germanic impulse to form a nation. Religion it regarded as a means of closely uniting all peoples. Since earliest times the *Pontifex maximus* in Rome was the chief official in the hierarchy, *judex atque arbiter rerum divinarum humanarumque*, to whom (according to the legal theory) the King and later the Consuls were subordinate.* Of course the remarkably developed political sense of the old Romans had prevented the *Pontifex maximus* from ever abusing his theoretical power as judge of all things divine and human, just in the same way as the unlimited power (according to the legal fiction) of the *paterfamilias* over the life and death of his family never gave rise to excesses; † the Romans in fact had been the very reverse of anarchists. But now, in the unfettered human chaos, the title and its legal claims were revived; never before or since has such weight been attached to theoretical "law"; vested legal rights were never so much flaunted

* See especially Leist: *Græco-italische Rechtsgeschichte*, § 69.

† See vol. i. p. 162.

INTRODUCTO

and insisted upon as at this time malice were the sole ruling forces. the opinion that the unwritten the written; now only the writt commentary of Ulpian, a gloss for quite different conditions— decided the rights of whole people a seal on it legalised every crime administrator and advocate of this was the city of Rome with her it stands to reason that she em; to her own advantage. But at th inherited the Jewish hierocratic High Priest as supreme power; the fathers from the third century o Testament utterances and ideas the shadow of a doubt that the establishment of a universal State rule as a foundation.* Here, there must be viewed as a purely political not Church that is opposed to another, one political ideal to ar

But apart from the political struggle so bitterly and irreconcilably as w idea came in conflict with German and the Jewish theocracy with C "Render unto Cæsar the things broke out another very important gion itself. And in the nineteenth no more at an end than the other. the beginning of the century the to have lost all acuteness, the the appearance of an epoch of t

* Naturally the oldest are to be seen Tertullian, &c., had no idea of the position of Christianity.

A. V.
Roulers
this, the
plus
series
it is
incorporated
it

bly great. But I return to this in these "Foundations," which discusses Germanic world; this section has to the struggle of the great powers for remacy.

LIGION AND THE STATE

How the usual custom and, as I had contrast State and Church, not State should be in danger of dealing with the Roman Church is first and foremost, a national power; it inherited the erium, and, in league with the Emperor ights of an absolute universal empire, tablished by God. It thus conflicted dition and the Germanic impulse to Religion it regarded as a means of l peoples. Since earliest times the in Rome was the chief official in *index atque arbiter rerum divinarum* whom (according to the legal theory) r the Consuls were subordinate.* Of rably developed political sense of the prevented the *Pontifex maximus* from heoretical power as judge of all things just in the same way as the unlimited o the legal fiction) of the paterfamilias death of his family never gave rise to mans in fact had been the very reverse t now, in the unfettered human chaos, gal claims were revived; never before weight been attached to theoretical gal rights were never so much flaunted

* *Græco-italische Rechtsgeschichte*, § 69.

and insisted upon as at this time, when violence and malice were the sole ruling forces. Pericles had expressed the opinion that the unwritten law stood higher than the written; now only the written word was valid; a commentary of Ulpian, a gloss of Tribonian—intended for quite different conditions—was *ratio scripta* and decided the rights of whole peoples; a parchment with a seal on it legalised every crime. The heiress, administrator and advocate of this view of political law was the city of Rome with her *Pontifex maximus*, and it stands to reason that she employed these principles to her own advantage. But at the same time the Church inherited the Jewish hierocratic idea of State, with the High Priest as supreme power; the writings of the Church fathers from the third century onwards are full of Old Testament utterances and ideas; and there cannot be the shadow of a doubt that the Roman ideal was the establishment of a universal State with the Jewish priestly rule as a foundation.* Here, therefore, the Roman Church must be viewed as a purely political power: here it is not Church that is opposed to State, but one State to another, one political ideal to another.

But apart from the political struggle, which never raged so bitterly and irreconcilably as when the Roman imperial idea came in conflict with Germanic national aspirations, and the Jewish theocracy with Christ's pronouncement, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," there broke out another very important battle, that about religion itself. And in the nineteenth century this struggle is no more at an end than the other. In our secular States at the beginning of the century the religious contrasts seemed to have lost all acuteness, the nineteenth century had the appearance of an epoch of unconditional tolerance;

* Naturally the oldest are to be excepted, who, like Origenes, Tertullian, &c., had no idea of the possible predominant position of Christianity.

A. 4
see p 9.
note

10 FOUNDATIONS OF THE XIXTH CENTURY

but during the last thirty years the Church agitators have been once more zealously at work, and the night of the Middle Ages still lies so black around us that in this field every weapon is considered good, and actually proves itself good, though it may be lying, falsification of history, political pressure or social compulsion. It is no mere trifle that lies at the root of this religious strife. Underneath a dogmatic strife, so subtle that it seems to the layman senseless and indifferent, there slumbers not seldom one of those fundamental spiritual questions which decide the whole tendency of a nation's life. How many laymen, for instance, are there in Europe who are capable of understanding the conflict concerning the nature of communion? And yet it was the dogma of transubstantiation (issued in the year 1215, exactly at the moment when the English forced the *Magna Charta* from their king), which inevitably broke up Europe into several hostile camps. Race differences are at the bottom of this. But race is, as we have seen, plastic, inconstant and composed of manifold elements almost always striving with each other for the mastery: frequently the victory of a religious dogma has given one element preponderance over the others and thus determined the whole further development of a race or nation. Perhaps even the greatest thinker of the time has not quite understood the dogma in question: for dogma deals with the Inexpressible and Unthinkable: but in such cases the direction is the important matter—the orientation of the will, if I may so express it. Thus we can easily understand how State and Religion can and must affect each other, and that not only in the sense of a tussle between universal Church and national Government: there is also the troublous fact that the State possesses the means (and till lately possessed almost unlimited means) of checking a moral and intellectual movement revealing itself in religion; friction may also

A. H.
this
notion
must
be
buried

A. H.
leher
this

arise
direct
one w
doubt
growt
not o
I th
I have
for sp
tion—
Religi
I mus
two s
their
of the
from
upon
impos
to call
to-day
in the
us, so
the b
make
justifi
is app
forum
cealed
on the
ism of
influen
the ni
In deci
* Ver
part of
† E.g.
the Isau

CENTURY

urch agitators
nd the night of
us that in this
and actually
ig, falsification
ompulsion. It
i this religious
o subtle that
ifferent, there
ental spiritual
y of a nation's
ere in Europe
lict concerning
as the dogma
1215, exactly
Magna Charta
e up Europe
ces are at the
seen, plastic,
ments almost
mastery; fre-
has given one
d thus deter-
of a race or
r of the time
uestion: for
Unthinkable:
fant matter—
ress it. Thus
Religion can
y in the sense
ional Govern-
at the State
d almost un-
l intellectual
ion may also

INTRODUCTORY

II

arise through the complete victory of some religious view directing the State itself into an entirely new course. Any one who glances impartially at the map of Europe cannot doubt that religion was and is a powerful factor in the growth of States and the development of culture.* It not only reveals, but makes, character.

I think that I shall be doing justice to the object which I have in view if, when dealing with this epoch, I choose for special treatment the two great objects of contention—State and Religion, the struggle in Religion and for Religion, the struggle in the State and for the State. But I must defend myself from the appearance of postulating two separate entities, which became a unity only by their capability of influencing each other; I am rather of the opinion that the complete separation of religious from civic life, which is so popular to-day, rests upon a dangerous error of judgment. It is in reality impossible. In former centuries it was the custom to call Religion the soul and the State the body; † but to-day, when the intimate connection of soul and body in the individual becomes more and more present to us, so that we scarcely know where we are to assume the boundary-line to be, such a distinction should make us pause. We know that behind a dispute about justification by faith and justification by works, which is apparently carried on entirely and exclusively in the forum of the soul, very "corporeal" things may be concealed; the course of history has shown us this; and on the other hand we see the moulding and the mechanism of the corporate State having a great and decisive influence upon the nature of the soul (e.g., France since the night of St. Bartholomew and the Dragonades). In decisive moments the ideas State and Religion coalesce

* Very beautifully shown by Schiller at the beginning of the first part of his *Thirty Years War*.

† E.g., Gregory II. in his frequently mentioned letter to Emperor Leo the Isaurian.

As the
as
conversion
to Magi
ideas
& party)

CENTURY

speech assert
us his Religion,
his State; and
battle with the
is at the same
n spite of the
of a distinction
ity; practical
history, and
hem with the

SEVENTH CHAPTER

RELIGION

Rightly understand the driving power of religion, do what it behoves
you to further it, and seek to fulfil your duty in this.—ZOROASTER.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY

ON a former occasion (vol. i. p. 249) I expressed my personal conviction that the earthly life of Jesus Christ forms the origin and source, the strength and—fundamentally—the significance of everything that has ever called itself Christian religion. I shall not repeat myself, but refer once for all to the chapter on Christ. In that chapter I completely separated the sublime figure of Christ from all historical Christianity, here I purpose to deal with the complementary aspect, and to speak of the rise and growth of the Christian religion. It will be my endeavour to bring out certain leading ideas without even touching the inviolable Figure on the Cross. This separation is not only possible but necessary; it would show a blasphemous lack of critical insight to try to identify with the rock itself the strange structures that have been built upon it by human profundity, acuteness, shortsightedness, confusion, stupidity, by tradition and piety, superstition, malice, senselessness, convention, philosophic speculation and devotion to mysticism—amid the never-ceasing clatter of tongues and swords and the crackling of flames. The whole superstructure of the Christian Churches has hitherto been outside of the

14 FOUNDATIONS OF THE XIXTH CENTURY

personality of Christ. Jewish will, united to Aryan mythical thought, has formed its principal part; much was derived from Syria, Egypt, &c.; the appearance of Christ upon earth was, to begin with, only the incitement to the constitution of religion, its driving power—as when the lightning breaks through the clouds and there follows a downpour of rain, or when sunbeams suddenly fall upon certain substances which have nothing in common, and they, at once transformed, burst the boundaries that formerly separated them and unite to form a new compound. It would certainly be unwise to try to estimate the power of the sunbeam and the lightning from these effects. All honour to those who built upon Christ, but we must not permit our vision or our judgment to be dimmed. There is not only a past and a present, there is also a future; for it we must maintain our full freedom. I doubt whether we can rightly judge the past in its relation to the present unless a living divination of the needs of the future carries the mind aloft. Taking the standpoint of the present alone the eye is too much earthbound to be able to see all the possible sequences. It was a Christian, and a Christian in sympathy with the Roman Church, who at the beginning of the nineteenth century said: "The New Testament is still a book with seven seals. Christianity must be studied by man for eternities. In the gospels lie the outlines of future gospels." * Whoever studies carefully the history of Christianity sees that it is always and everywhere in a state of flux, always and everywhere waging an inward struggle. Whoever, on the other hand, cherishes the foolish delusion that Christianity has now received its various final forms, overlooks the fact that even the Romish Church, which is considered particularly conservative, has created new dogmas in every century, while older ones (certainly with

* Novalis: *Fragmente*.

A. H.
must
useable
he thinks.

less noise
even in
Church
schisms
that, as
holds the
monstrous
heart no
past. S
tianity is
less cour
one mor
obituary
torical ex
conclusio
tion. Th
of these
same, it
This erro
Christ—t
religiosity
religious
what is
natures o
law and t

The Ch
time, und
imagined
solid stru
stood, na
Eastern E
most dive
sophical t

, united to Aryan
 incipal part; much
 ; the appearance of
 ith, only the incite-
 , its driving power
 hrough the clouds
 rain, or when sun-
 substances which
 at once transformed,
 separated them and
 It would certainly
 wer of the sunbeam
 its. All honour to
 e must not permit
 dimmed. There is
re is also a future:
freedom. I doubt
 past in its relation
 ion of the needs of
 king the standpoint
 uch earthbound to
 es. It was a Chris-
 y with the Roman
 nineteenth century
 a book with seven
 y man for eternities.
 e gospels." * Who-
 of Christianity sees
 state of flux, always
 truggle. Whoever,
 olish delusion that
 arious final forms,
 nish Church, which
 e, has created new
 ones (certainly with

less noise) were being borne to their grave; he forgets that, even in the nineteenth century, that firmly established Church has experienced more movements, struggles and schisms than almost any other. Such a man imagines that, as the process of development is at an end, he now holds the sum of Christianity in his hands and from this monstrous supposition he constructs in the piety of his heart not only the present and the future but also the past. Still more monstrous is the supposition that Christianity is exhausted and spent, sustained in its boundless course only by the law of inertia; and yet more than one moral philosopher of recent times has written the obituary notice of Christianity, speaking of it as of an historical experiment now over, the beginning, middle and conclusion of which are capable of analytical demonstration. The error of judgment, which lies at the bottom of these opposite views is, it is obvious, practically the same, it leads moreover to equally false conclusions. This error we avoid when we distinguish the personality of Christ—that ever-gushing constant spring of the loftiest religiosity—from the structures which the changing religious needs, the changing mental claims of men, and—what is more important—the fundamentally different natures of dissimilar human races have erected as the law and temple of their worship.

RELIGIOUS DELIRIUM

The Christian religion took its rise at a very peculiar time, under as unfavourable circumstances as could be imagined for the establishment of a uniform, worthy and solid structure. In those very districts where its cradle stood, namely, in Western Asia, Northern Africa and Eastern Europe, there had been a peculiar fusion of the most diverse superstitions, myths, mysteries and philosophical theorems, whereby, as was inevitable, all had

D. T.
 How
 much
 work
 we do
 in
 shaking
 these
 structures.

ehension—the inevitable in the natural course of things to weld together in one and this work could be doing strife. Reduced to life was a struggle for and Jewish religious in-ly after the death of Jesus and the heathen lost violently between Christians and Athanasians, and to-day it goes on in the clouds of theory and ground current in our ear by a comparison. Two trees of different kind without uprooting them in such a fashion that they grow. Upward growth is a bility for both; despite the result, for, as a religion is in such a case it survived the operation of its own leaves and gave alien would every-

Exactly the same structure of religion. Jewish Messianic faith is a mythology of the things they not fuse, in the other. Take, for example: here Jehovah,

suggested this comparison: like, their language in the genealogy betray the fact grafted upon a Jewish

there the old Aryan Trinity. Take again the conception of the Messiah: here the expectation of a hero of the tribe of David, who will win for the Jews the empire of the world, there the Logos become flesh, fastened on to metaphysical speculations, which had occupied the Greek philosophers for five hundred years before the birth of Christ.* Christ, the undeniably historical personality, is forced into both systems; for the Jewish historical myth he had to supply the Messiah, although no one was less suitable; in the neo-Platonic myth he is the fleeting incomprehensible manifestation of an abstract scheme of thought—he, the moral genius in its highest potentiality, the greatest religious individuality that ever lived!

Nevertheless even admitting the necessary untrustworthiness and defects of such a hybrid representation, we can hardly imagine how a universal religion could have arisen in that chaos of peoples without the cooperation of these two elements. Of course, if Christ had preached to Indian or Germanic peoples his words would have had quite a different influence. There has never been a less Christian age—if I am allowed the paradox—than the centuries in which the Christian Church originated. A real understanding of Christ's words was at that time out of the question. But when through him the stimulus to religious elevation was given to that chaotic and deluded mass of human beings, how could a temple have been built for them without basing everything upon the Jewish chronicle and the Jewish tendency to view things from a concrete historical standpoint? One could only keep these slavish souls, who had nothing to lean upon either in themselves or in the national life around them, by giving them something tangible, something material and dogmatically certain; it was a religious law, not philosophical speculations about duty and

* I said five hundred years, for see Harnack on the identity of Logos and Nous: *Dogmengeschichte*, § 22.

A H
Thanks
it is
absolute
application
to
German
evangelism
in 1923.

virtue, that they required; for that reason indeed many ~~had already adopted Judaism~~. But Judaism—invaluable as a power of will—possesses only a very small and, being Semitic, a very limited creative capacity; the architect had therefore to be sought elsewhere. Without the wealth of form and the creative power of the Hellenic spirit, or let us say simply, without Homer, Plato and Aristotle, and in the further background Persia and India—the outward cosmogonic and mythological structure of the Christian Church could never have become the temple of a universal faith. The early teachers of the Church all link themselves with Plato, the later ones with Aristotle as well. Any Church history will testify to the extensive literary poetical and philosophical culture of the earliest, that is the Greek, fathers, and from that we may form a high estimate of the value of this culture for the fundamental dogmas of Christianity. The Indo-European mythology could not of course receive colour and life under such strange auspices; it was Christian art which at a later time helped as far as possible to make good this want; yet, thanks to the influence of the Hellenic eye, this mythology at least received a geometric and in so far visible shape: the ancient Aryan conception of the Trinity supplied the skilfully built cosmic temple, in which were erected the altars of an entirely new religion.

We must now become quite clear about the nature of these two most important constructive elements of the Christian religion, otherwise it will be impossible to understand the very complicated strife about articles of faith, which has been raging from the first century of our era to the present day—but especially during the first centuries. The various leading spirits confuse in the most varying proportions the most contradictory views, doctrines and instincts of Jew and Indo-European. Let us therefore consider first the mythologically moulding

influence
growing Cl
pulse whic
spirit of Ju

In chap
the differ
I assume
physical v
peculiarity
consists in
reduced to
it is not a
is it a mor
this one re
Christian C
Testament
Christ; it
respects fo
or badly to
idea of the
do well to d
that is, bet
of inner ex
the sky is tl
menon; the
fact of man
and mythol
as Wolfgan
"Symbolist
of dogma."
manifestly

* See vol. i.
† It is easy
Heathenism, c
philosophers,
(Apol. xlvii.)
‡ Christliche

THE MYTHOLOGY OF OUTER EXPERIENCE

As an excellent example of mythology which grows from external experience I should like to mention especially the conception of the Trinity. Thanks to the influence of Hellenic sentiment, the Christian Church (in spite of the violent opposition of the Jewish Christians), had, in the moulding of its dogma, steered successfully past that most dangerous cliff, Semitic monotheism, and has preserved in her otherwise perilously Judaized conception of the Godhead the sacred "Three in Number" of the Aryans.* It is well known that we continually come across the number Three among the Indo-Europeans: it is, as Goethe says,

die ewig unveraltete,
Dreinemig—Dreigestaltete.

We find it in the three groups of the Indian gods, at a later time (several centuries before Christ) developed into the detailed and expressly stated doctrine of the Trinity, the Trimūrti: "He, who is Vishnu, is also Civa, and he, who is Civa, is also Brahma: one being but three Gods." And the conception can be traced from the distant east to the shores of the Atlantic Ocean, where Patricius found the clover leaf as the symbol of the Trinity among the Druids. The number Three was bound at an early time to impress itself upon races that were inclined to poetry and metaphysics, for it and it alone is not a chance number (like five or ten which are derived from the fingers) nor a pedantically calculated

* That the Indo-Europeans also were at bottom monotheists, I have at a much earlier point emphasised, in opposition to the widespread popular error (see vol. i. pp. 218 and 424); cf. also Jac. Grimm in the preface to his *Deutsche Mythologie* (pp. xlv.-xlv.) and Max Müller in his lectures on the Science of Languages (ii. 385). But this kind of monotheism must be distinguished from the Semitic.

number (seven w. phenomena) rather be authors o all human —time, s but (to q results th unities, b threefoldn original pl individual science ha ran take : fluid, the the people earth, wat

If we sea: proceeding into trifling intuitive d analytically metaphysic we derive t dogma too entirely un creating re as was the Eranians a symbolism

* Thus, for thesis, antithesis father, the diff

EXPERIENCE

logy which grows
mention especially
is to the influence
church (in spite of
Christians), had,
successfully past
monotheism, and has
judaised conception
in "Number" of the
continually come
Indo-Europeans :

to,
the.

the Indian gods, at a
the Christ) developed
the doctrine of the
Vishnu, is also Civa,
one being but three
be traced from the
Atlantic Ocean, where
the symbol of the
number Three was
itself upon races that
physics, for it and it
five or ten which are
mathematically calculated

at bottom monotheists, I
in opposition to the wide-
44); cf. also Jac. Grimm in the
-xiv.) and Max Müller in his
(ii. 385). But this kind of
the Semitic.

number (like seven, which is derived from the so-called seven wandering stars), it expresses a fundamental phenomenon, so that the conception of a Trinity might rather be called an experience than a symbol. The authors of the Upanishads had already recognised that all human knowledge rests on three fundamental forms—time, space, causality—and that not a triplicity but (to quote from Kant) a "unity of apperception" results therefrom; space and time also are inseparable unities, but possess three dimensions. In short, the threefoldness as unity surrounds us on all sides as an original phenomenon of experience and is reflected in all individual cases. Thus, for example, the most modern science has proved that without exception every element can take three—but only three—forms: the solid, the fluid, the gaseous; and this only further shows, what the people long ago knew, that our planet consists of earth, water and air. As Homer says

Everything was divided into three.

If we search for such conceptions intentionally, the proceeding very soon degenerates (as in the case of Hegel) into trifling; * but there is no trifling in the spontaneous, intuitive development into a myth of a general, but not analytically divided, physical and at the same time metaphysical cosmic experience. And from this example we derive the consoling certainty that in the Christian dogma too the Indo-European spirit has not become entirely untrue to its own nature, but that its myth-creating religion has still remained nature-symbolism, as was the case from time immemorial with the Indo-Eranians and the Teutonic nations. But here the symbolism is very subtle indeed, because in the first

* Thus, for example, the so-called necessary progression of the thesis, antithesis and synthesis, or again the deity of the Absolute as father, the different existence as son, the return to itself as spirit.

Christian centuries philosophical abstraction flourished, while artistic creative power was dormant.* We must also emphasise the fact that the myth was not felt by the great mass of the Christians as a symbol; but the same was true of the Indians and Teutonic peoples with their deities of light, air and water; it is indeed no mere symbol, all nature testifies to the inner, transcendental truth of such a dogma as well as to its power of vigorous progressive development.†

Now the structure of Christian dogma contains a great deal of such external, or, if we will, cosmic mythology.

In the first place nearly everything which as doctrine supplements the conception of the Trinity: the incarnation of the Word, the Paraclete, &c. More especially is the myth of God becoming man an old Indian ancestral property. We see it in the idea of unity in the very first book of the *Rigveda*; it meets us in philosophical transformation in the doctrine of the identity of Atma and Brahma; and it assumed visible form in the God-man Krishna, a figure which the poet makes God explain in the *Bhagavadgītā* as follows: "Again and again when virtue languishes and injustice prevails I create myself (in human form). For the protection of the good, the destruction of the evil and the confirmation of virtue I am born on earth." ‡ The dogmatic conception of the nature of Buddha is merely a modification of this myth. The conception, too, that the god who became man could

* See the whole conclusion of the first chapter.

† The Egyptian Triads were formerly allowed to have a greater influence upon the moulding of Christian dogmas than was right. In truth the conception of the son of God in his relation to God the Father (the son "not made, nor created but begotten," literally as in the Athanasian Creed) seems specifically Egyptian: we find it in all the various Egyptian systems of gods; but the third person is the goddess (Cf. Maspero: *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient classique*, 1895, i. 151, and Budge: *The Book of the Dead*, p. xcvi.)

‡ *Bhagavadgītā*, Book IV. §§ 7 and 8.

only be
decided
much-r
heaven
the bir
express
and th
Christi
concept
peace-o
this at
feature
Of cour
meanin
backgro
because
Jesus C
metaph
recast l
figured
has bee
the fact
reverse
not my
greatne
the hist
myth h

Before
experie
forming
the visi
inherit

exclusively by the ever-increasing population of "foreigners and slaves" and inspired all genuine Hellenes with horror and contempt.* The more deep the religious and creative consciousness sank, the more boldly did the chaos raise its head. A fusion of all shades of superstitions was brought about by the Roman Empire, and when Constantine II. at the end of the fourth century proclaimed the Christian religion to be the religion of the State and so forced all those who were at heart non-Christians into the community of the Christians, all the chaotic conceptions of degenerate "heathendom" flowed in at the same time and from those days onward formed—at least to a great extent—an essential element of the dogma.

This moment is the turning-point in the development of the Christian religion.

Noble Christians, especially the Greek fathers, fought desperately against the disfiguration of their pure, simple faith, a struggle which found its most important but its most violent and best known expression in the long conflict about image-worship. Already in this, Rome, prompted by race, culture and tradition, took the side of the chaos. At the end of the fourth century the great Vigilantius, a Goth, raises his voice against the pseudo-mythological Pantheon of guardian angels and martyrs, the abuse of relics—and the monkhood taken over from the Egyptian worship of Serapis; † but Hieronymus,

* See especially the famous speech of Demosthenes *De Corona*, and for a summary of the facts Jevons: *Introduction to the History of Religion*, 1896, chap. xxiii. For the tracing back of the Last Supper to Old Babylon see Otto Pfleiderer's *Christusbild*, p. 84, and for its relation to other old mysteries see the same author's *Entstehung des Christentums*, 1905, p. 154. For the fundamental facts see Albr. Dieterich's *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 1903.

† Pachomius, the founder of real monkhood, was an Egyptian like his predecessor, the hermit Antonius. He was a native of Upper Egypt, and as a "national attendant on Serapis" learned the practices which he afterwards transferred almost unchanged to Christianity. (Cf. Zöckler: *Ashese und Mönchtum*, 2nd ed. p. 193 f.)

1913:7
* A. H. contemplates this and
howls upon the ^{future} pollution of
the Nazi party. 11 years later
he will whisper the original
(A. H. ...)

who
the
by
at v

T
myt
dow
figu
atte
we s
Ti
all r
of m
to
conc
a vis
expe
all l
it w
salva
the l
basis
sever
altho
Greel
exter
pessu
elsew

And

* C/
Müller
† C/

MYTHOLOGY

foreigners
comes with
religious
ly did the
of super-
nature, and
the century
religion of
heart non-
uns, all the
m" flowed
d formed—
ment of the

development

ers, fought
pure, simple
portant but
in the long
this, Rome,
the side of
ry the great
the pseudo-
and martyrs,
en over from
Hieronymus,

*De Corona, and
story of Religion,
to Old Babylon
tion to other old
tentisms, 1905,
1's Eine Mithras-*

an Egyptian like
native of Upper
ned the practices
to Christianity.
(.)

and
of
red/late
original

RELIGION

31

who was educated in Rome, fights it down and enriches the world and the calendar with new saints invented by his own imagination. The "pious lie" was already at work.*

THE MYTHOLOGY OF INNER EXPERIENCE

This may suffice to illustrate the manner in which the mythology derived from outer experience and handed down by the Indo-Europeans was unavoidably disfigured by the Chaos of Peoples. If we now turn our attention to the forming of myths from inner experience we shall find the Indo-European legacy in purer form.

The kernel of the Christian religion, the focus in which all rays concentrate, is the conception of a "redemption of man": this idea has always been and still is strange to the Jews; it absolutely contradicts their whole conception of religion; † for here we have not to do with a visible, historical fact, but with an inexpressible, inner experience. It is, on the other hand, the central idea in all Indo-Eranian religious views; they all revolve, at it were, round the longing for redemption, the hope of salvation; nor was this idea of redemption strange to the Hellenes; we find it in their mysteries: it forms the basis of many of their myths, and in Plato (e.g., in the seventh book of the *Republic*) it is clearly recognisable, although, for the reason stated in the first chapter, the Greeks of the Classical epoch revealed to a very small extent the inner, moral, or, as we should say to-day, pessimistic side of these myths. They sought the kernel elsewhere:

What are treasures to me in comparison with life.

And yet alongside of this high estimate of life as the

* Cf. vol. i. p. 313. For the "adoption of heathendom," see also Müller, p. 204 f.

† Cf. vol. i. p. 413, and also the passage on p. 337, quoted from Graetz.

look up
(a note for ~~myself~~)

except the case of a very few men—an Apostle Paul and a Martin Luther. Should any one be inclined to doubt that here we are dealing with the mythical shaping of inexpressible inner experiences, I would refer him to the speech of Christ to Nicodemus, in which the word "regeneration" would be just as senseless as the story in *Genesis* of the degeneration of the first beings by the eating of an apple, if there were not here as there, a case of making visible a perfectly actual and present but at the same time invisible process which therefore the understanding cannot grasp. And in reference to the fall by sin I refer to Luther, who writes: "Original sin means the fall of all nature"; and again: "The earth is indeed innocent and would willingly bring forth the best; but it is hindered by the curse that has fallen upon men by reason of sin." Here natural affinity between man's innermost action and surrounding nature is obviously postulated: that is Indo-European mythical religion in its full development (see vol. i. pp. 214 and 412). I may also say that when this mythical religion reveals itself as the conception of reason (as in the case of Schopenhauer) it forms 1 do-European metaphysics.*

Reflection upon this brings home to us the profound and very significant fact that our Indo-European view of "sin" is altogether mythical, that is, it reaches beyond the real world. I have already pointed out (vol. i. p. 390) how fundamentally distinct the Jewish view is, so that the same word denotes with them quite a different thing; I have, moreover, studied various modern Jewish handbooks of religious teaching without anywhere finding a discussion of the idea of "sin": whoever does not break the law is righteous; on the other hand, the Jewish theologians expressly and energetically reject the dogma

* Luther's thoughts are vaguely anticipated in the 5th chapter of the *Epistle to the Romans*, but they are found quite fully expressed in the writings of Scotus Erigena, whom he valued so highly (see *De div. Nat.*, Book V. chap. 36).

of
Old
the
reli
stan
que
con
recc
it is
is 1
sum
Hea
defu
cont
of J
by c
as w
by sl
obsc
Chur
not 1
over
cripti
Veda
it no
dread
to his
• C
II, 89.
† S
purely
but ne
assume
obvious
arbitrar
that P
in the f
§ Rig

le Paul and a
ed to doubt
al shaping of
er him to the
he word "re-
as the story
beings by the
there, a case of
but at the same
understanding
l by sin I refer
ans the fall of
ndeed innocent
; but it is hin-
nen by reason
1 man's inner-
bviously postu-
religion in its
12). I may also
eals itself as the
(Schopenhauer) it

us the profound
European view of
: reaches beyond
out (vol. i. p. 390)
view is, so that
a different thing ;
ern Jewish hand-
rywhere finding a
ver does not break
hand, the Jewish
reject the dogma
in the 5th chapter of
uite fully expressed in
so highly (see *De. divi*

of original sin which the Christians derived from the Old Testament.* Now if we reflect on this position of the Jews, which is perfectly justified by their history and religion, we shall soon come to see that from our different standpoint sin and original sin are synonyms. It is a question of an unavoidable condition of all life. Our conception of sinfulness is the first step towards the recognition of a transcendental connection of things ; it is evidence that our direct experience of this connection is beginning—an experience which receives its consummation in the words of Christ : " The Kingdom of Heaven is within you " (see vol. i. p. 187). Augustine's definition : "*Peccatum est dictum, factum vel concupitum contra legem æternam*" † is only a superficial extension of Jewish conceptions ; Paul goes to the root of the matter by calling sin itself a " law "—a law of the flesh, or, as we should say to-day, an empirical law of nature—and by showing in a famous passage which has been considered obscure but is perfectly clear (*Romans viii.*), that the Church law, that so-called *lex æterna* of Augustine, has not the least power over sin, which is a fact of nature, over which grace alone can prevail.‡ The exact transcription of the Old Indian thought ! The singer of the Veda already " searches eagerly for his sin " and finds it not in his will but in his condition, which even in his dreams holds evil up before his eyes, and finally he turns to his God, " the God of grace," who enlightens the simple.§

* Consult as an example Philippon's *Israelitische Religionslehre*, ii. 89.

† Sin is a breach of the everlasting law by word, deed or desire.

‡ Cf. especially Pfleiderer : *Der Paulinismus*, 2nd ed. p. 50 f. This purely scientific theological exposition is naturally different from mine, but nevertheless confirms it, especially by the proof (p. 59) that Paul assumed the presence of an impulse to sin before the Fall, which obviously could mean nothing but the removal of the myth beyond arbitrary historical boundaries ; then also by the clear demonstration that Paul, in opposition to the Augustinian dogmatists, recognised in the flesh the common and unchanging source of all sinful nature, § *Rigveda* vii. 86.

of the Fall became so weakened that the Jesuits to-day are generally described as semi-Pelagians, and they themselves even call their doctrine a *scientia media*.^{*} As soon as the myth is infringed, Judaism is inevitable.

It is clear that the struggle must rage more fiercely concerning the conception of grace; for the Fall was at least found in the sacred books of the Israelites, though only as uncomprehended myth, whereas grace is nowhere to be found there and is and remains quite meaningless to them. The storm had already burst among the Apostles, and it has not yet died away. Law or grace: the two could no more exist simultaneously than man could at once serve God and mammon. "I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain" (*Paul to the Galatians* ii. 21). One such passage is decisive; to play off against it other so-called "canonical" utterances (e.g., *The Epistle of James* ii. 14, 24) is childish; for it is not a question of theological hair-splitting but of one of the great facts of experience of inner life amongst us Indo-Europeans. "Only he receives redemption, whom redemption chooses," says the Kâtha-Upanishad. And what gift is it that this metaphysical myth lets us "receive by grace"? According to the Indo-Eranians knowledge, according to the European Christians faith: both guaranteeing a regeneration, that is, awakening man to the consciousness of a different connection of things.† I quote again the words of Christ, for they cannot too often be quoted: "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you." This is a discernment or a faith, obtained by divine grace. Redemption by knowledge, redemption by

^{*} I shall only quote one witness whose judgment is moderate and correct, Sainte-Beuve. He writes (*Port Royal*, Book IV. chap. 1): "*Les Jésuites n'attestent pas moins par leur méthode d'éducation qu'ils sont semi-pélagiens tendant au Pélagianisme pur, que par leur doctrine d'écarter.*"

† Cf. vol. i. pp. 193 and 437; and the paragraph on "Views of Existence" in the ninth chapter (vol. ii.).

faith: two people have emphasis on Jesus Christ same inner reaching in as India shows negation and while redemption its darkest strongly positive

To the Jesuits

So much those myths which certainly, the temple but This structure foundations, remains to derived from nature of the appear more

Nothing influence in merely negative at the matter help of any we shall see Helleno-Aryan that is hostile

case of Pelagius. Without giving up our natural point of view, an unprejudiced consideration will show us that the Jewish contribution is very important and almost indispensable. For in this marriage the Jewish spirit was the masculine principle, the generative element, the will. Nothing entitles us to assume that Hellenic speculation, Egyptian asceticism and international mysticism, without the fervour of the Jewish will to believe, would ever have given the world a new religious ideal and at the same time a new life. Neither the Roman Stoics with their noble but cold, impotent moral philosophy, nor the aimless, mystic self-negation of the theology introduced from India to Asia Minor, nor the opposite solution found in the neo-Platonic Philo, where the Israelite faith is viewed in a mystical, symbolical fashion, and Hellenic thought, deformed by senility, must embrace this strangely adorned youngest daughter of Israel—none of these, obviously, would have led to the goal. How could we otherwise explain the fact that at the very time when Christ was born Judaism itself, so exclusive in its nature, so scornful of everything alien, so stern and joyless and devoid of beauty, had begun a genuine and most successful propaganda? The Jewish religion is disinclined to all conversion, but the Gentiles, impelled by longing for faith, went over to it in crowds. And that too although the Jew was hated. We speak of the Anti-Semitism of to-day. Renan assures us that horror of the Jewish character was even more intense in the century before the birth of Christ.* What is it then that forms the secret attraction of Judaism? Its will. That will which, ruling in the sphere of religion, created unconditional, blind faith. Poetry, philosophy, science, mysticism, mythology—all these are widely divergent and to a certain extent paralyse the will; they testify to an unworldly, speculative, ideal tendency of

* *Histoire du peuple d'Israël* v. 227.

A. H.
on reading
Chambers

mind, which proud counter Indian sage to which makes Achilles, who of fearlessness in the nineteenth the negation directed inward of the Jew. direction; it will to live Christianity: to-day seems a doctrine of and a religious intolerance.

Next to the bound up with historical view treated at length of will and then discussed its suppose both like merely to decisive an unshakable events was born at which Christ "The young current reacts for certainty. they wanted Christian teaching definite facts

up our natural point
 ation will show us
 very important and
 this marriage the
 iple, the generative
 us to assume that
 eticism and inter-
 vour of the Jewish
 en the world a new
 a new life. Neither
 : but cold, impotent
 mystic self-negation
 ndia to Asia Minor,
 e neo-Platonic Philo-
 , in a mystical, sym-
 ught, deformed by
 ly adorned youngest
 bviously, would have
 wise explain the fact
 : was born Judaism
 cornful of everything
 void of beauty, had
 essful propaganda?
 o all conversion, but
 : faith, went over to
 the Jew was hated.
 day. Renan assures
 cter was even more
 h of Christ.* What
 raction of Judaism?
 he sphere of religion,
 Poetry, philosophy,
 these are widely
 alysed the will; they
 , ideal tendency of

v. 2271

mind, which produces in the case of all noble men that
 proud contempt of life which makes it possible for the
 Indian sage to lay himself while still alive in his own grave,
 which makes the inimitable greatness of Homer's hero
 Achilles, which stamps the German Siegfried as a model
 of fearlessness and which received monumental expression
 in the nineteenth century in Schopenhauer's doctrine of
 the negation of the will to live. The will is here in a way
 directed inwardly. This is quite different in the case
 of the Jew. His will at all times took an outward
 direction; it was the unconditional will to live. This
 will to live was the first thing that Judaism gave to
 Christianity: hence that contradiction, which even
 to-day seems to many an inexplicable riddle, between
 a doctrine of inner conversion, toleration and mercifulness,
 and a religion of exclusive self-assertion and fanatical
 intolerance.

Next to this general tendency of will—and inseparably
 bound up with it—must be mentioned the Jewish purely
 historical view of faith. In the third chapter I have
 treated at length the relation between the Jewish faith
 of will and the teaching of Christ, while I have in the fifth
 discussed its relation to religion as a whole; I pre-
 suppose both passages to be known.* Here I should
 like merely to call attention to the fact, how great and
 decisive an influence the Jewish faith as a material
 unshakable conviction concerning definite historical
 events was bound to exercise at that moment of history
 at which Christianity arose. On this point Hatch writes:
 "The young Christian communities were helped by the
 current reaction against pure speculation—the longing
 for certainty. The mass of men were sick of theories;
 they wanted certainty. The current teaching of the
 Christian teachers gave this certainty. It appealed to
 definite facts of which their predecessors were eye-

* See vol. i. pp. 238 f. and 415 f.

At H.
 their
 will to
 live at
 all
 costs
 will
 cost
 them
 their
 lives.
 The only
 way
 to
 squash
 a people
 is to
 destroy
 their
 most
 basic
 motive.

witnesses. Its simple tradition of the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ was a necessary basis for the satisfaction of men's needs." * That was a beginning. The attention was in the first place directed solely to Jesus Christ; the sacred books of the Jews were counted as very suspicious documents; Luther speaks in anger of the small respect which men like Origenes and even Hieronymus (as he tells us) paid to the Old Testament; most of the gnostics rejected it *in toto*; Marcion actually regarded it as a work of the Devil. But as soon as the thin edge of Jewish historical religion had found its way into men's ideas, the whole wedge could not fail gradually to be driven in. It is believed that the so-called Jewish Christians suffered a defeat and that the heathen Christians with Paul carried off the victory? That is only true in a very conditional and fragmentary manner. Outwardly, indeed, the Jewish law with its "sign of the Covenant" suffered complete shipwreck, outwardly, too, the Indo-European with his Trinity and other mythology and metaphysics prevailed; but inwardly, during the first centuries, the true backbone of Christianity came to be Jewish history—that history which had been remodelled by fanatical priests according to certain hieratic theories and plans, which had been supplemented and constructed with genius but at the same time with caprice—that history which historically was utterly untrue.† Christ's advent, which had been foretold to them by authentic witnesses, was to those poor men of the chaos like a light in the darkness; it was an historical phenomenon. Sublime spirits indeed placed this historic personality in a symbolical temple; but what signified logos and demiurgos and emanations of the divine principle to the common people? Its

* *Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*, 6th ed. p. 312.

† See vol. I, pp. 452 and 460.

healthy i
which ga
The Mes
means pl
formed t
possessed
sublime
Sufferer
Creator
earth to
" which
certainty
had, as
certainty
of Jewis
and religi
Closely
intoleranc
an essent
To the Je
and desti
this belie
existence
permanen
stake son
something
of the p
Jews whic
and unbel
times to
ness of th
ful impul
there wa
moral mo
lends con

★ Those
and
wise
urg
the
TP

altogether lacking. The introduction, therefore, of compulsory faith into the Chaos (and then among the Germanic nations) was in a way an effect without a cause, in other words the rule of caprice. What in the case of the Jews had been an objective result became here a subjective command. What there had moved in a very limited sphere, that of national tradition and national religious law, ruled here without any limitations. The Aryan tendency to establish dogmas (*see* vol. i. p. 429) entered into a fatal union with the historical narrowness and deliberate intolerance of the Jews. Hence the wild struggle for the possession of the power to proclaim dogmas, lasting through all the first centuries of our era. Mild men like Irenæus remained almost without influence; the more intolerant the Christian bishop was, the more power did he possess. But this Christian intolerance is distinguished from Jewish intolerance in the same way as Christian dogma is distinguished from Jewish dogma: for the Jews were hemmed in on all sides, confined within definite narrow boundaries, whereas the whole field of the human intellect stood open to Christian dogma and Christian intolerance; moreover Jewish faith and Jewish intolerance have never possessed far-reaching power, whereas the Christians, with Rome, soon ruled the world. And thus we find such inconsistencies as that a heathen Emperor (Aurelian, in the year 272) forces upon Christianity the primateship of the Roman bishop, and that a Christian Emperor, Theodosius, commands, as a purely political measure, that the Christian religion be believed on pain of death. I say nothing of other inconsistencies, *e.g.*, that the nature of God, the relation of the Father to the Son, the eternity of the punishments of hell, &c., *ad inf.*, were settled by majority by Bishops, who frequently could neither read nor write, and became binding upon all men from a fixed day, in somewhat the same

A. H.
 Arabis
 not only
 the first
 but the
 only
 emanant
 power
 (Or could
 this go
 to Galilee.)

way a
 vote o
 for us
 though
 that :
 develo
 we are
 and es
 But
 Church
 skeleto
 ment
 it is a
 on the
 punish
 former
 fundar
 itself t
 and de
 gards t
 and in
 into ti
 are no
 and or
 unceas
 forcible
 the lea
 concep
 it had
 Indo-E
 the wor
 which

* See
 and comp
 concerni
 of chap. i.

his heart.
 t" senti-
 s not the
 : in every
 e of free-
 ians, with
 us on his
 c decree?
 -belonging
 ous writer
 the Chris-
mitifs sont
: eux, pas
le culte." †
 s freedom.
 : Christians
 d theories,
 ough Jesus
 world!" †
 ts outward
 individual
 anity, it is
 : Germanic
 ven in the
 nant, every
 ngregation,
 ; We men
 rly inclined,
 commercial
 t absolutely
 iod. More-

nis, 27th ed.
 esent so-called
 i century.

over these early Christians were more fortunate than we: the shadow of the theocratically transformed Roman imperial idea had not yet fallen upon them. It was, however, a fatal feature of the northern movement that it always had to make itself felt as a reaction—that it had to tear down before it could think of building up. But this very negative character permits us to unite an almost inestimable mass of heterogeneous historical facts under one single term, viz., the Revolt against Rome. From the opposition of Vigilantius, in the fourth century, against the scandal of monachism which was threatening the prosperity of the nations, to Bismarck's conflict with the Jesuits, there is a trait of relationship uniting all these movements; for, however different the impulse may be which drives them to revolt, Rome itself represents so uniform, so persistently logical and so strongly established an idea, that all opposition to it receives a peculiar and to a certain extent similar colouring.

In order therefore to be clear we must hold fast to this idea of a Revolt against Rome. But inside it we must note an important difference. Under the uniform exterior the idea "Rome" conceals two fundamentally different tendencies: the one flows from a Christian source, the other from a heathen; the one aims at an ecclesiastical, the other at a political ideal. Rome is, as Byron says, "an hermaphrodite of empire" * Here again the unfortunate discord that we encounter in Christianity at every step! And in fact not only do two ideals—a political and an ecclesiastical—stand side by side, but the political ideal of Rome, Jewish-heathen in foundation and structure, contains a social dream so magnificent that it has at all times captivated even the greatest minds; whereas the religious ideal, permeated though it may be by the presence of Christ

* *The Deformed Transformed* L. 21

Ahi, Constantin! di quanto mal fu matre,
Non la tua conversion, ma quella dote
Che da te prese il primo ricco patre! *

And according to him Constantine deserves double blame, first because he led the Church astray, secondly because he weakened his own Empire. In verse 55 of the twentieth canto of the *Paradiso*, he says that Constantine "destroyed the world," by giving power to the Church. And if we trace this idea in Dante's work *De Monarchia*, it is clear that we have here to deal with an absolutely heathen-historical doctrine—the conception that universal power is the legitimate legacy of the Roman Empire! † How is it possible to approach so close to the fundamental idea of Rome's ecclesiastical power and yet not grasp it? For it is the Church itself that inherits that world-power. It was only by its taking possession of it that the *Civitas Dei* came into being. Long ago Augustine had proved with a logic which we should have liked Dante and his apologists to have possessed, that the power of the State was based upon the power of sin; henceforth, since by Christ's death the power of sin was broken, the State must submit to the Church, in other words, the Church stood at the head of the civic government. The Pope is, according to the orthodox doctrine, the representative of God, vicarius Dei in terris; ‡ if he were merely the "representative of Christ" or the "successor of Peter," his function could be regarded as exclusively the care of souls, for Christ said: "My Kingdom is not of this world"; but who would presume

* *Inferno* xix.: "O Constantine! How much evil has been caused not by your conversion but by the gift which the first rich father [= Pope] received from you."

† *De Monarchia*, the whole of the second book. But see especially chap. iii., in which the "divine predestination" of the Roman people as the world-ruling power is derived not from interpretations of Old Testament prophets or from the appointment of Peter but proved from the genealogical tree of Aeneas and Creusa! Race and not religion is the decisive thing for Dante!

‡ *Concilium Tridentinum decretum de reformatione*, chap. i.

The Origin
Points at
the head
of the
State

blame,
 ecause
 of the
 antine
 hurch.
 archia,
 olutely
 at uni-
 Roman
 lose to
 ver and
 nherits
 session
 ng ago
 should
 ssessed,
 : power
r of sin
rch, in
re civic
thodox
Dei in
 Christ "
 egarded
 l: "My
presume
 has been
 ich father
 especially
 an people
 ns of Old
 oved from
 it religion

ii

to exercise authority over the representative on earth of the almighty Godhead? Who dare deny that the Temporal is just as much subject to God as the Eternal? Who would venture in any sphere to refuse to recognise his supremacy? Though, therefore, in theological matters of faith, Dante may have been a strictly orthodox Catholic, who did not doubt the "infallible preceptorship of the Church" *—such dogmatic agreement is of little importance, the important thing is to know what a man, by the whole tendency of his nature, is and must be, wills and must will; and this impelled Dante to attack in passionate words not only the inviolable person of the *Pontifex maximus* and almost continuously to scourge all the servants of the Church, but to undermine the foundations of the Roman religion.

This attack, too, was hurled back from the mighty walls of Rome, upon which it left not a single trace.

* Kraus, p. 703 f., seems to successfully establish his thesis, but to have no idea how little such formal orthodoxy means and how dangerous his own standpoint is for the Roman Church. Moreover I cannot help calling attention to the fact that Dante's famous confession of faith at the end of the 24th canto of the *Paradiso* is really grievously abstract. Kraus regards as final proof of Dante's orthodoxy a Credo, which does not mention the name of Jesus Christ! What, on the contrary, has struck me is that Dante does not go beyond general mythology. And if I review in my memory a series of other utterances, I get the impression that Dante (like many other of his contemporaries) can hardly be called a Christian at all. The great cosmic God in Heaven and the Roman Church on earth: everything intellectual and political, or moral and abstract. There is an infinite longing for religion, but religion itself, that Heaven which does not come with outward signs, had been stolen from the great and noble man in his cradle. Dante's poetical greatness lies not least of all in the fearful tragedy of the thirteenth century, the century of Innocent III. and Thomas Aquinas! His hope is content with the *luce intellettuale* (*Par.* xxx.), and his true guide is not Beatrice nor the holy Bernhard, but the author of the *Summa theologiæ*, who sought to illuminate with the pure light of reason and to idealise the almost un-Christianised Christendom and the night of that age which hated all knowledge and beauty. Thomas Aquinas signifies the nationalistic supplement of a materialistic religion; Dante threw himself into his arms. (See the interesting book—which in truth is written in support of quite a different thesis—of the English Catholic, E. G. Gardner, *Dante's Ten Heavens*, 1898.)

108 FOUNDATIONS OF THE XIXTH CENTURY

I have intentionally emphasised the struggle between North and South only as it manifested itself inside the Church of Rome, and that not merely because I have already had occasion to speak of other manifestations, or because in point of time and historical sequence they belong only to the next epoch of culture, but because I think that this side of the matter is usually neglected, and that it is of great significance for the comprehension of the present age. The Reformation strengthened the Catholic Church at a later time; for it effected the elimination of elements that could not be assimilated, elements which, in the persons of submissive and yet rebellious sons—like Charlemagne and Dante—were much more dangerous than if they had been enemies, inasmuch as they inwardly hindered the logical development of the Roman ideal while outwardly they could further it little or nothing. A Charlemagne with Dante as his Chancellor would have wrecked the Roman Church; but a Luther has made the Church so clear concerning itself that the Council of Trent has meant for it the dawn of a new day.

RELIGIOUS INSTINCTS OF RACE

I need not return to the question of race-differences, although they are at the bottom of this struggle between North and South; what is evident does not require proof. But I shall not break off this short discussion of the northern power in the Christian religious struggle and pass to "Rome," without first begging the reader to take up some good history, e.g., the first volume of Lamprecht's *Deutsche Geschichte*; * careful study will convince him how deeply rooted in the Germanic character are certain fundamental convictions; at the same time he will discover that though

* *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, 2nd ed. pp. iv. and 550.

declared war
e Papacy was
uns bitterly of
id others with
lead and other
ng themselves
ie would have
ologians. As
ture of Mary
to its purpose

band in hand
was an ele-
and "subli-
ras too much
ver departed
y of humanity
he works of
imed at) and
Freiheit eines
t the North
ow little the
the Chaos—
re at all in-
t. A Luther
h themselves,
he himself
ts of know-
but not the
a man like
thoroughly
s declared war
uaction, I quote
xit: *Romanus*
et cum recenti

understanding

understood, as I remarked above, the character and the needs of that parti-coloured population which for centuries furnished the bearers and mediators of civilisation and culture. Rome demanded from its adherents neither greatness of character nor independent thought, the Church itself relieved them of that; for talent and imaginative enthusiasm it had indeed room—under the one condition of obedience—but such gifted and visionary men were merely auxiliaries; the attention was directed continuously to the great masses, and for them religion was so completely transferred from head and heart to the visible Church, that it became accessible to every one, comprehensible to every one, and as clear as daylight to all.* Never has an institution displayed so admirable and clear-sighted a knowledge of mediocre humanity as that Church, which began at an early time to organise itself

Hellenic thought. It is easy to see how true that was of the whole Roman Church if we take the trouble to read in Hefele's *Konziliengeschichte*, vol. ii. p. 255 f., the edict of the Emperor Justinian against Origenes and the fifteen anathemas against him of the Synods of Constantinople of the year 543. What these people did not notice gives us as good an idea of their mental qualities as what they found worthy of being anathematised. For example, the bigots did not notice that Origenes believes that the *peccatum originale* existed before the so-called fall, and yet that is, as I have shown above, the central point of his absolutely anti-Roman religion. On the other hand, it was revolting to them that this clear Hellenic mind considered a plurality of inhabited worlds an understood thing and that he taught the doctrine that the earth must have gradually grown by process of development. But they found it most fearful of all that he praised the destruction of the body in death as a liberation (whereas the people of the Chaos who were led by Rome could not think of immortality as anything but the eternal life of their wretched bodies), &c. &c. Many Popes, e.g., Coelestin, who crushed Nestorius, understood not a word of Greek and had in fact a very indifferent education, but this will surprise no one who has learned from Hefele's *Konziliengeschichte* that many of the bishops who by vote of majority founded the Christian dogma could not read, write, nor even sign their name.

* The high-spirited African Church had given the Roman Church a good example in this as so much else, by inserting in its confession of faith the words: "I believe in forgiveness of sins, in the resurrection of the body and in eternal life through the holy church (see Harnack: *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis*, 27th ed. p. 9).

A. H.
Here is
the core
of the
matter

p 122

Outside the
Jews,
outside
the
Catholics
I will
be God,
and
like God,
I will need
a Pope.
(Emilia H.)

around the Pontifex maximus as central point. From the Jews it took the hierocracy, the intolerance, the historical materialism—but carefully avoided the inexorably strict moral commands and the sublime simplicity of Judaism, the sworn foe of all superstition (for this would have scared away the people, which is always more superstitious than religious); it willingly adopted Germanic earnestness, as also mystical rapture—but it took care that strict subjectivity did not make the path of salvation too full of thorns for weak souls and that mystical flights did not emancipate from the cult of the Church; it did not exactly reject the mystical speculations of the Hellenes—it understood their worth for the human imagination—but it robbed the myth of its plastic, incalculable, developable and so ever revolutionary significance, and condemned it to perpetual immobility like an idol to be worshipped. On the other hand, it adopted in the most large-hearted manner the ceremonies and especially the sacraments of the splendour-loving Chaos which sought religion in magic. This is its own ~~real~~ element, the one thing which the Imperium, that is, Rome, contributed independently to the structure of Christianity; and so it was that while holy men did not cease to reveal in Christianity the contrast to heathendom, the great masses passed from the one to the other without much noticing the difference: for they still found the splendidly robed priesthood, the processions, the images, the miracle-working local sanctuaries, the mystical transformation of the sacrifice, the material communication of eternal life, the confession, the forgiveness of sins, the indulgences—all things to which they had long been accustomed.

SS
the
concentration
camps

* Wurnberg

the gaulaters
and Goering

From
nce, the
the in-
me sim-
tion (for
s always
adopted
—but it
the path
and that
lt of the
specula-
h for the
s plastic,
lutionary
mobility
hand, it
remonies
ur-loving
; its own
t, that is,
icture of
n did not
thendom,
r without
ound the
e images,
mystical
ommuni-
veness of
they had

alter
sering

THE VICTORY OF THE CHAOS

I must still say a few words in explanation of this open, ceremonious entrance of the spirit of the Chaos into Christianity; it gave Christianity a peculiar colouring, which has more or less tinged all confessions up to the present day (even those which are separated from Rome), and it reached its culminating point at the end of the period with which we are occupied. The proclamation of the dogma of transubstantiation, in the year 1215, betokens the completion of a 1000 years' development in this direction.*

The adoption of the objective religion of Paul (in opposition to the subjective) involved as was inevitable a view of expiation similar to that of the Jews; but what gives the Jew a special claim to our honest admiration is his unceasing struggle against superstition and magic; his religion was materialism, but, as I pointed out in a former chapter, abstract, not concrete materialism.† Now towards the end of the second century of our era an absolutely concrete materialism, though tinged with mysticism, had spread like a plague through the whole Roman Empire. That this sudden resuscitation of old superstitions was brought about by the Semites, by those Semites, namely, who were not under the benevolent law of Jehovah, has been proved;‡ for the Jewish Prophets themselves had had trouble enough to suppress the belief (which was always asserting itself) in the magic efficacy of eaten sacrificial flesh; §

* The final formal completion was reached some years later, first by the introduction of the obligatory adoration of the Host in the year 1264, secondly by the universal introduction of the festival of the holy body in the year 1311, to celebrate the wonderful transformation of the Host into the body of God.

† See vol. i. p. 224 f.

‡ See especially Rob. Smith: *Religion of the Semites* (1894), p. 358. For this whole question read lectures 8, 9, 10, 11:

§ See Smith, and as a supplement Cheyne: *Isaiah*, p. 368;

* P. T. Indeed, there was a real efficacy present. The panic of the death of the sacrificer and reinforced the exorcism even as a wholly new strength from the fears of

and it was this very faith, which was so widespread among born materialists, that now spread like wildfire through all the countries of the strongly Semitised Chaos of peoples. It was everlasting life that was demanded by miserable creatures, who might well feel how little of eternity there was in their own existence. It was everlasting life that the Priests of the newly arranged mysteries promised them through the mediation of "Agapes," common, ceremonious meals, in which flesh and blood, magically transformed to divine substance, were partaken of, and in which by the direct communication of this substance of eternity which conferred immortality the body of the human being was likewise transformed, to rise after death to everlasting life.* Thus Apuleius, for example, writes about his initiation into the mysteries of Isis, that he dare not betray what must be concealed, and can only say this: he had reached the borders of the realm of death, had crossed the threshold of Proserpina and had returned from thence "reborn in all elements."† Those initiated into the cult of Mithras were also called in *aeternum renati*, for ever regenerate.‡

There is no doubt that we must see in this a revival of the very earliest, most widespread, totemistic§ delusions, conceptions against which the noblest men of all countries have long and successfully contended. It certainly seems

* Rohde: *Psyche*, 1st ed. p. 687.

† *Der goldene Esel*, Book XI.

‡ Rohde, as above, and Dieterich's *Eine Mithrasliturgie*.

§ The use of the word *totemism* in this passage has led to misunderstandings and it indeed betrays an almost too daring ellipsis of thought. Totemism means "animal-worship," a custom spread over the whole world; the animal in question is sacred and inviolate (the cow in India, the ape in Southern India, the crocodile among certain African races, &c.). But if we trace the further development of this custom, we find that the sacred Totem nevertheless was sometimes sacrificed—thus, for example, in Mexico the youth worshipped as a God, the idea here being that by partaking of divine flesh and blood one receives a share of divinity: in view of this connection I have characterised these conceptions as totemistic.

* D. T. So did I convince A. H. that
he was like Apuleius - he, too, in the
war had certainly reached the
borders of death.

tt

pread
~~there~~
 Chaos
~~anded~~
 little
 t was
 angled
 on of
 flesh
 were
 ion of
 rtality
 rmed,
 uleius,
 steries
 created,
 fers of
 erpina
 nte," †
 called

zival of
 lusions,
 untries
 y seems

misunder-
 thought.
 the whole
 e cow in
 n African
 s custom,
 crificed—
 the idea
 receives a
 ised these

f. that
 in the
 d the

to me doubtful whether the conception in this particular Semitic form of the Egypto-Roman mysteries ever existed among the Indo-Europeans; but these Indo-Europeans had in the meantime developed another idea, that of substitution at sacrifices: *in sacris simulata pro veris accipi*.* Thus we see the old Indians using baked cakes in the form of discs (hosts) as symbolical representatives of the animals to be slain. Now in the Roman chaos, where all thoughts are found jumbled confusedly together, that Semitic conception of the magic change of substance in the human being became fused with this Aryan symbolic conception of *simulata pro veris*, which had really been meant only to show that the former literally interpreted thank-offering was now a matter of the heart only.† Thus in the sacrificial meals of the pre-Christian Roman mystery-cults men partook not of flesh and blood but of bread and wine—magically transformed. It is well known what a part these mysteries played. Every one will at least remember having read in Cic. *De Legibus* ii. 14, that it was only these mysteries (then consisting of a "baptism" and a "love-feast") that gave men "understanding in life and hope in death." But no one will fail to notice that we have here, in these *renati*, a view of regeneration absolutely contrary to that taught and lived by Christ. Christ and Antichrist stand opposed. Absolute idealism, which aims at a complete transformation of the inner man, his motives and purposes, is here opposed by a materialism intensified to madness, for by partaking of a mysterious food it hopes for a magical transformation of the ephemeral body into an immortal one. This conception means a moral atavism, such as only a period of the most utter decay could produce.

* See Leist: *Gräco-italische Rechtsgeschichte*, p. 267 f.; Jhering: *Vorgeschichte der Indoeuropäer*, p. 313; &c.

† Augustine in his happy hours has this view too: *Nos ipsi in cordibus nostris invisibile sacrificium esse debemus* (*De Civ. Dei* x. 19).

A. W + H. G.
 as A. H.
 secret.
 And as
 healer
 said it,
 both are
 necessary.
 Ht

Ht D.T. willing to die for the
 Fatherland must become
 an equivalent of the wine
 and the host

These mysteries, like everything else, were influenced by the genuine Christianity of the early days: it idealised them and used the forms of its time to give them a new purport. In the oldest post-evangelical writing, the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, found in 1883, and dating from the first Christian century, the mystic meal is merely a thank-offering (Eucharist). When taking the cup the congregation says: "We thank Thee, O Father, for the sacred vine of Thy servant David, which Thou hast proclaimed by Thy servant Jesus; Thine be honour to all eternity." When taking the bread it says: "We thank Thee, O Father, for life and knowledge, which Thou hast made known to us by Thy servant Jesus; Thine be honour to all eternity." * In the somewhat later so-called *Apostolic Constitutions* the bread and wine are designated "gifts in honour of Christ." † Of a transformation of the elements into body and blood of Christ no one at that time knows anything. It is in fact characteristic of the earliest Christians to avoid the word "mysterion" which was then so common (in Latin it was rendered by *sacramentum*). It is only in the fourth century (that is, after Christianity became the official, obligatory religion of the absolutely un-Christian Empire) that the word comes into use, unquestionably as the symptom of a new idea. ‡ But the best minds strove unceasingly against this gradual introduction into religion of materialism and magic.

Origenes, for example, is of opinion that not only is it to be understood merely "figuratively," when we speak of the body of Christ at the Eucharist, but that this "figure" is suited only to "the simple"; in reality it is a "spiritual communion" that takes place. Hence, too, according to Origenes it is a matter of indifference who partakes of the Sacrament, 'he partaking in itself

* According to the edition of the Roman Catholic Professor Narcissus Liebert.

† Book VIII. chap. xii.

‡ Hatch, p. 302. Cf., too, what has been said on p. 20.

* A. H. concludes that Chamberlain is profoundly wrong which is why he was ultimately powerless — "a wandering scholar."

see in the bread and wine the actual body of Christ and from that to prove that a magic transformation was brought about in its recipients.

These two tendencies * existed side by side for centuries, without ever coming to a decisive dogmatic struggle. The feeling of a mysterious danger may have contributed to prevent it; besides Rome, which at a very early period had quietly chosen the second way, knew that it had against it the most eminent Church fathers, as well as the oldest tradition. Once more it was the too conscientious North which threw the torch of war into this idyllic peace, where under the stole of a single universal and infallible Church the adherents of two different religions lived. In the ninth century the abbot Radbert, in his book *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini*, taught for the first time as an irrefutable dogma the doctrine of the magical transformation of the bread into the objectively present body of Christ, which exercised a magical and immortalising influence upon all who partook of it—even upon the ignorant and unbelieving. And who took up the gauntlet? In the most rapid survey such a fact cannot be passed over: it was the King of the Franks, later supported by the King of England! As always, the first instinct was correct; the Germanic princes immediately divined that their national independence was being attacked.*

* In reality there are only two. Whoever has cast the most superficial glance at the witches' cauldron of theological sophism, will be grateful to me for seeking to introduce by means of extreme simplification not only clearness but also truthfulness into this confused matter, which, partly owing to the cunning calculation of greedy priests, partly owing to the religious delusion of honest but badly balanced minds, has become the real battlefield for all subtle follies and profound impossibilities. Here in particular lies the hereditary sin of all Protestant churches; for they rebelled against the Roman doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass and of transubstantiation but had not the courage to sweep out all the superstitions derived from the Chaos. Instead they took refuge in wretched sophistries and have ever since been flitting with characterless indcision hither and thither on dialectical pin-points, without ever putting foot on solid ground.

Y

and
was

ries,
ggle.
uted
arly
that
; as
too
into
ngle
two
obot
ini,
the
into
ised
par-
And
vey
; of
nd !
nic
in-
per-
ll be
fca-
tter,
rtly
nds,
und
tes-
the
rage
they
ting
nts,

RELIGION

129

dependence was being attacked.* Commissioned by Charles the Bald first of all Ratramnus and then the great Scotus Erigena refuted this doctrine of Radbert. That it was not a question here of a theological dispute of little consequence is proved by the fact that this same Scotus Erigena produces a whole system inspired by Origenes—an ideal religion, in which the Holy Script with its doctrines is viewed as "symbolism of the Inexpressible" (*res ineffabilis, incomprehensibilis*) and the difference between good and bad proved metaphysically indefensible, &c., and that exactly at the same moment the admirable Count Gottschalk, following in the footsteps of Augustine, develops the doctrines of divine grace and predestination. The quarrel could no longer be settled diplomatically. The Germanic spirit began to awaken; Rome could not let it have its way, otherwise its own power would soon be gone. Gottschalk was publicly scourged almost to death by the ecclesiastics in power and then condemned to lifelong misery in prison; Scotus, who had fled in time to his English home, was treacherously murdered by monks commissioned by Rome. And so, for centuries, men wrangled over the nature of the Sacrament. The Popes indeed maintained personally a very reserved, in fact ambiguous, attitude; they were more concerned about the keeping together of all Christians under their episcopal staff than about discussions which might shake the Church to its very foundations. But when in the eleventh century that fiery spirit Berengarius of Tours had once more begun to carry the religion of idealism through all France, the decision could no longer be postponed. There now sat on the Papal throne Gregory VII., the author of the *Dictatus papæ*,† in which

* It is worth noting that in the case of the old mysteries, partaking in them removed all bonds of connection with the nation of one's birth. The initiated formed an international, extra-national family.

† In recent times the authorship of the Pope has been doubted, but Catholics who are to be taken earnestly from a scientific point of view

see 128
P 128

for the first time it was frankly declared that Emperors and Princes were unconditionally subject to the Pope: he was that *Pontifex maximus* who first imposed on all bishops of the Church the vassal oath of complete allegiance to Rome, a man whose purity of heart increased tenfold his might which was great in itself; now, too, Rome felt strong enough to enforce its view in regard to the sacrament. Dragged from prison to prison, from council to council, Berengarius had finally in the year 1059, in order to save his life, to retract his doctrine before an assembly of 113 bishops in Rome, and to confess to the faith that "the bread is not merely a sacrament but the true body of Christ that is chewed with the teeth."*

However, the conflict still went on, indeed it now became general. In the second half of the thirteenth century there was in all countries into which Germanic blood had penetrated—from Spain to Poland, from Italy to England†—an awakening of religious consciousness such

admit that this representation of the supposed "rights" of Rome, if not from the Pope himself, yet originated from the circle of his most intimate admirers and thus in the main gives correctly the opinion of Gregory, and this is confirmed by his actions and letters (*see Hefele, op. ed. v. 75*). Most amusing, on the other hand, is the twisting and turning of the historians who write under Jesuitical influence; they have taken much from the great Gregory but not his honesty and love of truth, and thus in their attempts at improvement they spoil the deeds and words of that very Pope under whom the Roman idea of State attained its noblest, purest and most unselfish form, and exerted its greatest moral influence. Note, for example, what trouble the Seminar-Professor Brück (as above, § 114) takes to prove that Gregory "wished no universal monarchy," and "did not regard the Princes as his vassals," &c., but Brück cannot at the same time refrain from mentioning that Gregory has spoken of an *imperium Christi* and admonished all Princes and peoples to recognise in the Church "their superior and mistress." Such dissimulation in face of the great fundamental facts of history is as unworthy as it is fruitless; the Roman bureaucratic idea of a world-state is so great that one does not need to be ashamed of it.

* In a letter to the Pope he calls them wild animals who begin to roar at the mere word "spiritual communion with Christ" (*see Neander, vi. 317*). At a later time Berengarius called the Papal throne *sedem non apostolicam sed seclum satanæ*.

† About the year 1200 there were Waldensian congregations "in

* P. H. ponders the intensity of the idea, but dislikes the idea of magic, first reduces him. "Hear, hear" I told him, you are absolutely

THE POSITION TO-DAY

At the beginning of the thirteenth century therefore the struggle of almost a thousand years had ended with the apparently unconditional victory of Rome and the complete defeat of the Germanic North. But what I have called the awakening of the Germanic spirit in the religious sphere was only the symptom of a general effort of men feeling their way, and making up their minds; soon it penetrated the civic, political and intellectual life; it was no longer merely a question of religion, it was an all-embracing revolt against the principles and methods of Rome. The struggle broke out afresh, but with different results. If Rome could venture to be tolerant, the struggle might be regarded to-day as at an end; but she cannot venture, for it would mean suicide; and thus the intellectual and material position which we Northmen have won with such pains and so incompletely is continually being undermined and eaten away. Besides Rome possesses, unsought and without any obligations, born allies in all enemies of Germanicism. What we need as a protection against this danger is an immediate and powerful regeneration of ideal sentiment, a regeneration that shall be specifically religious: we need to tear away the foreign rags and tatters that still hang upon our Christianity as the trappings of slavish hypocrisy: we need the creative power to construct out of the words and the spectacle of the crucified Son of Man a perfect religion fitting the truth of our nature, our capacities, and our present culture—a religion so directly convincing, so enchantingly beautiful, so present, so plastic, so eternally true, and yet so new, that we must give ourselves to it as a maid to her lover, without questioning, happy, enraptured—a religion so exactly suited to our highly gifted, but

A. H.
 random
 this at
 length

erefore
ed with
nd the
what I
in the
general
minds;
llectual
, it was
ethods
ith dif-
lerant,
end;
; and
ich we
incom-
away.
it any
nicism.
danger
f ideal
lly re-
gs and
e trap-
power
of the
truth
lture—
beauti-
yet so
aid to
red—a
l, but

delicate, easily injured, peculiar Teutonic nature, that it shall have the power to master our inmost souls, ennobling and strengthening us: if we do not succeed in this, from the shadows of the future a second Innocent III. will come forth, another fourth Lateran synod will meet, and once more the flames of the Inquisition will crackle and flare up to heaven. For the world—and even the Teuton—will rather throw themselves into the arms of Syro-Egyptian mysteries than be edified by the threadbare twaddle of ethical societies and such-like. And the world will be right. On the other hand an abstract, casuistically dogmatic Protestantism, imbued with Roman superstition such as the Reformation has bequeathed to us in various different forms, is no living power. It certainly conceals a power, a great one—the Germanic soul; but this kaleidoscope of manifold and inwardly inconsistent intolerances means hindrance to, not improvement of, this soul; hence the profound indifference of the majority of those who are of this confession, and the pitiful absence of cultivation of the greatest power of the heart, the religious power. Romanism, on the other hand, may be weak as a dogmatic religion, but its dogmatism is at least consistent; moreover the Romish Church—provided only certain concessions are made to it—is peculiarly tolerant and generous; it is so all-embracing that only Buddhism can compare with it, providing a home, a *civitas Dei*, for all characters, all tendencies of mind and heart, a home in which the sceptic (like many a Pope) can scarcely be called Christian;* and it joins hands with the average

* In the posthumous process against Boniface VIII. many ecclesiastical dignitaries asserted on oath that this mightiest of all Popes laughed at the conception of Heaven and Hell and said of Jesus Christ that he had been a very clever man, nothing more. Hefele is inclined to regard these charges as not unfounded (see vi. 461 and the preceding discussion of the subject). And yet—or rather in this way—Boniface grasped the central idea of the Roman thought more clearly than almost any one before or after him, and in his famous bull *Unam*

He knew.
they will
not go to
Christ.
"Flunk"
wandering
scholar
towards.
He will
give
them
something
better.
Not
Syro-
Egyptian
mysteries
but
Teutonic
circum-
stances.
He will
excite
the
Germanic
soul.

mind still fettered to heathen superstition and with the fanatical enthusiast, like Bernard of Clairvaux, "whosoul is enraptured in the fulness of the house of God and drinks new wine with Christ in the kingdom of his Father." * In addition there is the seductive and captivating idea of world and State, which is of great influence; for as an organised system, as a power of tradition, as a discernment of the human heart, Rome is great and admirable, more so almost than one can express in words. Even a Luther is said to have declared (*Tischreden*): "As far as outward government is concerned, the Empire of the Pope is the best thing for the world." A single David—strong in the innocently pure revolt of a genuine Indo-European against the shame inflicted upon our race—could perhaps lay low such a Goliath, but for a whole army of philosophising Lilliputians it would have been impossible. Its death too would be in no case desirable; for our Germanic Christianity will not and can not be the religion of the Chaos; the delusion of a world religion is rank chronistic and sacramental materialism; like a malady it clings to the Protestant Church out of its Roman past; only in limitation can we grow to the full possession of our idealising power.

A. H.
Germania!
Germania!
Germania!

A clear understanding of the momentous struggles in the sphere of religion in the nineteenth century and in the approaching future will be impossible if we have not before our minds an essentially correct and vividly coloured picture of the struggle in early Christianity, until the year 1215. What came later—the Reformation and the counter-Reformation—is much less important from a purely religious point of view, much more saturated with politics and ruled by politics; besides it remains a

sanctam, on which present Catholicism rests as on a foundation-stone, he has given expression to it. (More details of this bull in next chapter.) In his *Port Royal* (Book III. chap. iii.) Sainte-Beuve proves convincingly that "one can be a very good Catholic and yet scarcely a Christian."

* Helfferich: *Christliche Mystik* 1842 II. 231.

and with the
'whose soul
and drinks
her." * In
ing idea of
; for as an
a discern-
rable, more
Even a
: "As far
Empire of
A single
f a genuine
upon our
but for a
would have
in no case
ll not and
clusion of a
acramental
Protestant
itation can
power.
truggles in
ury and in
e have not
ly coloured
, until the
ation and
rtant from
: saturated
remains a
dation-stone,
text chapter.)
convincingly
Christian."

riddle, if we have not a knowledge of the past. It is this need that I have tried to meet in the present chapter.*

ORATIO PRO DOMO

If in the above account I am accused of partiality, I would reply that I do not possess the desirable gift of lying. What is the good of "objective phrases"? Even an enemy can appreciate honest frankness. When it is a question of the dearest possessions of the heart, I prefer, like the Teutons, to rush naked to battle, with the sentiment that God has given me, rather than to march to the field adorned in the artificial armour of a science which proves nothing, or in the toga of an empty rhetoric which reconciles everything.

epigram?

Nothing is further from my intention than the identification of individuals with their Churches. Our Churches to-day unite and separate by essentially external characteristics. When I read the *Memorials* of Cardinal Manning and see him calling the Jesuit Order the cancer of Catholicism, when I hear him violently complaining of the development (so zealously carried on at the present day) of the sacrament to downright idolatry, and calling the church in consequence a "booth" and an "exchange," when I see him working so actively for the spreading of the Bible and openly opposing the Roman tendency to suppress it (which he admits to be the predominant tendency), or when I take up such excellent, genuinely Germanic writings as Professor Schell's *Der Katholizismus als Prinzip des Fortschrittes*, I have a strong feeling that a single divine whirlwind would suffice to sweep away

* To any one who wishes to read an attempt at a systematic refutation of the opinions which I have expressed in this chapter and in other parts of the book on the essence and history of the Roman Church I recommend Prof. Dr. Albert Ehrhard's *Kritische Würdigung der "Foundations,"* originally published in the periodical *Kultur* and now as No. 14 of the *Vorträge und Abhandlungen*, published by the Leo-Gesellschaft (1901, Mayer and Co., Vienna).

the fatal jugglery of delusions inherited from the stone age, to scatter like a veil of mist the infatuations of the fallen empire of half-breeds and to unite in blood fraternity all Teutons—in religion and through religion.

Moreover in my account, as I promised, the centre of all Christianity—the figure on the Cross—has remained untouched. And it is this figure which binds us all together, no matter how we may be separated by mode of thought and tendency of race. It is my good fortune to possess several good and true friends among the Catholic clergy and to the present day I have not lost one. I remember moreover a very highly gifted Dominican, who liked to argue with me and to whom I am indebted for much information on theological matters, exclaiming in despair: "You are a terrible man! not even St. Thomas Aquinas could be a match for you!" And yet the reverend gentleman did not withdraw from me his good graces, nor I from him my admiration. What united us was greater and mightier than all that separated us; it was the figure of Jesus Christ. Though each may have believed the other so fettered to false error, that, transferred to the arena of the world, he would not have hesitated for a moment to attack him, yet, in the stillness of the cloister, where I was wont to visit the father, we always felt ourselves drawn into that condition so beautifully described by Augustine (*see* p. 75), in which everything—even the voice of the angels—is silent and only the One speaks; then we knew that we were united and with equal conviction we both confessed, "Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but His words shall not pass away."

* A. H. Total contempt now. What a wandering scholar. No principles, no final understanding that ideas are the children. One does not discuss them in the market place or even with friends. They must be invited to criticism. One did not

the national contrasts of the moment which are becoming more and more acutely felt, but also in many views and judgments which we pick up on the path of life without having any idea of their origin. Fundamentally it is a question, in fact, of two philosophies or views of existence, each of which so entirely shuts out the other that the two could not possibly exist side by side, and that it must be a struggle for life or death between them—were it not that men drift on unconsciously, like ships under full sail but without a rudder, aimlessly, heedlessly driven at the bidding of the wind. There again a remark of the sublimely great Teuton Goethe will throw light on the psychological riddle. In his *Aphorisms in Prose* he says of vitally mobile individuality, that it becomes aware of itself as "inwardly limitless, outwardly limited." That is a phrase pregnant with meaning: "outwardly limited, inwardly limitless." This expresses a fundamental law of all intellectual life. For the human individual, in fact, "outwardly limited" practically means personality, "inwardly limitless" means freedom; the same is true of a people. Now, if we follow up this thought, we shall find that the two conceptions are mutually dependent. Without the outward limitation the inner limitlessness is impossible; if, on the other hand, outward limitlessness is aimed at, the limit will have to be laid down inwardly. And this is the very formula of the neo-Roman ecclesiastical Imperium: inwardly limited, outwardly limitless. Sacrifice to me your human personality and I shall give you a share in Divinity; sacrifice to me your freedom, and I shall create an Empire which embraces the whole earth and in which order and peace shall eternally prevail; sacrifice to me your judgment and I shall reveal to you the absolute Truth; sacrifice to me Time and I

man may adopt and confess that religion which seems to him, as far as his knowledge goes, to be the true one, shall be excommunicated.⁴

A. H.
this can
be
converted!

berium, has
 is Teutonic
 y other to
 gagging of
 ies the one
 l Church is
 is doctrine
 lves felt in
 epeat, here
 te ideal of
 of human

prehended,
 hy or view
 limitless."
 outwardly,
 ag the law
 personality
 individual
 : limitless
 so forcibly
 o not need
 d chapter,
 f strictest
 unrivalled
 : be more
 the Cross,
 mitless"?
 ame truth
 ngdom of
 orms, but
 imitless?
 doctrine.
 that it is
 ve taken
 lity, that

have achieved great things. So soon as it strove to become universal, the strongest nation in the world—Rome—disappeared, and its virtues vanished with it. Everywhere it has been the same. The most vivid consciousness of race and the most constricted civic organisation were the necessary atmosphere for the immortal achievements of the Hellenes; the world-power of Alexander has only the significance of a mechanical spreading of Hellenic elements of culture. The original Persians were in poetry and religion one of the brightest, most energetic and most profoundly gifted races of history: when they had ascended the throne of a world-monarchy, their personality and with it their power disappeared. Even the Turks, when they became a great international power, lost their modest treasure of character, while their cousins, the Huns, by unscrupulously insisting upon the one sole national momentum, and by forcible fusion of their rich stock of sound German and Slavonic elements, are on the point of growing into a great nation before our eyes.

The consideration of these two points brings us to the conclusion that limitation is a general law of nature, quite as general as the striving after the Limitless. Man must go out into the Limitless—his nature imperatively demands it; to be able to do this, he must limit himself. Here the conflict of principles takes place: if we limit ourselves outwardly—in regard to race, Fatherland, personality—as strictly and resolutely as possible, then the inner kingdom of the Limitless will be opened to us, as it was to the Hellenes and the Brahman Indians; if, on the other hand, we strive after something which is unlimited—after an Absolute, an Eternal—we must build on the basis of a narrowly circumscribed inner life, otherwise success is impossible: every great Imperium proves this; it is proved by every philosophical and religious system which claims to be absolute and alone

A. 4.
 modo

which occupies more than a thousand years and only then leaves free scope for the conflict concerning the inner shaping of the State—has been portrayed by me from a more general standpoint, I have done so especially because I am keeping in view the nineteenth century. And though this is not the place to enter into details concerning that century, yet I should like at least to indicate this connection. For it would be a fatal error to suppose that the struggle was brought to an end by the wreck of the old political ideal. It is true that the opponents of universalism are no longer buried alive, nor are men burnt alive nowadays for asserting, like Hus (who followed Augustine), that Peter neither was nor is the head of the Church; Prince Bismarck, too, could issue laws and repeal laws without having actually to go to Canossa and stand there for three days before the gate in the shirt of the penitent. The old forms will never return, But the ideas of unlimited Absolutism are still very vigorous in our midst, not only within the old consecrated frame of the Roman Church, but also outside it. And wherever we see them at work—whether as Jesuitism or as Socialism, as philosophical systems or as industrial monopoly—there we must recognise (or we shall have to recognise it to our cost later) that the outwardly Unlimited demands the double sacrifice of personality and of freedom.

As regards the Church, we should indeed reveal little insight, were we in any way to depreciate the power of so wonderful an organism as the Roman hierarchy. No one can prophesy to what it may yet attain should its lucky star again be in the ascendant. When in the year 1871 the *excommunicatio major*, with all the canonical consequences attached to it, was pronounced against Döllinger, the police of Munich had to adopt special measures to protect his life; a single fact like this gives us a glimpse into abysses of fanatical univer-

A. H.
The
solution
is
absolutism
within
our
nation
provided
the
nation
is seen
as
equal
in all
major
particulars
(and elimination)
to a race.

salist delusion which might one day yawn beneath our feet in much greater dimensions.* But I should not like to lay much stress upon such things, nor upon the underhand methods of the above-mentioned conspiracy of persecuting chaplains and their creatures; it is in good not in evil that the source of all strength lies. In the idea of Catholicity, continuity, infallibility, divine appointment, all-embracing continuous revelation, God's Kingdom upon earth, the representative of God as supreme judge, every worldly career as the fulfilment of an ecclesiastical office—in all this there lies so much that is good and beautiful that honest belief in it must lend it strength. And this faith, as I think I have convincingly shown, permits no separation between Temporal and Eternal, between Worldly and Heavenly. In the very nature of this direction of will lies the Unlimited: it serves as basis to the structure which the will raises; every limitation is a disturbance, an obstruction, an evil to be overcome as soon as possible; for limitation—were it to be recognised as existing by right—could mean nothing less than the sacrifice of the idea itself. Catholic means universal, that is, an all-embracing unity. Therefore every truly orthodox, intelligent Catholic is virtually—though not actually, nor at the present day—a universalist, and that means an enemy of nations and of all individual freedom. Most of them do not

* In fact the excommunicated person is, according to Catholic Church law, an outlaw: In Gratian (*Causa* 23, p. 5, c. 47, according to Gibbon) we find the statement: *Homicidas non esse qui excommunicatos trucidant*. But in former centuries (by Decree of Urban II.) the Church had imposed penances upon the murderer of one excommunicated "in case his motive was not an absolutely pure one." Our beloved nineteenth century has, however, gone a step farther, and Cardinal Turcolemata, "the foremost supporter of Papal infallibility," has expressed in his commentary on Gratian the opinion that, according to the orthodox doctrine, the murderer of an excommunicated man does not require to do penance! (cf. Dollinger, *Briefe und Erklärungen über die vatikanischen Dekrete*, 1890, pp. 103, 131, 140).

A. H.
is told
this by
H.
"the Jews
are now
excommunicated
from our German
fold."

know this and many will indignantly deny it, but yet the fact remains; for the great, general ideas, the mathematical necessary inferences of thought and consequences of actions, are much more powerful than the individual with his goodwill and good intentions; here laws of nature prevail. Just as every schism must of necessity be followed by a further disruption into new schisms, because here the freedom of the individual is the primary cause, so every Catholicism exercises an irresistible power of integration: the individual cannot resist it any more than a piece of iron can resist the magnet. But for the great distance between Rome and Constantinople—great, having regard to the means of travel then available—the Oriental schism would never have taken place; but for the superhuman power of Luther's personality, the north of Europe would scarcely have succeeded in freeing itself from Rome. Cervantes, a faithful believer, is fond of quoting the remark, "Behind the Cross lurks the Devil." That surely is meant to indicate that the mind, once launched on this path of absolute religion, of blind belief in authority, knows no limit and brooks no obstruction. And, as a matter of fact, this very Devil has since then ruined the noble nation of Don Quixote. And when we further consider that the universalist and absolutist ideas from which the Church originated were a product of general decline, a last hope and a real safety-anchor for a raceless, chaotic human Babel (*see pp. 43, 71, 121*), we shall scarcely be able to refrain from thinking that from similar causes similar results would again ensue, and that, accordingly, in the present condition of the world, many things would tend once more to confirm the universal Church in its claims and plans. In view of this it would be only proper for those who with Goethe seek to attain "inner limitlessness" to emphasise as strongly as possible outward limitations, that is, free personality, pure race and

D. H.

D. T.

ur
ot
he
cy
od
he
p-
l's
as
an
is
it
ly
nd
ry
it
s;
il
—
ld
lf.
y-
is
ly
as
ot

ch
n)
os
he
ed
gl
as
eg
un
175

independent nations. And while Leo XIII. with perfect right (from his standpoint) refers our contemporaries to Gregory VII. and Thomas Aquinas, such men will point with equally good right to Charles the Simple and William the Conqueror, to Walther von der Vogelweide and Petrus Waldus, to that blacksmith who refused to obey the "alien" Pope, and to the great silent movement of the guilds, of the city leagues, of the secular universities, which, at the beginning of the epoch of which I speak, began to make their influence felt throughout all Europe as a first token of a new, national, anti-universal shaping of society, a new, absolutely anti-Roman culture.

In this conflict it is not merely a question of the national secular State in opposition to the universal ecclesiastical State; wherever we meet universalism there anti-nationalism and anti-individualism are its necessary correlatives. Nor does it need to be conscious universalism, it is sufficient that an idea aims at something absolute, something limitless. Thus, for example, all consistently reasoned Socialism leads to the absolute State. To call Socialists point-blank "a party dangerous to the State," as is usually done, is only to give rise to one of those confusions of which our age is so fond. Certainly Socialism signifies a danger to the individual national States, as it does, on the whole, to the principle of individualism, but it is no danger to the idea of the State. It honestly admits its internationalism; its character is revealed, however, not in disintegration, but in a wonderfully developed organisation, copied, as it were, from a machine. In both points it betrays its affinity to Rome. In fact, it represents the same Catholic idea as the Church, although it grasps it by the other end. For that reason, too, there is no room in its system for individual freedom and diversity, for personal originality. *Ce qui lie tous les socialistes, c'est la haine*

A. H.
see
P 173

de la liberté, . . . as Flaubert says.* He who tears down the outward barriers, puts up inner ones. Socialism is imperialism in disguise; it will hardly be realisable without hierarchy and Primacy; in the Catholic Church it finds a pattern of socialistic, anti-individualistic organisation. An absolutely similar movement towards the Limitless, with the same inevitable consequence of a suppression of the Individual, is encountered in the realm of great commercial and industrial undertakings. Read, for example, in the *Wirtschafts- und handelspolitische Rundschau* of 1897, the articles by R. E. May on the increase of syndicates and the consequent "international centralisation of production, as of capital" (p. 34 f.). This development in the direction of limited liability companies and colossal production by syndicates means a war to the knife against personality, which can assert itself only within narrow limits—whether it be as merchant or as manufacturer. And this movement extends from the individual person, as is evident, to the personality of nations. In a recent farce a merchant is represented as proudly exclaiming to every new-comer, "Do you know? I am transformed into a Company." If this economic tendency remained without counterpoise, the peoples could soon say of themselves, "We are transformed into an international Company." And if I may at one mighty leap spring over to a province very far remote from the economic one, to seek for further examples of the aspirations of universalism in our midst, I should like to call attention to the great Thomistic movement, which was called forth by the Papal Encyclical of the year 1879, *Aeternis Patris*, and is now of such compass that even scientific books from a certain camp have already the hardihood to declare Thomas Aquinas the greatest philosopher of all times, to tear down everything which—to the everlasting praise of humanity—

* Correspondence iii. 269.

A. H.
The only
question
is how
this
should
all
take
place
and
who
will
lead it.

viously it is always the same principle : allow your hands and feet to be fettered and you will see miracles ! Hang up before your eyes definite dogmas (which were decreed in the centuries of mankind's deepest humiliation by vote of majority, by bishops, many of whom could neither read nor write) and presuppose, in addition, that the first groping efforts of a brilliant, but, as has been proved, very one-sided Hellenic systematiser express the eternal, absolute and complete truth, and I shall give you a universal system ! That is an attack, a dangerous attack upon the innermost freedom of man ! Far from being inwardly limitless, as Goethe wished, he has now had two narrow bonds forged around his soul and his brain by an alien hand, that is the price which we have to pay for "universal knowledge." In any case, long before Leo XIII. issued his Encyclical, a universal system resting on similar principles had grown out of the Protestant Church, that of Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel. A Protestant Thomas Aquinas : that tells us everything. And yet there had been an Immanuel Kant, the Luther of philosophy, the destroyer of spurious knowledge, the annihilator of all systems, who had pointed out to us "the limits of our thinking power" and warned us "never to venture with speculative reason beyond the boundary of experience" ; but, after assigning to us such strict and definite outward limits, he had thrown open, as no philosopher had done before him, the doors to the inner world of the Limitless and thus revealed to us the home of the free man.*

* More details regarding Thomas Aquinas and Kant in the section on "Philosophy" in the following chapter. For the sake of completeness it may be mentioned that we have a Jewish as well as a Protestant Thomas Aquinas, namely, Spinoza, the maker of a universal system, the "renewer of the old Hebraic Cabbala" (i.e., of the magic secret doctrine), as Leibniz calls him. Spinoza has this also in common with the other two, that he has not enriched with a single creative thought either mathematics, his special province, or science, his hobby.

A. 14.
This is
what the
Catholics
do. I
shall
give the
people
truths
and
dogmas
which
will
open
their
eyes
to great
sublime
and
heroic
achievement

LIMITATION BASED ON PRINCIPLE

These cursory indications are merely intended to show in how many provinces the struggle between individualism and anti-individualism, nationalism and anti-nationalism (internationalism is another word for the same thing), freedom and non-freedom is still raging and will probably rage for ever. In the second book (not yet published) I shall have to enter more fully, in as far as they affect the present, into themes scarcely touched upon here. But I should not like in the meantime to be considered a pessimist. Seldom have the consciousness of race, national feeling, and suspicious safe-guarding of the rights of personality been so active and vigorous as in our time; a phase of feeling is passing over the nations at the close of the nineteenth century which reminds one of the dull cry of the hunted animal, when the noble creature at bay suddenly turns, determined to fight for its life. And in our case resolution means victory. For the great attractiveness of every Universalist idea is due to the weakness of men; the strong man turns from it and finds in his own breast, in his own family, in his own people, the Limitless, which he would not surrender for the whole cosmos with its countless stars. Goethe, from whom I derived the leading idea of this chapter, has in another passage beautifully expressed how the Limitless, the Catholic Absolute, is in consonance with a sluggish disposition:

Im Grenzenlosen sich zu finden,
Wird gern der Einzelne verschwinden,
Da lös't sich aller Überdruß:
Statt heissem Wünschen, wildem Wollen,
Statt last'gem Fordern, strengem Sollen,
Sich aufzugeben ist Genuss.*

* Man is but too ready to pass out of sight and take refuge in the limitless, where all trouble is at an end. No more fervent wishing, no

Now from generations than to sur-
conscious ma-
art, all this
did not exist
thirteenth c-
spheres, this
manding" o
heaven, rath-
dark centuri-
the "fervent
Our Teutonic
faith—not ec-
lovingly thro
which tell us
us most is the
sense of duty
every one y
Charlemagne,
in laborious
smith who re
Rome, everyw
men know w
But they knev
beginning of a

more wild willing
I shall." To yiel-

* I cannot refr-
remark of Richar-
wish, then we sha
quite surely to wh
clear and consci-
condition in which
one which we des-
for that reason it
it incapable, becau
you? Can you tl
and therefore atta

Goebbels
to A.H.?

A. H.
By focusing
upon the
German
race, I
will do
Goethe.
will attract
the weak
who need
the vigorous
and I
will inspire
the strong
man.

wild willing

A. H.
this will be
the last part of
every speech

PRINCIPLE

ely intended to show
between individual-
ism and anti-national-
ism (for the same thing),
and will probably
(not yet published)
as far as they affect
touched upon here.
ie to be considered a
sciousness of race,
life-guarding of the
and vigorous as in
ng over the nations
which reminds one
al, when the noble
rmined to fight for
on means victory.
y Universalist idea
strong man turns
in his own family,
hich he would not
its countless stars.
ading idea of this
utifully expressed
te, is in consonance

inden,

a Wollen,
a Sonen,

and take refuge in the
ore fervent wishing, no

He
will be
not
I speak
we.

Now from these nation-building Teutons of former generations we can learn that there is a higher enjoyment than to surrender, and that is, to assert ourselves. A conscious national policy, economic movements, science, art, all this scarcely existed in the olden time, or even did not exist at all; but what we see dawning about the thirteenth century, this vividly throbbing life in all spheres, this creative power, this "importunate demanding" of individual freedom, had not fallen from heaven, rather had the seed been sown in the previous dark centuries: the "wild willing" had tilled the soil, the "fervent wishing" had tended the delicate blooms. Our Teutonic culture is a result of toil and pain and faith—not ecclesiastical, but religious faith. If we go lovingly through those annals of our ancient forbears, which tell us so little and yet so much, what will strike us most is the almost incredible strength of the developed sense of duty; for the worst cause, as for the best, every one yields up his life unquestioningly. From Charlemagne, who after over-busy days spends his night in laborious writing exercises, to that splendid blacksmith who refused to forge fetters for the opponent of Rome, everywhere we find "the stern Shall." Did these men know what they wanted? I scarcely think so. But they knew what they did not want, and that is the beginning of all practical wisdom.* Thus Charlemagne,

more wild willing, no more importunate demanding! no more stern 'shall.'" To yield is joy!

* I cannot refrain from quoting here an infinitely profound political remark of Richard Wagner: "We need only know what we do not wish, then we shall with the spontaneous necessity of nature attain quite surely to what we do wish, and the latter only becomes perfectly clear and conscious to ourselves when we have attained it: for the condition in which we have put aside what we do not wish is just the one which we desired to reach. It is thus that the people acts, and for that reason it acts in the only right way. You, however, consider it incapable, because it does not know what it wants: but what know you? Can you think and comprehend anything but what is present and therefore attained? You could imagine it, arbitrarily fancy it,

A. 14
+ J. G.

for example, indulged many a childish illusion in regard to what he wished, and committed many a fatal error; but in what he did not wish he always hit the nail on the head: no interference on the part of the Pope, no worshipping of images, no granting of privileges to the nobility, &c. In his willing Charles was in many ways a universalist and absolutist, in his non-willing he proved himself a Teuton. Exactly the same attracted us in the case of Dante (p. 144 f.): his political idea of the future was a cobweb of the brain, his energetic rejection of all temporal claims of the Church a benefit of far-reaching influence.

And so we see that here, in the State, as in all human things, everything depends on the fundamental characteristics of the mental attitude, not on cognition. The mental attitude (*Gesinnung**) is the rudder, it decides the direction and with the direction the goal—even though this should long remain invisible. The conflict in the State was now, as I hope I have shown, in the very first place such a struggle between two directions, i.e., between the steersmen. As soon as the one had finally grasped the rudder firmly, the further development towards greater and greater freedom, more and more distinct nationalism and individualism, was natural and inevitable—just as inevitable as the contrary development of Caesarism and Papacy towards ever more restricted freedom.

Nothing is absolute in the world; even freedom and non-freedom denote only two directions, and neither the individual nor the nation can stand alone and perfectly independent; they surely belong to a whole, in which

but not know it. Only what the people has achieved can you know, till then may you be satisfied with recognising clearly what you do not want, denying what should rightly be denied, destroying what should be destroyed" (*Nachgelassene Schriften*, 1895, p. 118).

* The root of *Sinn* denotes a journey, a way, a going; *Gesinnung* therefore means a direction in which a man moves.

A. H.
puts it
up on
the wall
when in
Landsberg.

every un
that ever
came int
signed on
—the dir
sentative
of the d
hastened
communic
hand kept
was bound
enter into

I CENTURY

ght the genius
culture, if we
it is a definite
sical and moral
less Teutonic
o at the present
s from fog into
e most refined
ni-barbarism—
Yet Italy has
ocus of highly
prove this by
d demeanour;
dence that has
ain, but rather
regarded from
ch we occupy
lifferent ideals.
it went ahead
is on the road
its midst ele-
ly thoroughly
had already
olute sterility,
pure Teutonic
he Goths, the
the whole land
nd the south,
because they,
a caste apart,
p. 538, vol. i.)
f the Teutons
upulation until
centuries, in
ing of the fif-
erably to the

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 189

difficulty of fusion. "Thus these various Teutonic tribes," as Savigny points out, "lived with the main stock of the population (the remnant of the Roman Chaos of Peoples) locally mingling, but differing in customs and rights." Here, where the uncultured Teuton, by constant contact with a higher culture, first awoke to the consciousness of himself, many a movement first found the volcanic fire that burst into the formation of a new world: learning and industry, the obstinate assertion of civic rights, the early bloom of Teutonic art. The northern third of Italy—from Verona to Siena—resembles in its peculiar development a Germany whose Emperor might have lived on the other side of the high mountains. Everywhere German counts had taken the place of Roman provincial governors, and it was always only for a short time, till he was hastily called away, that a King resided in the land, while a jealous rival King, the Pope, was near at hand and ever rejoicing in intrigues. In this way the old Germanic tendency to form self-ruling cities, which is in the main an Indo-European characteristic, was able at an early period to develop in Northern Italy and become the ruling power in the land. The extreme north led the way; but Tuscany soon followed suit and profited by the Hundred Years War between Pope and Emperor to wrest the inheritance of Mathilda from both and to give to the world, in addition to a Pleiad of ever memorable cities, in which Petrarch, Ariosto, Mantegna, Correggio, Galilei and other immortals arose, the crown of all cities, Florence—formerly the townlet of a margrave, which was soon to represent the essence of anti-Roman, creative individualism—to be the birthplace of Dante and Giotto, of Donatello, Leonardo and Michael Angelo—the mother of the arts, from whose breast all the great men, even those who were born at a distance, even a Raphael, first drew the nurture of perfection.

↑↑↑ Doubtless, the area of a human being (w- far as it can think and perceive) begins to be inferior to the heart

D. H. *

→ belief that it is independent of the whole. ↑↑↑

* This will be our route to power. Awaken the pride of each city—arouse in them the belief that they are self-ruling. One cannot rule without a...

ENTURY

d adorn her-
e of the men
to the Papal
us awakened
; metropolis,
'ears' history
mmeasurable
power. This
alles-lettrists,
rary hobbies,
f something
leaving the
art, at the
oceans from
d shrunk in
al to human
tery of the
this a Re-
and least of
unscientific
rom out the
al, national
ion pattern;
in work and
eaceful uni-
ses of obser-
s of nature;
contrast to
is Aquinas;
in contrast
om of faith

time a new
I must dis-
; it would
any words

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 191

that the *rinascimento* of free Teutonic individuality began in Italy; rather might it be said that the first imperishable blossoms of its culture made their appearance there; but I wanted to call attention to the fact that even here in the south, at the doors of Rome, the sudden outburst of civic independence, industrial activity, scientific earnestness, and artistic creative power was through and through Teutonic, and in that sense anti-Roman. A glance at that age (to which I shall recur) proves it, a glance at the present age equally so. In the meantime, two circumstances have led to a progressive decrease of the Teutonic blood in Italy: on the one hand, the unhampered fusion with the ignoble mixed population, on the other, the destruction of the Teutonic nobility in never-ending civil wars, in the conflicts between cities, in the blood-feuds and other outbursts of wild passion. We need only read the history of one of these cities, for example, Perugia, which in the upper ranks of its society was almost completely Gothic-Langobardic! It is scarcely comprehensible how with such ceaseless slaughter of whole families (which began as soon as the city became independent), single branches still retained something of their genuinely Teutonic character until well into the sixteenth century; after that the Teutonic blood was exhausted.* It is evident that the hastily acquired culture, the violent assimilation of an essentially foreign civilisation, the sudden revelation, moreover, of Hellenism which was in sharpest contrast to them yet mentally akin, perhaps too, the incipient fusion with a blood which was poison to Teutons . . . it is evident that all these things had not merely conduced to a miraculous outburst of

A, it is
excited.
He had
never,
realized
before
how
great
loss
the
German
race.
Gothic,
yes, but
not so
great
as the
loss
created
the
Renaissance

* Goethe's unerring eye has perceived the race-relations here; of the Italian Renaissance he says: "It was as if the children of God had wedded the daughters of men," and he calls Pietro Perugino "an honest German soul" (*Ital. Reise*, 18/10/86 and 19/10/86).

of the order, let us say, by its admirer, Buss—will no longer wonder at the sudden disappearance of all genius, that is to say, of everything Teutonic. Raphael had still had the boldness to raise in the middle of the Vatican (in the "Disputa") an immortal monument to Savonarola, whom he fervently admired: Ignatius, on the other hand, forbade even the mention of the Tuscan's name.* Who could live in Italy to-day and move among its amiable, highly gifted inhabitants without feeling with pain that here a nation was lost and lost beyond all hope, because the inner impelling force, the greatness of soul, that would correspond to their talent are lacking? As a matter of fact, Race alone confers this force. Italy possessed it, so long as it possessed Teutons; yes, even to-day its population reveals, in those parts where Celts, Germans and Normans formerly were specially numerous, the thoroughly Teutonic industry, and gives birth to men who strive with the energy of despair to unite the country and guide it on to glorious paths: Cavour, the founder of the new Kingdom, was born in the extreme north; Crispi, who knew how to steer it past cliffs of danger, in the extreme south. But how can a people be again raised up, when the fountain of its strength has run dry? And what does it signify when a Giacomo Leopardi calls his people a "degenerate race" and holds up to them the example of their ancestors?† The ancestors of the great majority of the

* Raphael's enthusiastic admiration for Savonarola, for his master Perugino, and his friend Bartolomeo (see Eug. Müntz: *Raphael*, 1881, p. 133) is almost of as much importance in fixing the race of these men as the fact that Michael Angelo never mentioned the Madonna, and only once in jest mentioned a Saint, so that one of the greatest authorities on him could call him "an unconscious Protestant." In one of his sonnets Michael Angelo warns the Saviour not to come to Rome in person, where a trade is carried on in His divine blood.

E'l sangue di Cristo si vend' a giunelle

and where the priests would flay him to sell his skin.

† Cf. the two Sonnets: *All' Italia* and *Sopra il monumento di Dante*.

A, H.
He will
give
greatness
of soul
to all
true
Germans.

URY

univer-

lities of
of their
indaries
parative
degrees
groups
leutons,
atigable
eir part
n of the

r of the
sight of
er. For
soon as
, a pro-
ave the
is. For
hised to
that it
al to us
no such
all these
lyically
value as
for the
present
a "de-
to begin

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 201

with, exists only in the imagination of the thinker, is not presented by experience and should consequently be submitted to a metaphysical forum to be tested in regard to its admissibility. But even if this question of the descent of men and their relationship to one another were to leave the realm of phrases and enter that of the empirically demonstrable, it would hardly help us in forming our judgment of history; for every explanation by causes implicates a *regressus in infinitum*; it is like the unrolling of a map; we go on seeing something new—something new that belongs to that which is old—and even though the consequent widening of our sphere of observation may contribute to the enriching of our mind, still each individual fact remains as before, just what it was, and it is very doubtful whether our judgment is rendered essentially more acute by the knowledge of a more comprehensive connection—indeed, the reverse is just as possible. "Experience is boundless, because something new may always be discovered," as Goethe remarks in his criticism of Bacon of Verulam and the so-called inductive method; on the other hand, the essence and purpose of judgment is limitation. Excellence in judgment depends upon acuteness, not upon compass; the exactitude of what the eye sees will always be more important than its extent; hence too the inner justification of the more modern methods of historical research, according to which explanatory, philosophising, general expositions are abandoned in favour of painfully minute investigation of individual facts. Of course, as soon as the science of history loses itself in endless data, all that it accomplishes is to "shovel observations backwards and forwards" (as Justus Liebig says in righteous indignation at certain inductive methods of investigation); * yet, on the other hand, it is certain that the accurate knowledge of a single case is more

* Reden und Abhandlungen, 1874, p. 248.

A. H.
Jewell
use
this
phrase

A.H.
 the most
 delightful
 in this
 phase

valuable thing which we possess, our originality, that is to say, the sincerity of our own nature. Roman Law, which was proclaimed as a classical dogma, became in the sphere of public life the source of shocking violence and loss of freedom. I do not mean to say that this law is not, even at the present day, a model of juristical technique, the eternal high school of jurisprudence (*see* vol. i. p. 148 f.); but the fact that it was forced upon us Teutons as a dogma was obviously a great misfortune for our historical development; for not only did it not suit our conditions, it was something dead, misunderstood, an organism the former living significance of which was only revealed after the lapse of centuries in our own days by the most searching study of Roman History: before we could really understand what his intellect had constructed, we had to call the Roman himself from the grave. The same thing happened in every sphere. Not only in philosophy were we to be handmaids (*ancilla*), namely, of Aristotle (*see* vol. ii. p. 178), but the law of slavery was also introduced into the whole realm of thought and creative activity. It was only in the industrial and economic spheres that vigorous progress was made, for here there was no classical dogma to retard; even natural science and the discovery of the world had a strenuous conflict to wage—all intellectual sciences, Poetry and Art as well, a more strenuous one still—a conflict which has not even yet been fought out to a perfectly successful issue, which would leave us absolutely unfettered. It is certainly not a mere accident that by far the greatest poet of the epoch of the so-called Renaissance, Shakespeare, and the most powerful sculptor, Michael Angelo, understood none of the ancient languages; just consider in what mighty independence a Dante would have stood before us, had he not borrowed his hell from Virgil and welded together his ideals of State from the spurious law of Constantinople and the *Civitas Dei* of Augustine!

at is to
 , which
 sphere
 loss of
 t, even
 ie, the
 48 f.);
 dogma
 al de-
 itions,
 am the
 vealed
 y the
 re we
 con-
 grave.
 ily in
 mely,
 avery
 t and
 and
 e, for
 atural
 uous
 and
 which
 cess-
 ered.
 atest
 ake-
 gelo,
 con-
 have
 'irgil
 ious
 ine !

And why was it that this contact with past cultures, which should have brought unmixed blessing, became in many ways a curse? It was simply because we did not, and alas! do not even yet, comprehend the individuality of every manifestation of culture! The Tuscan æsthetes, for example, lauded the Greek tragedy as the eternal paragon of the drama, and did not perceive that not only are the conditions of our life very different from those of Attica, but that our gifts, our whole personality, with its light and shade, are absolutely distinct; hence it was that these would-be renewers of Hellenic culture produced all sorts of monstrosities and crushed the Italian drama in the bud. By this they only showed their utter ignorance both of Teutonism and of Hellenism. For what we should have learned from Hellenism was the significance for life of an art that had developed organically, and the significance for art of the unimpaired free personality; we took from it the very opposite, ready-made mechanical patterns and the despotism of false æsthetics. For it is only the conscious, free individual that can rise to the comprehension of the incomparableness of other individualities. The bungler fancies that every one is capable of all things; he does not understand that imitation is the most shameless stupidity. It was from such blundering misconceptions that the idea of fastening on to Greece and Rome, and of continuing their work, originated—an idea which—as we should be careful to remember—gives proof of an almost ridiculous underestimation of the achievements of these great nations while at the same time it shows a complete failure to realise our Teutonic strength and individuality.

A. H.
 I am
 that
 individual.

TURY

definite
of equili-
ore com-
sidered
one nor
This,
Herbert
ythmic
ilibrium
eivable
he dia-
ght an
t clever
, would
re, the
of our
wever,
nning
every

istory
! Dar-
of his
led in
ative
know
ause
lems
ophy

is the
pable
at is,

two

r the
leem

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 217

of evolution; but the struggle so manifestly steels existing powers, draws out physical and mental gifts and develops them by exercise (even old Homer teaches our children this lesson), that I will not dispute the fact at present. Fiske goes on to say: "It is the wholesale destruction of life, which has heretofore characterised evolution ever since life began, through which the higher forms of organic existence have been produced" (p. 95 f.); very well, we will admit it. But what about progress? Logically we should presuppose that it consisted in increase of wholesale murder, or were at least dependent upon it—a view which could reasonably be advanced on the strength of some phenomena of our time. But this is very wide of the mark! Fiske has a great advantage over such homely logic, for he knows not only the "origin" but also the "destiny" of man. He informs us that, "as evolution advances, the struggle for existence ceases to be a determining factor . . . this elimination of strife is a fact of utterly unparalleled grandeur; words cannot do justice to such a fact." This celestial peace is now the goal of progress, indeed it is progress itself. For Fiske, who is a very clever man, feels rightly that nobody has hitherto known the meaning of this talismanic word "progress"—now we do know. "At length," says Fiske, "at length we see what human progress means." I am afraid I must beg to differ. For what is to become of our soul, which we acquired with such honest pains? We were just informed that the struggle for existence had "produced" the soul: will it henceforth arise without a cause? And even supposing that the hobby-horse of heredity should kindly take it upon its Centaur back and carry it a stage farther, would the sensation of the struggle not lead, according to orthodox Darwinism, to the degeneration of the object produced,* so that our soul, as a mere

* Origin c. xiv.; Animals and Plants c. xxiv:

*P. H.
Leaves
out
the
dotted
line.
Never
reads
it. His
mind is
off at
express
the in
speed.
Only
murder,
mass
murder
will
produce
the
world
we
enjoy.*

ourselves, surrounded and at many points saturated to the core by incongruous elements, which tear down what we construct and estrange us from our own true nature. In Greece a national individuality had after a stern struggle fought its way to the daylight; in our case all is still ferment; the highest manifestations of our intellectual life stand side by side isolated, regarding each other with almost hostile eyes, and it will only be after hard work that we shall succeed as a united whole in reaching that stage upon which Hellenic, Roman, Indian and Egyptian cultures once stood.

*I will
bring
the
greatness
of Germany
to that
stage.*

HISTORICAL CRITERION

If we then free ourselves from the delusion of a progressive or retrogressive humanity, and content ourselves with the realisation of the fact that our culture is specifically North-European, *i.e.*, Teutonic, we shall at once gain a sure standard by which to judge our own past and our present, and at the same time a very useful standard to apply to a future which has yet to come. For nothing Individual is limitless. So long as we regard ourselves as the responsible representatives of all humanity, the more clear-seeing minds must be driven to despair by our poverty and obvious incapacity to pave the way for a golden age; at the same time, however, all shallow-brained phrase-makers turn us from those earnest aims which we might attain, and undermine what I should like to call historical morality, in that, shutting their eyes, blind to our universal limitation, and totally failing to realise the value of our specific talents, they dangle before our eyes the Impossible, the Absolute: natural rights, eternal peace, universal brotherhood, mutual fusion, &c. But if we know that we Northern Europeans are a definite individuality, responsible, not for humanity, but certainly for our own personality, we shall love and value

NTURY

ted to the
1 what we
ture. In
n struggle
all is still
ntellectual
rther with
ard work
reaching
dian and

of a pro-
ourselves
is specifi-
once gain
t and our
ndard to
r nothing
rselves as
the more
by our
ay for a
shallow-
est aims
ould like
eir eyes,
ailing to
le before
l rights,
sion, &c.
is are a
nity, but
nd value

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 223

our work as something individual, we shall recognise the fact that it is by no means complete, but still very defective, and, above all, far from being sufficiently independent; no vision of an "absolute" perfection will mislead us, but we shall, as Shakespeare wished, remain true to ourselves, and be satisfied with doing our very best within the limits of the Teuton's power of achievement; we shall deliberately defend ourselves against the un-Teutonic, and seek not only to extend our empire farther and farther over the surface of the globe and over the powers of nature, but above all unconditionally to subject the inner world to ourselves by mercilessly overthrowing and excluding those who are alien to us, and who, nevertheless, would fain gain the mastery over our thought. It is often said that politics can know no scruples; nothing at all can know scruples; scruples are a crime against self. Scruple is the soldier who, in the battle takes to his heels, presenting his back as a target to the enemy. The most sacred duty of the Teuton is to serve the Teutonic cause. This fact supplies us with an historical standard of measurement. In all spheres that man and that deed will be glorified as greatest and most important which most successfully advance specific Teutonism or have most vigorously supported its supremacy. Thus and thus only do we acquire a limiting, organising, absolutely positive principle of judgment. To refer to a well-known instance; why is it that, in spite of the admiration which his genius inspires, the personality of the great Byron has something repulsive in it for every thorough Teuton? Treitschke has answered this question in his brilliant essay on Byron: it is "because nowhere in this rich life do we encounter the idea of duty." That is an unsympathetic, un-Teutonic feature. On the other hand, we do not object in the least to his love-affairs; in them we rather see a proof of genuine race; and we observe with satisfaction that Byron—in contrast to Virgil, Juvenal,

*A. H.
suffer this.*

Lucian and their modern imitators—was in truth licentious, but not frivolous. Towards women he is gallant. This we welcome as Teutonic. In politics also this point of view will prove valid. We shall praise, for example, princes, when they oppose the claims of Rome—not because we are carried away by any dogmatically religious prejudice, but because we see in every rejection of international imperialism a furtherance of Teutonism; we shall blame them when they proceed to regard themselves as absolute rulers appointed by the grace of God, for by this they reveal themselves as plagiarists of the wretched Chaos of Peoples, and destroy the old Teutonic law of freedom, thus fettering at the same time the best powers of the people. In many cases, it is true, the situation is a very complicated one, but there, too, the same ruling principle clears everything up. Thus, for example, Louis XIV. by his shameful persecution of the Protestants brought about the subsequent decline of France. This was an act of incalculably far-reaching consequence for the anti-Teutonic cause, and he accomplished it in his capacity as a pupil of the Jesuits, who had brought him up in such crass ignorance that he could not even write his own language correctly, and knew nothing of history.* And yet this ruler proved himself in many respect a thorough Teuton; for example, in his courageous defence of the distinct rights and fundamental independence of the Gallican Church in opposition to the arrogant claims of Rome—there has seldom, I think, been a Catholic King who on every occasion paid so little regard to the person of the Pope; and another proof is his great organising activity.† One might also cite Frederick the Great of

* Cf. Letter xv. in the correspondence between Voltaire and Frederick the Great.

† It always gives me satisfaction to read again Buckle's philippics against Louis XIV. (*Civilisation* ii. 4) but Voltaire (to whom Buckle refers) gives a much fairer picture in his *Siècle de Louis XIV.* (See especially chap. xxix: on the King's power of work, his knowledge of men and organising ability).

Prussia, who could not safeguard the interests of all Teutonism in Central Europe except as an absolutely autocratic military leader and statesman, but withal was so thoroughly liberal in his sentiments that many an advocate of the French Revolution might well have taken a lesson from this monarch. At the same time another political example of the value of this cardinal principle occurs to me: he who regards the development and prosperity of Teutonism as the decisive criterion will not be long in doubt which document deserves most admiration, the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme* or the *Declaration of Independence* of the United States of North America. I shall return to this point again. In other spheres than that of politics the conception of the individual nature of the Teutonic spirit proves equally valid. The daring exploration of the earth not only gave new scope for a spirit of enterprise such as no other race ever possessed or yet possesses, but also cleared our minds of the close atmosphere of the Classical libraries and restored them to themselves; when Copernicus tore down the firmament of Heaven that had hemmed us in, and with it the Heaven of the Egyptians which had passed over into Christianity, immediately the Heaven of the Teuton stood revealed: "men have at all times and in all places thought that the heavens were many hundreds of thousands of miles from this earth . . . but the true Heaven is everywhere, even in the place where you stand and walk." (*) Printing was used first of all to disseminate the Gospel and to oppose the anti-Teutonic theocracy. And so on, *ad infinitum*.

INNER CONTRASTS

There is yet a word to be said, and one of great importance, if we would clearly recognise and distinguish what is thoroughly Teutonic. In the matters which I have

(*) Jacob Böhme: *Aurora* 19.

A. H.
Lester this
about
universal
... his
G...
to women
Sch...
(1937)

Goering
(1937)

ilippica
Buckle
V. (See
ledge of

just mentioned, as in a thousand others, we discover everywhere that specific characteristic of the Teuton, the close association—as though they were twin brothers, walking hand in hand—of the Practical and the Ideal (see vol. i. p. 550). At all points we shall encounter similar contradictions in the Teuton, and shall learn to value them equally highly. For when we realise that we have to deal with something individual, we shall, in forming our judgment, refrain above all from taking into consideration the logical notions of abstract theories about Good and Evil, Higher and Lower, and direct our attention simply to the individuality; but an individuality is always best recognised from its inner contrasts; where it is uniform, it is also without shape, without individuality. Thus, for example, the Teutons are characterised by a power of expansion possessed by no race before them, and at the same time by an inclination to concentration which is equally new.

We see the expansive power at work—in the practical sphere, in the gradual colonisation of the whole surface of the globe;—in the scientific sphere, in the revelation of the infinite Cosmos, in the search for ever remoter causes;—in the ideal sphere, in the conception of the Transcendent, in the boldness of hypotheses, and in sublime artistic flights which lead to more and more comprehensive means of expression. At the same time, however, we are inclined to return within more and more narrowly circumscribed limits, carefully cut off from everything external by ramparts and trenches; we return to the idea of blood-relationships of the Fatherland, of the native district,* of the village of our birth, of the inviolable home (my home is my castle, as in Rome), of the closest family circle; finally we return to the innermost central point of the individual, who now, purified and elevated to consciousness of absolute isolation, faces the outer world as an

* Beautifully described by Jacob Grimm in his Memoirs, where he tells how the inhabitants of Hessen-Nassau "look down with a kind of contempt" upon those of Hessen-Darmstadt.

r-
ie
ig
1.
a-
m
al
g-
he
nil,
to
og-
lso,
ple,
ion
age
ew.
ical
e of
the
-in
t, in
ghts
s of
ined
ibed
l by
and-
,* of
home
rcle ;
f the
ious-
is an
ere he
kind of

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 227

invisible, independent being, a supreme lord of freedom, as was the case with the Indians; this is that concentration which in other spheres reveals itself as division of countries into small Principalities, as limitation to a special "field," whether in science or industry, as inclination to form sects and schools as in Greece, as poetical effects of the innermost nature, *e.g.*, the woodcut, engraving, chamber music. In character these contrasted qualities which are held in coherence by the higher individuality of the race, signify a spirit of enterprise allied to conscientiousness, or they lead—if misguided—to speculation (on the Stock Exchange or in philosophy, it is all the same), to narrow-minded pedantry and pusillanimity.

I cannot on this occasion be expected to attempt an exhaustive description of Teutonic individuality; everything individual—however manifest and recognisable beyond all doubt it may be—is inexhaustible. As Goethe says, "Words cannot clearly reveal the Best," and if personality is the highest gift which we children of earth receive, then truly the individuality of our definite race is one of those "best" things. It alone carries along all separate personalities, as the ship is borne by the flood, and without it (or when this flood is too shallow easily to float anything great) even the strongest character must lie helpless and impotent, like a barque stranded and capsized. Already in the sixth chapter, with a view to stimulate interest, I have mentioned some characteristics of the Teuton; in the second part of this chapter many others will reveal themselves, but here, too, my sole object will be to stimulate, to impel the reader to open his eyes and see for himself.

THE TEUTONIC WORLD

It is the clear realisation of what the Teutons have achieved that will prove instructive. This is, I think, the task that remains for me to accomplish in this chapter. To discuss the gradual "Rise of a New World" means, for me, to describe the gradual rise of the Teutonic world. But the most important portion of the task has, in my opinion, been already accomplished by the enunciation and verification of this great central proposition that the new world is a specifically Teutonic world. In fact, I consider that this view is so important and so decisive for all comprehension of the Past, the Present and the Future, that I shall once more for the last time summarise the facts.

The civilisation and culture, which, radiating from Northern Europe, to-day dominate (though in very varying degrees) a considerable part of the world, are the work of Teutonism; what is not Teutonic consists either of alien elements not yet exorcised, which were formerly forcibly introduced and still, like baneful germs, circulate in the blood, or of alien wares sailing, to the disadvantage of our work and further development, under the Teutonic flag, under Teutonic protection and privilege, and they will continue to sail thus, until we send these pirate ships to the bottom. This work of Teutonism is beyond question the greatest that has hitherto been accomplished by man. It was achieved, not by the delusion of a "humanity," but by sound, selfish power, not by belief in authority, but by free investigation, not by contentedness with little, but by insatiable ravenous hunger. As the youngest of races, we Teutons could profit by the achievements of former ones; but this is no proof of a universal progress of humanity, but solely of the pre-eminent capabilities of a definite human species, capabilities which

A. H.
gives
assent

A. H.
Hear hear!

have
 ik, the
 apter.
 means,
 world.
 in my
 ciation
 at the
 , I con-
 for all
 Future,
 ise the

g from
 y vary-
 ie work
 ither of
 ormerly
 irculate
 vantage
 eutonic
 id they
 e ships
 beyond
 ublished
 on of a
 belief in
 tedness
 As the
 achieve-
 niversal
 eminent
 is which

have been proved to be gradually weakened by influx of non-Teutonic blood, or even (as in Austria) of anti-Teutonic principles. No one can prove that the predominance of Teutonism is a fortunate thing for all the inhabitants of the earth; from the earliest times down to the present day we see the Teutons, to make room for themselves, slaughtering whole tribes and races, or slowly killing them by systematic demoralisation. That the Teutons with their virtues alone and without their vices—such as greed, cruelty, treachery, disregard of all rights but their own right to rule (vol. i. p. 541), &c.—would have won the victory, no one will have the audacity to assert, but every one must admit that in the very places where they were most cruel—as, for instance, the Anglo-Saxons in England, the German Order in Prussia, the French and English in North America—they laid by this very means the surest foundation of what is highest and most moral.

Armed with this various store of knowledge, all flowing from one central fact, we are now, I think, in a position, with understanding and without prejudice, to regard the work of the Teutons, and to observe how, from about the twelfth century, when it began to assume definite form as isolated endeavour, it has gone on developing to the present day with unflagging zeal; we may even hope, by the irrefutability of our standpoint, to be able to some extent to surmount our greatest disadvantage, namely, the fact that we are still in the midst of a development of which we consequently only see a fragment. But my work keeps the nineteenth century alone in view. God willing, I shall at some later time not indeed describe this century in full detail, but examine and test with some thoroughness its collective achievement; in the meantime I am seeking in this book to discover in their essential outlines the Foundations of the achievements and aspirations of our nineteenth century. That and nothing more. I cannot possibly think of sketching, even in outline, the

A. H.
 Hear! Hear!
 Ht and
 A. H.
 uses.
 this is
 decisively
 in his
 people.

conditions of culture are high, it is frequently a very simple affair, as, for example, in the earliest days in India; often it develops to extreme complexity, as in ancient Babylon and among us Teutons. This element forms the centre of all civilisation; its influence extends upwards as well as downwards, and stamps its character upon all manifestations of social life. Certainly discoveries, science and industry contribute mightily to the shaping of the economic conditions of life, but they themselves both draw the possibility of their rise and continuance from the economic organism and are furthered or hindered by it. Thus it is that the nature, direction and tendency of a definite economic system can exercise upon the collective life of the people a stimulating influence of unparalleled greatness, or may paralyse it for ever. All politics—our dogmatic friends may say what they like—are based finally upon economic conditions: politics, however, are the visible body, economic conditions the unseen ramification of veins. This changes but slowly, but if it has once changed—if the blood circulates more sluggishly than formerly, or if, on the contrary, it begets new anastomoses and brings new vigour to every limb—then politics too must follow suit, whether they will or not. However much appearances may deceive us, a civic community never springs into prosperity because of, but in spite of its politics: politics alone can never offer to a civic community a perpetual guarantee of vigour—for proof look to later Rome and Byzantium. England is supposed to be the political nation above all others, but if we look more closely we shall find that all this political mechanism is intended to fetter the specifically political power, and to give free rein to the other unpolitical, living forces, especially the economic: *Magna Charta* itself denotes the annihilation of political justice in favour of free jurisdiction. All politics are in their essence merely

7.
 21.
 22.
 23.

perfect example of super-refined arbitrariness. For here it is not merely a question of the relations between man and man; the organising tendency of society lays its grip upon the inner personality of the individual and prevents him even there—as far as it can—from obeying the necessity of his nature; for it forces upon him as Law an arbitrarily established, minutely defined confession of Faith and, in addition, a fixed ceremonial for the lifting up of his heart and soul to God. To prove the need for Churches would be to carry owls to Athens, but this will not shake our conviction that we have here laid our finger upon the sorest spot of all politics, upon the spot where they reveal their most perilous side. In other ways politics might commit many really criminal mistakes, but in this respect there is very great temptation to commit the most serious of all crimes, the real “sin against the Holy Spirit,” I mean, Violence to the inner man, the robbery of personality. My next group I have entitled “*Weltanschauung*” * (perception of the problems of life) not “Philosophy,” for this Greek word (loving wisdom) is a miserably pale and cold vocable, and here we require above all colour and warmth. Wisdom! What is wisdom? I hope I shall not be compelled to quote Socrates and the Pythian priestess to justify my rejection of a Greek word. The German language has here, as it frequently has, infinite depth. ^{Goulds} it feeds us with good thoughts which are bountifully provided, like the mother's milk for the child. *Welt* meant originally not the earth, not the Cosmos, but mankind.† Though the eye roam through space, though thought may follow it like the elves who

* There is no equivalent in English. “Personal philosophy” comes nearest to it: one might almost paraphrase the word as “way of looking at life's problems.” The author's meaning is sufficiently clear from the context. Elsewhere I have rendered the word by the very comprehensive English term “philosophy.”

† A collective noun formed from *wer*, man, and *yide*, men (Kluge: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*).

A. H.
sees
all of
social
existence
as
robbing
his
person.
Goulds
uses
this —
“is in
against
the Holy
Spirit,”
was only
use of
philosophical
language.

l
s
-
n
o
e
re
st
ty
is
our
ino

about which they quarrel so obstinately as they do about their claims to the right of influencing them. In the same way every manifestation of social life can, without artificial forcing, be fitted into my short tabular list.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSES

Whoever will take the trouble to pass in review the various civilisations which are known to us, will find that their remarkable divergence is due to differences in the relations between Knowledge, Civilisation (in the narrower sense) and Culture, and, to be more minute, is determined by too great insistence upon neglect of one or the other of the seven elements. No study is more likely to throw a light upon our own peculiar individuality.

We find in Judaism, as always, a very extreme and therefore instructive example. Here Knowledge and Culture, that is to say, the terminal points, are wanting; in no province have the Jews made discoveries; science is under a ban except where medicine has been a paying industry; art is absent; religion a rudiment; philosophy a digest of misunderstood Helleno-Arabian formulas and spells. On the other hand, the comprehension of economic relations was abnormally developed; in the sphere of industry they had little inventive talent, but they exploited its value in the cleverest manner; politics were unexampled in their simplicity, because the Church usurped the monopoly of all arbitrary decisions. I do not know who it was—I think it was Gobineau—that called the Jews an anti-civilising power; on the contrary, they were, like all Semitic half-castes, Phœnicians, Carthaginians, &c., exclusively a civilising power. Thence the peculiarly unsatisfactory character of these Semitic peoples, for they have neither root nor blossom: their civilisation is neither based upon a knowledge slowly acquired by themselves and consequently really

*A. H. says
this in
speeches.*

RY

about
n the
hout
..

r the
find
nces
(in
ute,
it of
y is
in-

and
and
ng;
nce
ing
so-
las
of
the
but
tics
rch
I

the
ni-
er.
ge
e:
ge
ly

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 247

their own, nor does it grow into an individual, natural, necessary culture. We find the very opposite extreme in the Indo-Aryans, for here civilisation seems to be reduced, so to speak, to a minimum; industry carried on by Pariahs, economy left as simple as possible, politics never launching forth upon great and daring schemes;* on the other hand, remarkable diligence and success in the sciences (at least in some) and a tropical growth of culture (philosophy and poetry). Regarding the richness and complexity of Indo-Aryan philosophy and the sublimity of Indo-Aryan ethics I need say nothing more—in the course of this whole work I have kept the eye of the reader fixed upon them. In art the Indo-Aryans did not possess anything like the creative power of the Hellenes, but their poetical literature is the most extensive in the world; in many examples it is of the sublimest beauty and of such inexhaustible richness of invention that the Indian scholars had to divide the drama into thirty-six classes with a view to creating order in this one branch of poetical production.† In the present connection, however, the most important observation is the following. In spite of their achievements in the sphere of mathematics, grammar &c., the culture of the Indians considerably surpassed not only their civilisation but also their knowledge; hence they were what we call "top-heavy," all the more so, since their science was almost purely formal and lacking in the element of discovery, that is to say, it lacked the real material, or at least did not acquire new material to nourish the higher qualities and to keep the faculties constantly exercised. Here we notice something which will force itself again and again upon our attention, that Civilisation is a relatively indifferent central mass, while close relations of mutual correlation

* Or only very late—indeed, when it was too late.

† See Rajah Sourindro Mohun Tagore: *The Dramatic Sentiments of the Aryas* (Calcutta, 1881).

und at
c and
ck), I
trait-
into
of the
gious
ed to
aders
l the
ioths
spel,
tory
and
will
irits
ted,
ries
gic
ro-
und
the
ces
ble
ice
ti-
re
he
on
a)
ie
ie

want of a true religion that has sprung from, and is compatible with, our own individuality, I see the greatest danger for the future of the Teuton; this is his vulnerable heel; he who wounds our Achilles there will lay him low. Look back at the Hellene! Led by Alexander, he showed himself capable of conquering the whole world; but his weak point was politics; being gifted with extravagant talents even in this respect, he produced the foremost doctrinaires of politics, the most ingenious founders of States, the most brilliant orators on State affairs; but the success which he achieved in other spheres failed him in this:—he created nothing great and lasting; that was why he fell; it was solely his pitiful political condition that delivered him over to the Romans; with his freedom he lost his vital power; the first harmoniously complete human being was a thing of the past, and naught but his shadow now walked upon the earth. I think that in respect of religion we Teutons are in a similar case. A race so profoundly and inwardly religious is unknown to history; we are not more moral than other people, but much more religious. In this respect we occupy a position between the Indo-Aryan and the Hellene; our inborn metaphysical and religious need impels us to a much more artistic (*i.e.*, more illuminating) philosophy than that of the Indian, to a much more spiritual and therefore profounder one than that of the Hellenes, who surpass us in art. It is this very standpoint which deserves to be called religion, to distinguish it from philosophy and from art. If we tried to enumerate the true saints, the great preachers, the merciful helpers, the mystics of our race, if we were to inquire how many have suffered torture and death for their faith, if we were to investigate the important part played by religious conviction in all the most

Catholics had bravely opposed a few centuries before, and what would have filled not only the earliest Christians but even men like Ambrosius and Augustine with horror. (Cf. Harnack: *Grundriss der Dogmen geschichte*, § 81.)

A. G. *

* This must be captured.

Gods; I think that I see in this a proof of his great capacity for culture. A commercial company, with an eye only to good interest and not always proceeding conscientiously, subjugates India, but its activity is kept alive and ennobled by a whole succession of stainless military heroes and great statesmen, and it was the officials of this company who—fired by noble enthusiasm and qualified for their task by a learning acquired by great self-sacrifice—enriched our culture by the revelation of the old Aryan language. We are thrilled with horror when we read the history of the annihilation of the Indians in North America: everywhere on the side of the Europeans there is injustice, treachery, savage cruelty;* and yet how decisive was this very work of destruction for the later development of a noble, thoroughly Teutonic nation upon that soil! A comparative glance at the South American mestizo colonies convinces us of this.† That boundless passion displayed in the pursuit of gold leads to the recognition of yet another fact, one that is essential for the history of our discoveries. Passion may, indeed, influence very various parts of our being—that depends upon the individual; characteristic of our race are daring, endurance, self-sacrifice; great power of conception, which causes the individual to become quite wrapt up in his idea. But this element of passion does not by any means reveal itself merely in the sphere of egoistical interest: it confers on the artist power to work on amid poverty and neglect; it provides statesmen, reformers and martyrs; it has also given us our discoverers. Rousseau's remark, "*Il n'y a*

* Take as an example the total annihilation of the most intelligent and thoroughly friendly tribe of the Natchez by the French on the Mississippi (in Du Pratz: *History of Louisiana*) or the history of the relations between the English and the Cherokees (Trumbull: *History of the United States*). It is always the same story: a fearful injustice on the part of the Europeans provokes the Indians to take vengeance, and for this vengeance they are punished, that is, slaughtered.

† See vol. i. p. 286.

of all Teutons burst into bright flames? At first he was merely forbidden to write down the results of his experiments, that is to say, to communicate them to the world; then the reading of the books already issued was punished with excommunication, and his papers—the results of his studies—were destroyed; finally he was condemned to a cruel imprisonment, in which he remained for many years, till shortly before his death. The struggle which I have exemplified by these two cases lasted for centuries and cost much blood and suffering. Essentially, it is exactly the same struggle as that described in my eighth chapter: Rome against Teutonism. For, no matter what we may think of Roman infallibility, every unbiased person will admit that Rome has always with unerring instinct known how to hinder what was likely to further Teutonism, and to give support to everything whereby it was bound to be most seriously injured.

However, to rob the matter of all sting which might still wound, we will follow it back to its purely human kernel: what do we find there? We find that actual, concrete knowledge, that is, the great work of toilsome discovery, has one deadly enemy, omniscience. The Jews are a case in point (vol. i. p. 401); if a man possesses a sacred book, which contains all wisdom, then all further investigation is as superfluous as it is sinful: the Christian Church took over the Jewish tradition. This fastening on to Judaism, which was so fatal for our history, is being accomplished before our very eyes; it can be demonstrated step by step. The old Church Fathers, taking their stand expressly upon the Jewish Thora, are unanimous in preaching contempt of art and of science. Ambrosius, for example, says that Moses had been educated in all worldly wisdom and had proved that "science is a pernicious folly, upon which we must turn our backs, before we can find God." "To study astronomy and

A. L.

in completely retarding for three whole centuries the mathematical, physical, astronomical and philological researches which had already begun ! *

We now understand why the work of discovery was so late in starting. At the same time we perceive a universal law which applies to all knowledge : it is not ignorance but omniscience that forms a fatal atmosphere for every increase of the material of knowledge. Wisdom and ignorance are both merely designations for notions that can never be accurately fixed, because they are purely relative ; the absolute difference lies altogether elsewhere, it is the difference between the man who is conscious of his ignorance and the man who, owing to some self-deception, either imagines that he possesses all knowledge or thinks himself above all knowledge. Indeed, we might perhaps go further and assert that every science, even genuine science, contains a danger for discovery, in that it paralyses to some extent the untrammelled naturalness of the observer in his attitude to nature. Here, as elsewhere (*see* p. 182), the decisive thing is not so much the amount or the nature of knowledge as the attitude of the mind towards it.† In the recognition of this fact lies the whole importance of

As H.
I am
not
himself
as
omniscient

* This is the philosopher whom the Jesuits to-day elevate to the throne (*see* p. 177) and whose doctrines are henceforth to supply the foundation for the philosophical culture of all Roman Catholics ! We can see how freely the Teutonic spirit moved, before these fetters were imposed by the Church, from the fact that at the University of Paris in the thirteenth century theses like the following were defended, "The sayings of the Theologists are based on fables," "There is no increase of knowledge because of the pretended knowledge of the Theologians," and "The Christian religion prevents increase of knowledge." (*Cf.* Wernicke: *Die mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Forschung*, &c., 1898, p. 5).

† Hence Kant's profound remark on the importance of astronomy : "The most important thing surely is that it has revealed to us the abyss of our ignorance, which, but for that science, we could never have conceived to be so great, and that reflection upon this must produce a great change in the determination of the final purposes of our employment of reason." (*Critique of Pure Reason*, note in the section entitled "Concerning the Transcendental Ideal.")

GUILDS AND CAPITALISTS

The reader will find innumerable accounts of the activity of the guilds between the thirteenth and the seventeenth centuries (approximately); it is the finest example of united effort: one for all, all for one. When we see how in these corporations everything is exactly determined and supervised by the council of the guild, as also by specially appointed committees of control, the town magistracy and so forth, so that not only the nature of the execution of every single piece of work in all its details, but also the maximum of daily work is fixed and must not be exceeded, we are inclined, with most authors, to exclaim in horror: the individual had not a jot of initiative, not a trace of freedom left! And yet this judgment is so one-sided as to be a direct misconception of the historical truth. For it was precisely by the union of many individuals to form a solid, united corporation that the Teuton won back the freedom which he had lost through contact with the Roman Empire. But for the innate instinct which led the Teutons to co-operate, they would have remained just as much slaves as the Egyptians, Carthaginians, Byzantines or the subjects of the Khalif. The isolated individual is to be compared to a chemical atom with little cohesive power; it is absorbed, destroyed. By adopting, of his own free will, a law and submitting unconditionally to it, the individual assured to himself a secure and decent livelihood—in fact a higher livelihood than that of our workmen to-day, and in addition the all-important possibility of intellectual freedom which in many cases was soon realised.* That is the one side of the matter.

* Leber, in his *Essai sur l'appréciation de la fortune privée au moyen-âge*, 1847, shows that the workman of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was on the average better off than to-day; by proving that "the money of the poor was then worth comparatively more than

A. H.
agree

more ground, and to-day these three countries would be glad to receive, as a gift of grace, the no longer up-to-date but yet comparatively free standpoint of the Council of Trent. And as far as Luther's school-reforms are concerned—which he sought to carry through with all the strength that a solitary giant has at his disposal—the best proof of his political sagacity is the fact that the Jesuits immediately followed in his footsteps, founded schools and wrote school-books with exactly the same titles and the same arrangement as those of Luther.* Freedom of conscience is a splendid achievement, as long as it forms the basis of genuine religion; but the modern assumption that every Church can harmonise with every system of politics is madness. In the artificial organisation of society the Church forms the inmost wheel, that is, an essential part of the political mechanism. This wheel may, of course, have more or less importance in the whole mechanism, but its structure and activity are bound to exercise influence upon the whole. And who can study the history of Europe from the year 1500 to the year 1900 and refuse to admit that the Roman Church has manifestly exercised a powerful influence upon the political history of nations? Look first at the nations which (in virtue of the numbers and pre-eminence of Catholics) belong to the Roman Church, and then at the so-called "Protestant" nations! Opinion may vary regarding

A. H.
underlines
this

* Nowhere can we feel the warm heart-throb of the Teuton better than when Luther begins to speak of education. He tells the Nobles that, if they seriously desire a Reformation, they should above all effect "a thorough reformation of the Universities." In his *Send-schreiben an die Bürgermeister und Ratsherren aller Städte in deutschen Landen* he writes in reference to schools, "If we gave one Gulden to oppose the Turks, here it were proper, even though they were at our throats, to give 100 Gulden, if but one boy might therewith be educated," . . . and he urges every citizen henceforth to give all the money, that he has hitherto thrown away on Masses, vigils, annual holidays, begging monks, pilgrimages and "all such rubbish," to the school, "to educate the poor children—which would be such a splendid investment."

sway of the new God that France was to present to the world, the God of phrase. Look at the famous *droits de l'homme*—against which the great Mirabeau thundered in vain, finally exclaiming: "At least do not call them rights; say simply: in the public interest it has been determined . . ."—they are, however, still regarded by serious French politicians as the dawn of freedom. At the very beginning we find the words: "*L'oubli ou le mépris des droits de l'homme sont l'unique cause des malheurs publics.*" It is impossible to think more superficially or to judge more falsely. It was not the rights, but the duties of men that the French had forgotten or despised, and so brought about the national catastrophe.

A. L.
concurs.

That is manifest enough from my previous remarks and is confirmed step by step in the further course of the Revolution. This solemn proclamation is based, therefore, from the very outset, on an untruth. We know what Sieyès cried out in the assembly, "You wish to possess freedom and you do not even know how to be just!" The rest of the proclamation is essentially a transcription by Lafayette of the Declaration of Independence of the Anglo-Saxons settled in America, and this Declaration, too, is little more than a word for word copy of the English "Agreement of the People" of the year 1647. We can understand why so clever a man as Adolphe Thiers in his History of the Revolution hurries over this declaration of the rights of humanity, remarking merely that "it is a pity time was wasted on such pseudo-philosophical commonplaces."* But the matter cannot be regarded so lightly, for the sad predominance which this riding to death of abstract principles of "freedom of humanity" acquired over statesmanlike insight into the needs and possibilities of a definite people at a definite moment, continued to spread like an infectious disease. Let us hope the day may come when every

* Chap. iii.

other: a deeply religious man is a true philosopher (in the living, popular sense of the word), and those choice minds that rise to comprehensive, clear, philosophical views—a Roger Bacon, a Leonardo, a Bruno, a Kant, a Goethe—are not often ecclesiastically pious, but always strikingly “religious.” We see, therefore, that philosophy and religion on the one hand further one another, and on the other hand are substitutes for, or complementary to, each other. On pp. 258-9 I wrote: In the want of a true religion springing from and corresponding to our individuality I see the greatest danger for the future of the Teuton, that is in him the heel of Achilles, whoever wounds him there, will lay him low. If we look closer, we shall see that the inadequacy of our ecclesiastical religion revealed itself, to begin with, in the invalidity of the philosophy which it presupposed; our earliest philosophers are all theologians and mostly honest ones, who pass through an inner struggle for truth, and truth always means the sincerity of views as determined by the special nature of the individual. Out of this struggle our Teutonic philosophy, which is absolutely new, gradually grew up. This development did not follow one straight line; the work was taken in hand simultaneously at most divergent points, as if in the building of a house, mason, carpenter, locksmith and painter each did his own work independently, troubling himself as little as possible about the others. It is the will of the architect that unites the essentially different aims; in this case instinct of race is the architect; the *homo europæus* can only follow definite paths, and he, as Master, to the best of his power forces his path upon others who do not belong to him. I do not think that the structure is complete; I am not bound to any school, but take joy in the growth and development of the Teutonic work, and do what I can reverently to assimilate it. My task in this section is, in the most general

A.H.
concerns

A.H.
sees
himself
as the
architect.
words
written
just for
him.

thought ; while all scientific knowledge gained in depth and religious conceptions in the Teutonic sense began to undergo a complete transformation.

THE COURSE OF FALSEHOOD

The other method, which I have designated the course of falsehood, remained absolutely barren of results ; for here arbitrary caprice and capricious arbitrariness predominated. The very attempt to rationalise all religion, that is, to accommodate it to reason, and yet at the same time to bind and put thought under the yoke of faith, is a double crime against human nature. For such an attempt to succeed the delusive belief in dogmatism must first become a raving madness. A Church doctrine which had been patched together out of the most varying foreign alien elements, and which contradicted itself in the most essential points, had to be declared eternal, divine truth ; a fragmentary, badly translated, often totally misunderstood, essentially individualistic, pre-Christian philosophy had to be declared infallible ; for without these prodigious acceptations the attempt would never have succeeded. And so this theology and this philosophy, which had no connection with one another, were forced into wedlock and a monstrosity was imposed upon humanity as the absolute, all-embracing system to be unconditionally accepted.* In this path development followed a straight, short line ; for, while divine truth is as manifold as the creatures in which it is reflected, the impious caprice of a human system, which lays down the law of "truth" and carries it out with fire and sword, soon reaches its limit, and any further step would be a negation of itself. Anselm, who died in the year 1109, can be regarded as the author of this method, which gags thought and feeling ; scarcely a hundred and fifty years after his death

* See p. 178.

A. H.
fleets
this?

A. H.
uses
this for
Parker
argument

Y

this
man
crea-
tion
sible
from
"So
not
you
then
are
the
scotus
inas.
must
ch a
His
u,"†

posi-
lines
e";
object
it is
from
so—
their
mise
man
the
-but

nned
ition

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 413

signing all necessary orthodox confessions, and we never find that—in spite of all the recommendations of the *sopor pacis* (the sleep of peace) by Bonaventura (1221-1274) and others—quietism has with us as with the Indians drained the veins of life. For that reason I shall limit myself to the narrow compass of this chapter, and only briefly point out what a destructive influence the army of Mystics exercised on the alien traditional religion, and how on the other hand they did so much to create and promote a new philosophy in keeping with our individuality. Usually too little is made both of the negative and of the positive activity of these men.

Very striking is, in the first place, their dislike for Jewish doctrines of religion; every Mystic is, whether he will or not, a born Anti-Semite. Pious minds like Bonaventura get over the difficulty by interpreting the whole Old Testament allegorically and giving a symbolical meaning to the borrowed mythical elements—a tendency which we find fully developed five hundred years earlier in Scotus Erigena, and which we may trace still further back, to Marcion and Origines.* But this does not satisfy those souls in their thirst after true religion. The strictly orthodox Thomas à Kempis prays with pathetic simplicity to God, "Let it not be Moses or the Prophets that speak to me, but speak thyself . . . from them I hear words indeed, but the spirit is absent; what they say is beautiful, but it warms not the heart."† This feeling we meet with in almost all the Mystics, but nowhere so beautifully expressed as by the great Jacob Böhme (1575-1624). In regard to many passages in the Bible, after he has explained all that he can (e.g., the whole history of creation), symbolically and allegorically, and sees that he cannot proceed any further, he simply exclaims, "Here the eyes of Moses are veiled,"

The place
for
symbolic
in Böhme's
Commentary

* See pp. 44 and 89.

† *De Imitatione Christi* Book III. chap. ii.

ôtrez sa croyance," says Diderot not quite unjustly.* If we take all these facts into consideration, we shall comprehend what an effect must have been produced by the beautiful doctrine of Eckhart: "Were there no Hell and no Kingdom of Heaven, yet I would love God—Thee, Thou sweet father, and Thy sublime nature"; and, "The right, perfect essence of the Spirit is to love God for His own goodness, though there were no Heaven and no Hell."† Some fifty years later the unknown author of the *Theologia deutsch*, that splendid monument of German mysticism in Catholic garb, expresses himself still more definitely, for he entitles his tenth chapter, "How perfect men have lost their fear of hell and desire of heaven," and shows that perfection consists in freedom from these conceptions: "The freedom of those men is such that they have lost fear of pain or hell, and hope of reward or heaven, and live in pure submission and obedience to everlasting goodness, in the complete freedom of fervent love." It is scarcely necessary to prove that between this freedom and the "quaking fear," which Loyola holds to be the soul of religion,‡ there is a gulf deeper and wider than that which separates planet from planet. There two radically different souls are speaking, a Teutonic and a non-Teutonic.§ In the following chapter this "man of Frankfort," as he is called, goes on to say that there is no hell in the ordinary, popular sense of a future penitentiary, but that hell is a phenomenon of our present life. This priest is obviously

D.T.
quoting
this

* *Pensées philosophiques* xvii.

† Cf. the Twelfth Tractate and the glossary to it. Francis of Assisi also laid almost no stress on hell and very little on heaven (Sabatier, as above, p. 308).

‡ See vol. i. p. 569.

§ I remind the reader that Walfila could not translate the ideas hell and devil into Gothic, since this fortunate language knew no such conception (p. 111). Hell was the name of the friendly goddess of death, as also of her empire, and points etymologically to *bergen* (to hide), *verhüllen* (to conceal), but by no means to *Ifernium* (Heyne); *Teufel* has been formed from *Diabolus*.

at one with Origenes and Erigena and comes to the conclusion that "hell passes away and heaven continues to exist." One further remark most emphatically characterises his opinion. He calls heaven and hell "two good, sure ways for man in this age," he assigns to neither of these "ways" any preference over the other and expresses the opinion that "in hell a man may be quite at his ease and as safe as in heaven!" This view, which we find in this form or in a similar form among other Mystics, e.g., Eckhart's pupils Tauler and Seuse, is especially often and clearly expressed by Jacob Böhme: it is the expression of a philosophy which has pursued the thought further, and is on the point of passing from a negative conclusion to a positive conception. Thus to the question, "Whither does the soul go when the body dies, be it blessed or condemned?" he gives the answer, "The soul does not require to leave the body, but the external, mortal life and the body separated themselves from it. The soul has previously had heaven and hell within it . . . for heaven and hell are everywhere present. It is merely a turning of the will towards the love of God or towards the wrath of God, and such may take place while the body is still alive."* Here nothing remains vague; for we manifestly stand with both feet on the foundation of a new religion; it is not new in so far as Böhme can point in this case to the words of Christ: "The Kingdom of God cometh not with outward signs"; "The world of angels is within the place (*in loco*) of this world";† but it is a new religion as compared with all Church doctrines. In another passage he writes: "The right, holy man, who is concealed in the visible man, is in Heaven as

P. T.
I am
but
man
~~body~~
(one time
a day!)
and
am quite
at my
ease
in hell.
Also Böhme

* *Der Weg zu Christo*, Book VI. §§ 36, 37. This conception is Indo-European and proves at once the race of the author. When the Persian Omar Khayyám sent out his soul to get knowledge, it returned with the news, "I myself am Heaven and Hell" (*Rubáiyát*).

† *Mysterium magnum*, 2, 18.

Y
con-
nues
cally
hell
signs
the
man
!"
ilar
uler
by
phy
the
ive
the
?"
to
he
re-
en
ng
th
ill
ri-
w
in
d
ls
a

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 417

well as God, and Heaven is in him."* And Böhme fearlessly goes further and denies the absolute difference between good and evil; the inner foundation of the soul, he says, is neither good nor bad, God himself is both: "He is himself all Existence, he is Good and Evil, Heaven and Earth, Light and Darkness";† it is the will that first "distinguishes" in the mass of indifferent actions, it is by the will that the action of the doer becomes good or evil. This is pure Indian doctrine; our theologians have long since and without difficulty proved that it simply contradicts the doctrine of the Christian Church.‡

While the mystics already named and the incalculable number of others who held similar views, whether Protestants or Catholics, remained inside the Church, without ever thinking how thoroughly they were undermining that toilsomely erected structure, there were large groups of Mystics who perhaps did not go so far in viewing the essence of religion in the light of inward experience as the *Theologia deutsch* and Jacob Böhme, or as the saintly Antoinette Bourignon (1616-80), who wished to unite all sects by abolishing the doctrines of Scripture and emphasising only the longing for God: but these teachers directly attacked all ecclesiasticism and priesthood, dogmas, scripture and sacrament. Thus Amalrich of Chartres (died 1209), Professor of Theology in Paris, rejected the whole Old Testament and all sacraments, and accepted only the direct revelation of God in the heart of each individual. This gave rise to the league of the "Brothers of the Free Spirit," which was, it seems, a rather licentious and outrageous society. Others again, like Johannes Wessel (1419-89) by greater moderation achieved greater success; Wessel is essentially a

* *Sendbrief* dated 18.1.1618, § 10.

† *Mysterium magnum* 8, 24.

‡ Cf., for example, the short work of Dr. Albert Peip: *Jakob Böhme*, 1860, p. 16 f.

D. T.
Here,
we find
company,
Böhme
was in
error.
Wessel
was

Y

n us
but
lirec-
that
i not
on of
once
if the
n and
n the
ho is
rs the
empia
ich: "

fatal
once
meless
ritably
College
was the
id that
at the
ranists
is est,
illy, in
ine, in
its, 2nd

the in-
manist
p. 562).
r form,
linger:

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 431

short, the whole Roman structure, the whole "foul-smelling weeds of theology," as he calls them, are so denounced that some have been of opinion that this one work contributed more than anything else to the Reformation.* Similar methods and equal ability are revealed with as much force in the eighteenth century by Voltaire.

The most important contribution of the Humanists towards the construction of a new Teutonic philosophy is the relinking of our intellectual life to that of the related Indo-Europeans, in particular to that of the Hellenes,† and as a result of this the gradual development of the conception "man." The Mystics had destroyed the idea of time and so of history—a perfectly justifiable reaction against the abuse of history by the Church; it was the task of the Humanists to build up true history anew, and so to put an end to the evil dream which the Chaos had conjured up. From Picus of Mirandola, who sees the divine guidance of God in the intellectual achievement of the Hellene, down to that great Humanist Johann Gottfried Herder, who asks himself "whether God might not after all have a plan in the vocation and institution of the human race," and who collects the "Voices" of all peoples, we see the historical horizon being extended, and we notice how this contact with the

* All the first great Humanists of Germany are anti-scholastic—(Lamprecht, as above, iv. p. 69). It is not right to reproach men like Erasmus, Coornhert, Thomas More, &c., for not joining the Reformation later. For such men were in consequence of their humanistic studies intellectually far too much in advance of their time to prefer a Lutheran or Calvinistic dogmatism to the Romish. They rightly felt that scepticism would always come to terms more easily with a religion of good works than with one of faith; they anticipated—correctly as it turned out—a new era of universal intolerance, and thought that it would be more feasible to destroy one single utterly rotten Church from within than several Churches which from the humanistic standpoint were just as impossible, but had been steeled by conflicts. Regarded from this high watch-tower the Reformation meant a new lease of life to ecclesiastical error.

† The Indologists were the real humanists of the nineteenth century. Cf. my small work *Arische Weltanschauung*, 1905.

Has
application
to how
Communion
might
be really
if it had
all
been done
in flower
fashion.

and the journey is ended as soon as begun."* Thus Locke's life-work, the *Essay on the Human Understanding*, might have been written at any time during the preceding two thousand five hundred years, if only some one had felt inclined to apply himself to nature. Learning, instruments, mathematical or other discoveries are not required, but only faithful observation of Self, questioning of Self in the same way as we should observe and question any other phenomenon of nature. What hindered the much greater Aristotle from achieving this but the anthropomorphic superficiality of Hellenic observation of nature, which like a comet following a hyperbolic course approached every given fact with frenzied speed, soon afterwards to lose sight of it for ever? What hindered Augustine, who possessed profound philosophical gifts, but his systematic contempt of nature? What Thomas Aquinas but the delusion that he knew everything without observing anything? This turning towards nature—this new goal of the intellect, an achievement of the Teutonic soul—signifies, as I have said, a mighty, indeed almost incalculable, enrichment of the human mind: for it provides it constantly with inexhaustible material (*i.e.*, conceptions) and new associations (*i.e.*, ideas). Now man drinks directly from the fountain of all invention, all genius. That is an essential feature of our new world, which may well inspire us with pride and confidence in ourselves. Formerly man resembled the pump-driving donkeys of Southern Europe. He was compelled all day long to turn round in the circle of his own poor self, merely to provide some water for his thirst; now he lies at the breasts of Mother Nature.

We have already advanced further than the remark of Alphonse de Candolle seemed to lead us; the knowledge of our ignorance introduced us to the inexhaustible

* Über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen, Bf. 9.

* A. H. understands passage to be converted for future action in speeches - Landtag.

to the root of things; Locke answers: Reason is divine Revelation, hence it is infallible, as far as it goes. That is not genuine investigation of nature, but only an attempt at it, hence the defectiveness of the result.

In the interests of the unphilosophical reader I have sketched from the negative side the condition of our young, developing philosophy at that time. In this way he will be better able to understand what had now to be done to save and improve it. To begin with, it had to be purified, purged of the last traces of alien ingredients; in the second place, the scientific philosopher had to have the full courage of his convictions; he had, like Columbus, to trust himself unhesitatingly to the ocean of nature, and not fancy, as the crew did, that he was lost as soon as the spire of the last church-tower disappeared below the horizon. But this required not merely courage, such as the foolhardy Hume possessed, but also the solemn consciousness of great responsibility. Who had the right to lead men away from the sacred ancestral home? Only he who possesses the power to lead them to a new one.

That is why it was only by a man like Kant that the work could be executed, for he not only possessed phenomenal intellectual gifts, but a moral character which was equally great. Kant is the true *rocher de bronze* of our new philosophy. Whether we agree with all his philosophical conclusions is a matter of indifference; he alone possessed the power to tear us away, he alone possessed the moral justification for doing so, he, whose long life was a model of spotless honour, strict self-control and complete devotion to an aim which he regarded as sacred. When just over twenty years of age he wrote: "I believe it is sometimes advisable to have a certain noble confidence in one's own powers. On this I take my stand. I have already mapped out the course which I wish to follow. I shall make a start and nothing shall prevent me from

*With
copies
then for
future
reference.*

historically issued and therefore at all times revocable commands (which make an end of ethical law), &c. Metaphysically inclined races, such as the Aryans, never fell into this error: * their mythologies reveal a wonderful divination of metaphysical perception, or, as we may say with the same justice, scientific metaphysics signify the awakening into new life of far-seeing mythology; but, as history shows, this higher divination has not been able to prevail against the forcible assertions of less gifted human beings, who conclude from mere semblance and are sunk in blind historical superstition, and there is but one antidote powerful enough to save us: our scientific philosophy. This uncritical identification leads to other shallow and therefore injurious systems, as soon as, for example, in place of projecting inner experience into the world of phenomena, the latter with all its mechanism is brought into the inner world. Thusso-called "scientific" monism, materialism, &c., have arisen, doctrines which will certainly never acquire the universal importance of Judaism—since it is too much to expect of most men that they will deny what they know most surely—but which have nevertheless in the nineteenth century produced so much confusion of thought.†

* See vol. i. pp. 229, 437, vol. ii. p. 23.

† It is remarkable how affinity between these two errors—uncritically projecting inner experience into the world of phenomena and bringing the outer world into inner experience—manifests itself in life: theists become in the twinkling of an eye atheists, a strikingly common thing in the case of Jews, since, if they are orthodox (and even when they have become Christians) they are convinced, genuine theists, whereas with us God is always in the background and even the orthodox mind is filled by the Redeemer or the Mother of God, the saints or the sacrament. I should never have dreamt that theistic conviction could be so firmly rooted in the brain had I not had occasion, in the case of a friend, a Jewish scholar, to observe the genesis and obstinacy of the apparently opposite "atheistical" conception. It is absolutely impossible ever to bring home to such a man what we Teutons understand by Godhead, religion, morality. Here lies the hard insoluble kernel of the "Jewish problem." And this is the reason why an impartial man, without a trace of contempt for the

A. H.
is offended
at the case
with which
H. S. C. attacks
the Jews, but
rejects the kernel
— they are absolutely
in the wrong

In view of all this—and in contrast to all mystical pantheism and pananthropism—it is our duty to adhere to and emphasise the division into two worlds, as it results from strictly scientifically treated experience. But the boundary-line must be drawn at the right place: to have accurately determined this place is one of the greatest achievements of our new philosophy. We must, of course, not draw that line between man and world; all that I have said proves the impossibility of this; man may turn whither he will, at every step he perceives nature in himself and himself in nature. To draw the line between the world of phenomena and the hypothetical "thing in itself" (as one of Kant's famous successors undertook to do) would from the purely scientific standpoint also be very disputable, for in that case the boundary runs outside of all experience. In so far as the unmechanical world is derived purely from inner, individual experience, which only by analogy is transferred to other individuals, we may well, for simplicity of expression, distinguish between a world *in us* and a world *outside us*, but we must carefully note that the world "outside us" comprises every "phenomenon," hence also our own body, and not it alone but also the understanding which perceives the world of bodies and thinks. This expression "in us" and "outside us" is often met with in Kant and others. But even he is open to objection; for in the first place we are—as I said above—involuntarily impelled, if not to transform this inner world as the Jew does to an outer cause, yet to attribute

In many respects worthy and excellent Jews, can and must regard the presence of a large number of them in our midst as a danger not to be under-estimated. Not only the Jew, but also all that is derived from the Jewish mind, corrodes and disintegrates what is best in us. And so Kant rightly reproached the Christian Churches for making all men Jews, by representing the importance of Christ as lying in this, that He was the historically expected Jewish Messiah. Were Judaism not thus inoculated into us, the Jews in flesh and blood would be much less dangerous for our culture than they are.

see p 492

must seek in ourselves, not outside ourselves."* That means, when we change it to the terms of our definition: Religion we must seek only in the world which cannot be interpreted mechanically. It is not true that we find in the world of phenomena that can be interpreted mechanically anything that points to freedom, morality, Divinity. Whoever carries the idea of freedom over into mechanical nature destroys both nature and the true significance of freedom (p. 420); the same holds good with regard to God (p. 470); and as far as morality is concerned an unprejudiced glance suffices—in spite of all heroic efforts of the apologists from Aristotle to Bishop Butler's famous book on the *Analogy between Revealed Religion and the Laws of Nature*—to show that nature is neither moral nor sensible. The ideas of goodness, pity, duty, virtue, repentance, are just as strange to her as sensible, symmetrical, appropriate arrangement. Nature capable of mechanical interpretation is evil, stupid, feelingless; virtue, genius and goodness belong only to nature which cannot be mechanically interpreted. Meister Eckhart knew that well and therefore uttered the memorable words: "If I say, God is good, it is not true: rather I am good. God is not good. If I say also, God is wise, it is not true: I am wiser than he."† Genuine natural science could leave no doubt concerning the correctness of this judgment. We must seek religion in that nature which cannot be mechanically interpreted.

I shall not attempt to give an account of Kant's theory of morals and religion, that would take me too far and has, besides, been done by others; I think I have performed my special task if I have succeeded in clearly representing on the most general lines the genesis of our new philosophy; that prepares the ground for a clear-sighted, sure judgment of the philosophy of the

* *Religion*, 4 Stück, 1 Teil, 2 Abschnitt.

† *Predigt*, 99.

P.T.'s
credo

It is only the descent into the hell of self-knowledge that paves the way for the ascent into heaven."*

In regard to this autonomy of will and this ascension into heaven, I beg the reader to refer to the passage in the chapter on the Entrance of the Teutons into the History of the World (*see* vol. i. p. 549 f.), where I briefly alluded to Kant's gloriously daring idea. But there is still a link wanting in the chain, to enable us to grasp the religious thought completely. What is it that has given me so high an opinion of that which I discovered on my descent into the abyss of the heart? It is the perception of the high dignity of man. For the first step necessary to bring us to the truly moral standpoint is to root out all the contempt of Self and of the human race which the Christian Church—in contrast to Christ—(*see* vol. i. p. 7) has nurtured. The inborn evil in the heart of man is not destroyed by penance, for that again clings to the outer world of appearance, but by fixing our attention on the lofty qualities in our own hearts. The dignity of man grows with his consciousness of it.

It is of great importance that Kant is here in exact agreement with Goethe. Well known is Goethe's theory of the three reverences—for what is above us, for what is equal to us, and for what is below us—from which arise three kinds of genuine religion; but true religion arises from a fourth "highest reverence," that is, reverence for Self; it is only when he has reached this stage that man, according to Goethe, attains the highest pinnacle that he is capable of attaining.† I have

* Kant writes not "*zur Himmelahrt*" but "*zur Vergötterung*," but owing to the common usage of this word in ordinary speech misunderstanding might easily arise. Schiller says, "The moral will makes man divine" (*Anmut und Würde*; and Voltaire, "*St Dieu n'est pas dans nous, il n'exista jamais*" (*Poème sur la Loi Naturelle*). Profound is also Goethe's thought: "Since God became man, in order that we poor creatures of sense might grasp and comprehend Him, we must see to it especially that we do not again make Him God." (*Brief des Pastors zu* * * * *an den neuen Pastor zu* * * *.)

† *Wanderjahre*, Bk. II. chap. i.

A. H.
See
speech.

Dr. T.
this kind
of knowledge
must be
kept from
us
or we will
lose our
social machine.

A. H.
chuckles
over
this
"we will
make sure."

URY

nowledge

*

scension

passage

into the

l briefly

is still

asp the

is given

ered on

the per-

rst step

nt is to

an race

Christ—

ne heart

t again

y fixing

hearts.

s of it.

a exact

-theory

or what

which

rue re-

," that

ed this

highest

have

ing," but

ech mis-

oral will

St. Dieu

(aturelle).

man, in

urehem

ake Him

* *)

FROM THE YEAR 1200 TO THE YEAR 1800 489

referred to this theme in the passage mentioned above, at the same time also quoting Kant; I must now supplement what was there said by one of the greatest and most glorious passages of all Kant's writings; it forms the only worthy commentary to Goethe's religion of reverence for Self. "Now I set forth man as asking

himself: What is that in me which enables me to sacrifice the inmost lures of my impulses and all wishes that proceed from my nature, to a law which promises me no advantage in return and no penalty if I transgress it; which indeed, the more sternly it commands and the less it offers in return, the more I reverence it? This question stirs our whole soul in amazed wonder at the greatness and sublimity of the inner faculty in man and the insolubility of the mystery which it conceals (for the answer: 'it is freedom,' would be tautological, because it is freedom itself that creates the mystery). We can never tire of directing our attention to it and admiring in ourselves a power which yields to no power of nature. . . . Here is what Archimedes wanted, but did not find: a firm point on which reason could place its lever, and that without applying it to the present or to a future world, but merely to its inner idea of freedom (which immovable moral law provides as a sure foundation) in order by its principles to set in motion the human will, even in opposition to all nature."*

It is manifest that this religion presents a direct contrast to the mechanical view.† Teutonic science teaches the most painfully exact fixing of that which is present and bids us be satisfied with that, since it is not by hypothesis or tricks of magic that we can learn to master the world of phenomena but only by accurately, indeed slavishly, adapting ourselves to it; Teutonic religion, on the other hand, opens up a wide realm, which slumbers as a sub-

* From the book: *Von einem neuerdings erhobenen vornehmen Ton in der Philosophie* (1796).

† Naturally also to Ethics as "science"; on this see p. 64 note.

D.T.
reworks
this
G.A.H.

lime ideal in our inmost soul, and teaches us: here you are free, here you are yourselves nature—creative, legislative; the realm of ideals of itself has no existence, but by your efforts it can truly come into life; as "phenomenon" you are indeed bound to the universal law of faultless mechanical necessity, but experience teaches you that you possess autonomy and freedom in the inner realm;—use them! The connection between the two worlds—the seen and the unseen, the temporal and the eternal—otherwise undiscoverable, lies in the hearts of you men yourselves, and by the moral conception of the inner world the significance of the outer world is determined; conscience teaches you that every day; it is the lesson taught by art, love, pity, and the whole history of mankind; here you are free, as soon as you but know and will it; you can transfigure the visible world, become regenerate yourselves, transform time to eternity, plough the Kingdom of God in the field—Be this then your task! Religion shall no longer signify for you faith in the past and hope for something future, nor (as with the Indians) mere metaphysical perception—but the deed of the present! If you but believe in yourselves, you have the power to realise the new "possible Kingdom" wake up then, for the dawn is at hand!

*Chamberlain
redo.*

*again
D.T.
connects
it for
A. H.*

CHRIST AND KANT

Who could fail to be at once struck with the affinity between the religious philosophy of Kant—won by faithful, critical study of nature—and the living heart of the teaching of Christ? Did not the latter say, the Kingdom of God is not outside you, but within you? But the resemblance is not limited to this central point. Whoever studies Kant's many writings on religion and moral law will find the resemblance in many places; for example, take their attitude to the officially recognised

form of religion. We find in both the same reverential clinging to the forms regarded as sacred, united to complete independence of intellect, which, breathing upon a thing that is old, transforms it into a thing that is new.* For example, Kant does not reject the Bible, but he values it not on account of what we "take out" of it, but because of what we "put into it with moral thought."† And though he has no objections to Churches "of which there are several equally good forms," yet he has the courage frankly to say:‡ "To look upon this statutory service (the historical methods of praise and Church dogmas) as essential to the service of God and to make it the first condition of divine pleasure in man is a religious delusion, the adherence to which is a false service, i.e., a worship of God directly contrary to that true service demanded of Him."§ Kant, therefore, demands a religion "in spirit and in truth," and faith in a God "whose kingdom is not of this world" (that is, not of the world of phenomena). He was, moreover, well aware of this agreement. In his book on religion, which appeared in his seventieth year, he gives in about four pages a concise and beautiful exposition of the teaching of Christ, exclusively according to the *Gospel of St. Matthew*, and concludes: "Here now is a complete religion . . . illustrated moreover by an example, although neither the truth of the doctrines nor the dignity and nobility of the teacher needed any further attestation."§ These few words are very significant. For however sublime and elevating everything which Kant has achieved,

DT.
This
notion
is an
antipathetic
to the Party
as it is to
the Church

* See vol. i. p. 221.

† *Der Streit der Fakultäten*, I Division, supplement.

‡ *Die Religion*, u.s.w. Section 4, Part 2, Introduction. The title of the 3rd section of this part is amusing: "Concerning Priesthood as a Regiment in the False Service of the Good Principle."

§ Section 4, Part 1, Division 1. In this exposition there is an interpretation which will not be very acceptable to the "regiment of false service"; the words, "wide is the gate and broad is the path that leadeth to destruction, and they are many that walk thereon," he interprets as referring to the Churches!

lual
lop-
ual,
ork,
ity,
rch
rch
lea
ry,
en-
lly
ver
le-
it,
it
on
no
in
t.
if
se
n-
d
it
3.
ll
d
-
3
-
3
r
r
r

A.H.
HSC is a
cool. The
Kas is
drenched
in bitterness
and sense
of persecution.
So it is the
only way
to fight back!!

it
3.
U
-
P
-
3
C
-
3
r
I
I

3. 11 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

It is no easy matter in these days to speak about art ; for, despite the example of all the best German authors, an absolutely senseless limitation of the notion " art " has become naturalised among us, and, on the other hand, the systematising philosophy of history has cruelly paralysed our faculty of looking at historical facts with open, truth-seeking eyes, and of passing a sound judgment upon them. I sincerely regret the necessity of mixing up polemical controversy with this final section, where I would fain be soaring in the highest regions, but there is

knowledge is shaped, it becomes a living portion of our consciousness, and is henceforth "a condition of our subject." This knowledge I can now look at from all sides, can, so to speak, turn it over and over. That is already a very great gain. But it is not all. A knowledge which has become a condition of my Ego, something which I not only "regard," but "feel";—it is part of my life; "in a word, it is at once my condition and my achievement." To transform knowledge into fact! to summarise the past in such a way that we no longer take pride in an empty, borrowed learning concerning things long dead and buried, but make of the knowledge of the past a living, determining power for the present! a knowledge which has so fully entered our consciousness that even unconsciously it determines our judgment! Surely a sublime and worthy aim! And the greater the difficulty there is, in view of the increase of new facts, in surveying the whole field of knowledge, the more worthy of attainment that aim becomes. "In order to rescue ourselves from endless complexity, and once more to attain simplicity, we must always ask ourselves the question: How would Plato have acted?" Such is the advice of our greatest Teuton, Goethe. But the aphorism might well plunge us into despair, for who would dare to say: thus and thus only would a Teutonic Plato of to-day have set about the task of reducing complexity to simplicity, which means, to possibility of life?

Far be it from me to pretend that in this book I have succeeded in picturing the Foundations of the Nineteenth Century upon these principles. Between the undertaking and the execution of such a task, so many intentions, so many hopes are wrecked on the narrow, sharp limitations of a man's own powers that he cannot write his last words without a sense of humility. Whatever success my book may have attained I owe to those giants of our race upon whom I have kept my eyes steadfastly fixed.

A. H.
promise
speech