Classica et Orientalia 11

CLeO

Sebastian Fink, Klaus Eisterer, Robert Rollinger,
Dirk Rupnow (Hg.)

Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt

Ein Forscherleben zwischen Orient und Okzident

Harrassowitz

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Classica et Orientalia

Herausgegeben von
Reinhold Bichler, Bruno Jacobs,
Giovanni B. Lanfranchi, Robert Rollinger,
Kai Ruffing und Josef Wiesehöfer

Band 11

2015
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt

Ein Forscherleben zwischen Orient und Okzident

Herausgegeben von
Sebastian Fink, Klaus Eisterer,
Robert Rollinger und Dirk Rupnow

2015
Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Umschlagabbildung: Das Ehepaar Lehmann-Haupt gemalt von Kenneth Green,
Privatbesitz Christopher Lehmann-Haupt.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.dnb.de abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Informationen zum Verlagsprogramm finden Sie unter
http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.
Druck und Verarbeitung: ♾ Hubert & Co., Göttingen
Printed in Germany

ISSN 2190-3638
ISBN 978-3-447-10327-5
e-ISBN PDF 978-3-447-19352-8

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Inhalt

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt und die Urartologie

Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupts metrologische Forschungen

Werksverzeichnis

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Zeitgeschichte und Altertumswissenschaft im Dialog. Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt (1861–1938): Ein Forscherleben zwischen Berlin, Istanbul und Innsbruck

Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt (1861–1938) war von 1918 bis zu seiner Emeritierung im Jahre 1932 Inhaber des Lehrstuhles für Alte Geschichte an der Universität Innsbruck. Das Jahr 2013 schien besonders geeignet, den lange gehegten Wunsch nach einer Würdigung dieses Gelehrten zu erfüllen, da dieses Jahr gleich zwei Gedenktage bot. Lehmann-Haupt hatte seine Stelle in Innsbruck am 01.10.1918 angetreten – kein ganz rundes, aber immerhin ein fünfundneunzigjähriges Jubiläum – und am 24.07.2013 jährte sich sein Todestag zum fünfundsiebzigsten Mal.

Dieses Jubiläumsjahr nahmen wir zum Anlass, um Versäumtes nachzuholen. Aufgrund der politischen Situation in seinem Todesjahr und der jüdischen Vorfahren Lehmann-Haupts erschien kaum ein Nachruf, selbst die von ihm 1901 gegründete Zeitschrift *Klio* brachte kein Wort über den Tod ihres Gründers. Mit Ausnahme zweier Artikel von Günther Lorenz und Gerhard Oberkofler sind bisher keine größeren Arbeiten über Leben und Werk Lehmann-Haupts publiziert worden.[1]

Nicht zuletzt auch aufgrund der engen Verbindungen der Forschungen Lehmann-Haupts mit der aktuellen Ausrichtung des Instituts für Alte Geschichte und Altorientalistik an der Universität Innsbruck (Bedeutung des Alten Orients für die Alte Geschichte, Kulturkontakte, archäologische Urartu-Forschung) schien es uns angebracht, sein Leben und Werk endlich gebührend zu würdigen und eingehender zu untersuchen. Dazu organisierten wir eine Reihe von acht Vorträgen, die in Kooperation zwischen der Orient-Gesellschaft Hammer-Purgstall einerseits, sowie den Instituten für Zeitgeschichte sowie Alte Geschichte und Altorientalistik andererseits zwischen März 2013 und Jänner 2014 durchgeführt wurden. Die Vorträge sollten einige ausgewählte Themenbereiche der Forschung Lehmann-Haupts behandeln und auf die wichtigsten Stationen in seinem Leben (Berlin / Armenien / Innsbruck) eingehen. Ein Vortrag widmete sich auch dem Leben und der schriftstellerischen Tätigkeit von Therese Lehmann-Haupt, die ihrem Ehemann am 29.11.1938 freiwillig in den Tod folgte.[2] Für den hier vorliegenden Sammelband wurde die Vortrags-

1 Lorenz, Günther 1985: Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt, in: Reinhold Bichler (Hg.), *100 Jahre Alte Geschichte in Innsbruck. Franz Hampl zum 75. Geburtstag* (= Veröffentlichungen der Universität Innsbruck 151, Forschungen zur Innsbrucker Universitätsgeschichte 13), Innsbruck 1985, 33–45; 102–103; Oberkofler, Gerhard 1969: *Die Geschichtlichen Fächer an der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Innsbruck 1850–1945* (= Veröffentlichungen der Universität Innsbruck 39, Forschungen zur Geschichte der Universität Innsbruck 6), Innsbruck 1969. – Angelika Kellner hat die Biographie Lehmann-Haupts im Rahmen einer Diplomarbeit neu aufgearbeitet. Sie förderte umfangreiche Archivmaterialien zu Tage, nicht zuletzt einen umfangreichen Briefwechsel, die die Beschäftigung mit dem Gelehrten und Menschen Lehmann-Haupt auf eine solide Grundlage stellen. Die Ergebnisse dieser Diplomarbeit erscheinen in Artikelform in der *Klio*, die damit auch ihren Gründer gebührend würdigt. Kellner im Druck sowie Kellner in diesem Band.

2 Riccabona in diesem Band.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

reihe thematisch ergänzt und durch ein ausführliches Werksverzeichnis Lehmann-Haupts abgerundet. Ein besonderer Glücksfall war, dass wir mit Christopher Lehmann-Haupt einen in New York wohnhaften Enkel Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupts für den Eröffnungsvortrag der Reihe gewinnen konnten, der derzeit an einem Buch über seine Familiengeschichte schreibt. Sein Beitrag gewährt einen persönlichen Blick auf das Ehepaar Lehmann-Haupt.[3]

Die Beschäftigung mit diesem faszinierenden Gelehrten, der in vielen Bereichen die interdisziplinär ausgerichteten Forschungsansätze der Gegenwart bereits vorwegnahm, war, wie bereits angedeutet, ein Forschungsdesiderat, da die wissenschaftshistorische Bedeutung Lehmann-Haupts weit über Innsbruck hinausreicht. Durch das zeitgeschichtlich bedingte Ausbleiben öffentlicher Würdigungen im Jahre 1938[4] sowie das Versiegen interdisziplinärer Forschungsaktivitäten nach 1945 darf Carl Lehmann-Haupt durchaus als ein ‚vergessener' Wissenschaftler bezeichnet werden. Dies macht sich bis in die unmittelbare Gegenwart bemerkbar, wenn man etwa im vor Kurzem erschienenen und als ‚Biographisches Lexikon' bezeichneten jüngsten Supplementband des Neuen Pauly *Geschichte der Altertumswissenschaften* (2012) vergeblich einen Eintrag zu Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt sucht.

Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt wurde 1861 als Sohn des Juristen und Übersetzers Emil Lehmann (er übersetzte u.a. die Werke Dickens ins Deutsche) in Hamburg geboren. Die Geschwister Emil Lehmanns emigrierten aus Deutschland und ließen sich in Amerika, Frankreich und England nieder. Für Carl Friedrich hatte dies den ‚Vorteil', auf ein weitreichendes Netzwerk an erfolg- und einflussreichen Verwandten in aller Welt zurückgreifen zu können. Er begann seine juristischen Studien und wandte sich bald der Orientalistik zu. 1883 promovierte er in Göttingen zum Doktor der Rechtswissenschaften. 1886 legte er eine Bearbeitung der Inschriften des babylonischen Königs Šamaš-šumu-ukīn bei Friedrich Delitzsch vor, der zu diesem Zeitpunkt einer der bedeutendsten Assyriologen Deutschlands war. Damit wurde er zum Doktor der Philosophie promoviert.[5]

1893 habilitierte er sich in Berlin für Alte Geschichte und unternahm gemeinsam mit Waldemar Belck von Mai 1898 bis Oktober 1899 eine bedeutende Armenien-Expedition, die für die weitere Erforschung des antiken Großreiches von Urartu, das vom 9. bis 7. Jh. v. Chr. Bestand hatte, grundlegend war und deren Auswertung Lehmann-Haupt noch für viele Jahrzehnte beschäftigte.[6] 1901 erhielt er eine außerordentliche Professur in Berlin, wechselte jedoch 1911 als Professor für Griechisch an die Universität Liverpool. Bei Kriegsausbruch kehrte Lehmann-Haupt nach Deutschland zurück und lehrte an der Universität Greifswald. 1915 wechselte er nach Konstantinopel, wo er und seine Frau wohl Zeugen der Auswirkung der Armenierverfolgung wurden, deren Schrecken Therese Lehmann-

3 Siehe dazu auch den Beitrag von Christopher Lehmann-Haupt in diesem Band. Im Zuge seines Innsbruck-Aufenthaltes gab Christopher Lehmann-Haupt zwei Interviews: *Tiroler Tageszeitung*, Nummer 80 vom 21.03.2013, 13 und *MOLE* 11, 2013, 14.

4 Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt wurde von nationalsozialistischer Seite wohl als Jude klassifiziert, was zu den Problemen mit Schachermeyr und zum weitgehenden Ausbleiben von Nachrufen führte. Er selbst nahm sich jedoch wohl als patriotischen Deutschen wahr, was sich unter anderem auch in seinem Engagement in der Südtirol-Frage zeigte. Siehe dazu Kellner in diesem Band. Zu der schwierigen Frage nach seiner Selbstwahrnehmung siehe Hagen, Kieser und Kellner in diesem Band.

5 Zur Berliner Zeit Lehmann-Haupts siehe Rebenich in diesem Band.

6 Zu den Urartu-Forschungen Lehmann-Haupts siehe Kroll und Salvini in diesem Band.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Haupt in einem kurzen aber eindrucksvollen Text festhielt.[7] 1918 nahm er einen Ruf nach Innsbruck an, wo er bis zu seinem Tode im Jahr 1938 wohnhaft blieb und wo unter anderem der einflussreiche österreichische Althistoriker Fritz Schachermeyr (1895–1987) zu seinen Schülern zählte.[8]

Lehmann-Haupt war ein äußerst produktiver Wissenschaftler, der auf vielen Gebieten tätig war. Seine Publikationen beschäftigen sich zunächst mit spezifisch assyriologischen Themen, wie etwa der Edition von Keilschrifttexten oder Überlegungen zum babylonischen Zahlensystem und konzentrieren sich dann sehr stark auf die metrologische Forschung, zu der Lehmann-Haupt mehr als 30 Publikationen vorgelegt hat.[9] Urartu bildete naturgemäß einen weiteren Schwerpunkt seiner Publikationen, daneben äußerte er sich vermehrt zu althistorischen Fragen. 1910 erschien der erste Band *Armenien einst und jetzt*. 1911 legte er eine über 300 Seiten starke Geschichte Israels vor. 1926 wurde der zweite Armenienband publiziert. In diesem Zusammenhang machte er mehrfach auf die Armenienfrage aufmerksam. 1928 konnte nach langen Vorarbeiten die über viele Jahrzehnte maßgebende Publikation der urartäischen Inschriften vorlegen. Durch die persönliche Beziehung zu Charles Dickens motiviert, publizierte Lehmann-Haupt auch zwei Aufsätze zu diesem Schriftsteller, in denen er persönliche Erinnerungen verarbeitete.

Bereits die Publikationen zur Metrologie offenbaren einen spezifischen Forschungsansatz Lehmann-Haupts, den er in späteren Jahren etwa auch für die Interpretation klassischer Autoren wie Herodot nutzte: die Kulturkontaktforschung und insbesondere die Zusammenschau altorientalischer und klassisch-antiker Quellen zur Lösung historischer Fragestellungen.

Trotz der vielen neuen Erkenntnisse über Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt bleibt noch der Hinweis auf offene Fragen. Vor allem für die Zeit Lehmann-Haupts in Istanbul und Liverpool konnte nur sehr wenig Material herangezogen werden, da wir zu den Istanbuler Akten keinen Zugang hatten und sich in Liverpool keine Unterlagen zu Lehmann-Haupt finden ließen. Es würde uns freuen, wenn Neuentdeckungen auf diesem Gebiet in einigen Jahren eine erweiterte Neuauflage des Bandes nötig machen würden.

Abschließend möchten wir uns ganz herzlich bei der Orient-Gesellschaft Hammer-Purgstall bedanken, durch deren finanzielle Unterstützung die Vortragsreihe ermöglicht wurde. Für Druckkostenzuschüsse danken wir dem Land Tirol und dem Land Vorarlberg, sowie der Philosophisch-Historischen Fakultät der Universität Innsbruck. Frau Mag. Reinstadler-Rettenbacher haben wir für ihre professionelle Unterstützung bei der Herstellung des Bandes sowie des Indexes zu danken.

Klaus Eisterer, Sebastian Fink, Robert Rollinger und Dirk Rupnow

7 Siehe dazu Kieser und Riccabona in diesem Band.

8 Zur nicht unproblematischen Beziehung zwischen Schachermeyr und Lehmann-Haupt siehe Pesditschek in diesem Band.

9 Siehe dazu Scharringer in diesem Band.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt and the Lehmann Family Secrets

Christopher Lehmann-Haupt

At first it seemed like an amazing coincidence. I had been writing a memoir about a year right after World War II when as a 12-year-old I happened to be living in Berlin while my father was working for the United States Military Government. I had found myself taking a long genealogical detour, to explore what it must have been like for my father to be back in the country of his birth.

Just as I was beginning to grasp the surprising (to me) magnitude of his father (and my grandfather) Carl Friedrich Lehmann-Haupt's career as an ancient historian, I received – right out of the blue – an e-mail from a young instructor at the University of Innsbruck, where C.F. ended his illustrious career in what I understood was a thud of humiliation. Would I be willing, the e-mailer asked, to deliver the opening lecture in a series of nine to be devoted to my grandfather and his wife, Therese, on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of their deaths?

The timing was amazing, because the University couldn't possibly know about the memoir I was writing or exactly where I was in it. But the more I discussed the prospect with the correspondent – Dr. Sebastian Fink of the Department of Ancient History and Assyriology – the more I saw the e-mail and its contents as coincidental in the most literal sense of that word – that is, defining two similar events happening independently at the same time. Just like me, Innsbruck too was realizing the magnitude of Carl Friedrich's career. And the reason that I, among several family candidates, had been invited to Innsbruck was simply that when you Google the name Lehmann-Haupt my name comes up first, if only because, among the present generation I happen to have been around the longest.

The invitation impressed me instantly as both exciting and potentially valuable to my book. To spend a week or so in Innsbruck visiting the haunts of my grandparents that I was too young to take in as a child; that we had inexplicably missed on a motor-trip south in the summer of 1947, and that I was now through my research beginning to comprehend: this could help me a lot to understand more about my family and possibly something more about myself that I had never ever seen before.

Yet in the light of what I had learned about my grandparents by the time Sebastian Fink's e-mail arrived, the invitation also raised a complex set of problems, not to mention an inexplicable feeling of dread.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Here is what I had learned in the six months or so before. A little of it came from tapping memories of my early childhood, and from going over the well-trodden ground of family gossip with my younger brother Carl. But the richest part of it came from the Internet, the most useful item there being a profile written in 1985 by a prominent faculty member at the University of Innsbruck, Günther Lorenz, another professor of ancient history there.

His essay appeared in a volume celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the Institute for Ancient History in Innsbruck (*100 Jahre Alte Geschichte in Innsbruck*).[1] My grandfather was included because 70 years earlier he had been a member of the faculty there. (He had retired in 1932, although following the takeover of Austria by Nazi Germany, or 'Anschluss', on March 12th, 1938, he might well have been among the members of the university who for "political" and "racial" reasons, as the Nazis put it, were expelled from the University and excluded from its subsequent records.) After laboriously translating Lorenz's sometimes difficult German, I had an entryway into Carl's and Therese's lives and the ground for much deeper digging.

C.F.'s preparation for his chosen profession had been exhaustive and impressive, to say the least. Born in Hamburg in 1861 to Emil and Amalie (Leo) Lehmann, he attended the prestigious old gymnasium Johanneum (founded in 1529), which to this day still focuses on teaching Latin and ancient Greece, and says it is proud of having educated some of Germany's political leaders and notable scientists. After graduating, he spent the next three years studying law at Heidelberg, Leipzig, Berlin and Göttingen, receiving his law doctorate in 1883. But along the way he got caught up with the study of philology and other aspects of ancient history. This came from exposure to some of the age's leading Assyriologists and Orientalists, as specialists in ancient Mesopotamian culture were then called (long before Edward Said, the Palestinian literary theorist, in his influential study, 'Orientalism', gave the term a negative, Western imperialist, connotation). Likely one of C.F.'s influences was Theodor Mommsen, the great 19th century German classicist and Nobel Laureate in Literature (1902) for his works on Roman history.[2] Mommsen had a

1 Lorenz 1985. All the following English citations of this article are based on my translation.

2 Best known for his still influential history of Rome, Mommsen, the only literature Nobel Laureate to date for a nonfiction work, is likely remembered today by those few familiar with him for beating out Leo Tolstoy for the prize. But a sense of his importance in the 19th century is conveyed by no less that Mark Twain in his report on a large formal banquet in his own honor at the University of Berlin, in 1882:

"When apparently the last eminent guest had long ago taken his place, again those three bugle-blasts rang out, and once more the swords leaped from their scabbards. Who might this late comer be? Nobody was interested to inquire. Still, indolent eyes were turned toward the distant entrance, and we saw the silken gleam and the lifted sword of a guard of honor plowing through the remote crowds. Then we saw that end of the house rising to its feet; saw it rise abreast the advancing guard all along like a wave. This supreme honor had been offered to no one before. There was an excited whisper at our table – 'MOMMSEN!' – and the whole house rose. Rose and shouted and stamped and clapped and banged the beer mugs. Just simply a storm!"

"Then the little man with his long hair and Emersonian face edged his way past us and took his seat. I could have touched him with my hand – Mommsen! – think of it! (...) I would have walked a great many miles to get a sight of him, and here he was, without trouble or tramp or cost of any kind. Here he was clothed in a titanic deceptive modesty which made him look like any other men." (Meltzer 1960)

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

family connection to the Lehmanns evident in his having written a poem when young about a painting by C.F.'s uncle Rudolf, who in 1859 in turn drew Mommsen's portrait (now in the British Museum). Family lore also has it that at some point Mommsen tutored C.F. privately during crack-of-dawn sessions. Much later, after Mommsen's death in 1903, C.F. published an obituary in *Klio*, a journal of ancient history he had founded in 1901 and edited for years after.

But whatever caused C.F.'s shift of interest, as a result he never practiced law. Instead, he attended Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore and then the University of Berlin, and studied ancient history toward a second doctorate in philosophy, which he got in 1886. Much of Carl's research for his thesis depended on his growing command of cuneiform, the type of writing composed of wedge-shaped elements used in various forms by most ancient Middle-Eastern cultures. Focusing on the reign of a 7th-century BCE Assyrian king of Babylon who led an unsuccessful rebellion against his younger brother, then king of Assyria, C.F. followed the old-fashioned style of submitting the resulting thesis in Latin. He showed the breadth of his knowledge, Lorenz writes, by interweaving the text with cuneiform writing and transcription, and accompanying this with Latin translation and commentary.

The completion of this doctoral work earned C.F. an appointment as an unpaid assistant in the Egyptian department of the Royal Museum of Berlin. This launched him on a period of years consumed by intense research, prolific publication and lecturing, and productive fieldwork. All this activity composed a process common to many European and near-Asian countries, known as habilitation (from the Latin habilis, 'fit, proper, skillful'). Habilitation seems to require variously the acquisition, as opposed to reacquisition, of special teaching skills, as well as the publication of a post-doctoral doctorate in the form of a book; and attaining the qualifications to supervise doctoral candidates on one's own. In German-speaking countries, completing one's habilitation earns one the title 'Privatdozent' and confers the right to teach independently at the university level. In my grandfather's case, habilitation meant publishing numerous articles in the somewhat arcane field of metrology – or the science of measurement. It meant bringing out a book, *Shamash-Shum-Ukin: King of Babylon*, developed from his second doctoral thesis, and undertaking a remarkable archaeological fieldtrip that literally changed him for a time from a lampblack-smeared scholar to a version of Indiana Jones.[3]

This trek occurred after a prominent chemist, Waldemar Belck, who was mining copper in the Trans-Caucasus for a pioneering German telegraph company, Siemens, had turned up cuneiform evidence of ancient civilizations that caught the interest of influential people familiar with C.F.'s work on that subject. After an introduction, Belck and C.F. began to publish their findings jointly. Finally, late in the 1890's, the two determined to confirm their developing theories through a first-hand search for evidence.

Delayed by Kurdish unrest in the region, finally in 1898 they realized their plans. Starting out from Tbilisi, Georgia, which they had reached by Russian railroad, they traveled south, mainly by horseback and accompanied by pack animals. In the next year and half, exploring in Armenia, northern Iran and Iraq, and eastern Turkey, the two not only confirmed theories they had developed before the outing, but also discovered new material.

3 For the importance and circumstances of this journey see Kroll and Salvini in this volume.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

C.F. himself, especially after Belck was called away to testify in court about nearly being murdered by robbers, dug up material that he would develop and write about for the remainder of his long career.

What must have been particularly thrilling to my grandfather was to find concrete evidence of what he had until then learned about only in lecture halls and libraries. For instance, in Van, on the Eastern shore of Lake Van, in Eastern Turkey (once part of Armenia), he and Belck found the passes and fords that Xenophon of Athens – the Greek historian, philosopher, military general and former student of Socrates – must have traveled circa 400 BCE to lead his 10,000 mercenaries north to the Baltic Sea against the hostile Persians and Medes. This was the great adventure he wrote about in *Anabasis* (*The Expedition*), which students of Greek to this day read in the same way that Latin students read Caesar's *Gallic Wars*.

Farther west in Turkey, near what is today the city of Silvan, C.F. discovered the ancient city of Tigranocerta, once part of Armenia. It was there that during the third Roman-Mithradatic war of the first century BCE, the Roman Consul Lucius Licinius Lucullus in 69 BCE defeated King Tigranes the Great of Armenia, whose wife, Cleopatra of Pontus, was the daughter of King Mithdridatis VI of Pontus. In his later writings, C.F. reconstructed the battle, in which most of Tig-ranes's empire to the south of the Taurus Mountains was lost to the Romans. To the northwest of Silvan, in Diyakbar Province, C.F. explored the so-called Tigris Tunnel, a natural cave complex through which one of the tributaries of the Tigris River flows. While the place had already been discovered decades earlier, Carl was the first to take impressions of some of the relief sites and inscriptions on the walls (some of them physically hard to reach), and to publish them subsequently. These wall markings are apparently thought to be part of a practice of Upper Mesopotamian Bronze and Iron Age cultures to place a stamp marking significant places, and thereby help to create, so to speak, a social memory. The Tigris Tunnel has come to be thought of by contemporary Assyriologists as an especially rich 'site of memory'.

What was most telling about the expedition was the fulfillment of its main purpose to begin with – the partnership's further confirmation at several places in both Armenia and Turkey of the theory that ancient historians had been developing since the 1820's and that C.F. and Belck had worked on together for more than a decade. This was the existence of a hitherto unknown non-Semitic Iron Age civilization centered around Lake Van on the mountainous plateau between Asia Minor, Mesopotamia and the Caucasus mountains later known as the Armenian Highlands. The kingdom rose to power in the mid-9th-century BCE, but was conquered by the Medes in the early 6th century BCE. The land has come to be known as Urartu, thought to be a variation of Ararat of the Old Testament, although my grandfather and his partner referred to it as Khaldini, after the god the Urartians worshiped, named Khaldi. Mount Ararat itself is situated within the former kingdom, about 75 miles north of present-day Van, its former capital.

My grandfather's profiler, Günther Lorenz, writes that at an Urartu fortress near Van, the team studied the area using instruments such as sextants, barometers and thermometers. Carl carried out excavations, made paper impressions of inscriptions he found, took samples of the citadel's rocks and made the first photographs of the site with a telephoto lens. He amazed local Christian dignitaries and churchgoers by revealing Urartian inscriptions on the reverse sides of the stone of a local church's walls (Armenia having adopted Christian-

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

ity in the early 4th century CE). Altogether, the expedition nearly doubled the evidence of Urartian culture, as well as yielding a rich store of information about the early Christian and Muslim cultures of Armenia. In fact, Lorenz adds, the material gathered was so rich that a bitter conflict broke out between C.F. and Belck over the right to make use of it. Lorenz logically enough traces this to Belck's being the leader of the expedition while C.F. was only his staff, although C.F. had the greater technical and language skills to interpret the material. Whatever the cause, friendship soon turned to enmity, with my grandfather ending up in possession of the material, enabling him to make important advances in his career.[4]

Lorenz sees this personal turmoil as a pattern in my grandfather's subsequent career; he details numerous fallings out with colleagues and potential protégés, and concludes that at the end of his professional dealings, C.F. had failed to create a "school" at the university level, and thus remains in memory a prominent academic loner. ("Und so bleibt die Erinnerung an einen markanten akademischen Einzelgänger.")

Lorenz leaves the impression too that the somewhat halting and erratic course of C.F.'s career can be explained by his prickliness, hypersensitivity and personal stand-offishness. Such quirks would certainly be one explanation for why after completing his archaeological fieldwork and being appointed in 1901 to an associate professorship at the University of Berlin[5], C.F. soon fell out with his esteemed circle of colleagues – several of whom were his original inspiration for taking up ancient history – and left in 1911 for England, where thanks to family connections, he found teaching positions at Liverpool and Oxford. Then, only a few years later, in 1914, he left England to become a supplementary professor first in Greifswald, the German university-city on the Baltic, and then in Constantinople, Turkey. Finally, in 1918 he took over the chair of ancient history at Innsbruck, where he stayed until his retirement in 1932 and the cessation of his lectureship in 1936.

Certainly, some bumps in the road of C.F.'s progress can be explained by the personal enmity he aroused, for whatever reason. This seems powerfully reflected in a passage by a German ancient historian, Johannes Martin Renger, in a history he wrote of his discipline as it was taught at the University of Berlin: "A sense of the degree of mutual enmity [among C.F.L. and his colleagues] is reflected in an editorial by F.D. Peiser [founder of the publication *Orientalische Literaturzeitung*] commenting on Lehmann's appointment [to his Berlin professorship]: 'I apologize for the delay in publishing this, (...) but when the announcement appeared in the daily papers I thought it was more or less a bad joke. Otherwise, Ancient History will be whatever it makes of itself without having to worry about the activity of the garbage on which it lives'."[6] Renger adds that this contemptuous notice by Peiser must be read with the understanding that at the time Peiser's friend Hugo Winckler, an archaeologist and ancient historian of equal standing to my grandfather's, was still an unsalaried 'Privatdozent'.

So, evidently professional rivalry is another possible explanation for the shape of C.F.'s career, to be added to his apparent contrariness. So too is European history: given his German nationality, the outbreak of World War I forced C.F. to leave England, and his (and his wife's) outspoken support of Armenia during Turkey's massacre of its population

4 Lorenz 1985: 34–36.
5 Meaning that he had only a token salary and administrative duties.
6 Renger 1979: 173.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

mustn't have sat well in Constantinople. Yet I can't help seeing the acid of anti-Semitism eating away at C.F.'s professional existence. True, his mind was literally captivated by the subject of Babylon. But he suffered to a metaphorical Babylonian Captivity, in which he not only silenced his own song, so to speak, but also tried with limited success to sing the songs of his captors.

Lorenz, his profiler, comes closest to conceding this outright when he writes that at the end of C.F.'s career and life, he was burdened by official inquiries about his and his wife's "origins". Lorenz reports that the investigation correctly concluded that "the woman" was "purely Aryan", and incorrectly that C.F. "is probably not a full Jew".[7] And he refers obliquely to the injustice with which C.F. was treated after his death: "And so the chronicler is left to note that Lehmann-Haupt was not even acknowledged in an obituary in *Klio*, the journal he himself had founded and whose editor he had entrusted as his successor; there appeared not a single word of remembrance".[8] This, however, is only half the story, as I would later learn.

But for me, still feeling the bitter chill of a powerful history I had recently read – *The Pity of It All. A Portrait of the German-Jewish Epoch 1743–1933*, by the Israeli writer Amos Elon – I couldn't help seeing the 'burden' of C.F.'s Jewishness as playing a role throughout his career. And not only did it affect his résumé as a teacher, it also colored the treatment of his scholarly work. To explain this properly one has to understand certain obscure corners of his specialty as an ancient historian. These can be summed up roughly under the heading Cultural Diffusion, or the theory that ancient civilizations exercised deep influences on those that succeeded them. Much of C.F.'s early work was devoted to proving the validity of Cultural Diffusion.

Here are a couple of examples. Having founded the journal *Klio* at the time of his appointment to Berlin's faculty, C.F. devoted the first essay he published in it to a subject that a decade later became a small book, *Die historische Semiramis und ihre Zeit. Vortrag in der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft zu Berlin am 6. Februar* [The Historical Semiramis and Her Time]. This was an exercise that is worth detailing for its implications if not its actual achievement. In this study he set about to distinguish between two figures, one legendary, the other historical. The legendary one, known in Greek as Semiramis, was thought to be the queen who inspired certain stupendous projects of antiquity, from the artificial banks of the Euphrates to the Hanging Gardens of Babylon (also called The Hanging Gardens of Semiramis). The latter is one of the so-called 'Seven Wonders of the Ancient World', along with the Colossus of Rhodes, the Great Pyramid of Giza, and so forth. To this day, Assyrians still often name their female children Semiramis, or Samira, for short. To distinguish the actual historical figure from the legend, C.F. identified and described the Assyrian queen Shammuramat, spouse of King Shamshi-Adad V, who ruled the Assyrian empire from 824 BCE to 811 BCE, and then was regent for four years until her son Adad-nirari III came of age. She was the reality that gave rise to the myth.

Emboldened by the success of this exercise, my grandfather gradually took on bigger and bigger projects of separating historical fact from mythology, and of showing that within every legend lies a kernel of historical truth. Eventually he arrived at the most challenging

7 Unless of course he meant that C.F. was not fully committed to his ostensible religion.
8 Lorenz 1985: 44.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

one of all, namely to distinguish between what is actual and what is legendary in the Old Testament. This projected him directly into the middle of the heated scholarly debate going on at the turn of the 19th century that was known as Panbabylonism, or what its adherents and commentators sometimes referred to as 'the Babel-Bible controversy'.

Panbabylonism is a school of historical thought that regards the Hebrew Bible and Judaism as deriving largely from Babylonian mythology, specifically versions of creation myths found on fragmentary clay tablets dating back to the Bronze Age. The school arose in the late 19th century and lasted into the 1920's, when its tenets were more or less refuted, although to this day they still remain influential in some obscure quarters. At its extreme, the movement served as an instrument of anti-Semitism. One example is a book, *Die große Täuschung* [The Great Deception], by Friedrich Delitzsch, like Mommsen a major influence on my grandfather's decision to study ancient history, as well as one of his close colleagues at the University of Berlin. This work not only attacked the accuracy of the Hebrew Bible, but also took on the New Testament by arguing among other things that Jesus was not a Jew at all but rather a Galilean Aryan. My grandfather had contributed somewhat to the movement by supporting the notion of so-called cultural diffusion, an essential tenet of Panbabylonism. In 1889, presumably after his return from Armenia and before his appointment to Berlin, he submitted a paper to the Eighth International Congress of Orientalists, then meeting in Stockholm. This paper, on one of his specialties, metrology, or the science of measurement, was titled, *Das altbabylonische Maß- und Gewichtssystem als Grundlage der antiken Gewichts-, Münz- und Maßsysteme* [The Old Babylonian System of Volume and Weight as the Foundation of the Ancient System of Weight, Coinage, and Volume]. According to Gary D. Thompson[9], an historian of the Panbabylonism movement: "The paper resulted in the general acceptance of the notion that a single system of measures spread through the world by diffusion from Mesopotamia". From this notion – what I will somewhat crudely call 'the one-size-fits-all theory of metrology' – it was subsequently inferred that scientific thinking too, and even culture itself, spread by diffusion from Mesopotamia.

Aware that he had contributed to a movement he didn't wholly embrace, my grandfather then sought to tip the balance back by challenging several of his colleagues, in particular Delitzsch, author of *Die große Täuschung* [The Great Deception]. In a series of publications during his decade of teaching at Berlin, C.F. tried to show that the cultural and historical achievements of Mesopotamia had value quite apart from their influence on Israel. At the same time, he sought to establish what was real and original in the Bible. Whether he succeeded or not is beyond my ability to judge. But Günther Lorenz in his profile sums up C.F.'s achievement as follows: "While he intended to expunge from the legend-ridden history of Israel only concrete details that are directly refutable, he did not succeed at freeing himself completely from Old Testament narrative of a mythical character, and at leaving open where necessary the resulting gaps in the historical picture".[10] In other words, Lorenz seems to be saying in this somewhat opaque sentence, C.F. didn't just throw out the refutable facts in the Old Testament and leave the resulting gaps in the narrative for readers and scholars to puzzle out for themselves. Instead, Lorenz says, Carl

9 Thompson 2004–2012.
10 Lorenz 1985: 38.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

allowed some residual mythology to influence him and thereby cause him to distort the Bible's story back to its former coherence. Maybe I'm straining here to tailor my reading of Lorenz to fit how I see my grandfather's life, but I can't help seeing a message lurking in these words that Carl made the mistake of still supporting the legendary aspects of the Old Testament and of thus allowing his being a Jew to influence his scholarship.[11]

Did C.F. react in any way to these possible undercurrents in the flow of his career? Yes and no, at least so far as I can see. His private life seemed to progress unexceptionally in the years from 1901 until the outbreak of World War I. In 1901, perhaps feeling better off financially because of his new job, he married Therese Haupt, the daughter of a school-board head in Stettin. In October 1903, their son, Hellmut Otto Emil (my father), was born, and the following November their daughter, Agnes Miriam. Surprisingly (at least to me), not until 1905 did the two decide to merge their surnames into Lehmann-Haupt. I had somehow always thought that the point of this name change was to bring Therese more prominently into the partnership, as it were, because of her growing reputation as a writer. But the better I get to know C.F., the more I suspect that his motive was to become more German. Therese, after all, was Lutheran, the daughter of parents who would three decades later become "strong Nazis"[12] (although somewhat paradoxically perhaps, Therese herself became a Zionist[13]). Further evidence of C.F.'s Germanophilia is that when World War I broke out, he not only hastily left England (leaving his furniture and scholarly material behind) and volunteered for military service,[14] but also wrote lectures and pamphlets calling for all Germans abroad to be proud and supportive of the homeland and to vigorously oppose all negative comment about Germany and its policy. In short, C.F. seems to have been one of the breed of German Jews who reacted to bigotry by striving to become more German than the Germans. Later, at a critical moment in modern German history, he would go dangerously further in flaunting this tendency.

Anti-Semitism may even have tinged C.F.'s work in that other of his arcane specialties, historical metrology, or the ancient history of weights and measures, at the time an important area of classical studies. Doubtless taking his cue from a giant in the discipline, his mentor Theodor Mommsen, C.F. published nearly three-dozen scholarly articles on the subject from 1886 through 1931. The great majority appeared before 1920, after which the general view of metrology changed radically. The gist of his outlook in these writings was consistent with his take on Cultural Diffusion – that the Assyrian-Babylonian system of weights and measures had greatly influenced corresponding systems in the Greco-Roman world and later cultures.

11 Commenting on my analysis, Sebastian Fink wrote: "This is all very uncertain stuff, because nobody knows how to date the Old Testament. Today it seems that quite a lot of the old parts were written after the time of Alexander the Great". So Lorenz may have been criticizing C.F. for accepting uncertain dates.

12 This is according to my father's third wife, Ingeborg Pfeifer Lehmann-Haupt, who survives him as of this writing.

13 Also according to Ingeborg Pfeifer Lehmann-Haupt.

14 In the event, as I learned in Innsbruck, C.F. ended up supervising the mail in the prison-of-war camp Zossen, 20 miles south of Berlin.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

But if Panbabylonism was infused with prejudice, then historical metrology was absolutely deluged by it. At least that's the impression you get from one outspoken scholar in the field, Livio Catullo Stecchini (1913–1979), author of among other works, *A History of Measures*, which is easily accessible on-line (at least in part), although it seems never to have been formally published. To convey how riven with ideology the subject was, Stecchini writes in his introduction, "Why Study Metrology?": "It took me many years to discover that I was engaged in a field that, within its limits, was as dangerous as the study of astronomy in the age of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation."[15]

Now, I should admit straight out that Stecchini's work is peremptorily dismissed by many serious ancient historians, and with good cause. Most damning, his theories on metrology were popularized in Peter Tomkins's best-selling *Secrets of the Great Pyramid*, aligning him with the crackpot school of Pyramidology, which holds that the key to all ancient measurements lies in the dimensions of the Great Pyramid of Giza, in Egypt. Nearly as damning, Stecchini defended the theories of the controversial Russian psychiatrist Immanuel Velikovsky, who wrote, among other books, the highly debatable *Worlds in Collision*, which posited (pseudo-scientifically, most argue) that the earth's early history was altered by near collisions with Jupiter, originally a comet, and Mars. Finally, Stecchini is accused by many astute readers of a flawed habit of reasoning – that is, starting out with an assumption and then trying to verify it by means of highly selective evidence.

Yet while browsing through *A History of Measures* – if browsing is the right word for what you have to do to penetrate Stecchini's obfuscating prose – I found that dismissing him out of hand isn't entirely fair. In *A History of Measures* at least, he is actually quite critical of Pyramidologists and likely would protest being counted in their number. As for the controversial Velikovsky: before his theories on ancient history stirred up trouble, he was a founder of Hebrew University in Jerusalem and a respected psychoanalyst. Finally, if Stecchini's reasoning on metrology may be flawed, if not altogether baffling, he has much of interest to say on the politics surrounding the subject. This comes from having lived through its stormiest times, during which he studied in Germany, Italy and the U.S.A. Moreover, he knew the key languages – German, Italian and English – in which many obscure scholarly battles over it were fought.[16]

Most compellingly, at least for me, Stecchini writes in great and specific detail of how my grandfather's reputation as a metrologist suffered because of his being Jewish. Moreover, as I read Stecchini, I see other odd attractions in his polemics, among them his provocative theories on the historical origins of anti-Semitism, which, while not original with him, are compellingly articulated. In short, Stecchini may be a crank, as some have called him, but what he has to say suggests that many a crank has its case.

15 The epigraph that heads Stecchini's introductory chapter in *A History of Measures* reads as follows: "La metrologia non é scienza, é un incubo." [Metrology is Not a Science; It's a Nightmare.]

16 It may also reflect on his career that after having studied at the University of Rome and the University of Freiburg, and having taken his doctorate at Harvard, and teaching at the University of Rome and the University of Chicago, he ended up at Paterson State University, a relatively marginal locale for the study of Ancient History.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

Reading Stecchini on metrology in general and on my grandfather in particular, you have to wonder how such a seemingly rational subject could have attracted such irrationality. How could such furious disputes have arisen over concrete questions about how objects in the physical world might first have been described in terms of their lengths, their weights, and, if hollowed out, how much liquid they could hold and how much that in turn may have weighed?

One major enemy of objectivity in this field has been the scarcity of physical evidence – samples of exemplary lengths, weights and containers. Stone gets chipped over time, metal corrodes, and pottery gets broken. Paradoxically, one major appeal of the theory that metrological systems got passed along from older cultures to newer ones – the so-called Cultural Diffusion that my grandfather theorized – was the relative scarcity of samples and the consequent inability to measure them precisely compared with the evidence from later periods of study.

Equally damaging to objectivity has been the philosophical predispositions of scholars examining ancient metrological evidence, however scarce the samples may have been. These outlooks have ranged from the ridiculous to the sublime, but mostly they've been confused and confusing. Take the school of Pyramidology, for example. One sophisticated hobbyist in metrology whom I found through the Internet, Jon Bosak, better known as the information engineer who led the development of XML,[17] characterizes the ultimate absurdity of Pyramidology by reporting that this school held that the Great Pyramid of Egypt, if properly measured by a length called the Pyramid Inch, "reveals in its features the history of the world, both past and present".[18]

Or take the views of the English and Germans toward one another just prior to World War I. Stecchini reports that on the eve of World War I – one of whose causes was of course industrial competition between England and Germany – English classical scholars decided that they had grown too dependent on their German counterparts. He writes: "The archaeologist Sir William Ramsay proclaimed that there were two methods of scientific research: one, called the 'method of exhaustion', by which the researcher considered all possibilities before choosing one; and the other by which the researcher conceived a new idea. The first method required 'continuity of working' and belonged to the Germanic races; the second method required 'ingenuity' and belonged to the Anglo-Saxon races." Ramsay concluded that because the English method arrived at "discoveries", whereas the German method of exhaustion could only do "useful work", the English method had to be superior. For the moment at least, Stecchini leaves aside the problems several schools of scholarship found with Jewish thinking on any subject.

Yet when it comes to examining the more thoughtful motives of historical metrologists, Stecchini defines in the loftiest terms what divides two of the most intellectually respectable camps. One camp, he suggests, saw the earliest attempts to measure objects as re-

17 Extensible Markup Language (XML) is a markup language that defines a set of rules for encoding documents in a format that is both human-readable and machine-readable.

18 Bosak 2010: VII. Bosak continues: "Given the bad odor surrounding the subject of historical metrology (as it's properly called), the reluctance of modern historians to trace our standards farther back than the medieval era is hardly surprising. And the innocent but unfortunate tendency of early 20th century archaeologists to propose theory ahead of the data soured a couple of generations of later archaeologists on the subject as well."

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

flecting the inherently rational structure of the human mind. Thus, the first measuring cultures are seen as having conceived an entire, integrated system that related everything from units of length to those of volume and even to the value of coins (which may be why shekels and talents, for instance, designate both units of weight and currency). What I'm calling, for informality's sake, a one-size-fits-all theory of measurement, such integrated systems would be likely to influence succeeding cultures, thereby offering evidence of Cultural Diffusion. These earliest, influential cultures, partly designated as Semitic, occupied the Fertile Crescent (Mesopotamia) around the 30th century BCE. This area encompassed the Akkadian, Babylonian and Assyrian civilizations along the Tigris and Euphrates rivers.

In contrast, the opposing camp seems to have judged early cultures as lacking the capacity (or need) to integrate and systematize. In this view, primitive societies likely developed measurements piecemeal and unintegrated – a shekel here and a talent there, so to speak. Succeeding cultures would thus be left to their own devices in developing a metrology, thereby invalidating Cultural Diffusion.

In practical fact, the search for a one-size-fits-all theory of metrology was pretty much abandoned after 1920, for the simple reason that research had turned up too much disparate evidence for an integrated system to survive. This may well be why my grandfather, a proponent of Cultural Diffusion, stopped concentrating on metrology in the 1920's. As one recent book on the subject[19] puts it, my grandfather, characterized as the "the last great representative of the school of comparative metrology at the start of the 20th century", stood for a paradigm that was left behind when precise measurement began, and when the belief in a common metrology for the whole of the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean was given up in consequence. In short, after 1920 or so, what I call the one-size-fits-all theory was no longer taken seriously.

But the somewhat quixotic Stecchini puts his own, unique, spin on the history of metrology. He holds to a one-size-fits-all theory, arguing against the prevailing consensus that metrological evidence was too fragmented to support a coherent system of measurement throughout ancient history. But he goes much further, insisting that "metrology is so central to ancient history that its study tends to expand in all directions", ultimately implying "a recognizable rational order" in the world.

Against my more sober judgment, I'm inclined to hear Stecchini out for several somewhat subjective reasons. First and foremost, he places my grandfather at the heart of his argument, pronouncing him the "soundest" and "most responsible scholar of ancient measures in this century (...) scientifically rigorous and alien from any flight of mystical imagination". And second, he blames the rejection of metrology as a study, and, interchangeably, of my grandfather's work, on a profound form of anti-Semitism. And I'm inclined to be sympathetic to these positions partly because of the way Amos Elon frames the situation of Jews in Germany in *The Pity of It All*, partly because of how Stecchini accounts for my grandfather's professional struggles, and partly because of his ultimate fate as a scholar, which, as I study Stecchini, I'm just beginning to glimpse.

19 Chambon 2011.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528

I'll skip explaining here just why exactly C.F.'s work is so central to Stecchini's case for a one-size-fits-all theory of metrology both in the ancient world and thereafter. Any quick summary would only prove too confusing, given the complexity of its details and the disputes they aroused. Suffice to say that Stecchini credits C.F. for discovering a fundamental ratio in "ancient and medieval units of volume and weight", even arguing that a subsequent translation of a work by Aristotle served to confirm his theory.

As I've said, what's worth considering, despite its being somewhat self-serving of me to do so, is Stecchini's explanation for why my grandfather's theories were rejected. Addressing the question of "why there has been" what he terms "such an explosion of irrationality in a field so dry and technical", Stecchini digs down deep to the core of his reasoning. "My studies of ancient metrology have led me to two general conclusions: first, that metrology was born mainly from the practice of the international merchant class of the ancient world and, second, that metrology provided the foundation for the scientific rational vision of the world."

Having said this, Stecchini implies that those opposed to a one-size-fits-all theory of metrology prefer a vision of ancient cultures in harmony with the natural world around them and disinclined to create abstractions that would presumably separate those cultures from that world. And fittingly enough, he wraps up this point by citing the sociologist Max Weber's "description of the frame of mind necessary to the development of capitalism". From this Stecchini concludes: "Metrology is closely linked with an outlook that corresponds to that of the modern capitalistic scientific world. It is for this reason that there are people who, with the same logic for which Jews are blamed for modern capitalism and science, recognize in metrology something Semitic."[20]

Stecchini sees my grandfather in particular as having been a victim of this anti-Semitism, which is of why I'm disposed to take his controversial commentary at least in part seriously. Having made his discovery, Carl Friedrich then erred in his calculations, Stecchini laments, and therefore "could not develop the brilliant insights of his (...) writings". He thus left his work open to attack "*in toto*", and "after the death of Mommsen in 1903 (...) found himself isolated among ancient scholars". In sum, what Carl Friedrich's career ultimately suffered, Stecchini insists, was less a consequence of his miscalculations, but more the presence of pervasive anti-Semitism, especially in Germany, where the study of metrology itself was considered tainted by its connections with ancient Semitic cultures.

20 Stecchini: 14. – Readers familiar with Weber's writing will note that by citing him in this context, Stecchini ignores that Weber in his classic *The Protestant Ethic and the 'Spirit' of Capitalism and Other Writings*, specifically excludes Jews as having contributed to the spirit of capitalism. However, Jack Barbalet, an Australian sociologist, argues that Weber erred in this judgment. In his sensibly argued study *Weber, Passion and Profits. 'The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism' in Context*. Barbalet writes that Weber, although far from being an anti-Semite, for complex reasons confused what is inherent in Judaism as a religion with the way that society forced its adherents to practice it, thus marginalizing them and keeping them from full participation in capitalism. In his chapter "The Jewish Question. Religious Doctrine and Sociological Method" Barbalet concludes that it is therefore "simply erroneous to hold that economic outcome" in the case of Jews "derives from religious belief", and not from experience. So it would seem that inadvertently Stecchini, in his somewhat roughshod manner, turns out to be correct in his implication that Jews could have contributed to the invention of capitalism.

ISBN Print: 9783447103275 — ISBN E-Book: 9783447193528