Introduction: Representations of the Destruction of Jerusalem in Nineteenth-Century German Music, Art, and Literature

Two sisters died by their own hands in a suburb of Kassel in Germany in August 1885. The former lady's maids lived modestly and apparently had saved a pretty penny. There was no obvious reason for the gruesome deed that left both women drenched in blood in their locked bed-chamber. What could have motivated the gory deed? The papers were ready with an answer: "For some time, traces of mental derangement, a kind of insane religious enthusiasm, caused by too much reading of the Bible had been observed in both ladies";[1] more specifically, "the elder sister, after listening to a sermon about the destruction of Jerusalem, was convinced that she herself was personally involved in it."[2] Though vague as to the nature of the poor woman's imaginary involvement in the destruction of Jerusalem, the paper seems to suggest that this marked the culmination of her religious insanity and tipped her over the edge, taking her younger sibling with her into the abyss of self-inflicted death. A few years later, in 1889, another German paper described a construction site in the city of Hagen. A bridge was being dismantled to be replaced with a new structure. The note stated laconically: "As with the destruction of Jerusalem, nor beam nor stone remained one upon the other."[3]

Both of these examples, two of many, suggest the ubiquity of an imaginary of the destruction of Jerusalem in nineteenth-century Germany in very different social contexts. The portrayal of the perceived chaos at the construction site indicates that by then the imaginary of the historical occurrence had been diminished to the description of quotidian phenomena, that it had been disengaged from its religious context and had, in fact, been stripped down to a metaphorical essence; the historical occurrence of the destruction of Jerusalem as prophesied by Jesus—"they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another"[4]—had turned proverbial. The earlier note is particularly intriguing because it more or less at the same

1 Anonymous, [Untitled Note], *Sächsischer Landes-Anzeiger* (August 22, 1885): 2: "Seit einiger Zeit bemerkte man an den beiden [. . .] Spuren geistiger Gestörtheit, eine Art religiöser wahnsinniger Schwärmerei, hervorgerufen durch allzu vieles Bibellesen."

2 Ibid.: "So bildete sich die ältere Schwester, nachdem sie am Sonntag eine Predigt über die Zerstörung Jerusalems gehört, ein, sie sei persönlich dabei betheiligt gewesen."

3 Anonymous, [Untitled Note], *Hagener Zeitung* (June 13, 1889): 2: "Wie bei der Zerstörung Jerusalems ist kein Balken beim andern und kein Stein auf dem andern geblieben."

4 Luke 19:44; see also Matthew 24:2.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111662954-001

time established the religious context of the historical event as a potentially destructive and lethal force that played, and preyed, on the imagination.

The date is important in this context. The syndicated note about the double suicide appeared in the press on August 22 and it stated that the ghastly deed was prompted by a sermon that was shortly before attended by at least the elder of the two sisters, though it is more likely that the women went to church together almost two weeks earlier, on August 9, 1885. The date is significant because it confirms that the sermon preached on this tenth Sunday after Trinity was indeed about the destruction of Jerusalem. In the Protestant liturgical year, the tenth Sunday after Trinity used to be called *Judensonntag* (Jews' Sunday), a designation which has more recently been amended to *Israelsonntag* (Israel Sunday).[5] It is in close temporal proximity to the actual date of the destruction of the Second Temple on August 30 as well as *Tisha b'Av*, the ninth of the month of *Av* in the Jewish calendar, on which the destructions of the First Temple in 586/587 BCE and that of the Second Temple more than 600 years later are lamented in Judaism.

The significance of this tenth Sunday after Trinity lay in its commemoration of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Second Temple as an exhortatory example of the punishment the Lord would visit upon those who denied him. Sermons on this day would emphatically impress on congregants their sinfulness and invoke the destruction of Jerusalem as a type of the Last Judgment. One wonders if the pastor in Kassel restrained his homiletic fervor in subsequent years in response to the double suicide. The pericope scheduled for the *Judensonntag*, the passage from Scripture to be read and expounded in the sermon, was Luke 19:41–48, the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem by Jesus. Narratives of the destruction of Jerusalem were, moreover, also included in many hymnals and were read aloud in churches in additional afternoon meetings of the congregation on the Jews' Sunday. The *Judensonntag* was called thus not only because it emphasized the alleged obstinacy of the Jews in rejecting salvation and the ensuing cataclysmic divine punishment that supposedly signified their rejection by the Lord; but also because offertories on this particular day in the liturgical cycle were since 1853 designated for the Christian mission to the Jews.[6]

The conversion of the Jews to Christianity was an important concern in particular to Protestantism, ever since Martin Luther had envisaged—and then discarded—the notion of returning the Jews to the fold of the Lord. The idea was revived in the late seventeenth century with the rise of Pietism. In the early nine-

5 See Irene Mildenberger, *Der Israelsonntag—Gedenktag der Zerstörung Jerusalems: Untersuchungen zu seiner homiletischen und liturgischen Gestaltung in der evangelischen Tradition* (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2004), p. 5.

6 See ibid., p. 70.

teenth century, several societies for the promotion of Christianity among the Jews were established in the German-speaking lands in emulation of similar efforts in Britain. In a religious sense, conversion envisaged the reconciliation with the Chosen People that was recognized to have been the first witness of divine revelation but then forfeited its chosen status by rejecting the new covenant and supposedly enacting deicide; in a social sense, it signified the assimilation into Christian majority culture of a minority that was otherwise historically perceived as alien and withdrawn. Yet with the rise of biological antisemitism such notions were increasingly challenged. Jewishness, if it was biologically defined, and the oriental otherness it supposedly entailed, could not be effaced with a sprinkle of water, and be it the water of the baptismal font.

The historical occurrence remembered on the *Judensonntag* as an exhortation to the faithful—with at least in this one case fatal consequences—was the destruction of Jerusalem and the Second Temple in the year 70 CE by the Romans under Titus as it was recorded by the Jewish historian Yosef ben Matityahu, better known by his Romanized name Flavius Josephus. The Jewish War, initiated by the Jewish revolt against Roman rule, was one of the most violent and vicious armed conflicts in history. It lasted from 66–73 CE, when it was eventually concluded with the Roman conquest of the Jewish mountain stronghold of Masada.

Jerusalem, in which Jews from the whole province and beyond were trapped after having gathered for the Passover celebrations at the Temple, was besieged by the Romans for five months.[7] It was defended by inimical factions of Jews who simultaneously fought among themselves until the Zealots emerged as the dominant power in the city. According to Josephus, Jerusalem was devastated from within by murder, famine, and cannibalism during the siege. From the outside, its formidable defences were eventually breached in slow succession. Finally, the Temple went up in flames; the last remnant of the defenders surrendered about a month later. Once again according to Josephus, more than a million Jews were killed during the siege and fall of Jerusalem.[8] The city was razed, with the exception of three of its towers, which were left as monuments to the Roman effort of breaching such imposing defences. Most of the surviving Jews were enslaved, many of them were killed in the arena, and some were paraded at the triumphal procession of Titus in Rome in 71

7 See Flavius Josephus, *The Jewish War*, transl. G. A. Williamson (1959; London: Penguin, 1981), books 5–7 for the Jewish historian's contemporary, and controversial, account of the destruction of Jerusalem and the Second Temple.

8 See ibid., p. 371 (6.9.3). For ease of reference, book, chapter, and section indicators following the translation of the works of Josephus by William Whiston of 1737 are subsequently added throughout in parenthesis, see *The Works of Josephus*, transl. William Whiston (1737; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987).

CE. The occasion was commemorated after the early death of the imperator by his brother Domitian with the still extant Arch of Titus, one of whose decorative relief panels includes the visual representation of the spoils taken from the Temple.

The ubiquity of the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem in public discourse in nineteenth-century Germany as well as in the country's cultural production made the historical occurrence a significant, yet as such so far largely ignored, factor in negotiations of German and Jewish identities. It was taken up by writers, artists, and composers of both German and Jewish heritage. The process was complicated through its shifting historical contexts throughout the nineteenth century. The Wars of Liberation during the Napoleonic era, the rise of German nationalism, the revolutions of 1830 and 1848, and eventually the foundation of the German Empire; the *Kulturkampf*, involving Protestantism and Catholicism as well as the secular state; Jewish emancipation, the creation of a Jewish public sphere and secular literature, the emergence of the Jewish Reform movement and the concomitant creation of Jewish neo-Orthodoxy, the initiation of a secular Jewish historiography; the renewed wide-spread interest in the antisemitic legend of the Wandering Jew, the advance of biological antisemitism, and anxieties about the alleged "Jewification" of German culture; as well as theological, musical, and literary debates all contributed to shaping the cultural engagement with the destruction of Jerusalem in nineteenth-century Germany, of which the negotiation of Jewish and German identities was an important factor.

A particularly potent artistic manifestation of the subject which proved to be highly productive in the further cultural engagement with the destruction of Jerusalem was a monumental painting by Wilhelm von Kaulbach which I discuss in chapter I of this book. With the artist's cartoon of *Die Zerstörung Jerusalems* (*The Destruction of Jerusalem*) exhibited since 1838, the painting—eventually completed in 1846 and given a central position since 1853 in the Neue Pinakothek in Munich—was widely acclaimed both in Germany and abroad (see Figure 1). A fresco version of the composition was carried out by the painter and his workshop in the context of a monumental representation of the universal history of civilization in the stairwell of the Neues Museum in Berlin from 1847–51. Prints of Kaulbach's painting by various artists were published throughout the remainder of the century and beyond. In a large format and costly, they made fashionable gifts for special occasions.[9] Details from the painting were similarly reproduced

9 See, e.g., *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung. Morgen-Ausgabe* (February 19, 1879): 6; *Central-Volksblatt für den Regierungsbezirk Arnsberg* (September 14, 1889): 2; *Rhein- und Ruhrzeitung* (August 29, 1882): 2; *Westfälische Zeitung* (October 29, 1888): 2.

Figure 1: Wilhelm von Kaulbach, *Die Zerstörung Jerusalems* (1846); oil on canvas; 585 cm × 705 cm; Neue Pinakothek, Munich. (Public domain.)

in prints, photographs, and collotypes as well as other media.[10] Rather popular in a devotional context was the group of the withdrawing Christians. The motif was designated *The Flight from Jerusalem* and was offered as a cheap lithograph;[11] the same group was produced by the *Königliche Porzellan-Manufaktur* (Royal Porcelain Factory) in Berlin as a lithophane and was variously painted by Carl Meinelt on porcelain plaques which were also manufactured by the *Königliche Porzellan-Manufaktur*.[12] The group was abstracted, and adapted, for instance also for Lucas

10 See, e.g., Anonymous, "Foreign Notes and News," *The British Journal of Photography* 22.792 (July 9, 1875): 332–3, 333.

11 See, e.g., an advertisement in the *New Weekly Catholic Magazine* 1.1 (November 14, 1846): 12, as well as in subsequent issues.

12 Lithophanes are thin plaques of moulded and painted porcelain behind which a light source would be positioned; a steel print of the design for Meinelt's porcelain paintings was marketed since 1867.

Caspar Businger's popular Catholic ecclesiastical history *Christus in seiner Kirche* (1880; Christ in His Church) in the anonymous illustration "Auszug des Christenthums aus Jerusalem" (Exodus of Christianity from Jerusalem; see Figure 2),[13] its adaptation offering a useful indicator of its cultural productivity and assimilability.

Figure 2: Anonymous, "Auszug des Christenthums aus Jerusalem," in Lucas Caspar Businger, *Christus in seiner Kirche: Eine Kirchengeschichte für Schule und Haus* (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1880), p. 217. (Public domain.)

Itself informed by the conversation with earlier representations of the destruction of Jerusalem in different media and from various cultural contexts, notably from Britain, Kaulbach's spectacular painting was, more importantly, an inspiration also to artists who worked in other areas of cultural production in Germany—in music, art, and literature. In its particular rendering of the narrative of the destruction of Jerusalem, it introduced, reconfigured, and transformed stereotypes of Jewishness, in particular of the Beautiful Jewess and the Wandering Jew; though secularized, it

13 See Lucas Caspar Businger, *Christus in seiner Kirche: Eine Kirchengeschichte für Schule und Haus* (Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1880), p. 217.

articulated the doctrine of supersession, which was to inform the large majority of Christian engagements with the subject. Kaulbach's conception of history was influenced by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's teleological understanding of universal history, which he combined with the specifically Catholic approach of Joseph Görres. On this historical-philosophical agenda the artist imposed through formal analogies the iconographic framework of representations of the Last Judgment. As such, his painting, which includes no battle scenes, offered a fundamentally new perspective on the historical occurrence which sought to encompass its historical essence as a turning point in universal history rather than the specific moment in time.

Executed in a neo-baroque style, Kaulbach's painting includes figures of religious significance—prophets and angels—which tie the historical occurrence to the progress of history as salvation history. Titus is in this manner confirmed as the instrument of the Lord's wrath. The High Priest, though represented as a noble figure, signifies superseded Judaism as he kills himself. The Zealots are reduced to grim desperation. The gruesome figure of Mary of Bethezuba, who devoured her own new-born, is shown in contemplation of her unnatural deed. Ahasuerus flees the scene in terror pursued by three demons. In a published explanation of his painting, Kaulbach identified this figure as representative of modern Jewry and of all those who were cast out into the outer darkness for their never repented guilt. This intrinsically antisemitic conception of Ahasuerus and the Jews was controversially explored in subsequent engagements with the subject. Finally, as an articulation of the doctrine of supersession, the Christians are shown in the painting in association with symbols of martyrdom and redemption as they withdraw unharmed from the stricken city. The artist's constellation of figures, abstracted mainly from Josephus and the ecclesiastical history of Eusebius, functioned as a blueprint for numerous subsequent representations, though it also provoked some significant reinterpretations.

My own interest in the painting and the pervasiveness of its subject in nineteenth-century Germany was piqued more than a decade ago by Oskar Panizza's description of Itzig Faitel Stern in his grotesque "Der operierte Jud'" (1893; "The Operated Jew"). The satirical text uses the intermedial reference to Kaulbach's *Zerstörung Jerusalems* to create the image of its Jewish protagonist in the reader's mind: "Itzig's nose assumed a form which was similar to that of the high priest who was the most prominent and striking figure of Kaulbach's painting 'The Destruction of Jerusalem'."[14] Much could be said about this, and about the fre-

14 Oskar Panizza, "The Operated Jew," in Jack Zipes, *The Operated Jew: Two Tales of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Routledge, 1991), pp. 47–74, p. 48; see also Oskar Panizza, "Der operierte Jud'," in *Vi-*

quently alleged articulation of antisemitism in the story. In the present context, however, it is sufficient to note the writer's apparent confidence in the universal resonance of his reference. The ubiquity of Kaulbach's *Zerstörung Jerusalems* in its different medial manifestations and across different social strata was certainly assured in Germany throughout the second half of the nineteenth century.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, toward the end of the century emerged a certain fatigue in relation to the grand gestures and poses of the style of which Kaulbach's monumental history painting was such a prominent example:

> In history painting, it [i.e., the pose] has plied its dreadful trade on a large scale and therefore today a strong whiff of enmity against it wafts through the younger generation of the artistic world. And it is good if for once they enjoy a lasting peace and unpaintedness, those Lucretias and Cleopatras, those destructions of Jerusalem and Carthage, those rose-wreathed Neros and unfortunate Konradins and those never-ending Ludwigs, Heinrichs, and Karls of the Middle Ages with their deeds and fates.[15]

While there were indeed no visual representations of the destruction of Jerusalem in Germany whose impact on public discourse was in any way comparable to Kaulbach's painting, there was nevertheless no "lasting peace" to be enjoyed by the subject.

⁂

In this book, initiated by my reading of Panizza's grotesque, I explore the surprising profusion of cultural engagements with the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem in nineteenth-century Germany. I argue that representations of the historical occurrence, like the monumental painting by Kaulbach, constitute a significant but so far largely neglected arena for the negotiation of shifting Jewish imaginaries in which both German and Jewish creative minds engaged. I moreover contend that Kaulbach's painting had an enormous impact on the further development of Jewish imaginaries through its extraordinary cultural productivity. It influenced librettists and composers as well as poets and writers whose works related to it in different

---

sionen der Dämmerung (1893; Munich: Müller, 1914), pp. 213–42, p. 215: "Itzigs Nase hatte jene hohepriesterliche Form, wie sie Kaulbach in seiner 'Zerstörung Jerusalems' der vordersten und markantesten Figur seines Bildes verliehen hat."

15 Anonymous, "Posen," *Kölner Nachrichten* (December 5, 1889): 2–3, 3: "In großem Maßstab hat sie [i.e., the pose] in der Historienmalerei ihr Unwesen getrieben und so geht heute ein starker Zug von Feindschaft gegen sie durch die jüngere Generation der Kunstwelt. Und es ist gut, wenn sie sich einmal einer dauernden Ruhe und Ungemaltheit erfreuen, diese Lukretien und Kleopatren, diese Zerstörungen von Jerusalem und Karthago, diese rosenbekränzten Neros und unglückseligen Konradins und diese unabsehbare Ludwige, Heinriche und Karle des Mittelalters mit ihren Thaten und Schicksalen."

ways, either adopting its suggestions or critically confronting them. Arguably, a succession of dramatic poems and plays in which the figure of Ahasuerus, the Wandering Jew, was given prominence derived from an engagement with the monumental painting. Beyond Kaulbach, the destruction of Jerusalem was given frequent literary articulation in particular in the context of the *Kulturkampf*. The critical examination of these texts contributes also to a better understanding of the parameters of this conflict and the scope of its enactment. The largely intermedial and comparative approach of my book serves to emphasize the striking medial and generic diversity of engagements with the destruction of Jerusalem which indicates the pervasive presence of the subject in public discourse in nineteenth-century Germany and hence also its significance for the negotiation of both Jewish and German identities.

Kaulbach himself initiated two libretti for oratorios that were based on his painting. As I discuss in chapter I, he appears to have envisaged a kind of *Gesamtkunstwerk* in which his painting would interact with the verbal and musical components of an oratorio. The artist's efforts and the resulting intermedial works may have indirectly inspired the surprising profusion of further oratorical engagements with the destruction of Jerusalem. After an early manifestation in Carl Loewe's *Die Zerstörung von Jerusalem* (The Destruction of Jerusalem) of 1829, the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem proliferated as one of the more prominent thematic preoccupations of nineteenth-century German oratorios that was unique in the European context. Whether Kaulbach was familiar with Loewe's oratorio must remain conjectural. Conversely, however, it seems that there can be little doubt that the remaining five oratorios in some way or other relate to the artist's monumental painting.

The musical genre of the oratorio became very popular in early nineteenth-century Germany. In relation to the destruction of Jerusalem, it promoted the active performative engagement of the singers' collective with the subject as well as the partisan enjoyment of the performances by mostly bourgeois audiences. While there does not seem to be an obvious historical pattern to the musical adaptations of, and responses to, Kaulbach's *Zerstörung Jerusalems*, their proliferation nevertheless indicates the cultural significance and productivity of the monumental painting which offered a distinctly idealist interpretation of history that went far beyond the scope of previous and subsequent pictorial representations of the subject. The impact of Kaulbach's painting may also be inferred from the efforts of Jewish artists and composers, such as Eduard Bendemann and Ferdinand Hiller, to reclaim Jewish history in opposition to it. With the dissemination of printed libretti, the oratorio participated moreover in a wider literary discourse on the destruction of Jerusalem that permeated nineteenth-century German society on different levels of class, education, age, and gender and that, if to some extent circumscribed by genre conventions and authoritarian structures (such as censorship), provided a platform also for

the intervention in topical issues among which the negotiation of German and Jewish identities and their interaction with one another were prominent.

At the same time, the oratorio and pictorial representations were not, of course, the only forms of cultural production to arise from, and to impact on, discourse on the Jews in Germany. A profusion of dramatic texts, historical fiction, and epics which similarly engaged with the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem originated in the long nineteenth century. The different media and the variety of genres corresponded to a diversity of approaches, though in some instances references to Kaulbach's *Zerstörung Jerusalems* indicate the painting's cultural impact and productivity far beyond the musical and artistic spheres. Perhaps unexpectedly, the religious dimension and the potential for social interpellation of the subject emerge even more prominently from some of these literary engagements with the destruction of Jerusalem than from the oratorial or pictorial traditions.

It may safely be assumed that the large majority of contemporary writers, artists, and composers must in some way have been familiar with, or at least cognizant of, Kaulbach's monumental secularized Hegelian interpretation of the destruction of Jerusalem as a turning point in universal history after the first exhibition of his cartoon in 1838 and the publication of a plethora of newspaper notices and advertisements that appeared subsequently in the press as well as in more specialized periodicals. Naturally, not every writer, artist, and composer elected to engage directly with the painting; some chose to ignore it altogether. In fact, though presumably stimulated by the impact of Kaulbach's widely known pictorial-philosophical conception, the engagement with the destruction of Jerusalem took on a dynamic of its own in the course of the nineteenth century.

In terms of genre choices, which I examine in chapter II, this was significantly influenced by the perceived decline of epic poetry as well as the rise of both the dramatic poem and the novel, and more specifically the historical novel. This paradigm change was initiated in Britain, where important source texts for the subsequent German engagement with the subject originated. Samuel Taylor Coleridge's abortive plan of writing an epic about the destruction of Jerusalem is indicative in this context, as are contemporary reviews of epic and dramatic poems by Charles Peers (1823) and Henry Hart Milman (1820), respectively, which favored the more dialogic approach of the latter. Shortly afterward, George Croly adopted in his anonymously published *Salathiel* (1828) the form of the novel. A lengthy fictional narrative, which conjoins the historical destruction of Jerusalem with the legend of the Wandering Jew, this text responded and contributed to the increasing prominence of the Ahasuerus figure in contemporary literature. A decade later, the writer Karl Gutzkow initiated in Germany an acerbic debate about the figure of Ahasuerus as an ambiguous symbol of Jewish particularity or universality. Both Croly and the debate instigated by Gutzkow may well have inspired Kaulbach to include the figure of the Wandering

Jew in his painting. The artist's visual representation, in turn, influenced against this background a series of dramatic poems and plays. In chapter III, I explore the strikingly different directions in which the figure of Ahasuerus is developed in these in the widest sense dramatic works.

The negotiation of the categories of particularism and universalism had a significant impact also on efforts of Jewish self-definition in the first half of the nineteenth century. In the wake of the *Haskalah*, the Jewish enlightenment, and adopting the modern historical-critical method of textual criticism, the *Wissenschaft des Judenthums* arose from it. This scholarly enquiry into Jewishness and Judaism most importantly developed the focus on a secular Jewish historiography which wrote the Jews back into history and challenged preconceived constructions of Jewishness. The Jewish Reform movement sought to redefine Judaism in conversation with conceptions of modernity and enlightenment values, while neo-Orthodoxy emerged as a counter-movement that aimed to re-establish traditional Judaism within the parameters of the enlightenment and emancipation. These efforts, and in particular the engagement with contemporary research into the historical Jesus and his Jewishness, informed to differing degrees the relatively small number of Jewish engagements with the subject of the destruction of Jerusalem in Germany which mostly sought to promote a conciliatory stance between Judaism and Christianity and which I investigate in chapter V.

Altogether much more prolific was the Protestant and Catholic appropriation of the subject in the context of the *Kulturkampf*, which I explore in chapter IV. This had a pervasive influence on denominational literary production in Germany. In fact, the denominational divide prompted the perhaps most productive engagement in German literature with the destruction of Jerusalem because the historical occurrence was turned effectively into a battlefield in the *Kulturkampf* which had a significant impact on the political, social, and cultural fabric of Germany in the wake of the revolutions of 1848. These texts were predominantly understood to be *Tendenzliteratur*, literature with a political or ideological objective, a genre frequently considered inferior in contemporary discourse. Though both might have been thought to be tendentious, there was nevertheless a marked qualitative difference between the Catholic and the Protestant traditions of writing which had an influence also on the respective representations of the destruction of Jerusalem.

Catholic literature programmatically sought to illustrate and reinforce the certainties and doctrines of the Catholic faith. It frequently took inspiration from saints' legends and was altogether considered to be lagging behind the aesthetic achievements of contemporary literature. This sparked in the early years of the twentieth century the so-called inferiority debate in which some Catholic writers advocated—against the forceful resistance of others—the alignment of their writ-

ing with the aesthetic criteria of mainstream literature. In the context of the destruction of Jerusalem, Catholic literary production focused frequently on the early church, its rituals, and the symbolism of material objects as well as, eventually, the triumphant martyrdom of the protagonist. The conversion of Jewish characters, typically of the Beautiful Jewess, is another frequently employed trope, though Catholic writers primarily focused on the conversion of Romans to Christianity. In either case, in Catholic literature conversion often converged with a fervent martyrdom as the ultimate and triumphant affirmation of (the) faith.

Within the political context of the *Kulturkampf*, Catholic literature about the destruction of Jerusalem, encompassing novels as well as simple plays for Catholic workers' clubs and calendar stories,[16] frequently served the apologetic objective of refuting allegations of dual loyalties and that the Catholic Church effectively constituted a subversive state within the state. Another important aim was to articulate through allusions to, and covert analogies with, contemporary society a veiled criticism of nationalist endeavors and irreligious modern tendencies as well as the alleged victimization of Catholics in the German Empire. Conversely, these texts sought to instil in their readers the fortitude in the face of adversity that characterized the early Christian martyrs they portrayed. Finally, they celebrated the greater glory of God and of the Catholic Church whose ultimate triumph in the future they envisaged.

Protestant writing had a much stronger psychological focus which favored the individual. In this it emulated, and coincided with, trends of contemporary literature. It moreover frequently articulated a national pathos, which reflects the dominant socio-political role of Protestantism, initially in the northern states of Germany and subsequently in the German Empire as opposed to the predominantly Catholic Austro-Hungarian Empire. The perception and representation of Jewish characters in literary texts about the destruction of Jerusalem of Protestant provenance frequently differs from those in Catholic texts. Particularly novels emerging from a Pietist background or from the Protestant Awakening Movement focus on the conversion paradigm and the continued soteriological significance of the Jews. At the same time, the early Christian community is typically associated in these texts with simple, socially determined rituals and an unmediated relationship between the individual and the divinity as well as unadorned congregational spaces, while the potential symbolic value of material objects is largely disregarded. The difference between the dichotomous denominational approaches in narrative fic-

16 See, e.g., Philipp Laicus, "Die Zerstörung Jerusalems," in *Leo-Kalender für das katholische Volk 1881* (Würzburg: Woerl, 1881), pp. 6–30.

tion about the historical occurrence is most obvious in the respective treatment of the Eucharist, or the Last Supper.

In Jewish engagements with the destruction of Jerusalem, which I explore in chapter V, conversion is unsurprisingly not a prominent topic. These texts instead tend to marvel at the survival of the Jews and Judaism after the historical cataclysm. The majority more specifically engages with the historical figure of Jesus. They emphasize his Jewishness and situate his teachings within Judaism. Early Christian sects, such as the Ebionites, as well as the figure of Hillel the Elder and his tolerant school gain particular significance in this context. In this respect, most of the texts of Jewish provenance, which participated in an extended conversation with contemporary theological approaches, were apologetic and against the background of mounting antisemitism sought to promote a reconciliation with Christianity which was based on the Jewishness of Jesus and of his precepts. These values are represented by Jewish characters who resist conversion and the notion of the divinity of Jesus but adopt Christian ideas and in this way embody a model of reconciliation.

Very different, almost aggressive, was the earlier attempt to recover the "Jewish spirit" and rewrite the history of the Jewish War by revaluating the leaders of the Jewish insurgents and by challenging the authority of Josephus's historical narrative. Of particular relevance in this context are a historical-dramatic poem by Julius Kossarski and a revisionist historiographical text by Heinrich Graetz. These efforts were closely connected to the *Institut zur Förderung der israelitischen Literatur* (Institute for the Promotion of Israelite Literature) established by Ludwig Philippson in 1855, which published both texts. The moderately Reform-oriented rabbi had already contributed significantly to the creation of a Jewish public sphere in Germany with his earlier foundation of the over time enormously influential *Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums* in 1837. A prolific writer, Philippson published in the third volume of this paper a novella of his own which represents the earliest engagement with the destruction of Jerusalem in German-language narrative fiction I was able to identify.

Altogether, my book is based on the observation that in nineteenth-century Germany a clear awareness of, and an engagement with, representations of the destruction of Jerusalem was in evidence in different media and genres and across their respective boundaries. This coincided with the attempt to harness literary, artistic, and musical expression to the wider debate on Jewish emancipation and, indeed, perceptions of Jewishness and anxieties about the Jewish contribution to what was perceived as German culture; it also is an indicator of the impact of a historical event of perceived pivotal significance on the ways in which the presence and the position of Jews were configured in the context of nineteenth-century Germany. I argue that due to the popular impact of both the oratorio and (some of) the

paintings discussed, as well as dramatic poems, epics, and historical fiction, these diverse cultural engagements with the subject must be considered a formative, if nowadays largely neglected force emerging from and shaping discourse on the Jews in Germany during the nineteenth century.

∗∗∗

Samuel Taylor and Heinrich von Kleist despaired about writing about what they both thought to be one of the most poignant subjects for literary representation. Friedrich von Uechtritz, inspired by Kleist's interest in the destruction of Jerusalem, also faltered initially, insisting that the subject was "completely unwieldy and inhibiting, even contrary."[17] Uechtritz eventually wrote a novel about the destruction of Jerusalem, which I discuss in chapter IV of this book, but his—as well as Coleridge's and Kleist's—hesitation is indicative of the forbidding scope of the subject. Their issues, if in slightly different form, were also mine. Musical, artistic, and literary engagements with the destruction of Jerusalem, as discussed in this introduction, simply proliferated in nineteenth-century Germany.

Originally, I aimed to explore in my book the representation of the destruction of Jerusalem in the nineteenth century in a European context. I, too, soon despaired. The material was much too rich for such a project, even though none of the other European national literatures of this period produced a proliferation of cultural engagements with the destruction of Jerusalem similar in scope to that in Germany. Hence my reluctant decision to focus exclusively on this country, though I could not resist to include a glance on the vagaries of the subject in British literature which, as mentioned before, had a profound impact on subsequent German variations on the theme. Yet the problem persisted. In the German cultural context alone, the extant material would easily fill several volumes. I decided to restrict myself to one, yet the material gathered for this one—albeit hefty—volume has also proven to be "unwieldy and inhibiting," and perhaps even a little "contrary"; given the proliferation of literary engagements with the destruction of Jerusalem, I had to make some difficult choices of inclusion and exclusion.[18]

---

17 Friedrich von Uechtritz, *Eleazar: Eine Erzählung aus der Zeit des großen jüdischen Krieges im ersten Jahrhunderte nach Christo*, 3 vols (Jena: Costenoble, 1867), pp. x–xi: "völlig unhandlich und spröde, ja selbst widrig."

18 Among these works are, for instance, Adolf Jauß, *Juda: Erzählung aus der Zeit der Zerstörung Jerusalems durch Titus* (Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1870); J. Paulus, *Maria: Eine Erzählung aus der Zeit der Zerstörung Jerusalems* (Stuttgart: Steinkopf, 1889); Anton Ohorn, *Der Tempelhauptmann: Historische Erzählung aus der Zeit der Zerstörung Jerusalems* (Leipzig: Bredt, 1899); and Charles Henry Rohe, *Thamar oder die Zerstörung Jerusalems* (Columbus, OH: Lutherische Verlagshandlung, 1888). The latter is interesting because it was published in German by a Lutheran publishing house in America for a German-speaking Protestant readership, which was situated outside

The abundance of material from different media and genres has resulted in rather long chapters. Each of these chapters is nevertheless followed by a digression; these are in some instances contrapuntal to the main body of the preceding chapter and at other times provide additional relevant information or elaborate interconnections between chapters. With this, I may have shifted the experience of the unwieldy and contrary to the reader of my book. I nevertheless think that this is the best way to tell its narrative.

With the objective of appreciating the idiosyncratic character, stylistic peculiarity, and integrity of each of the many texts I discuss, I include what some readers may perhaps think an unreasonable amount of quotations. These are integral to my efforts of creating an associative understanding of the historical presence of these texts. Translations are mine, if not otherwise indicated, since of most of the texts with which I worked no translations into English are available. In accordance with my desire to maintain the integrity of these texts, I sought to re-create their character in the original language as closely as possible without losing any subtleties of meaning and yet to provide texts which reflect the style and tone of their time and are still readable. The original text is either added in square brackets within the quotation or in footnotes. I retain throughout the original spelling of German-language texts, once again with the objective of maintaining their integrity.

My decision to reproduce some of the visual representations discussed in my book not from the original but from contemporary prints is motivated by a similar objective. In the nineteenth century, most encounters with these works would have been mediated through various reproductions rather than the confrontation with the much less easily accessible originals. They would have been perceived and would have achieved their potential of cultural productivity through the filter of a remediation which in many cases cannot be traced in detail but which would have constituted the first level of this very cultural productivity.

For better readability, I harmonized the names of the historical *dramatis personae* of the destruction of Jerusalem which recur frequently in different manifestations. I chose to use the prevalent English version throughout, yet indicate at the first mention of the particular character in a particular text in parentheses the particular form their name takes in each respective instance.

---

the immediate ramifications of the *Kulturkampf*; the text was translated into English in 1919. It is moreover interesting to note in this context that an epic poem about the destruction of Jerusalem attributed to the fictitious third-century Jewish writer Ben Asaph was published in America already in 1857, see Anselm Korlstoff, *The Moriad; Or, End of the Jewish State* (Nashville, TN: Stitt, 1857).

Titles of primary texts—oratorios, paintings, and literature—I generally reference in my own text in their original languages (with the exceptions of classical texts, to which I refer by their established English titles, and of Hebrew titles, which are transliterated). The publication, release, or completion date and a translation of the title follow in parentheses. If a text has been translated into English, this is indicated with the translated title either being printed in italics or set in quotation marks; the translated titles of texts which were not published in translation are printed in roman.

Finally, regarding terminology, I follow recent usage of spelling antisemitism without hyphen and capitalization in order to discourage misleading essentialist associations. With regard to historical manifestations of antisemitism, subtle shifts occurred as to the exact nature of this racist phenomenon across the nineteenth century; these are generally not elaborated in this book, with the exception of the rise of biological antisemitism since the final decades of the century. I also do not use hyphens when referring to German Jewish or British Jewish identities. In this way, the phenomenon is implicitly generalized, so as to emphasize the significance of the Jewish element in otherwise frequently hyphenated and therefore partially elided identities. I am aware of the recent practice of referring to Jews as Jewish identifying. I nevertheless chose to retain the older usage of "Jews," and sometimes even "the Jews," because this reflects historical practice contemporary to the texts I discuss. The more recent terminology moreover tends to gloss over shifts of perception and responses to "residual" Jewishness, as for instance in the cases of assimilation, acculturation, and conversion. I am also aware, and so should be the reader, that the reference to identities and identifications is always problematic inasmuch as they are determined by voluntary and involuntary ascriptions and attributions from both the inside and the outside. Identities are, moreover, dynamic and processual. This should also be remembered when reading the five chapters of my book, which do not follow a chronological trajectory but elaborate in an overarching and interweaving approach genre-focused and thematic as well as contextual, or situational, convergences.