

The Illusion of Finality:
Time and Community in the Writings of E.A.
Freeman, J.B. Bury and the English-Teutonic
Circle of Historians

Thesis Submitted to the Degree of D.Phil.,

The University of Oxford, History Faculty, Hilary Term 2015

By Oded Y. Steinberg

Lincoln College, Oxford

Abstract

The Illusion of Finality-Time and Community in the Writings of E.A. Freeman, J.B.

Bury and the English-Teutonic Circle of Historians.

Thesis Submitted to the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Oxford, History
Faculty, Hilary Term 2015.

By Oded Y. Steinberg, Lincoln College, Oxford

This thesis aims to show, how periodization and race converged vigorously during the nineteenth century. The research focuses mainly on the question of how nineteenth century historians viewed the transformation from Antiquity to the Middle Ages. For many scholars, the year 476 A.D. became associated with the fall of Rome. During the nineteenth century, historians elaborated two main arguments: 1) 'The Roman' emphasized the decline that had occurred after the fall of Rome. 2) 'The Teutonic' signified the rejuvenation which the German tribes had brought about in the decaying Empire. Although I relate to the 'Roman' argument, the heart of the discussion is devoted to the 'Teutonic' school that was supported not only by German but also by British or more accurately English historians.

The first part of the dissertation is devoted to the theme of 'Community and Race'. In this part, I engage with the thematic question of how the historians of the second half of the nineteenth century constructed past and present communities through the concept of race. A close community or *Gemeinschaft* of English and German historians emerged during the middle of the nineteenth century. Based on the concept of Teutonic kinship, this community emphasized the notions of race and historical time, which actually invented a new sense of belonging. The English and the Germans were one, an almost indivisible community founded on a purported notion of race. Despite several national or particularistic inclinations, these nations had a common Teutonic past, which always bonded them together. Therefore, the historians 'imagined' a new ultimate transnational (racial) community of belonging.

In the second part I study the theme of 'Time'. The linkage between the two parts is embedded in the idea of the Community as a 'Time Maker'. Namely, in what manner does the construction of a community by the historians defines the division of time. The chapter that links the two themes of 'Community' and 'Time' examines the writings of scholars in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries who underlined the Germanic invasions of the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. as the events that symbolized the fall of Rome and the end of Antiquity. This governing observation is connected directly with the racial Teutonic feelings that were prevalent among English and German historians. The discussion of it set the framework for the following chapters, which delve into the distinct periodization's of Edward Augustus Freeman (1823-92) and John Bagnell Bury (1861-1927). These historians, who were in constant and close contact until the death of Freeman in 1892, reveal similarities as well as major differences in their historical writings. The main reason why they were chosen derives from the new periodization which they had adopted. Both of them devised a method that signified a departure from the accepted and almost 'sacred' division between Antiquity and the Middle Ages.

Acknowledgements

In the opening pages of his ninth chapter, focusing on the history of the Germanic tribes, Edward Gibbon wrote: ‘The subject [Germanic tribes], however various and important, has already been so frequently, so ably, and so successfully discussed, that it is now grown familiar to the reader, and difficult to the writer’. Indeed, if the great Gibbon observed the subject, already during the eighteenth century, as thoroughly researched and for that reason challenging, what could a relatively young researcher think 230 years later? However, through this project I learned that despite its immensity, one could point to certain under-researched paths by asking certain particular questions. These questions focus mainly on the method in which ancient narratives constructed the notions of community, nation, race and time among certain nineteenth century British and German scholars.

This fascination with antiquity and nationalism, which derived probably from the fact that I read too many *Asterix* books in my childhood years, was a complicated but yet an awarding project. It was achieved thanks to the great advice and support of many. Fore and foremost I wish to thank my supervisor, Oliver Zimmer, who supported this project from the start and contributed to it immensely with his pragmatic advice. I could not have asked for a better supervisor. I also wish to thank the assistance and friendship of many other colleagues: Ilya Afannasyev, Guy Beiner, Ben Edsall, Abigail Green, Athena Leoussi, and Sam Sheran, who all read parts of this work and enriched me with constructive comments. I also wish to thank my teachers and colleagues from my *alma mater*, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Dan Diner, Bianca Kühnel, Doron Mendels and Matthias Schmidt for their support throughout the years. Of course, the responsibility for the dissertation rests solely on my shoulders.

As a father of two children, I must say that these last three years were very challenging and I could not have written my dissertation without the help of certain individuals and awarding bodies. I wish to thank Lincoln College and the Polonsky foundation for their support throughout these years. I also wish to show my greatest gratitude to the following foundations: the Anglo-Israel, Anglo-Jewish and the British Friends of the Hebrew University. Several individuals deserve special thanks. Raymond and Sandra Dwek and Carmella Elan-Gaston, who were our guardians in Oxford and welcomed us as their own family. I cherish their kindness and friendship especially through the difficult and rewarding times we experienced.

My parents-in-law Lisa and Charlie Harvith deserve special thanks. Their frequent visits to Oxford together with their constant assistance was and is immensely helpful. My parents Matti and Yael Steinberg have also inspired me. Thanks to them I learned to ask questions and to be interested not only in the present but also in the past. Their support, encouragement and love is admired. I also wish to thank my brother Rafi and my sisters Orly and Chen for their long and short distance love and support.

Finally, I wish to thank my family. My wife Rachel is my beacon and without her endless care and love this project would have been unimaginable. My kids, Nadav and Ayala, give me magical moments every day and remind me constantly about the important things in life. This project is dedicated to them and to the memory of my brother-in-law Yair (Yaya) Harvith, who passed away while we were at Oxford.

Contents

Abbreviations.....	7
Introduction.....	8
‘Race’, ‘Language’ and ‘Periodization’ - Several Remarks.....	17
The Pillars of Periodization.....	19
Racial Boundaries – between Time, Community and Space.....	25
John Pinkerton-Gothic vs. Celtic.....	33
Sir Walter Scott- Anglo-Saxons and Normans.....	35
Turner –The Father of Anglo-Saxonism	37
Chapter 1: The English Teutonic Circle – Freeman, Stubbs and Green.....	43
The Germanic Origins of England.....	45
The ‘English Question’.....	48
The ‘Foundation’ of France.....	52
Teutonic–Latin	57
Swiss <i>Gemeinde</i>	59
Racial-Ethnic Implications	66
Teutonic Scandinavia	70
Race=Language?	75
‘Germanic’ America.....	81
Chapter 2: Roman Decline and Teutonic Rejuvenation-The Racial German /English <i>Gemeinschaft</i> of Historians (1850’s-80s).....	85
Contemporary Views.....	88
Lineage of Historians –Early Influences	90
Bunsen and the Establishment of the Community.....	98
The Core of the Historians’ Community	105
Max Müller: Supremacy of Language and Superiority of the Aryan.....	107
Charles Kingsley and Müller: The Collaboration of Teutonism and Protestantism...	117
Admiration and Criticism	126
<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>	136
Conclusion.....	138
Chapter 3: The Race of Time - The Convergence of Race and Periodization	141
Early Perceptions -Winning and Waning of Rome	145
Tribal Degeneration and the Formation of the Middle Ages.....	147
The Noble Savage – Regeneration	152
The Formative Victory of Barbarism and Christianity.....	159
Roman vs. Germanic	164

Towards a New Periodization?	168
Chapter 4: Freeman and Bryce- History without Periods?.....	173
Thomas Arnold and the Origin of the Idea.....	174
Freeman and the <i>Unity of History</i>	181
Back to 476 A.D.	188
East, Islam and the Ottomans	192
The French Enemy.....	203
Rome - From Antiquity to?	205
The Unity and the Study of History.....	210
Bryce : Imperialism and Roman-German Unity from Augustus to 1804 A.D.....	219
A Tale of Two Empires: Rome and Britain.....	232
Chapter 5: Bury, Freeman and the Unity of the East	237
Bury, Freeman's Follower?	237
George Finlay - the British 'Father' of the Eastern Roman Empire.....	241
The Late Roman Empire.....	243
The 'Decline and Fall?' Gibbon and Bury	247
Bury's Anti-Catholicism	252
The Dominance of Modernity	256
Historical Time	259
The Tribal Role in the 'Fall'	262
The Merit of Inconsistency.....	268
The Rise of the East.....	270
The Rule of Contingency.....	274
Opposing Germany.....	279
Conclusion.....	282
Bibliography	289

Abbreviations

BL	British Library
Bod.	Bodleian Library
JRLM	John Ryland's Library Manchester
ODNB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i>
SR	<i>Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art</i>
RPA	<i>Rationalist Press Association</i>

Introduction

‘History can only exist as a discipline if it develops a theory of periodization’¹

These words of Reinhart Koselleck summarize the method that materialized in the Enlightenment and was further developed during the nineteenth century. Within this period, the division of historical time became prevalent among historians. For the first time, according to Koselleck, concepts [*Begriffe*] such as the Middle Ages or the Renaissance were associated with a unique and demarcated historical era. As Koselleck writes following Kant: ‘So far history had followed chronology: and now it was necessary that chronology should follow history’². In fact, it could be argued that this development in the classification of time contributed to the establishment of history as a profession or even as an independent discipline. History suddenly possessed borders or *limes*. These ‘borders of time’ defined the main division of history into three demarcated periods: Antiquity, Middle Ages and Modernity. This Eurocentric triad dominates our general perception of historical time and corresponds with the division between Antiquity, Feudalism and Capitalism. It does not, as Jack Goody notes, take into consideration other ‘spaces’ or ‘times’ of non-European civilizations³. In the modern era, especially because of the tendency to trace Modernity’s own alleged origin, this

¹ Reinhart Koselleck, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts, Cultural Memory in the Present*, trans. by Todd Samuel Presner and others; foreword by Hayden White (Stanford, Cal., 2002), p.4; The words ‘Theory of periodization’ were originally written as ‘eine Theorie der geschichtlichen Zeiten’. See: Reinhart Koselleck, ‘Über die Theoriebedürftigkeit der Geschichtswissenschaft’ [1972], in Reinhart Koselleck, *Zeitschichten: Studien zur Historik* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000), s. 302; Helge Jordheim argues exceptionally that the English translation is misleading. According to her, Koselleck actually defies periodization and promotes a parallel notion of time or of ‘temporalities’. Most, however, still observe Koselleck as adopting a theory of periodization. See: Helge Jordheim, ‘Against Periodization: Koselleck’s Theory of Multiple Temporalities’, *History and Theory* 51, no. 2 (2012): pp. 151-71.

² *Ibid.*, p. 119.

³ Jack Goody, *The Theft of History* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 12-23.

division became almost sanctified and could be referred to as the historiographical ‘Holy Trinity’.

The rise of periodization as a concept in the nineteenth century was simultaneous with the rise of two other sometimes amalgamated terms: nation and race. While Koselleck acknowledges the reception of periodization as a central concept in the writings of nineteenth century scholars, the significance of nationalism (as a concept), according to some, remained almost unnoticed by the scholars of the era. For instance, Isaiah Berlin argues that, excluding Moses Hess in his *Rome and Jerusalem*, no other nineteenth century contemporary thinker considered nationalism as the political force of the future⁴. Whether one accepts or refutes Berlin’s assertion, his argument seems plausible in the sense that for most nineteenth century scholars, nationalism was merely another stage in human progress. This stage corresponded with the basic natural feeling, common to many, of belonging to a certain community or *Gemeinschaft*. One can argue that like nationalism, race was not identified as a distinct concept until the modern period. Nevertheless, my point of departure for the whole discussion is that the concepts of ‘race’ and ‘nation’ were transformed during this era, especially due to changes in the scientific and the philological fields.

As my thesis aims to show, periodization, race and nationalism converged vigorously during the nineteenth century. Through race, scholars categorized time with a more definite criterion based upon scientific and philological reasoning. Race reflected the assumed ‘purity’ of the community in the most predominant way. The appearance of a certain race at a specific

⁴ Isaiah Berlin, *Selected Writings* (Oxford, 1981), p. 337; Vis-à-vis this claim about the uniqueness of Hess, one must mention Lord Acton’s essay about the present and future influence of nationality written in 1862. See: Lord Acton, ‘Nationality’, in Gopal Balakrishna (ed.), *Mapping the Nation* (London, 1996), pp. 17–38.;

space and time signified the beginning or the end of a period, i.e. a certain correlation existed between the method in which several historians divided time and their conception about the emergence of communities. For many historians, the beginning or end of a certain era also signified the ascent or descent of a race or of a nation. Contemporary historians tend to discuss race and time prolifically, though usually as independent entities, without exploring the explicit correlation between these terms. In my study, however, they are incorporated, since the development of the modern racial doctrine, the thesis argues, influenced the division of time. Throughout the discussion I will refer to this aspect as the ‘racial time’. At this point it must be clarified that I do not claim that according to these historians, only racial characteristics demarcated history. I rather argue that racial perceptions of time were dominant, but not exclusive, in the division of time. The racial element, I assert, was especially prevalent in the modern perception of the invasion/wandering of the Germanic tribes into the realms of the Roman Empire. A development that signified for many the end of Antiquity and the beginning of the Middle Ages.

My research focuses on two main and linked thematic questions. The first question is how a certain group of British and German historians of the second half of the nineteenth century constructed their past and present communities especially through the ‘Teutonic’ notion⁵. The second, rather more prominent, resulting question is how, especially following this Teutonic notion, these nineteenth century historians viewed the transformation from Antiquity to the Middle Ages.

⁵ Throughout the discussion, I focus on the alleged Teutonic origin of the English (not British) and their affinity with the Germans. Some of the ‘Teutonic’ historians, such as Bryce, were British and not English and emphasized the Teutonic kinship of the English nation. For that reason, I refer to them as British historians.

Thus, the thesis is divided into two parts: ‘Community’ and ‘Time’. In the first part entitled ‘Community’ (First and Second chapters), I will engage with a close community or *Gemeinschaft* of British and German historians that emerged during the middle of the nineteenth century. This community included on the British side Edward Augustus Freeman (1823-92), William Stubbs (1825-1901), John Richard Green (1837-83) and James Bryce (1838–1922). On the German side it encompassed scholars like Christian Karl Josias von Bunsen (1791-1860), Max Müller (1823-1900) and Reinhold Pauli (1823–82). Based on the concept of Teutonic kinship, these figures emphasized the notions of race, culture, religion and historical time. The British or more accurately the English and the Germans were one, an almost indivisible community founded on purported notion of race and actually invented a new sense of belonging. Despite several national or particularistic inclinations, these nations had a common Teutonic past, which bound them together. Therefore, the historians ‘imagined’ a new ultimate (racial, ethnic, cultural) community of belonging that included several sub-nations. As part of the intertwining of community a Teutonic past was meant to create the present common ground.

The linkage between the Teutonic community and the periodization of Antiquity is embedded in the idea of the community as a ‘Time Maker’ (Third chapter). Namely, in what manner did the construction of a community define the historians’ division of time? For many historians, the year 476 A.D. became associated with the fall of Rome. During the nineteenth century, historians elaborated two main arguments: one that could be named ‘the Roman’ emphasized the continuation of Rome into the Middle Ages; while the other, called ‘the Germanic’ signified the rejuvenation which the German tribes had brought about the decaying empire. Although I will relate to the ‘Roman’ argument, the heart of the discussion is devoted

to the ‘Teutonic’ school that was supported not only by German but also by British historians. It examines how various scholars during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries marked the Germanic invasions of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. as the events that symbolized the fall of Rome and the end of Antiquity. This governing observation was connected directly with the Teutonic feelings that were prevalent among English and German historians. For these historians, the Teutonic tribes played one of the most significant roles in the history of humanity. They defeated Rome, the greatest empire of all times; paved the way for the Middle Ages; embraced the Christian faith and spread Christianity among the pagans. It was the tribes’ natural racial dominance, attributed to them already in the remote past, which allowed them to have such a dramatic effect on history. For that reason, their infiltration into the Roman Empire was crucial in setting the borders of time, since they injected a new ethno-racial character into the decaying empire. For some German and English historians, this was not an ‘ordinary’ conquest but a ‘formative’ one that altered the racial and religious character of the empire. This change actually symbolized the transformation from Antiquity to the Middle Ages.

Hence, already throughout the first three chapters of the thesis, further to the engagement with the theme of the Teutonic community, I also discuss how the concept of the Teutonic ancestry influenced the periodization of German, French and English historians. Yet, while the first chapters are dedicated to the conventional periodization, in the second part (fourth and fifth chapters), I study the theme of ‘Time’ in further detail and delve into the rather distinct periodizations of Freeman, Bryce and John Bagnell Bury (1861-1927). As will be discussed, although these historians still cherished some aspects of the conventional triad periodization, they mainly adopted historic continuum and applied a certain *longue durée* approach to their writings.

Both Freeman and Bryce occupied the post of Regius Professor in Oxford during a certain stage of their academic career. Bryce, a Presbyterian Ulster-Scott, was Regius Professor of Civil Law from 1870 and until 1893. In the beginning of his post, law was still incorporated with Modern History under the same honorary degree, but in 1872 following the support of Bryce, Law and Modern History were finally separated⁶. Bryce's colleagues were Stubbs and then Freeman, who were both consecutive Regius Professors of Modern history in Oxford. Stubbs held the position until he became the Bishop of Chester in 1884 and was then replaced by Freeman. Freeman's appointment marked the apex of his academic career after spending all his life as an independent scholar or 'man of letters'. His late official nomination, did not prevent some from observing him as the founder of the professional historic discipline in Britain, especially due to his adoption of certain methods from the German historians⁷. Despite several attempts to engage formally in political affairs Freeman was never elected to Parliament. Bryce, however, enjoyed much success in the political field and during and after his post as Regius Professor he attained official public posts. He served first as a Member of Parliament and later as the British ambassador in the USA.

In the case of Freeman and Bryce, both historians belonged, as will be elaborated in the first part of the work, to the Teutonic circle. They acknowledged the significance of the Germanic tribes, their contribution to history and their vast influence on the nations of modern Europe. However, as will be described, there were some differences between Freeman and Bryce in the 'level' of attachment to the Teutonic myth. Despite their admiration for the tribes,

⁶ John T. Seaman, *A Citizen of the World: The Life of James Bryce* (London; New York, 2006), p.124.

⁷ John R. Davis, *The Victorians and Germany* (Oxford; Bern, 2007), p.184.

they did not adopt the conventional periodization and in contrast to many German and English scholars devised a new scheme for historical time. Bryce and Freeman had a close relationship for over 40 years, until Freeman's death. In terms of the number and intensity of exchanged letters and years of friendship, the correspondence between the two was similar to the relationship of Freeman with the historian J.R. Green.

Bryce identified an empire which had lasted for almost two millennia from Augustus until the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in the beginning of the nineteenth century. This empire integrated the Roman element with the Teutonic one and this was the key for its longevity. According to Bryce, this prolonged imperial existence was possible mainly due to an institutional, cultural and juristic inheritance which 'glued' the empire together for centuries.

Freeman also argued for a certain fusion of Teutonism and Romanism. Yet, while Bryce continued 'his' empire until Modernity, Freeman concluded that the end of Rome was with the coronation of Charlemagne and the rise of Islam. The Islamic conquest in particular was the new political and religious tide, and for Freeman even a racial historical force. Freeman, for his part, and this is one of the findings of my study, was not acknowledged enough for his unique historical periodization. The obscurity of Freeman's periodization was contradictory to the likewise very famous periodization of Henri Pirenne (1862-1935)⁸. For Pirenne, as for Freeman, the fall of Rome only came when the Arabs had seized control of the Mediterranean during the seventh century. However, Pirenne, unlike Freeman, placed the heart

⁸ Henri Pirenne, *Mohammed and Charlemagne* (London, 1939).

of his explanation on economy, since following the conquest a trade buffer separated Europe from the Middle East and North Africa.

Through Freeman who was a fervent nationalist and a supporter of Teutonic notions, it is possible to examine the historian's role in the process of the creation of national and even racial identity in the nineteenth century. Initially, Freeman, and to a certain extent also Bryce and Bury, promoted the theory of the 'unity of history', which presumably disregarded the divisions in history and located enduring political, economic, cultural and racial historic connections between periods, places and nations. However, Freeman still identified the Arabs of the seventh century as those who breached through the 'unity'. Freeman linked the Saracens with the political discourse of his own era. His animosity towards the Ottomans and their oppression of the Christian communities in the East caused him to observe them as the great arch-rivals of the Christian West in history; thus, his political stance influenced his perception of time.

The Ottomans were also the ones who brought about Rome's end according to J.B. Bury, since it was the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 that symbolized the empire's final fall. However, for Bury it was less about Islam and more about the Eastern Roman Empire, which continued the empire as a religious institution and a source of material power. Bury who was the Regius Professor of Modern History in Cambridge from 1902 until his death in 1927, was one of the originators of the study of the Eastern Roman Empire. Bury was less known for his writing about the philosophy of history, but some did acknowledge him as the 'father' of the philosophy of history in Britain, even preceding the work of the famous R.G. Collingwood

(1889-1943)⁹. The idea of contingency in history, as seen for example in his famous article 'Cleopatra's Nose'¹⁰, was not only a central pillar in his own writings, but also had a bearing in the conceptions of other historians. Bury's fame, nonetheless, originated primarily from his research of Antiquity. He wrote numerous books and articles about the emperors and institutions of the Roman East and introduced a new vision of the Roman and European past. For him, Rome and with it Antiquity was not terminated in the fifth century A.D., but there was a continuation between the 'old' Rome of the West and the 'new' Rome of the East. This later period of the Roman Empire presented political and cultural achievements that even surpassed the glory of the early Roman Empire. Thus, like Freeman and Bryce he also adopted an alternative periodization.

Bury, to some extent, was a 'follower' of Freeman and edited several of his works. As a classicist he delved into similar subjects of inquiry and was mainly influenced by Freeman's positive treatment of Byzantium, or as Bury called it the 'Late Roman Empire'. However, he can be viewed also as a contrasting example to Freeman. Unlike the latter, he was far less keen on the Teutonic aspect and by that he was distinct especially from Freeman, who regarded the Teutonic kernel as vital in the construction of the English community and in the division of time. Both of these historians, in addition to their personal contact, shared innovative periodizations and fostered the theory of the 'unity of history'. Nevertheless, there was also a fundamental difference between their approaches in relation to the themes of 'race' and

⁹ Doris S. Goldstein, 'J. B. Bury's Philosophy of History: A Reappraisal', *The American Historical Review* 82, vol. 4 (1977): p.896.

¹⁰ John B. Bury, 'Cleopatra's Nose', *R. P. A. Annual*, 1916, 16–23. The title follows the famous saying of Pascal: 'had Cleopatra's nose been shorter the whole face of the world would have changed'.

Teutonism. Hence, the glaring similarities and differences between them is the main reason why I have chosen to concentrate on their writings.

Bury was perhaps less nationalistic than Freeman but his ‘personal’ and in a sense even national inclinations were evident especially in his treatment of religion. Comparable to race, religion denotes another most prominent component of historical periodization. However, unlike race, which, I maintain, became central especially during Modernity, religion was already dominant in the perception of time since Antiquity (before/after Christ, B.C.-A.D. etc.). Bury’s method merged the religious and the national and influenced his conception of time. Bury, an Irish Protestant who began his academic career in the Anglican oriented institution of Trinity College (Dublin), recognised the Catholic Church as the greatest enemy of history and of progress. Therefore, he identified a viable, inseparable link between ancient pre-Catholic Rome and Constantinople. Bury wished to endorse the institutional continuation between Rome and the Eastern Empire, while marginalizing the position of the western Church in replacing Rome.

In conclusion, these historians reveal similarities as well as major differences in their writings and they all devised a method that signified a departure from the accepted and almost ‘sacred’ division between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Thus, each from his unique point of view, presented an innovative scheme for the division of time.

‘Race’, ‘Language’ and ‘Periodization’- Several Remarks

Throughout this work I shall refer to terms such as ‘race’, ‘language’ and ‘periodization’, and their role in the process of constructing the national community by the various historians. My discussion, hence, begins with a certain clarification of these terms. ‘Race’ in many instances

also included what in the post-WWII era is defined in the research as ‘ethnicity’, i.e. a common ancestry with shared memories and culture¹¹. Thus in the nineteenth century, race and ethnicity were not entirely distinct and in some cases it is even futile to distinguish between them¹². Race, until and even after Darwin, either meant ‘lineage’ or ‘type’. As ‘lineage’, it often described a common ancestry of all mankind and an evolving physical differentiation which led to the division of mankind into races. Nevertheless, both definitions were part of an emerging scientific discourse regarding the nature and origin of man.

The purported theory that a physical difference separates human beings became prominent from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This injected a prominent physical-biological dimension into the term, ‘race’. It was evident in the works of naturalists such as Camper and Linnaeus in the eighteenth century and later Cuvier and Vogt in the nineteenth century. The developing scientific research was also very influential in the field of philology and scholars such as Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744 –1803), Friedrich Schlegel (1772-1829), Jacob Grimm (1783–1863) and others developed a range of theories explaining the origins of languages¹³. For some scholars, language also became an essential part of racial belonging, while others perceived the two as separate. Both race and language were believed to derive from an ancient past and were essential building-blocks of communities as they fuse the past with the present. These concepts embody an almost timeless kernel that sustains historical as well as present communities. Often, language and race were used by certain scholars as synonymous concepts. However, a great difference still exists between the two

¹¹ John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, *Ethnicity* (Oxford, 1996), p.6.

¹² Michael Banton, *The Idea of Race* (London, 1977), p.8.

¹³ Chris Manias, *Race, Science, and the Nation: Reconstructing the Ancient Past in Britain, France and Germany* (London, 2013), pp. 23-40.

since one can learn and adopt a particular language and become a member of a community, while race could not be acquired since it is a biological, natural and deterministic criterion. The scholars that will be at the centre of this research reflect sometimes a rather vague and loose definition of these terms. Occasionally, the distinction between race and language was clear while in other cases it disappeared, and the two terms were seen as organically related. Thus, caution should be taken when asserting that the scholars followed a certain interpretation of language and race. Still, and this is the main point, both race and language were able to construct new classifications of belonging during the nineteenth century, which either united or divided communities.

The Pillars of Periodization

It is important, in the context of the present discussion, to examine this issue from a broader perspective and to ask what the meaning of historical periodization is: is it meant to technically divide history between different periods or maybe it has an essential meaning that influences the way we perceive the past. Obviously, these are vast questions, and there is not enough space, in the scope of this research, to focus on all the meanings. Yet, it is important to point them out in the background of the study and attempt to understand the deeper meaning of periodization¹⁴. Thus, I will now present other factors, besides race, which regulate historical periodization but also define communities. These other factors are vital since in many cases they converge with the racial aspect in the various works of the historians. Furthermore, these

¹⁴ Several works on periodization must be noted here: H. Spangenberg, 'Die Perioden der Weltgeschichte,' *Historische Zeitschrift* 127, no. 1 (1923): pp. 1–49; Karl Löwith, *Meaning in History* (Chicago ; London, 1949). Yehoshua Arieli, 'Modernity and the Problem of Secularization,' in *History and Politics*, (Tel-Aviv, 1992), 135–200 (Hebrew).

categories of periodization, I maintain, intertwined during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with the Germanist and Romanist arguments.

In conjunction with the racial division of time, which as claimed was predominantly a derivative of Modernity, one can name several other leading methods of periodization. The religious division of time originated already in Antiquity and therefore was far from being a modern ‘invention’. In Christianity, the concept of B.C. and *Anno Domini*, mentioned by *Dionysius Exiguus* [Denis the ‘Small’] in 525 A.D. and later used in the writing of the Venerable Bede (672 – 735), separated time into two eras: before the birth of Christ and after his first appearance¹⁵. This conception of time was founded on a specific end-event. In this future event, Christ will reappear in a second coming, the *Parusia*, and redeem the world. The establishment of the Christian community by Christ and his followers marked the beginning of a new epoch. Bede adopted in his *de temporum ratione* (66)¹⁶ the scheme of Augustine of Hippo (354 – 430 A.D.). The latter devised the most famous Christian timeline which identified six ages in the world. Five of these ages, which began with Adam in the Garden of Eden, already came to pass, while the sixth and final age commenced with the birth of Jesus Christ: ‘With His coming the sixth age has entered on its process; so that now the spiritual grace, which in previous times was known to a few patriarchs and prophets, may be made manifest to all nations...’ (*Of The Catechising of the Uninstructed*, 22, 39). Augustine himself relied on the periodic construction of Eusebius of Caesarea who in his *Kanones* mentioned six ages before the arrival of Christ. Hence, Eusebius identified seven and not six ages. There are also

¹⁵ Bede referred to this as ‘*anno igitur ante incarnationem Dominicam*’ - [before the incarnation of the Lord] And *anno ab incarnatione Domini* [after the incarnation]. See: Bede, ‘*Historiam ecclesiasticam gentis Anglorum*’, in *Historical Works* (Cambridge, Mass., 1930), Liber quintus, XXIV.

¹⁶ Bede, *The Reckoning of Time* (Liverpool, 1999), pp.355–6.

other differences between the two periodizations. For instance, Augustine, following the genealogical list in the synoptic Gospels, mentioned that each of the last three eras lasted fourteen generations. Eusebius, however, divided the last three eras differently. Nevertheless, both of these Church fathers emphasized the time before and after the arrival of Jesus as the monumental event in the history of the world. This event changed history forever and will eventually lead to the redemption of the Christian community.

Time, therefore, merged with a religious sequence and was even controlled by it. In this category of religious interpretations, one could also mention the Jewish notion of the *Messiah* and the idea of the *Mahdi* in Islam¹⁷. Time, or more accurately history, as Mircea Eliade comments, will ‘*cease to exist*’ when the messiah will appear¹⁸. These religions manifest a forthcoming miraculous appearance that will initiate a new order that is almost out of time. The religious community of the believers will almost become universal, ceasing to exist in its former structure. Thus, religious time is attuned with the transformation in the community and vice versa.

In a sense, the religious conception of time, especially by contemporaries who look back into the past, emphasizes the fact that the past was far more glorious than the present. This vision embeds a prominent nostalgic feature that mythicized the deeds of the founding members or institutions. The Jews flourished when the temple existed. Christianity reached its zenith when Jesus and his disciples wandered in the Galilee and Judea. Muhammad’s voyages and deeds in the Arabian Peninsula became a theme which every Muslim wishes to emulate.

¹⁷ The mainstream of the Shia believes that the Twelfth Imam, Muhammad al-Mahdi who disappeared in the ninth century, is the *Mahdi* that will return from occultation and save the world from sin.

¹⁸ Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return, or, Cosmos and History* (Princeton, N.J, 1971), p. 107.

As for the future, in all the monotheistic religions it possesses the potential to be equal and even superior to the past, yet this will only be achieved in a certain forthcoming era and only if the members of the community will act according to certain rules. Thus, time moves downwards from a past peak, with the belief that one future day the members of the community will be redeemed and even surpass the nostalgic-celebrated past.

The division between monarchies and reigns of kings or the political periodization, as I label it, also originated in Antiquity. Possibly this is the most conventional method of periodization. Until our own age it is the most common method to delineate certain historical eras. The succession of kings provided a definite timeline that allows chronicles and books such as the Bible to present a sequence that depends on one criterion only, the year of the king. Bible chapters open in numerous times with a verse stating the year or the era of a particular king. In the New Testament for example, the famous verse from the synoptic gospels stated that Jesus was born during the reign of Herod (*Matthew*, 2, 1). This example had in fact created one of the most dominant periodizations in history since it located Jesus in a specific time which allowed later writers to develop the scheme of B.C. and A.D. Despite its given name, the political division of history is sometimes apolitical, since it technically divides time between rulers with no distinct political agenda. Nevertheless, in other cases this periodization may depend on the political tendency of contemporary or of later writers. In general, special stature was usually given to the last ruler in the lineage. For example, the young Roman emperor with the ironic name of Romulus Augustus (merging both the name of the mythic father of Rome, Romulus and that of Augustus the founder of the Principate), signified the end of the Roman Empire because he was the last emperor to rule in the city of Rome before the barbaric invasion of 476 A.D.. A similar stature was attributed to the first monarch in the line

of kings. In fact, this was the case with William the Conqueror who symbolized for many historians a new period in English history.

In Antiquity there were examples for a fusion between the religious and the political periodizations. Perhaps, the most prominent example was the very famous description of the four monarchies in the book of Daniel. These narratives appear twice in the book. In the first instance (2,31ff) there is a description of a four-pieced figure that signifies the four monarchies that rule the world one after another. These kingdoms will be followed by a fifth eternal kingdom which will be the kingdom of God (2,44). Later in the book, this vision of Daniel is repeated in a dream depicting four animals that surface from the sea successively (7,17-18). Once again, each of these animals symbolizes the four monarchies which ruled the world one after the other. One of the main debates in regard to these prophecies is which monarchies they signify. One strand which seems more fitting to the second century B.C., the era when the book was written, maintained that the kingdoms were Babylon, Media, Persia and Macedonia/Greece. Another strand argued that they denote Media, Persia, Greece and Rome. The difference between the two interpretations derives from the fact that the second possibility was offered after the decline of Greece and before the establishment of the promised kingdom of heaven. For this reason, the fourth kingdom was seen as Rome and not as Greece. The scheme of the four kingdoms was the foundation for the medievalist concept of the *translatio imperii*. This idea embedded the succession of the Roman Empire and later kingdoms such as the Carolingians, Russia and France, which all identified their kingdoms as the heirs of the empire. According to this interpretation, the fourth empire, Rome, never fell and in fact continued to thrive through certain political entities (Carolingians, Holy Roman Empire, etc.).

Another interpretation of time may be defined as social time. This interpretation, comparable with racial time, can also be regarded as the product of Modernity. It is epitomized in the development of the socialist/Marxist schemes of history. Perhaps in similarity with the dependency of religious time on certain sacred texts, social time is predominantly based on several nineteenth century texts, such as the *Communist Manifesto*¹⁹. This notion of social time is reflected in the opening pages of the *Manifesto*, where Marx and Engels wrote their famous sentence that all history was in fact the story of the class struggle²⁰. Class, therefore, governs time. Their footnote for this sentence is even more relevant to our discussion. They claim there that before 1837 the scholarship on this subject did not exist, but then following the publications of several scholars, the impact of class on the course of history was finally revealed. Among the names they mentioned was the German legal historian Georg Ludwig von Maurer (1790–1872) who argued that all the Teutonic races had devised a communal ownership already during their natural stage²¹. The significance of Maurer is crucial. In his study, race and class merge and the Teutonic races reflected this communal concept in the most seamless way.

What, then, is ‘racial time’? I define it as a modern invention in which certain scholars divided history according to the emergence and fall of races throughout history. The racial alternation is achieved through conquest, invasion or even peaceful migration that may eventually transform the political, religious, social and economic conditions either of a whole

¹⁹ David Cannadine, *The Undivided Past : History beyond Our Differences* (London, 2013), pp.176–7.

²⁰ Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto* (London, 2008), p.33.

²¹ Ibid., footnote 2; Georg Ludwig von Maurer, *Einleitung Zur Geschichte Der Mark-, Hof-, Dorf- Und Stadtverfassung Und Der Öffentlichen Gewalt* (München, 1854).

civilization or of a particular community and land. For instance, the case-study of the wandering of the Teutonic tribes provides one of the most explicit historical examples for the convergence between periodization and race.

Racial Boundaries – between Time, Community and Space

According to various researchers, natural borders such as the Rhine, the Danube, the Alps and the Pyrenees were considered as borders that separated various cultures even during the times of the Romans. What was natural was identified with what was authentic. Thus, Andreas Alföldi defined the rivers Rhine and Danube that demarcated the territories of the Barbarians from the Roman Empire as ‘moral barriers’. He says: ‘...the frontier line was ... the line of demarcation between two fundamentally different realms of thought, whose moral codes did not expand across the boundary’²². Julius Caesar and Strabo described at the beginning of the first century B.C. the regions beyond the Rhine as wild zones which were inhabited by barbaric peoples, while they referred to the rest of the Roman provinces as belonging to established civilization. In this, they expressed a common Roman perception according to which Rome ruled the world (*orbis terrarum*) and therefore its rulers should be accorded the title ‘the masters of the world’ (*dominus totius orbis*). In classical Greece, four hundred years earlier, a similar contrast was made wherein the zone of culture was defined as the ‘populated world’ which was an antithesis to the ‘wild’ zone. The peoples who resided within the border were sometimes attributed similar and identical characteristics. This contributed to the formation of a comprehensive or stereotypical generic perception in which whole communities were

²²Andreas Alföldi, ‘The Moral Barrier on Rhine and Danube,’ in Eric Birley (ed.), *The Congress of Roman Frontier Studies* (Durham, England, 1949), p.1.

described as if they were one person with a unique personality. Nevertheless, alongside this view, one can also find amongst the ancient writers a more nuanced perception that differentiated between various ethnic groups according to characteristics and customs. One should note that most writers held both perceptions.

The perception that there existed a clear geographical boundary between the Roman world and the barbarian one greatly enhanced both the attitude that regarded the Germanic tribes as wild people who destroyed the ancient world, and the attitude that named them as the 'knights of freedom' who created a better world. These two approaches are based, among others, on the dichotomist view of the natural border that had already developed during ancient times.

Following this claim, a substantial premise arose in which the ethnic/racial, cultural and geographical boundary also outlined the boundary of the historical era. In other words, the contrast between the Barbarians and the Romans determined also the periodization of Antiquity and of the Middle Ages. As long as the clear geographical boundary between the two cultures was kept, it was regarded as one historical era. However, when the Germanic tribes crossed the Rhine and Danube Rivers starting in the fourth century and spread all over the empire during the fifth century, there came an end to the Ancient era and a new historical epoch had begun. According to most scholars, as I will demonstrate, there is no difference between those who observed the Germanic tribes as heroes and those who viewed them as the meanest of people. According to both approaches, since the tribes breached the old borders and upturned the conventional order, they were defined as the harbingers of the Middle Ages.

For some, the crossing of the natural, almost mythic geographical border also embodied a racial change. Following the invasions, a great mass of people arrived in a space which was new to them and in fact transformed its character and culture and especially affected the status of the old inhabitants. The Rhine marked geographically one of these racial borders, and its crossing by the tribes became a dramatic event, in particular during the wars of German unity and independence. These arguments concerning the ‘racial time’ are most significant since they nourished the construction of the racial English-German community of historians. Through them it was possible to construct a transnational racial affinity linking England and Germany. The Teutonic crossing of the Rhine (406 A.D.) and later the crossing of the Channel by the Anglo-Saxons (449 A.D.) were part of the same great Teutonic expansion. According to the discussed historians, it was the racial emergence of the Teutons that altered time and even more significantly bonded Germany and England forever. This as I aim to argue is the main significance of the ‘racial time’. It allowed new racial communal demarcations to come into force, periodize history and influence the construction of communities during the nineteenth century.

One example for the amalgamation of race and periodization emerges from the arguments of the German philosopher, Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762 –1814). Fichte described the tribes as real Germans who had commenced a new age: ‘Der Deutsche ist zuvörderst ein Stamm der Germanier überhaupt, ..., und so an aus sich selbst eine neue Zeit, im Gegensatze des untergegangenen Alterthums, zu entwickeln’²³. He was of the opinion that the whole

²³Johann Gottlieb Fichte, ‘Reden an Die Deutsche Nation Achte Rede -Vierte Rede, Hauptverschiedenheit Zwischen Den Deutschen Und Den Übrigen Völkern Germanischer Abkunft’, *Sämmtliche Werke*, Band 7 (Berlin, 1845), s.311; In a different place he wrote: ‘...ein wahrhafter Deutscher nur könne leben wollen, um eben

modern world must regard them as such since their belief in the principle of freedom paved the way to the future: ‘Ihrem beharrlichen Widerstande verdankt es die ganze neue Welt, dass sie da ist, so wie sie da ist’²⁴. The German nation was constructed thanks to the tribes because it inherited their innate characteristics. According to Fichte, the tribes determine the nature of the German nation both at present and in the future:

Ihnen verdanken wir, die nächsten Erben ihres Bodens, ihrer Sprache und ihrer Gesinnung, dass wir noch Deutsche sind, dass der Strom ursprünglichen und selbstständigen Lebens uns noch trägt, ihnen verdanken wir Alles, was wir seitdem als Nation gewesen sind, ihnen, falls es nicht etwa jetzt mit uns zu Ende ist, und der letzte von ihnen abstammte Blutstropfen in unseren Adern versiegt ist, ihnen werden wir verdanken Alles, was wir noch ferner seyn werden.²⁵

The significant sentence here, which may refer to an emerging racial discourse, is the one that states that the modern Germans were connected to their tribal ancestors not only through cultural, political or geographical links but also through an actual physical connection. Consequently, the blood of the Germanic tribes’ flows in the veins [*Adern*] of the modern nation.

The German poet and historian, Ernest Moritz Arndt (1769 – 1860) also signified the Rhine as an integral part of the German ‘racial’ sphere²⁶. The people who dwelled in the Rhine valley belonged to the Germanic tribe of the *Alemanni* as attested through their language, manners and physical appearance. Despite their mingling with other races, which caused a

Deutscher zu seyn und zu bleiben, und die Seinigen zu eben solchen zu bilden. See: Ibid., ‘Was ein Volk sey, in der höhern Bedeutung des Worts, und was Vaterlandsliebe?’, s. 389.

²⁴ Ibid., s.390.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Today there is an ongoing debate in Germany about the legacy of Arndt. In 1933 the University of Greifswald was named after Arndt by the Nazis. The new regime was inspired with his racial vision and adorned the 19th century scholar with this honour. In our days, the current students of the university are engaged in a campaign to eliminate the name of Arndt from the university’s name. See: ‘Uni Ohne Arndt’, accessed April 30 2014, at <http://www.uniohnearndt.de/>.

certain degeneration, the ancient Germanic kernel of the people on both banks of the Rhine was evident. Thus, the purity of the race was most vital for preserving its strength²⁷. The Franks, however, when entering Gallia in the fifth century became mingled with other races and lost their purity: ‘...the Frank in Gaul was soon contaminated by the corrupt, servile, and Romanised Gaul, and became as cunning and faithless as he was brave and cruel’²⁸. This had been the origin of the French character that was manifested in their ill deeds throughout history. The invasions of the Germanic tribes did not exterminate the Gallo-Romans. Instead, a fusion occurred between the two races which created France. The racial alternation in Gallia and the ability of the Germanic tribes to prevent the Romans from conquering the territory East from the Rhine, marked the emergence of a new racial order and era that resulted eventually in the construction of the European states. The same threat of racial dilution also endangered the purity of Germany in Arndt’s times: ‘...the Rhine, of which Germany was once so proud, will be shared with the Franks, that this fine race will be reduced to a hybrid set; that Germany, the unconquered, will become the scorn of all nations’²⁹. Arndt explained how animosity toward another race was necessary for the freedom of the nation. If Arminius, thanks to his and the Germanic people’s courage, had not pushed the Romans out of the Danube and Rheine the German people would not have survived, yet eventually: ‘die Römer wurden geschlagen und

²⁷ Some argue that Arndt did not emphasize the notion of racial purity even though he did advocate a racial argument. See: Brian Vick, ‘Arndt and German Ideas of Race: Between Kant and Social Darwinism,’ in Walter Erhart and Arne Koch (eds.), *Ernst Moritz Arndt (1769-1860): deutscher Nationalismus--Europa--transatlantische Perspektiven* (Tübingen, 2007).

²⁸ Ernst Moritz Arndt and John Robert Seeley, *The Life and Adventures of Ernst Moritz Arndt, the Singer of the German Fatherland* (Boston, 1879), p.304.

²⁹ Ibid., p.105.

über den Rhein und die Donau getrieben , und Rom ging endlich durch germanische Tapferkeit in Trümmern . Das war Volksliebe und Volkshaß'³⁰.

The discourse of race and time was not omitted from the French scene and thinkers such as Emmanuel Joseph Sieyès (1748 – 1836) identified the people of the Third Estate with the Gauls and the nobility with the Franks. For those thinkers, the Gauls were the sole ancestors of the French, while the Franks were considered conquerors and not ‘natives’ of France. Therefore, only the offspring of the Gauls, meaning the masses, are fit to be called ‘French’. This means that the Gallic myth served the philosophers of the revolution in their political and social struggle against the nobility and the royalty. This was a historic authorization of the fact that the French nobility that originated from the Franks did not deserve its political and social status³¹. It is important to emphasize that this argumentation was a reaction to the claim of some representatives of the nobility such as Henri de Boulainvilliers (1658 – 1722) who argued long before the French Revolution that the nobles deserved their high social and political status because they were the offspring of the Franks. For him, the Franks, following the conquest, deprived the local Gallo-Romans of their superior rights and stature. Hence, there was a racial struggle in between the two populations. The main attribute of the Franks was their love of freedom, notions that originated in Tacitus. Boulainvilliers identified the Franks as an over-class. For him, The Gallo-Romans were tyrannical and oppressive, as seen in their legislation, tax laws and governmental system. This split between the Franks and the Romans reflected the

³⁰Ernst Moritz Arndt, *Ueber Volkshass und über den Gebrauch einer fremden Sprache* (Leipzig, 1813), s.13.

³¹ Krzysztof Pomian, ‘Franks and Gauls,’ in Pierre Nora and Lawrence DKritzman (eds.), *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past* (3 vol. New York, 1996), I , p.55.

political stance of Boulainvilliers. Thus, he wished to endorse the power of the aristocracy and was against the growing power of the Third Estate³².

The position of the ethnic-status struggle between the Gallic-Roman and the German conquerors became very significant during the nineteenth century. Its effects can be probably found in the thesis of Marx and Engels on the struggle between the different social classes and in the racist views of de Gobineau (1816 –82). The perception of the existence of a ‘struggle’ was integrated also into the national-territorial confrontation between France and Germany that reached its peak during the nineteenth century. This insight enabled French statesmen and thinkers to argue that some disputed territories belonged to France and not to Germany, for they (the French) were the native people of Gallia/France while the Germans were conquerors who invaded this territory and therefore had no historic rights. The French discourse demonstrates the amalgamation of the racial time with what I defined earlier as the social time. As in the case of religion and race, the two ideas merge and construct a certain understanding of history.

Before dealing in the first chapter and throughout the work with the notions of ‘race’ and ‘time’ in the writings of the English-Teutonic historians, I wish to present, briefly, the origin of the Anglo-Saxon racial theme among three major British scholars: John Pinkerton, Sir Walter Scott and Sharon Turner. This short introduction will commence with a concise description of current scholarship and definitions of Anglo-Saxonism. At the next stage, I will focus on the ideas of the above Anglo-Saxon scholars which will be vital for the rest of the

³² Ian N. Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2013), pp.23–8.

discussion since they fused the notions of race and time within their arguments. Hence, the evolving interest in the Anglo-Saxon past and its racial implications laid the foundation for the views of the English-Teutonic historians.

‘Anglo-Saxonism’ as a distinct collective feeling denotes the peculiarity as well as the alleged superiority of the Anglo-Saxons. The term, in some cases, is parallel to Teutonism especially as an antonym to Celticism³³. Yet, while Teutonism includes all people of Germanic decent, Anglo-Saxonism mainly refers to the English speaking people. During the study, in most instances, Anglo-Saxonism and Teutonism will be interchangeable terms. Anglo-Saxonism embodies ancient as well as early-modern/modern characteristics. According to Frantzen and Niles, it signifies ‘a self-conscious national and racial identity first came into being among the early peoples of the region that we now call England and how, over time, through both scholarly and popular promptings, that identity was transformed into an originary myth available to a wide range of political and social interests’.³⁴ In the following discussion, I will refer to the modern aspects of this term, to its racial connotations and the method in which it constructed modern communities and time. As Horsman and others asserted, affinity towards Anglo-Saxonism existed in Britain since the sixteenth century. However, the racial aspect of Anglo-Saxonism and its alleged superiority over Celtic identity became most prevalent during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and was apparent in various fields

³³ ‘Anglo-Saxonism, n’, *OED Online*, (Oxford, June 2015), accessed 15 July, 2015 at [tp://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2355/view/Entry/7608?redirectedFrom=anglo-Saxonism%5C](http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2355/view/Entry/7608?redirectedFrom=anglo-Saxonism%5C); ‘Teutonism, n’. *OED Online*. (Oxford, June 2015) accessed 15 July, 2015 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2355/view/Entry/199965?redirectedFrom=teutonism>.

³⁴ Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles, ‘Introduction: Anglo-Saxonism and Medievalism’, in Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles (eds), *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity* (Gainesville, 1997), p.1.

such as history, philology, archaeology and literature³⁵. This racial element was not only a feature of English Anglo-Saxonism but also central in the America³⁶. As illustrated, the subject of Anglo-Saxonism is widely studied. Nevertheless, in the following discussion I will stress a less researched path: the amalgamation of racial Anglo-Saxonism/Teutonism with the division of time.

John Pinkerton-Gothic vs. Celtic

The Scottish historian John Pinkerton (1758-1826) delineated a clear separation between the Celtic and Germanic or as he named them the ‘Gothic races’³⁷. Pinkerton asserted that all the great nations of Europe, including his ‘imagined’ ancestors, the Picts, had descended from Scythian or Gothic stock. When the Scythians invaded Europe from their native land of Persia, they pushed the Celtic people into the far western parts of Europe, towards Gaul and the British Isles. The Celtic influence remained notable until Modernity, especially in the Celto-Welsh, Celto-Irish and in the highland communities of Scotland³⁸. Pinkerton described the Celts in degrading words: ‘...they are savages, have been savages since the world began, and will be

³⁵ Reginald Horsman, ‘Origins of Racial Anglo-Saxonism in Great Britain before 1850’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37, no. 3 (1976):pp. 388-9; Hugh A. MacDougall, *Racial Myth in English History: Trojans, Teutons and Anglo-Saxons*, (Montreal, 1981), pp. 45-8, 89-103.; Billie Melman, ‘Claiming the Nation's Past: The Invention of an Anglo-Saxon Tradition’, *Journal of Contemporary History* 26, no. 3/4, (Sep., 1991), p. 587; Howard Williams, ‘Anglo-Saxonism and Victorian Archaeology: William Wylie's Fairford Graves’, *Early Medieval Europe* 16, no. 1 (2008): pp. 51-2; Some Victorians, like Mathew Arnold, presented a unique fusion of the two identities. See: Joep Leerssen, ‘Englishness, Ethnicity and Matthew Arnold’, *European Journal of English Studies* 10, no. 1, pp. 64-6.

³⁶ Reginald Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny : The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* (Cambridge, MA., 1981); Eric Kaufmann, ‘American Exceptionalism Reconsidered: Anglo-Saxon Ethnogenesis in the “Universal” Nation, 1776-1850’, *Journal of American Studies* 33, no. 3 (1999): pp. 447-9.

³⁷ Horsman, *Race and Manifest Destiny : The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*, p.33.

³⁸ John Pinkerton, *A Dissertation on the Origin and Progress of the Scythians or Goths. Being an Introduction to the Ancient and Modern History of Europe* (London, 1787). p.90; subsequent to Pinkerton, another famous Scotsman, Thomas Carlyle continued to emphasize the difference between the Saxon lowlanders and the Irish/Celtic highlanders. Following their ‘Scottishness’ together with the ideas of Walter Scott, one could even claim that Scottish writers invented the idea of English-Saxonism. See: Robert Young, *The Idea of English Ethnicity* (Malden, MA ; Oxford, 2008), pp.30-1.

for ever savages while a separate people; that is, while themselves, and of unmixed blood; I say the contempt borne by those Celts for the English, Lowland Scots, and later Irish (who are English and Scots) is extreme and knows no boundaries'³⁹.

Pinkerton offered a secular chronological timeline which epitomized the deeds of a single ultimate race, the Goths. Other histories pale in comparison to the Goths. Their expansion was divided into two waves. The first portrayed their emergence from Persia beginning in 3660 B.C., when they defeated the Egyptians and conquered all of Asia. In 740 B.C., the Scythians conquered Scandinavia, Germany and large parts of Gaul. In 300 B.C. the *Belgai*, who following Pinkerton were a Germanic people, entered the south of England and Ireland. At the same time the Picts, the forefathers of the lowland Scots, sailed from Scandinavia to Northern Britain and inhabited large parts of the area⁴⁰. During the second wave of wanderings, the Goths engaged once again with the Roman Empire. Gradually, and in particular from the fourth century A.D., they gained major success in their struggle with Rome until they managed to defeat the Western Empire. Pinkerton, like many others, even though he pointed that this happened in 475 and not 476, marked this year as crucial in the development of history. He ended his chronology not long after with the conquest of Gaul by the Franks between 490 and 509 A.D.⁴¹.

³⁹ Pinkerton, *A Dissertation on the Origin and Progress of the Scythians or Goths*, p.92.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p.189.

⁴¹ Pinkerton was in contact with Edward Gibbon, who presented a rather similar scheme about the significance of the fifth century A.D.. Gibbon wished Pinkerton to edit a book on the English historians. However, the project was not implemented due to Gibbon's death. See: John Pinkerton, *The Literary Correspondence of John Pinkerton*, pr. from the Originals in the Possession of D. Turner (2 vol., London, 1830), I, pp.330–3; Sarah Couper, 'Pinkerton, John (1758–1826)', *ODNB*, (Oxford, 2004), accessed 1 May 2014 at <http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2117/view/article/22301>.

The uniqueness of Pinkerton and the main cause for his inclusion in the discussion is that he offers a racial periodization of history. He adopted an original view that attached the history of Europe, and in a sense the history of the world, to the deeds of one race. In the case of the Scots and English, this marked a prominent difference from the ruling observation since their history began 800 hundred years earlier, at the end of the fourth century B.C., and not in 449 A.D. The main argument classified the English and Scots in a similar and larger racial community. As with the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons, and the early Belgic and Pictish invasions, the Germanic race pressed the Celts to the outskirts of the isles. Thus, one race gradually replaced another as the major force. A significant conclusion from Pinkerton's treatise is the usage of race as demarcating time. However, as will be discussed, unlike the approach of many of his contemporaries and of the English-Teutonic historians, Pinkerton located the racial transformation in an earlier stage and under different racial classification. For Freeman and Stubbs, the Scots/Picts were part of the Celtic race and were inferior to the Anglo-Saxon Germanic race, which only arrived in the Isles during the fifth century A.D.

Sir Walter Scott- Anglo-Saxons and Normans

One of Pinkerton associates and also a fellow Scotsman, the famous author Walter Scott (1771-1832), refuted his attack against the Celts and in particular the Celts of Scotland, who were regarded by Pinkerton as '...dishonoured, timid, filthy, ignorant and degraded race'⁴². Scott defended the Celts of the highlands and named their merits. He also doubted the theory of Pinkerton that the Picts, the supposed forefathers of the Scottish lowlanders, had originated from a Scythian/Germanic origin. Tacitus, Pinkerton's main source, did not mention that the

⁴²Walter Scott, 'Ancient History of Scotland', in *The Prose Works of Sir Walter Scott* (Edinburgh, 1835), p.321.

Caledonians spoke a Germanic language, but only wrote that a physical similarity existed between the Caledonians and the Germanic tribes. For Scott, the physical evidence was not sufficient to prove a viable Germanic linkage between the two people. Language is the ultimate test for substantiating an ethnic bond⁴³. The conclusion of Scott was that the Picts and Caledonians were in fact the same people. However, they were not of Germanic but of Celtic decent and were driven to the north of Scotland as a result of the Roman peril⁴⁴. The faults of Pinkerton, Scott wrote, were however a consequence of his early years as a researcher and one should not be too critical of him⁴⁵. Scott himself, and this is his main relevance to the discussion, incorporated in his notable historical novel *Ivanhoe* another racial distinction which became a crucial factor in the national periodization of English history. In Scott's case, the decisive racial division which determined periodization was between the Anglo-Saxons and Normans. Hence, 1066 A.D. symbolized a monumental event in the course of English history:

...the sufferings of the inferior classes, arose from the consequences of the Conquest by Duke William of Normandy. Four generations had not sufficed to blend the hostile blood of the Normans and Anglo-Saxons, or to unite, by common language and mutual interests, two hostile races, one of which still felt the elation of triumph, while the other groaned under all the consequences of defeat. The power had been completely placed in the hands of the Norman nobility, by the event of the battle of Hastings...⁴⁶

The differences between the races were exemplified through language, manners, class and blood. The new noble aristocracy spoke Norman-French, while the Anglo-Saxons used their Saxon-Germanic tongue. For Scott, language, it seems, was the main factor for distinguishing between races/classes. Scott's influence may be regarded as pivotal since he

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 325-32.

⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 335-6.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 327.

⁴⁶ Walter Scott, *Ivanhoe: A Romance* (3 vol., Edinburgh; London, 1820), I, p.4.

inspired many writers in Britain and abroad. The famous Augustin Thierry (1795 – 1856), for example, adopted the narrative of Scott for explaining the clash between the local Anglo-Saxons and the new Norman conquerors⁴⁷. The main convergence in Scott's and Thierry's narratives was between race, time and class. Time changed when a new race entered the Islands, a race that denoted a new social order in which the Normans became superior over the Anglo-Saxons. However, the physical aspect was not omitted from Scott's description, as Scott quoted the poet Thomson's *Liberty* in the opening lines of his third chapter: 'The German Ocean roar, deep-blooming, strong, and yellow hair'd, the blue-eyed Saxon came'⁴⁸. In regards to Scott, the main argument was that he offered a clear racial-lingual boundary between the Anglo-Saxons and the Normans. This boundary distinguished between two epochs in the history of England. The first one stretched from the invasion of the Anglo-Saxons until the Norman Conquest, whereas the second originated after 1066 A.D. and lasted up to Modernity.

Turner –The Father of Anglo-Saxonism

The English historian Sharon Turner (1768-1847) was another critic of Pinkerton's ill-treatment of the Celts. In his *History of the Anglo-Saxons* he paved the way for a whole strand of nineteenth century Anglo-Saxon historiography. Scott himself, as he remarked in his preface to *Ivanhoe*, relied primarily on the scholarly efforts of Turner⁴⁹. Turner accepted the division in Europe between the Celtic and Gothic/Germanic races. These races were

⁴⁷ Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages*, pp.100–2.

⁴⁸ Scott, *Ivanhoe*, I, p.47.

⁴⁹ Ibid., I, pp.XIII–XIV.

distinguished through their language⁵⁰. To these two dominant European races, Turner added the Slavonic race that inhabited the Eastern parts of Europe. Among the human race there are two types of nations: one is the settled and the other is the nomadic. The fact that the latter is characterized by constant movement from land to land and had left us no written texts, does not mean that the nomadic nations are more barbaric or savage. On the contrary, some of the nomadic people contributed to the world far more than some of the settled nations which also includes nations which brought misery and despair. The ancestors of the English, for instance, belonged to the nomadic type including both the Celtic and the Germanic races. For Turner, this was, of course, proof that the nomadic was at least equal if not superior to the settled nations of Egypt, Babylon, Greece and Rome. Turner, unlike several other contemporaries (Pinkerton) and as I will show other succeeding scholars (Freeman, Stubbs), did not identify only one ethnic group as the source of the English nation, i.e., the Celts, that were the first to inhabit the isles. The Anglo-Saxons and then the Normans were all part of the English nation: ‘The Cimmerians and Celts may be regarded as our first ancestors, and from the German or Gothic nations who formed, with the Scythians, the second wave of population into Europe, our Anglo-Saxon and Norman ancestors proceeded’⁵¹. Races existed, but this did not prove that the English had descended from one sole race. The melting pot of history eventually amalgamated all these races into one national group.

This is a racial-lingual periodization of a different kind since instead of seeing an enduring struggle between the races that resulted in the victory of one race, there is a fusion.

⁵⁰ Sharon Turner, *The History of the Anglo-Saxons: From the Earliest Period to the Norman Conquest*, 6th edn. (3 vol., London, 1836), I, p.4, 25.

⁵¹ Ibid., p.23.

This does not mean that the races were not involved in confrontations at certain times. In addition, one should not deduce that all the races which construct the English nation had an equal stature and impact. Therefore, Turner divided the periods according to the different races and identified a distinction between the Celts, Anglo-Saxons and Normans. The Norman period should be separated from the earlier Anglo-Saxon era by the fact that the Normans connected Britain with the continent. They functioned as a bridgehead between the two spheres. Links had been established beforehand, yet the fact that the Normans developed their kingdom in Normandy on the coastal north-western regions of Gaul and were deeply invested with the continent enabled them to enhance the bond. The connections with Europe reached their zenith during the Norman era, but the Anglo-Saxons still had the most dramatic impact on the evolution of the English nation. Furthermore, like the Anglo-Saxons, all the great modern nations of Europe belonged to the same Germanic race⁵². These nations began to rise into their noble position in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. when the Anglo-Saxons first sailed to the isles. Language, once again, proved the continuation between the Germanic tribes and the modern nations of Europe. Nevertheless, as in the case of Scott, physical attributions still denote some significance in Turner's narrative, e.g., when illustrating the Celts, he wrote that the Britons were taller than the Gauls and the Romans, and also added that: 'Their hair was less yellow' as compared with the Gauls. Further examples can be found for the usage of physical criteria as classifying race, yet, in Turner's opinion, language still retained the main factor for proving racial continuity and uniqueness.

⁵² Ibid., pp.79–85.

The importance of language will be seen throughout the discussion. The role of the philologist was for that matter no less and sometimes even more dramatic than that of the historian. It was through language that one traced an alleged linkage to the ancient past. Similar to the racial aspect, language stood above time and hence controlled its course. Race became the independent variable which influences the dependent variable of history. Language, similarly, acted as another independent variable that governed time. The two, of course, also operated together and through them some scholars, historians as well as philologists, defined the periodization of history.

The main conclusion from the writings of these modern 'Anglo-Saxon' historians is their linkage between race and time. They divide English history according to the appearance of different races in the isles. Therefore, the national history of England was, among other factors, a consequence of the racial alternations. Some or even the majority of these modern 'Anglo-Saxon' historians belonged without a doubt to the German school. For them the wanderings of the Anglo-Saxons and the founding of England were part of a great Germanic awakening that stormed through the Roman Empire.

Following these examples of the 'racial time', one may ask how the racial and national schemes differed from each other. Many nineteenth century scholars comprehended the concepts of nation and race as nearly identical and therefore interchangeable. Thus, the main difficulty is to differentiate between them, since for some, such a distinction is only semantic. Indeed, one could claim that race is focused on the physical aspect while the nation is more concerned with language, cultural, political and religious definitions. Yet, in regards to nineteenth century historiography, this distinction was less apparent, since the physical aspect

was occasionally adjoined with the discourse on the nation, while other traits, such as language, were linked to race. Race and ethnicity were intermingled.

Another, perhaps, more accurate distinction is between what each of the terms consists of and classifies. Race may include a variety of nations and for that reason distinct nations can be part of the same race. The nation, alternatively, denotes a specific group usually living in a particular land. For that reason, 'racial time' is more general and includes a more universal periodization. However, the national periodization concentrates on the timeline of the nation itself. In many cases there is a fusion between the two and the more general 'racial time' is attached to the particularistic national time. The reason for this is due mainly to the fact that before the 'birth' of the nation in a specific historical event the people who construct it belonged to a certain race. Therefore, to detect their origins one had to invent an earlier sense of belonging that precedes the nation. As many scholars demonstrate⁵³, the racial discourse emerged with great vigour during the middle of the nineteenth century. Conversely, sometimes, the 'new' racial units, breached the singular national demarcations and constructed other usually more generalized classifications. As will be presented in the first part, the Pan-Teutonic movement created a shared transnational community that included England, Scandinavia, Germany, Switzerland and the United States. The racial and the national distinctions added new and particularistic delineations to the division of historical time. Thus, they were not only dividing time but also used as a substantial tool for differentiating as well as merging people

⁵³Edward Beasley, *The Victorian Reinvention of Race: New Racisms and the Problem of Grouping in the Human Sciences* (London, 2010), pp.2–5, 63; Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Victorian Minds* (London, 1968), pp. 218-21.

and communities. Suddenly, every nation and race conceptualized a unique timeline which was deemed essential for its creation.

Chapter 1: The English Teutonic Circle – Freeman, Stubbs and Green

Now I have told you about Caradoc and Boadicea, and it is right that you should know about them and care for them. But you should care for Arminius a great deal more, for though he did not live in our land, he was our own kinsman, our bone and our flesh. If he had not hindered the Romans from conquering Germany, we should not now be talking English; perhaps we should not be a nation at all⁵⁴.

These words of E.A. Freeman, taken from his book *Old English History for Children*, epitomize Freeman's approach to the origins of the English nation. For Freeman, the English are part and parcel of the German tribes and are distinct from the Celtic autochthonic inhabitants of the British Isles. Therefore, English children as well as adults should seek their past in the deeds of the people who inhabited the German lands and be conscious of the linkage between the German tribes and the English nation. This is not only a matter of past events but it determines the present and the future affinities between England and the Germany. For Freeman, a common English and German community or *Gemeinschaft* that shared roots, territory, and ancestors was a viable and almost present reality. As the two following chapters aim to show, such a close Anglo-German community emerged during the middle of the nineteenth century. This community believed that in order to revive the unique bond between the German and the English nations, it was necessary, first, to write historical books and second, to establish English and German communities beginning with a community of historians.

In this chapter, the main focus will be on the English-Teutonic historians and on the question of how the idea of a pan-Germanic heritage constructed the past and present perception of their community. Some of the English historians, as Peter Mandler demonstrates,

⁵⁴Edward A. Freeman, *Old English History for Children* (London, 1869), p. 22.

became obsessed with Teutonic themes⁵⁵. This obsession was depicted sometimes by contemporaries as ‘Teutomania’⁵⁶. In its origin, the term ‘Teutonic’ defined a certain Germanic tribe from northern Europe. Yet, with time it became a generic name which referred to the whole Germanic people including in England. The affiliated German and English scholars were united in their shared interest in the common Germanic origins of their people. In contrast to the decadence of Rome (fourth -fifth centuries), for these scholars the tribes symbolized the regeneration of the Western Europe which eventually led to the establishment of both England and Germany.

As I aim to show the English-Teutonic historians divided history into the era before the Anglo-Saxon invasions of 449 A.D. and the period following them. They identified a racial struggle between the newly arrived Anglo-Saxons and the local Roman-Celtic populations which in fact resulted in the establishment of the English nation. This perception of the racial difference between the former people which inhabited the islands and the succeeding Anglo-Saxon invaders became in fact a historical border between the time prior to the invasions, when England had not been established yet, and the preceding era when the Anglo-Saxon race founded England. Hence, their comprehension of the founding era of English history was partly through the prism of race. According to them, race was sometimes, though not always, the

⁵⁵Peter Mandler, *The English National Character: The History of an Idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair* (New Haven, Conn; London, 2006), pp.86–7.

⁵⁶ The term denotes the keenness of nineteenth century historians to research the alleged Teutonic history of their nations. The term is attributed to Michael Burleigh, a contemporary scholar. See: Michael Burleigh, *The Racial State: Germany 1933-1945* (Cambridge, 1991), p.25; Nevertheless, it was already used during the 19th century. For instance, the most notable Jewish historian of the 19th century, Heinrich Graetz, wrote a chapter with this term in the title. See: Heinrich Graetz ‘The Reaction and Teutomania’, *History of the Jews* (6 vol., Philadelphia, 1898), V, pp. 510-35.

pillar of the nation. For Freeman and his colleagues, the construction of the community was dependent on its racial homogeneity and the alienation of other races.

The Germanic Origins of England

In this context, E.A. Freeman in the second half of the nineteenth century sets a departure point for the whole discussion. The name 'England' itself, as he emphasized, had derived from the tribe of the Angles. This tribe together with the Saxons and Jutes invaded the British Isles during the fifth century A.D. The native lands of these people were the regions of northern Germany and Denmark. Freeman accentuated the very eminent national characteristics of the tribes: 'The conquerors who wrought this change were our own forefathers'⁵⁷. The 'Teutonic heritage' was not an exclusive assertion of Freeman, and as John Burrow demonstrates in his famous book, *A Liberal Decent*, it can be found in the writings of many prominent Victorian scholars. The mid-Victorian historians adopted the idea of the freedom of the English people that was embedded already by their ancestors, the Germanic/Teutonic tribes of Antiquity and the early Middle Ages⁵⁸.

Stubbs also advocated this notion. Stubbs's book *English Constitution* was one of the anchors of the 'Teutonic heritage'. According to Stubbs, the four central monarchies of Europe, Spain, Germany, England and France were based on the Germanic institutional heritage. The German invasions destroyed part of the Roman system and a clear dividing line separated the Roman era and the era of Germanic tribal dominance in the territories of the former Western

⁵⁷Edward A. Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe* (2 vol., London, 1881), p.97.

⁵⁸ John W. Burrow, *A Liberal Decent : Victorian Historians and the English Past* (Cambridge, 1981).

Empire, which later evolved into the great European powers⁵⁹. However, while in Gaul and Spain the central Roman influence was fused with the German element, in both Germany and England the Roman ‘effect’ was suppressed and almost unnoticeable. In Germania, no invasion of another race occurred and there was almost a purity of race founded upon the Germanic tribes. England and Germany hardly inherited any laws from the Roman system. Their laws were mostly dependent on the German customs; in a sense, England became even more ‘Germanized’ than Germany itself since it was much more ‘protected’ from external Roman influences⁶⁰. The English of these centuries were almost identical with the Germans described by Stubbs following Tacitus’s *Germania* as follows: ‘...it is necessary to begin the story of the English civilisation by comparing the state of Britain in the fifth century with that of Germany in the first’⁶¹. In terms of language, the Anglo-Saxons were hardly affected by Latin and they maintained their pure Germanic language, similar to the preservation of language in Scandinavia. For this reason, when the Vikings invaded England during the ninth century they were quickly integrated into the existing society. This was also true for the Normans who, Stubbs argued, were of similar German descent⁶². For him, there was a clear distinction between the Anglo-Saxons and the local Britons-Celts of the Isles:

The English are not aboriginal, that is, they are not identical with the race that occupied their home at the dawn of history. They are a people of German descent in the main constituents of blood, character, and language, but most especially, in connexion with our subject, in the possession of the elements of primitive German civilisation and the common germs of German institutions. This descent is not a

⁵⁹ William Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development* (3 vol. Oxford, 1874), I, pp. 2–3.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp.10;58–9.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p.63.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp.8–11.

matter of inference. It is a recorded fact of history, which those characteristics bear out to the fullest degree of certainty⁶³.

He stressed that unlike the growing unity and influence between the Franks and the Gauls, ‘from the Briton and the Roman of the fifth century we [English people] have received nothing’.⁶⁴ The national history of England in the British Isles had commenced during the fifth century, but the birth of the ‘race’, a term used by Stubbs⁶⁵, had begun in the forests of Germany. The important point that Stubbs emphasized was that territory was not the foundation of the nation but only another manifestation of its character, i.e. the nation is not dependent on territory but on culture, law and institutions. It is a dynamic entity, which moves from place to place and still preserves its main features. Thus, the fact that the Anglo-Saxons wandered westward to the British Isles did not alter their character and a continuous history linked them to their German origins.

J.R. Green adopted a similar idea. The latter, an Anglican clergyman and historian, was one of Freeman’s closest friends as can be seen from the vast corpus of letters that they exchanged over a period of more than twenty years⁶⁶. According to Green, the emergence of the English people happened in the northern lands of Germany along the Baltic Sea:

⁶³ Ibid., p.2.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p.3

⁶⁵ In most places when Stubbs mentioned the term ‘race’ it seems parallel to that of the nation. However, it did denote a certain kinship/blood relation between people. See, for example: William Stubbs, *The Early Plantagenets*, Sixth edn. (London, 1889), p.230.

⁶⁶ Most of these letters have never been published. Despite the fact that Freeman sent to Green a vast number of letters, there is only scattered evidence for this fact in the edited letters of Freeman. The reason for this was that after Green’s death, when his wife Alice continued his work and wished to publish his letters, Freeman refused to pass certain letters to her, since they exposed ‘secrets’ about Green’s early life. In a response, Alice also refused to send the numerous letters (from Freeman to Green) to Freeman’s family and they have never been published. Today, most of these letters could be found in the Freeman Archives, JRLM and in the archive of Jesus College, Oxford, where Green studied. See: Anthony Brundage, *The People’s Historian: John Richard Green and the Writing of History in Victorian England*, Studies in Historiography, no. 2 (Westport, Conn., 1994), pp.154–6.

Engle, Saxon, and Jute all belonged to the same Low German branch of the Teutonic family; and at the moment when history discovers them, they were being drawn together by the ties of a common blood, common speech, common social and political institutions. Each of them was destined to share in the conquest of the land in which we live; and it is from the union of all of them when its conquest was complete that the English people has sprung⁶⁷.

Green's view, therefore, echoed the idea of Freeman that the origins of England were deep-rooted in the tribal and ancient territories of Germany. In his *Short History*, Green wrote that the English people were of German race and maintained the political and social institutions and customs of the German people. The notion of 'freemen' sustained their society and there was an attachment between the communities and the land. The men of the village met in councils that decided upon the guiding principles of the community. A historical continuity existed between these councils and the English constitutional method: '...as their descendants, the man of a later England, meet in parliament at Westminster, to frame laws and do justice to the great empire which has sprung from this little body of farmer-commonwealths in Sleswick'⁶⁸. Green himself referred to these people as the 'English'. Consequently, when he described their society and religion he spoke of 'English society'. The conquest of the isles was also titled as 'the English conquest'. This means that Green asserted that these tribes had already been English before invading Britain.

The 'English Question'

From the corpus of letters exchanged between Freeman and Green, which also included correspondence with Stubbs and James Bryce, it seems that the question regarding the English origins was not so trivial. There was a whole debate on what can be titled as the 'English

⁶⁷ John R. Green, *A Short History of the English People*, New ed., thoroughly rev. (Toronto, 1888 [1874]), p.2.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p.4.

question'. The question was from what time one can define the tribes of the Jutes and Saxons as English. Green, as his letter to Freeman from 18th of March 1876 attested, was of the opinion that these two tribal communities belonged under the general name 'English' already before their invasion into the isles. Yet, despite this opinion, he was willing to follow the arguments of Freeman and Stubbs: 'My own belief is that *Engle* is the older name of the whole folk. But I have no right to set myself against all you wise people on the point, and above all in a popular book where I can't give my reasons. So I will change matters as Stubbs and you wish, for the present'⁶⁹. This might seem to be a technical matter of no great importance, since why should the title 'English' be so significant as long as the tribes were acknowledged as the forefathers of the English nation. This, however, is a fundamental example in which the terms 'community' and 'periodization' converge mainly because, according to the views of these historians, the time when these tribes received their name might be crucial for determining the birth of the nation.

In another letter from Green to Freeman sent three days after the above mentioned letter, Green reaffirmed his decision to concede with the opinions of Freeman, Stubbs and Bryce⁷⁰. For that reason, in his *Short History of the English People* he intended to refer to the Jutes and Saxons as English only after they had invaded Britain in 449 A.D.. However, Green still needed clarification as to the exact era when the tribes had actually become known as English, since he did not know how to describe them in the course of his writing:

⁶⁹John R. Green and Stephen Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green* (London; New York, 1901), p.429; Freeman's argument can also be seen in another letter to Green. See: JRLM, MSS FA 1/8/57, Freeman to Green, 14 March, 1876.

⁷⁰Green, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.442.

As I told you, I made up my mind to yield to you [Freeman], Stubbs, and Bryce on the 'English' question; and I have been going through my proofs resolving the word whenever it occurs into 'Jute' or 'Saxon' as the case may be. But I find I must have some rule to go by, and as yet I am without one. I find myself without any sort of guide as to the date when it becomes right to speak of a Jute or a Saxon as English-men⁷¹.

At this point, Green summarized some of his main views in regards to the time when the tribes actually had become English. He admitted that he was a bit or even very confused regarding this issue. This is a noteworthy account especially since it demonstrates how this question became prominent in the ideas of Stubbs, Freeman and other historians of the era. Were the tribes 'English' already in the lands of Germany? Or only following their invasion to England in 449 A.D.? Or maybe they were still known under the separate names Saxons and Jutes until the ninth century A.D., when Egbert and later Alfred the 'Great' united them under a collective name. Some even argued that they became 'English' only following 1066 and the Norman Conquest:

The old rule was to state that in 800 Egbert made Angle and Saxon into Anglo-Saxon; and that in 1066 William made Anglo - Saxon + Norman into Englishmen. Then came the Lappenberg...which took them as Anglo-Saxon from the beginning till 1066, and then made Anglo-Saxon + Norman into Englishmen. Then came the early-Freeman-and-Guest time in which the Anglo-Saxon was wholly abolished, and Englishmen were held to have been in the beginning, are now, and ever shall be. Now we have reached the late-Freeman-and-Stubbs-and-High-Dutchmen-time in which Englishmen are held not to have been in the beginning, but to have come into being when?⁷² .

These historians struggle with a question of national identity. On the one hand, they claim an ancient continuity between the Germanic tribes, living in west-central Europe during the Roman epoch, and the English people. On the other hand, the facts do not entirely comply

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

with this perception since the early sources did not name all of the tribes as ‘English’. This is not a simple problem since it can be argued that between the English people and some of the old Germanic tribes there was no direct linkage but only a fragile or even a non-existent connection and that it was an ‘invented’ genealogy. According to some, a similar ‘labelling problem’ may not apply to other nations such as the Greeks, Jews or Armenians who had preserved their names, traditions, and language from Antiquity to modern times⁷³. In the eyes of these discordant historians, such notions could endanger the authenticity of the English people’s Antiquity. Antiquity, for that matter, is an important term because the longer the history of the nation is, the greater the legitimacy that it receives in the present. Therefore, it was critical to writers like Green, who attempted to illustrate the history of England, to prove or at least clarify when this community had been actually founded. Green did not find any evidence for the usage of the term ‘English’ by the Jutes or Anglo-Saxons. For Green, only the Angles can be considered English since they held a similar name:

As to the only people I really care about (for you know I was born the right side of the Thames) there is no difficulty. Thank God they always called themselves Englishmen (for with Baeda's ‘*Angli*’ staring me in the face I will have nothing to do with making imaginary differences between ‘Engle’ and ‘English,’ making in other words one people out of a substantive, and another out of an adjective !). It is merely for those wretched Jutes and benighted Saxons that I am concerned. When on the present theory am I to take it that God gave them the grace to bear the name of English⁷⁴.

Freeman’s response came several days later. Freeman maintained that only from the time of Alfred the Great were the Anglo-Saxons and Jutes denoted by the title ‘English’. In

⁷³ Hans Kohn, for instance, mentions the Greeks and the Jews as possessing a distinct ancient communal feeling. See: Hans Kohn, *Nationalism, Its Meaning and History*, rev. edn. (Princeton, NJ., 1965), pp.11–12. Anthony D. Smith discusses the ancient kernel of these ethnic groups. See: Anthony D. Smith, *National Identity* (London, 1991), pp.32–3.

⁷⁴ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.442.

addition, according to him there was no proof for the usage of the general term ‘English’ before the invasion of the tribes to the isles in 449. Freeman even told Green that he will be most pleased if any evidence for this may surface, but he was almost certain that none existed ⁷⁵. Nevertheless, one may identify the tribes as English in a broad sense in order ‘to express the after-unity of the people at large, and our identity with them’⁷⁶. This means that there is a connection commencing in Antiquity between these groups and the English people. This is not an artificial or a formal issue but one of essence and identity. Green, for that matter, decided to apply the following rule: in his book the tribes themselves had never called each other by the title ‘English’. Yet, when he mentioned them, he called them English since ‘my only aim is to drive into my readers' heads from the very opening that they are not reading about “foreigners”...’⁷⁷. Green, therefore, embraced an educational role that was designed to construct the identity of his English readers. It was less significant to him that the sources do not corroborate his opinion that the general title ‘English’ had not applied to these tribal groups before the conquest. What really mattered, was to emphasize the vital connection that linked the present English people with their German ancestors.

The ‘Foundation’ of France

Freeman and Green were not only interested in the history of the English community but they also discussed a similar question regarding the establishment date of modern France. In a letter Freeman sent to Green on 20 November 1873, he asserted that modern France had emerged in 987 when Hugh Capet was crowned as *rex Francorum*. As Freeman wrote, some historians

⁷⁵ JRLM, MSS FA1/8/58 A, Freeman to Green, 26 March, 1876.

⁷⁶ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.433.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

propose alternative dates such as 843 A.D., when the treaty of Verdun had divided the kingdom to three between the sons of Charlemagne, or 887 when Odo had been crowned as the king of western Francia and the Duke of France. Freeman, nevertheless, choose 987 as the year of the foundation since until then France had been ‘Roman and German’ and had not yet obtained its unique national identity⁷⁸. The discussion between the two historians evolved since Green was asked by Freeman to write a short history of France as part of Freeman’s edited series for schools on major European powers. Green, unlike Freeman, advocated for a much earlier date and the two were actually debating the start date of the book. An earlier book on Germany had already been written. Green commented that, unlike France, the German history commenced at a much earlier date. Green was very surprised by Freeman’s stance towards France especially since the latter, as the editor, decided that all the books in the series would begin in the ninth century A.D.. However, the narrative of Germany, written by James Sime and edited jointly by Freeman and William Ward⁷⁹, began in the early days of Arminius or as Green defines it ‘...before the beginning of things’⁸⁰. Green's response was very ironic and one can observe his criticism of Freeman who did not follow his own rule when writing on Germany⁸¹. Actually, despite Green’s decision to comply with Freeman’s terms for writing, in the end Green did not

⁷⁸ JRLM, MSS FA1/8/21A, Freeman to Green, 20 November 1873

⁷⁹ James Sime, *History of Germany*, edited by E.A. Freeman and Sir A.W. Ward, (London, 1874).

⁸⁰ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.340.

⁸¹ ‘I thought all the Wee Works were to start from 888, and lo, I behold Arminius and a host of prehistoric critters! I am sure your original plan was the right one, and I am sorry you haven't stuck to it, and warned your Wee sub-workers to stick to it. One sub-worker [by that Green referred to himself] at any rate doth hereby strike against any “overtime” before 988’. See: Ibid.

write the book⁸². It seems that the differences in opinion, as seen in their numerous discussions on the scope and dates of the book, led to this outcome⁸³.

A very substantial conclusion arises from the last correspondence. According to Freeman, Germany and England possessed an ancient history that linked them with the tribal communities of Antiquity. France, by contrast, lacked this kind of history. Thus, a very fragile historical connection existed between 'Modern' France of the tenth century and the Gauls, Romans and Germans who had inhabited the same territory beforehand. Freeman, in fact, hardly identified the prior centuries as belonging to France's national history. The explanation to Freeman's approach could be related to his tendency to sometimes epitomize Teutonic motifs as noble while belittling Celtic, Latin, and Semitic influences. He considered the Teutonic stock as ancient and continuous, while other cultures or even races were less influential in history.

As for Green, although he might be perceived as another Whig historian with Teutonic affinities, this is only a partial observation. Bryce, already in 1883, a short while after Green's death, commented that Green, despite Freeman's influence, 'did not belong in any special sense to what has been called Freeman's school'⁸⁴. Green, he asserted, followed the method of Herodotus (and not Thucydides), he was imaginative, wished to tell a story and was less

⁸² Charlotte Yonge replaced Green as the author. Green was not Freeman's first choice and he approached him after Mary Arnold, the granddaughter of Thomas and nephew of Matthew, was not able to finish the project. Yonge took over in 1874 but due to Freeman's 'harsh' editing it was only published in 1879. See: Susan Walton 'Charlotte M. Yonge and the 'historic harem' of Edward Augustus Freeman', *Journal of Victorian Culture* 11, no 2, (2006), pp. 238-41.

⁸³ For example : '...but you must judge for yourself whether you can bear to have "Little France" written on the same principles on which I have written my England, and if you can't you had better give it over to Hunt'. See: *Ibid.*, p.365.

⁸⁴ James Bryce, *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (London, 1903), p. 137.

‘critical and philosophical’. For that reason, unlike the more positivistic method of Freeman or Stubbs, he was sometimes attacked for his inaccuracy⁸⁵. Anthony Brundage classifies Green as a different kind of historian that departed from the Whig tradition by adopting a more social and cultural observation of history which set him apart from conventional political tags⁸⁶. Historic developments, following Green’s method, include various aspects and not only military events. In the first paragraph of his preface to the first edition of the *Short History*, Green coined his most famous dictum that there was more to history than ‘drum and trumpet’⁸⁷. Green himself was very much engaged with the social problems of the English sphere. From 1861, after taking clerical vows, he served for almost a decade as a minister in London’s poor East End. His wish to assist the less fortunate, derived, among other things, from the influence of the Christian Socialists movement⁸⁸. His historic approach could certainly be seen in the light of his social activities, and following his ‘social’ method he received the esteem of several key figures among the Christian socialists. For instance, Thomas Hughes defined him as ‘the first English historian who had a proper conception of the true object of history’⁸⁹.

Green diverged from other historians who ‘...have too often turned history into a mere record of the butchery of men by their fellow-men’⁹⁰. Bryce when writing to Freeman

⁸⁵ Ibid, pp. 149-59. Ian Hesketh, *The Science of History in Victorian Britain* (London, 2012), pp. 12-14, 36.

⁸⁶ Brundage, *The People’s Historian*, pp.4–5.

⁸⁷ Quoted in Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, 3rd edn. (Chicago, 2007), p.306.

⁸⁸ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, pp.51–60; The Christian Socialists movement was established in 1848 by F.D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, J. M. Ludlow and Thomas Hughes. They manifested about the social essence of Christianity and in practice supported greater cooperation in the economy and relief for the low social strata. The movement established cooperative workshops in London and published several journals such as *Politics for the People* and the *Christian Socialist*. See: Bernard M. G. Reardon, ‘Maurice, (John) Frederick Denison (1805–72)’, *ODNB* (Oxford,2004), accessed 10 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/18384>.

⁸⁹ Edward R. Norman, *The Victorian Christian Socialists* (Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York, 1987), p.147.

⁹⁰ Green, *A Short History of the English People*, p. XVII.

commented on this ‘social’ less political aspect in Green’s work: ‘J.R.G. [John Richard Green] would probably say it is too much a political history, and indeed a history of England’s foreign relations. This seems to be a fair criticism. But it is again very difficult in such narrow history to be “Social, economical and religious” ...’⁹¹. Freeman resented the fact that Green, whom he saw as his follower, did not continue his (Freeman’s) political historiographical path. Freeman even criticized Green in the obituary he published after the latter’s death for not researching the Angevin dynasty⁹².

On this point, Green thought once again that he and Freeman would be in dispute on the writing of the history of France. He also refused to divide history by reigns of kings since this presented a dull narrative which might be boring to children⁹³. Freeman even referred to this in one of his letters: ‘You [Green] are writing a history in which you think good to divide wholly by periods...’⁹⁴. This method was fulfilled in Green’s *Short History of England* when he declared that he would not write the history of kings and rulers, but the history of the English people⁹⁵. It is still a question whether Green really introduced a new social history that resembled or even preceded the writings of later social historians. Whatever the case may be, Green did introduce several new notions on historical writing.

⁹¹ Bod. Ms.Bryce 9, fol. 173, Bryce to Freeman 14 May, 1871

⁹² Brundage, *The People’s Historian*, p.153.

⁹³ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.364.

⁹⁴ JRLM, MSS FA1/8/21A, Freeman to Green, 20 November, 1873.

⁹⁵ Green, *Short History of the English People*, p.XVII

Teutonic–Latin

Yet this was not Green's sole distinction. Green, according to Freeman, became 'Latinized', especially after staying in Italy for extended periods of time⁹⁶. Freeman even accused him of forgetting his Teutonic origins and hating 'English things and Teutonic things in general'⁹⁷. He even defined Green as more 'Southern than Teutonic'⁹⁸. Freeman's criticism of Green might be exemplified in the debate around the *Short History of France*. Green's preference for Latin culture persuaded him, perhaps, to be interested in the history of France and in its links to Romanized Gaul. Freeman, from his point of view, stayed 'loyal' to Teutonic history. This loyalty was also apparent in the fact that for him German history signified unity, while in French history there is an embedded incoherence between Antiquity and Modernity. As will be discussed later in the work, Freeman's method of the 'unity in history' (see p.12) seems to apply mainly (but not solely) to the Aryan world.

The 'Latinized' character of Green was correspondingly exemplified in his first ever publicized article in the *Saturday Review*⁹⁹. The article, which was a consequence of Freeman's efforts to incorporate Green into the pool of writers, analysed Stubbs's inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History in Oxford. Green, despite his appreciation of some elements in Stubbs's lecture, was actually refuting Stubbs's approach that ancient and modern

⁹⁶ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.215.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ John Douglas Cook (1808? – 68) founded The *Saturday Review* in 3 of November, 1855. This weekly newspaper incorporated both conservative and liberal writers. The paper did not state an official support in any of the religious factions (High, Broad or Low Church). See: Barbara Q. Schmidt, 'Cook, John Douglas (1808?–1868)', *ODNB*, (Oxford, 2004), accessed 5 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/6145%5d>.

history should be totally divided¹⁰⁰. For Stubbs, Antiquity was dead while Modernity resembled a living organism that was relevant to the present and encompassed practical lessons¹⁰¹. Modernity was a product of two developments: Christianity and the dominance of the German tribes. The world progressed because of the breach that occurred in Antiquity. Christianity and the Germanization of Europe did not reflect a negative process. Quite the reverse: 'It is Christianity that gives to the modern world its living unity and at the same time cuts it off from the death of the past...such an influence so wide in its extension, so deep in its penetration,... so ancient in the past, and in the future eternal, could by itself account for the unity, the life of modern history'¹⁰². Ecclesiastical history was intertwined with modern history and symbolized its most prominent manifestation. The second pillar of Modernity was the Germanic heritage, described in Stubbs's *English Constitution*. These two pillars merged and formed Modernity through the establishment of long-lasting religious and political institutions.

Green supported the unity approach as originally introduced by Thomas Arnold (1795-1842), the historian and the famous headmaster of Rugby school, whose name will resurface throughout the work in relation to all of the historians. In light of his influence on the Teutonic historians, it was not surprising that in the opening paragraph of his review Green mentioned Arnold as the founder of the British historical discipline¹⁰³. The true meaning of the unity theory was that no real division existed between Antiquity and Modernity. Human beings, Green argued, construct clear marked periods for differentiating easily between communities

¹⁰⁰ John R. Green, 'Professor Stubbs's Inaugural Lecture', *SR* 23, no. 592 (March 2, 1867): pp. 278–80.

¹⁰¹ 'Compared with the study of Ancient History it is like the study of life compared with that of death, the view of the living body compared with that of the skeleton'. See: William Stubbs, 'Inaugural Lecture' in *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects*, (Oxford, 1887), p.15.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p.18.

¹⁰³ Green, 'Professor Stubbs's Inaugural Lecture', p.279.

and times. In fact, our own connection with the ancient world is similar to our linkage with the modern one: 'The pre-Christian world is not wholly dead to us, nor is the post-Christian world in necessity wholly living'¹⁰⁴. Despite the fact that institutions of states such as Germany and England might resemble the Christian–Germanic sphere far more than the classical one, other states such as Italy and France had preserved many classical Roman features in their institutions and language. Thus, it was necessary to categorize this Latin phenomenon and assess it. This argument preceded the debate between Freeman and Green on the writing of the history of France. From here, it is clear that already in this early stage of his academic career Green maintained that the 'unity of history' was also pertinent outside the Teutonic sphere.

Swiss Gemeinde

On November 17, 1871 Green told Freeman that his love of Italy was not in conflict with his admiration of the Swiss political system: '...I don't feel that my love for freedom clashes with my love for Italy, or that one's interest in liberty need sleep on this side of the Alps to wake so strenuously on the other'¹⁰⁵. This was a response to Freeman's 'accusation' that Green preferred Italian culture to the appreciation of Switzerland. Green admitted that he acknowledged the democracy of cities like Florence as superior even to the Swiss model. While the Swiss depended on institutions and constitutions, the Florentine democracy was one of 'man', i.e. humane. Green, in what would have seemed to Freeman as pure blasphemy, attested that the Teutonic model was narrow, since it only denoted the political aspect, while the Italian (Latin) one introduced a humanistic approach that included political, economic and cultural

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 280.

¹⁰⁵ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.308.

influences. In another letter, Green mocked Freeman, the ultra-Teutonic, for falling in love with the charms of Italy after they both visited Venice together: ‘Ah, cara Italia! I am afraid she takes the light a little out of other lands; to me our own history has seemed a shade narrow, aldermannic, unpoetic ever since I crossed the Alps. But even you, Teuto-Teutonnorum, yielded to the witchery of Venice and found your Capua in a gondola. Oh, how I triumphed on that memorable day’¹⁰⁶.

In Italy, Green, as the ‘people’s historian’, actually found the historical proof for his general social approach. For him, society as a whole came to life in the city-states of Italy. Green was curious about Freeman’s account of Switzerland and wished to learn more about its communities. In the meantime, Green only conceded that Switzerland was a beautiful place situated on his way south to Italy. Moreover, the model of Swiss cantons, as described by Freeman, sounded to him more Italian than English. The implication of this statement is that Green believed that there were some possible Italian-Swiss institutional influences and not necessarily a separate Teutonic political model.

Freeman adored Switzerland and observed it as the birthplace of democracy and Teutonic institutions. The Swiss federal history, according to Freeman, was vital for the evolvement of the political systems, especially in modern Germany and Britain. Freeman was very interested in Swiss Federalism and wished to write a whole book on this subject. Bryce, who knew of Freeman’s intention advised him in 1864 not to focus only on the federal aspect but to study general Swiss history¹⁰⁷.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p.333.

¹⁰⁷ Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, fol. 39, Bryce to Freeman, 3 August 1864.

This ‘warning’ or advice of Bryce might have resulted from two articles Freeman published a short while before, in which he mainly concentrated on the unique federal character of Switzerland. In these articles entitled, ‘The Landesgemeinde of Uri’¹⁰⁸ and ‘The Landesgemeinden of Uri and Appenzell’¹⁰⁹, Freeman, in what would turn out to be a very central notion of his historical understanding, illustrated the democratic features of the *Landesgemeinden*. The latter were political assemblies held in a public open space. Freeman compared them to the Athenian *Ecclesia* or the Roman *Comitia* (depending whether one attended Uri or Appenzell). Similar to an anthropologist living among his tribesman, Freeman briefed the readers on his fieldwork in the Swiss *Gemeinde*. He visited the cantons and through personal experience enriched his description of their political system. As he told Green, when he visited Switzerland he was ‘Federalizing in Berne’¹¹⁰. By this, Freeman meant that he was discovering the federal institutions from first sight. He attended the *Nationalrat*, visited several *Landesgemeinden*, went to hear debates and communicated with federal representatives and with the local people.

The cantons that maintain the method of popular assemblies present a unique case that was distinguished from other much larger cantons of the Swiss Federation. Freeman wrote that six cantons still preserve this ancient Teutonic democratic tradition¹¹¹. Uri was the canton Freeman chose to focus on, especially because it had acquired a central place in the history of Swiss independence. In Uri, especially in the months of the early summer of each year, the

¹⁰⁸ Edward A. Freeman, ‘The Landesgemeinde of Uri’, *SR* 15, no. 396 (May 30, 1863): pp. 686–7.

¹⁰⁹ Edward A. Freeman, ‘The Landesgemeinden of Uri and Appenzell’, *SR* 17, no. 447 (May 21, 1864): pp. 622–4.

¹¹⁰ JRLM, MSS FA1/8/6A, Freeman to Green, 10 November, 1871.

¹¹¹ The six Freeman named were: Uri, Glarus, two halves of Unterwalden and two halves of Appenzell. See: Freeman, ‘Uri and Appenzell’, p.623.

governmental system was presented through public gatherings and practices. In the heart of the system laid the *Gemeinde* or commune. The individual received the opportunity to participate in the proceedings through hereditary rights which were similar to Athenian democracy. If an individual settled in another *Gemeinde*, he lost his ability to influence his new community. Freeman even explained this method to Green through a place they both know very well, Oxford: ‘...a stranger goes and lives in Oxford, he is not only short from any share in port Meadow, but he has no vote for town, council, guardians ...it is such a charming medieval relic’¹¹².

In 1875 Freeman commented that he heard a rumour, while travelling in Normandy, that the unique political system of Uri, the *Landesgemeinde*, was about to be abolished ‘as they have done in Schwyz’; however, he was relieved to hear that ‘*die walsch Zung ist untru*’ [The Welsh/French tongue is false]¹¹³. The esteem Freeman showed for the ancient Swiss system is once again apparent. Furthermore, his aversion towards the French was also seen through his comment that the *Walsch/Welsch* or Gal-Welsh language, as Freeman referred to them in many occasions, should not be trusted¹¹⁴. The significant point is that, according to Freeman, one could conclude that both the language and the people who spoke it were unfaithful, as if there was a complete identification between the language and the nation or even the race which spoke it. Bryce in an earlier visit to Switzerland, told Freeman that during his tour near Geneva he was disturbed by the growing Francophile affinities of the region: ‘Chamoni, thankfully not

¹¹² JRLM, MSS FA1/8/7A, Freeman to Green, 18 December, 1871.

¹¹³ Bod., Ms. Bryce 6, fol.76, Freeman to Bryce, 8 October, 1875.

¹¹⁴ As for the term *Welsch*, in German it denotes several meanings: The French-Swiss language and people; Latin language; foreign people or language. In Proto-Germanic it either referred to the Roman-Celtic or Roman-Latin people. See: Werner Scholze-Stubenrecht et al. (eds.), *Oxford German Dictionary: German-English, English-German*, 3rd edn. (Oxford ; New York, 2008).

yet, let us hope never to be Gal-Welsh, albeit the folk there speak a tongue which is much more Gal Welsh than Italian'. Similar to Freeman, Bryce also 'feared' the influence of the Gal-Welsh'¹¹⁵. Bryce's concerns were not only limited to Switzerland. Several years before, while he toured the region of Schleswig-Holstein, he told Freeman about his concern regarding the growing usage of French by the locals: 'I am more and more concerned of the extreme jolly of the people here in talking French. Why on earth did they forget their natural Danish, to say nothing of the ...Saxon? It seems so absolutely ridiculous to hear the Gal-Welsh jabber coming out of the fine Dutch...'¹¹⁶. The Swiss and the Danish, as people of Teutonic decent, were corrupted by the language of the Galo-Welsh and forgot their Germanic origins. The change of language could also mean an alteration in the character of the people, and both Freeman and Bryce feared such implications which meant the loss of German or even Teutonic identity.

Freeman's admiration of Teutonic Switzerland was also evident in his associations with certain Swiss scholars. When he toured Switzerland in 1871, he praised once again the Swiss political system and also mentioned the faculty of the Swiss historians:

I have been several times in the *nationalrat* and I am especially struck with the singular order...so unlike our house of commons. ..I have been talking also to some of their statesmen and scholars. The mass of historical learning in Switzerland is something prodigious, and its results are piled up as Alps on their wise men's shelves. But to the outer world they are simply buried under bushes, because it is only one or two like Bopp who write books; other people write their essays-most learned and elaborate ones-in the transactions of societies which folk in general have no way of getting at¹¹⁷.

¹¹⁵ Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, Fol. 173, Bryce to Freeman, 20 September, 1871.

¹¹⁶ Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, Fol. 109, Bryce to Freeman, 6 March, 1867.

¹¹⁷ Bod.Ms. Bryce 5, Fol.282, Freeman to Bryce, 4 October, 1871.

One Swiss scholar, Freeman was in contact with was the writer and poet Alexander Baumgartner (1841-1910). In several of his letters, Baumgartner praised Freeman for his interest in Switzerland and stated that it was a pity Freeman had not visited his own canton of Glarus. In Baumgartner's opinion, Glarus symbolized a prominent example of the Swiss federal system. '...ours is the most lively and most primitive and republican and therefore the most interesting of all, since e.g. any *Ehrenmann* may on the spur of the moment rise and ask for the word, which he cannot do in Appenzell ...'¹¹⁸. According to Baumgartner, Freeman's books influenced him immensely and as a tutor of history he depended on his books for teaching English history to his pupils. As Freeman himself, Baumgartner noted the parallel notions between the Swiss and the English, especially in terms of their governmental heritage. This link between Freeman and Baumgartner epitomises the central point of the next chapter. A close relation among the historians of the Teutonic realm was established due to their belief in a shared past and present.

The political entities rooted in cantons such as Uri represented the most ancient republics in the history of the world and they have remained unaffected for a long time: '...they can be traced back as far as the people can be traced back at all'¹¹⁹. One did not need to imagine the Germans of Tacitus since communities like Uri and Unterwalden had preserved ancient modes of political engagement. In Uri, a genuine democracy thrived and enabled every citizen to be involved directly in the political process. The greatest deeds of kings and popes throughout history were negligible compared to the historical force of the demos as seen in

¹¹⁸ JRLM, FA1/7/20, Baumgartner to Freeman, 24 September, 1873.

¹¹⁹ Freeman, 'The Landesgemeinde of Uri,' p.686.

Uri. These people symbolized Swiss independence and were the descendants of the heroes of the battles of Sempach and Morgarten¹²⁰. They were also the forerunners of the whole Teutonic race and did not only signify Swiss liberty but also the Teutonic one. The ‘Eternal Democracy’ was perhaps the most momentous term that Freeman used to define this political tradition. The use of this term contains an inner meaning. Analogous to the ‘eternal city’ of Rome (*roma eterna*), and maybe even as a contrasting example to the Roman heritage, the democracy of Uri was almost timeless and thus presented living proof for the unity of history of the Teutonic realm. It was exactly this Antiquity, which provided the Swiss *Gemeinde* and the Teutonic institutions their present authority. This also handed them supremacy over other communities, like the Italians, who did not belong to the Teutonic race. Here, one can observe how Freeman attached the ‘unity of history’ to a certain existing community.

Hitherto, I have discussed how the formative period of the construction of the community was vital to historians like Freeman and Green. It was vital because the question whether the French nation had been a product of the tenth century or an evolution of earlier periods affected nineteenth century questions of identity and legitimacy. The superiority of the nation/race was engrained in the historical past, and if the past was characterized by grandeur, the present and future will also be. As George Mosse writes, relating to the importance of Antiquity for national communities: ‘the roots determine the firmness of the tree’¹²¹. The fact that Freeman identified a linkage and continuation between modern English/Swiss and the

¹²⁰These were two great battles in Swiss history. In the battle of Morgarten that was held in 1315 near the famous mountain pass with the same name, 1,500 Swiss soldiers defeated a much larger Austrian army led by Leopold I. The battle of Sempach occurred seventy one years later (1386). In this battle the old Swiss confederacy (*Alte Eidgenossenschaft*) was victorious against the Austrian troops of Leopold III. The two battles symbolize great events in the establishment of the future Swiss federation.

¹²¹ George L. Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution : a History of European Racism* (London, 1978), p. 47.

remote communities of the past can provide the nation with a powerful tool - the authority of time and heritage. The nation is akin to a family or individuals who wish to prove their stature through genealogical ties and relationships that stretch to distant and respectful forefathers¹²². The only difference between the individual and the nation is that the nation denotes a bigger unit and includes ties between multitudes. If nations are in fact only very big families, then this means that there are genealogical ties between all the nation's members. People who are outside the group cannot become members out of their own free will, but only through establishing blood links with the members of the family (e.g. through marriage).

Racial-Ethnic Implications

The repetitive use of terms such as 'Teutonic' and 'race' by Freeman leads many to define him as an ultra-racist historian. Christopher Parker argues that the liberal and racial attitudes of Freeman merged and complied with his political and ideological dogma¹²³. Marilyn Lake follows this line of argument but also presents the criticism of Freeman's extreme Teutonic notions by his own contemporaries, like the British-Australian historian Charles Pearson (1830-94). The latter, as Lake illustrates, argued that his controversy with Freeman was concentrated on the point of whether any continuity had existed between the Romans/Celts and the English or whether the Anglo-Saxons had been the only legitimate ancestors of the nation¹²⁴. In addition, Lake's article studies in an elaborate method Freeman's opinions towards

¹²² For instance, the genealogical list in the books of Luke (3, 23-38) and Mathew (1, 1-17) linked Jesus to King David, Abraham, Adam and finally to God. The list was destined to prove that Jesus is a decedent of the messianic lineage of the house of David and hence the son of God.

¹²³ C. J. W. Parker, 'The Failure of Liberal Racism: The Racial Ideas of E. A. Freeman', *The Historical Journal* 24, no. 04 (1981): pp. 825-46.

¹²⁴ Marilyn Lake, 'Essentially Teutonic': E A Freeman, Liberal Race Historian. A Transnational Perspective', in Catherine Hall and Keith McClelland (eds.), *Race, Nation and Empire : Making Histories, 1750 to the Present*, (Manchester, 2010), pp.60-1.

the dominions of the British Empire in America and Australia and how his Teutonic views constructed the federal kernel of these states¹²⁵. A different interpretation is presented by Vicky Morrisroe, who claims that Freeman, while employing a notion of race, mainly stressed lingual and institutional factors as constructing Aryan history and supremacy; “race” as “blood,” she argues, was not important for Freeman. Morrisroe has used Freeman’s *Comparative Politics* (1873) to “rehabilitate” him, rescuing from his reputation as a simplistic racial and nationalistic historian. As Morrisroe shows, Freeman, through the vast influence of Thomas Arnold and the comparative theories of Henry Maine, E.B. Tylor and Max Müller, presented a meta-historical view that identified the universal cyclical of Aryan institutions and events.¹²⁶

My aim is not necessarily to refute or validate these arguments regarding the racial tendencies of Freeman. As I will reaffirm, Freeman held a degrading approach towards Jews, Turks and Blacks. Nevertheless, I argue that a less deterministic view of Freeman’s racism is needed. ‘Race’ for Freeman was a more fluid term. Furthermore, unlike other studies on Freeman’s racial observations, his views will be studied in the context of the English-Teutonic circle. The context of the circle is significant, since it demonstrates if and what views these historians shared and what were the differences between their approaches.

The picture is, therefore, more complicated: although Freeman’s writings contained racist themes, the question is whether his approach was based on the physical aspect of race, or maybe on a different understanding that race was another method of emphasizing national

¹²⁵ Ibid, pp.65-71.

¹²⁶ Vicky Morrisroe, “‘Sanguinary Amusement’: E.A. Freeman, the Comparative Method and Victorian Theories of Race,” *Modern Intellectual History* 10, no.1 (2013): pp.27-56.

differences which do not necessarily depend on physical traits. It is even possible that Freeman took the middle way and merged the racist terminology and the nationalistic one.

Freeman and Green relied to some extent on the kinship theory of the nation. At this stage, it is important to elaborate on the different emphasis that sometimes emerges from the writing of these historians regarding the question of which nations were actually ‘privileged’. It seems that Green, especially in his writings in favour of Italian/Latin culture, offered a different, less racial explanation. However, some of his arguments lead to a different conclusion. For instance, in a letter he sent to Alexander Macmillan (1818-96), the founder of the famous publishing company, Green submitted to Macmillan notes regarding Freeman’s book *Sketch of European History*. From the content, it is explicit that Green observed the friction between different races as crucial to historical development: ‘Would it not be well to note that the struggle between Rome and Carthage was a war of races that it gave the Aryan, and not the Shemite [*sic*], the empire of the world? Freeman has done this in the case of the battle of Chalons, a struggle for life and death between the Aryan and Thracian races. Why not in that of the battle of Zama¹²⁷?’ Green included the Roman Empire as a vital part of the Aryan race. Consequently, one can also understand why he noted the importance of Italian and even French cultures, since those continue the legacy of the Roman Empire.

¹²⁷ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.319; The battle of Chalons was fought in the summer of 274 A.D. between Aurelian the Roman emperor and Tetricus, the Gallic emperor. The Roman army prevailed and brought the end to the Gallic empire. See: John Drinkwater, ‘Maximinus to Diocletian and the "crisis"’, in Alan Bowman, Averil Cameron, and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History - The Crisis of Empire, AD 193-337*, 2nd edn. (19 vol., Cambridge, 2005), vol. 12, pp.52–3.

The bond, as I aim to elaborate later, between the Aryan peoples was usually defined by common linguistic characteristics¹²⁸. Thus, language proves that there is a unique Aryan race, which separates Aryans from other races like the Semitic people¹²⁹. Following this reading of the term, it is no wonder that in his letter to Macmillan, Green emphasized a certain linguistic structure that allegedly supported his argument regarding the clash between the Aryan and the Semitic races. He noted that in the names of Hasdrubal and Hannibal, the leaders of Cartago, one can identify the Hebrew word Baal [בַּעַל] which appears in the bible and means god or master. This, he argued, proved the Semitic origin of Cartago and its struggle with Aryan Rome¹³⁰.

Freeman also recognized the pre-eminence of the Aryans and the nations of Europe over the Semites of the East. This superiority can be observed in the institutions and especially through the power of the popular assemblies that thrived among the Greeks, Romans and the Teutonic people. Consequently, when describing the Swiss *Landesgemeinden*, Freeman compared between the various assemblies of these Aryan people and concluded that their unique political method had derived from their Aryan origin. Freeman, following the emphasis of language as the main common feature of the Aryan kinfolk, identified an even greater

¹²⁸ In Sanskrit 'Aryan' means 'noble' and it was following the research of philologists like Freiderich von Schlegel that the term was first conceptualized by 19th century scholars. The exact implication of the term was rather vague and scholars argued about its actual sense. For instance, the origin of the Aryans was much debated among 19th century historians, philologists and anthropologists. Nevertheless, most argued that it referred to the whole family of the Indo-Germanic people. In addition, the common view was that the Aryans lands of origins had been situated in Asia somewhere between Iran and the Indian sub-continent. In a certain historical stage, these people had migrated to the West and many of the nations of Europe evolved from them. See: Léon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth: a History of Racist and Nationalist Ideas in Europe*, Columbus Centre Series, Studies in the Dynamics of Persecution and Extermination (London, 1974), pp.255–261.; Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution*, pp.39–45.

¹²⁹ As Maine declared in his Rede lecture: 'The new theory of linguistics has unquestionably produced a new theory of Race'. Cited in Christopher Hutton, 'Race And Language: Ties of "Blood And Speech"', *Fictive Identity and Empire In The Writings Of Henry Maine And Edward Freeman*, *Interventions* 2, no. 1 (2000): p.60.

¹³⁰ Green and Leslie, *Letters of John Richard Green*, p.319.

resemblance between the Teutonic nations. It seems that the Teutonic sub-group was more important to Freeman and Stubbs than to Green. Freeman claimed that the German language and English had been once one and the same, and this could be seen in the similarities that existed between the two languages. Together with these languages, one may also mention Danish, Swedish and Dutch as languages that belong to the same Teutonic family. These nations, despite the relative differences between their languages, actually belong to the same ethnic group¹³¹. Hence, it seems that language and race were almost identical.

Teutonic Scandinavia

Bryce, in a letter to Freeman, also expressed his special relation towards Scandinavia. Yet in his case the admiration was mainly towards the physical look of the Scandinavians: ‘how I love the northern places, and especially the Norway’s ones, more than I used as on Danes- I suspect your Sicilian North men were chiefly from Norway... They are still tall good looking fellows. The wormer not handsome, but with clean out faces’¹³². There was a reason why Bryce stressed to Freeman the resemblance of the Scandinavians to the Norman, who had conquered Sicily in the eleventh century. Freeman was very interested in the history of Sicily and argued about the common racial origin of the Normans to the Scandinavian and English people. Bryce also separated between the ‘superior’ southern Scandinavians and the ‘inferior’ races of the North: ‘In these high latitudes ...especially about Tromso, a good many Lepps. The race is partly disappointing, partly becoming abandoned by the Norwegians. They are, albeit given to

¹³¹ Freeman, *Old English History for Children*, pp.5–6.

¹³² Bod., Ms. 9, fol. 306, Bryce to Freeman, 6 August, 1891.

drinking when they have money in their pockets...'¹³³. According to Bryce, the Lepos from Lapland, also known as the *Sami* people, were still superior over other more 'primitive' races: 'They are of the least repulsive of the primitive races – superior to Red Indians and Polynesian, East Indian'¹³⁴. Thus, Bryce adopted a hierarchy of races. First of all, he differentiated between the Northman and the Lepps and then between the Lepps and other 'inferior' races. Bryce was very interested in the region since the name Goth had been maintained in a region of Southern Scandinavia: 'For a long time I wished to visit the one place which preserved the name of the Goths, albeit there is little to show how its folks were ever connected with our west of Alarich and Theodorich'¹³⁵. Bryce doubted the alleged links between the Scandinavian people and the Gothic tribes which had toppled the West. Yet, it appears here that Bryce did refer to the Teutonic lords, Alaric and Theodoric, as part of 'his' West and even as his ancestors.

It seems that Freeman, conversely, did observe a long lasting connection between his tribal forefathers and the Northman of Scandinavia. For this reason, according to Freeman, when the Vikings invaded the British Isles in the ninth century, they were easily assimilated with the local Anglo-Saxons¹³⁶. Comparable with the Angles, Saxons and Jutes three hundred years earlier, the Vikings were 'people of our own race'¹³⁷, worshiped the same gods and most importantly, understood the language spoken by most of the inhabitants of the island. Despite

¹³³ Ibid; In another letter Bryce argued that the Finns were the noblest people of Scandinavia: '...the most superior people which have written admirably both in Scandinavian and their own tongue ; and are the calmest people in Europe'. See: Bod., Ms.9, Fol. 308, Bryce to Freeman, 14 September, 1891.

¹³⁴ Bod., Ms.9, fol.306, Bryce to Freeman, 6 August, 1891.

¹³⁵ Bod., Ms.9, fol. 308, Bryce to Freeman, 14 September, 1891.

¹³⁶ The term 'Viking' appeared in English for the first time in 1807. The Victorians actually 'invented' the term and its first major use was in Walter Scott's novel *The Pirate*. See: Andrew Wawn, *The Vikings and the Victorians: Inventing the Old North in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cambridge,2000), pp.3-4; Joanne Parker, 'The Dragon and The Raven', *European Journal of English Studies* 13, no.3, p. 258.

¹³⁷ Freeman, *Old English History for Children*, p.91.

the fact that the Vikings were not Christians and even bitter enemies of the Church, once they converted, their integration was immediate:

But when they had once settled in the land and had become Christians, their language and manners differed so little from those of the English that the Danes and the English soon became one people. There is no doubt a great deal of Danish blood in all the north and east of England, but the Danes and the English did not remain as two separate nations in the way that the English and Welsh did, so that the Danes may rather be said to have become another tribe of Englishmen just like the Angles and the Saxons¹³⁸.

Here a very important difference surfaces between the invasion of the Vikings and that of the Anglo-Saxons. The latter, when invading the island in the fifth century, encountered the Welsh. In contrast to the Vikings, who eventually merged after a severe but relatively short battle with the local English, the Anglo-Saxons were not integrated into the Welsh communities. Freeman echoed this argument repeatedly and maintained that hardly any Welshmen had remained in the English parts of the country after the victory of the Anglo-Saxons. The separation between the English and Welsh was very clear from the early settlements of the isles. Hence, the question is why? Why did Freeman insist on distinguishing so ardently between the English and Welsh? Why was there such an emphasis on ethnic singularity that apparently had separated the two communities from each other?

Firstly, Freeman wished to emphasize that there had been two different races in the Isles. The Welsh were and are Celtic while the Anglo-Saxons and afterwards the Danes were and are of Teutonic stock. The prominence of the language as a factor of race rises again in regards to the Welsh. The meaning of the title 'Welsh', as Freeman explained, were those whose 'tongue cannot be understood' or in other words - foreigners. It was given to the local

¹³⁸ Ibid., pp.91–2.

Celtic people of England by the Germanic Anglo-Saxons¹³⁹. The Anglo-Saxons had a long and fierce confrontation with the Celtic people mainly because they were and, according to Freeman, are of a different race: ‘They met with a degree of strictly national resistance such as no other Teutonic conquerors met with’¹⁴⁰. The strong local resistance led the invading tribes to a horrific revenge that destroyed every trace of the local inhabitants belonging to Celtic and Roman communities. The national pride of Freeman was playing a major role here. Above all, he wished to prove that the English belong to the Continental Teutonic family of tribes. In addition, the mighty resistance of the local people was glorified, since it reflected on the strength and glory of the English tribal ancestors that succeeded in conquering the Isles. This also attested to the nature of the British Isles, as a place that was and always will be difficult to conquer. Freeman glorified the fact that the newcomers had hardly mingled with the autochthonic inhabitants, contributing to the formation of the English nation as the purest Teutonic nation. Dissimilar to various other barbarian people in the continent, such as the Franks, who adopted many elements from the Romans, the ancestors of the English were the most savage of all the Teutonic nations. They were hardly influenced by the empire in their safe haven of North Germany and could not find a common ground with the communities that adopted Roman elements in Britain¹⁴¹. This means that they were alien to both Celtic and Roman cultures.

However, especially following the Viking and then Norman invasions, other ethnic groups assimilated into the English nation. Nevertheless, in comparison with other nations,

¹³⁹ Ibid., pp.1-3

¹⁴⁰ Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe*, 96.

¹⁴¹ Freeman, *Old English History for Children*, pp.26-8.

England had preserved its Teutonic character in the most authentic way. Freeman argued that his motive was to research the ethnic sources of England through the context of the broader developments in Western Europe during the fifth century: ‘If I am set in this chair to strive to show that European history is one unbroken chain, I am set in it also to strive to show that Englishmen are Englishmen’¹⁴². It is evident through the examples that Freeman also aspired to prove that the theory of the ‘unity of history’ also applied in the case of his homeland, England. By separating the Anglo-Saxons tribes from the Welsh-Celtic, he demonstrated that the former belong to a long and continuous ancestry of Teutonic decedent and have no linkage with the autochthonic inhabitants of the island. The confrontation, it appears, could never be mitigated. There were periods of peaceful engagement, but because of the inherent differences between the English and the Welsh, there was always a possibility that a clash would erupt between these two ethnic groups.

To conclude the discussion hitherto, it seems that Green presented a bit ‘less Teutonic’ observation than Freeman and Stubbs. Freeman also named the Roman-Italians, French, and in fact most of the West European nations, as Aryan. However, as illustrated, he identified several levels of ‘Aryanism’. Thus, some of the nations were superior to others. The Teutonic English and German were superior to the Latin people, even though they all belong to the Aryan kinship. By that, Freeman resembled Stubbs who was located on the extreme edge of the spectrum. According to Stubbs, as seen in his inaugural lecture, the Roman Empire and its Latin descendants were left out, and the Teutonic nations were the main players in the scene. For this reason, he differentiated between the Ancient and the Modern periods. However,

¹⁴² Edward A. Freeman, *Western Europe in the Eighth Century & Onward : An Aftermath* (London, 1904), p.3.

despite the distinctions between these historians, it appears that all three amalgamate the notions of nation and race, and regard language as a critical criterion in determining them.

Race=Language?

Nevertheless, another reading of Freeman is also possible. In an article titled 'Race and Language', he actually acknowledged some of the limitations that surface in regard to these terms¹⁴³. He began by stating that philology and ethnic studies had transformed the research on race. In the past, no one would distinguish between the Teutonic and Celtic people or place Sanskrit and European tongues in a similar category. This alteration, Freeman emphasized, had a major impact on political issues. For instance, the article commenced with the depiction of an incident that occurred in Constantinople where several Magyar students came to the Turkish sultan for reinitiating the natural racial bond between the two people. The symbolical and perhaps political implications of this act were that Hungary, despite religious and national differences, recognized the Ottoman supremacy in the region. This act, Freeman argued, was a consequence of the science of philology that stressed the similarities between the Turkish and Hungarian languages¹⁴⁴. For Freeman, this example proved the vulnerability of the argument about the connection between race and language, since in some cases, it might undermine his political agenda. Hence, Freeman's stance against the Turks and their control of the Christian countries of southeast Europe, which will be discussed extensively later, can be weakened if such links were to be advanced:

Here we have a feeling [race] which professes to bind together, and which as a matter of fact has had a real effect in binding together, men whose kindred to one

¹⁴³ Edward A. Freeman, 'Race and Language', in *Historical Essays: Third Series* (London, 1879).

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., pp.173-7.

another is not so obvious at first sight as the kindred of Germans, Italians, or Serbs who are kept asunder by nothing but a purely artificial political boundary. It is a feeling at whose bidding the call to union goes forth to men whose dwellings are geographically far apart, to men who may have had no direct dealings with one another for years or for ages, to men whose languages, though the scholar may at once see that they are closely akin, may not be so closely akin as to be mutually intelligible for common purposes¹⁴⁵.

Alliances between nations like Greece and Bulgaria, which confront a common enemy (Ottomans), could also be broken because race set them apart, since one was Aryan and the other was Turanian. In some cases, one should conceivably distinguish between race, nationality and religion because they represent different entities. Furthermore, language does not always determine race and there are examples of people speaking various languages and still belonging to a similar race while the opposite is also true since: ‘...men who speak the same tongue are not therefore necessarily men of the same blood’¹⁴⁶. Race should be defined with greater certainty, not by cultural/lingual factors, but through fundamentally separate research, delving into the physical aspect. Here Freeman, like other theories that began to evolve in his period, such as the English eugenic movement, mentioned the physical element as defining race¹⁴⁷. This argument was constructed upon the research of the shape of the human skull, body and any other physical traits, which were allegedly unique to certain races. While the zoologist and the paleontologist differentiate and classify animals and reptiles, the researcher of race distinguished between families of humans. The cultural aspect still matters in this kind of ethnographic research, but it is only secondary to the physical identification. The main difference between the two is that humans can affect and alter the cultural sphere by

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p.178-9.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., p.183.

¹⁴⁷ Mosse, *Toward the Final Solution*, p.66.

learning languages and adopting customs, while the physical criterion is not dependent on the deeds of human beings but only on nature¹⁴⁸.

It must be noted, however, that this is not a conventional argument by Freeman and although the term 'race' reoccurred often in his writings it was not, explicitly at least, based on physical elements. He did, as seen previously in the discussion, argue for the relevance of language as the common denominator between nations (English and German). He also identified institutions as one of the main pillars that characterize races (the Swiss example). Until now, it seemed that race and language were almost synonymous terms for him, but in his article on 'Language and Race', he unprecedentedly advanced the physical element to the fore of the stage. Yet this, as Freeman stated, did not mean that he abandoned language or institutions. The physical factor was just seen as 'scientifically' superior, but language retained a crucial value for race. As Freeman mentioned, 'language is a presumption of race'¹⁴⁹. The two terms should not be intertwined automatically, but they still belong to the same semantic field and a linkage did exist between them.

For Freeman, there was also no such thing as a pure race, and during history people left or joined certain races through a process of assimilation or adaptation. The purest of all races were the Jews who married in between themselves and have cherished their traditions in zeal¹⁵⁰. Within the nations of Europe, the Swedes and Norwegians, because of their geographically

¹⁴⁸ Freeman, 'Race and Language', *Historical Essays: Third Series*, pp.183–4.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p.188.

¹⁵⁰ 'The Jews must be very nearly, if not absolutely, a pure race, in a sense in which no European nation is pure. The blood remains untouched by conversion; it remains untouched even by intermarriage. The Jew may be sure of his own stock, in a way in which none of the rest of us, Dutch, Welsh, or anything else, can be sure. The gens remains a gens by birth, and not by legal fiction. The phenomenon is one of the strangest in all history; the more it is thought of, the more its thorough strangeness comes out'. See: Ibid., p.230.

isolated lands of the north, remained the purest of all the Teutonic people¹⁵¹. However, even these people were not totally pure. The Aryans, in general, were not a 'natural family', and many individuals assimilated into the race without any blood linkage:

...they [Aryans] may have been more like an accidental party of fellow-travellers. And if we accept them as a natural family, it does not follow that the various branches which grew into separate races and nations, speaking separate, though kindred, languages, were necessarily marked off by more immediate kindred. It may be that there is no nearer kindred in blood between this or that Persian, this or that Greek, this or that Teuton, than the general kindred of all Aryans. For, when this or that party marched off from the common home, it does not follow that those who marched off together were necessarily immediate brothers or cousins. The party which grew into Hindoos or into Teutons may not have been made up exclusively of one set of near kinsfolk¹⁵².

Following this, Freeman wrote that it could even be stated that no Aryan race had ever existed, since it was never truly natural. Moreover, one could almost state that race was an invention altogether, since we identify race with blood ties and if those were fictional then nothing was actually real: 'No living Englishman can prove with absolute certainty that he comes in the male line of any of the Teutonic settlers in Britain in the fifth or sixth centuries'¹⁵³. This argument was brought up not because Freeman regarded race as insignificant. On the contrary, he wished to justify its use by discarding some objections against the notion of race. This is why, as in the case of language, he asserted that the understanding of race should be a 'presumption of a community of blood'. No definite proof existed for 'purity' of blood, yet it was assumed that races include some blood connections between most of their members. In

¹⁵¹ Ibid., p.209.

¹⁵² Ibid.,p.190.

¹⁵³ Ibid., p. 191.

the case of the Teutons, the supposed blood connections converged with the unique democratic institutions and both define the Teutonic race.

The question is why Freeman made these clarifications here. Were there perhaps certain circumstances that urged him to do so? Following the points made in his article, the answer is positive. Freeman's clarifications on race and language were a consequence of the political and national conditions that existed in South-Eastern Europe. According to him, these explanations were not required for Western Europe but vital for the East. As will be shown, the difference between the two spheres was that in the West a process of integration occurred between the locals and the invaders, while in the East this process was absent. The South-Eastern nations of Greece, Albania and Romania, which were under the threat and rule of the Ottomans, had lived since Antiquity in the same territories. These nations preserved their culture and proved the fact that in some instances language did denote race. They spoke a vernacular language that was not a result of a mixture of Slavic or Turkish influences, but an original and independent feature of their race. In contrast to the developments of the West, where in many places the Teutonic element converged with the Roman or the Celtic (they were all Aryans), the Aryan nations of the East were totally different from the Turks and never merged with them. The rules of adoption and assimilation, as named by Freeman, do not apply here. These rules contain the idea that any individual/community can join a certain race and after several generations be an integral part of it. The political implication was that these nations must gain full independence from the Ottomans, resulting from their shared ethno-genesis.

The situation in the West of Europe was profoundly dissimilar. For instance, in the British Isles, Wales and Scotland had no justification or even need for independence. They inhabited the same geographical unit and were assimilated with the English for many years.

Hence, there was no real necessity to advance any demands for their independence. Ireland, however, embodied a different case, since it was detached geographically from Britain. Following this, Freeman, as seen in many of his letters, supported home rule for Ireland¹⁵⁴. In a letter he wrote to Bryce in May 30, 1881, Freeman drew his own borders of the homeland: ‘I have not bothered myself much with Ireland...and other unpleasant parts of the world. My creed is a simple one the kingdoms of England and Scotland, the dominion of Wales, the town of Berwick -upon -Tweed, and (two things which are often forgotten the kingdom of Man and the duchy of Normandy). Those make up the extent of my geographical patriotism’¹⁵⁵.

This contradicts his previous remarks that accentuated the eminent differences between the Teutonic races that invaded England and the Welsh who settled in the islands beforehand. While in several places Freeman separated the two races, in his article on race he perceived them as almost unified. One must wonder what the source of the contradiction was. Sometimes he identified fusion within races, but in other cases he traced distinction. It must be asked then, what Freeman really thought of the notion of race. The answer is that race, despite the attempts to base it upon solid demarcations, was a very fluid term for him. It is ‘fluid’ since Freeman wished to leave it in this state, so it could serve his goals or arguments in a variety of cases and especially concerning political issues. Sometimes, in particular with the unbalanced relations in the East between the Ottoman and Christian nations, race retained a strict meaning that demarcated the border between communities. However, it also needed to remain flexible enough, since one did not want to claim that there was a definite racial aspect that, for instance,

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., pp.204-5.

¹⁵⁵ William R. W. Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* (2 vol., London, 1895), II ,p.175.

endorsed the ancient link between the Turks and Magyars. When Freeman wanted to state the uniqueness of the Teutonic nations, then the ancient connections of the English with the Germanic tribes through race and language were more explicit. Yet, when there was a need to justify the English claim for control of the whole British Isles, suddenly the differences between Celtic and Teuton were reduced. Several notions are mingled in Freeman's views. In the case of Britain he emphasised the notion of an Anglo-Saxon dominant ethnicity which had prevailed since Antiquity over the Celtic people¹⁵⁶. Ethno-genesis is another notion that arises here. The shared ancestral community bonded the English with other Teutonic communities. Accordingly, Freeman and others promoted the idea of a transnational Teutonic community. Switzerland and the people of Scandinavia were part of these sister-communities. America, as I will discuss now, was another and as I aim to show in the next chapter, Germany, the hub of Teutonism, was a prime example of the transnational ethno-genesis community.

'Germanic' America

The ties of 'blood and speech', as coined by Freeman, came to life when he concentrated on the unique components of the Teutonic race which appeared in the bond of England with the communities of the United States. The true ancestors of the American nation, as Freeman declared during his visit to Johns Hopkins University in 1881, had been the Anglo-Saxons and consequently the English. The United States was, therefore, another Anglo-Saxon nation

¹⁵⁶ During the 1930's, Karl Keller-Tarnuzerr, a Swiss racist writer, advocated for a Swiss dominant ethnicity and unique ethno-genesis. The Swiss are not French, German or Italians but originated from a certain Neolithic people, who resided near water sources and for that reason were called the *Pfahlbauer* [Pool-farmers]. Other races did intermingle in time with this core community, yet the dominant ethnicity was still that of the *Pfahlbauer*. See: Oliver Zimmer, ' "A Unique Fusion of the Natural and the Man-Made": The Trajectory of Swiss Nationalism, 1933-39', *Journal of Contemporary History* 39, no. 1 (January 1, 2004): pp.14–16; For a contemporary discussion on dominant ethnicity and the supposed tension between the latter and modern civic values see: Eric P. Kaufmann, *Rethinking Ethnicity : Majority Groups and Dominant Minorities* (London, 2004).

rooted in the Teutonic race. There was a gradual historical movement of the Teutonic nations westward, from their lands in Germany, to England and then across the Atlantic to the New World. The Teutonic movement carried and spread the idea of democratic institutions. The institutions of seventeenth century America had been even more 'Teutonic' than the ones that remained in contemporary England. A greater closeness persisted between American and ancient Anglo-Saxon institutions and the former echo nativity that waned in the old England¹⁵⁷:

The old Teutonic assembly, rather the old Aryan assembly, which had not long died out in the Frisian sea-lands, which still lived on in the Swabian mountain-lands, rose again to full life in the New England town-meeting. Here we have, supplied by the New England States, a direct contribution, and one of the most valuable of contributions, to the general history of Teutonic political life, and thereby to the general history of common Aryan political life¹⁵⁸.

Herbert B. Adams (1850-1901), an American historian from Baltimore and Freeman's friend, noted the latter's influence on his own comprehension of the American political system. Adams, following Freeman's work, also detected a close affinity between the Swiss *Landesgemeinden* and New-England's town meetings. Freeman's visit to the United States was, according to Adams, a great contribution to the study of 'local institutions' inspiring Adams to edit a book by the same title. The book also included Adams's article on the 'Germanic Origins of New-England Towns' that demonstrated the mutual influences between the Germanic tribes, English communities and American towns¹⁵⁹. Adams quoted Green's *History of the English People* as a reference to the kinship between the inhabitants of these

¹⁵⁷ Edward A. Freeman, 'An Introduction to American Institutional History Written for This Series', in Herbert B. Adams (ed.) *Local Institutions* (Baltimore, 1882), p. 15.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p.30.

¹⁵⁹ Herbert B. Adams, 'Germanic Origins of New-England Towns', in *Ibid.*, pp. 48-9; In regards to this theory Bryce asked Freeman: 'What did you think of Herbert B Adams theory about New England town Meetings, were not new creating there but perpetuations of something there living'. See: Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, Fol. 253, Bryce to Freeman, 14 October, 1886.

separate geographical spheres: ‘The town and village life of New England is as truly the reproduction of Old English types as those again are reproductions of the village community system of the ancient Germans. Investigators into American institutional history will turn as naturally to the mother country as the historians of England turn toward their older home beyond the German Ocean’¹⁶⁰. Federalism was a major component of this political heritage, and Adams urged Freeman to complete his book on federal government, as it is ‘the grandest idea in past politics and present history’¹⁶¹. He also tried to persuade Freeman to incorporate in his coming work on the American institutions the fact that the North-Eastern territories were the foundation of the ‘territorial union and common dominion and national *Mark*. I am going to lead you up to the *ager publicus*. The *Folkland* of the U.S. from the town commons of New-England which are after all but out-giving wastes of old England’¹⁶². The term ‘Mark’ is most substantial here in particular following the work of Von Maurer, the German scholar mentioned previously. The term ,which will be discussed comprehensively in the next chapter on the English-German links, defined the shared public land or *ager publicus* of the ancient Germanic tribes. This term, according to Freeman, Adams and others, was situated in the heart of the historical notion on Germanic liberty and was the foundation for the constitutions of England and later of the United States. The German-Teutonic influence was not explicit only in the use of the term *Mark* but of course, through the use of the term *Folkland* or rather *Volkland* that like the *Mark* retained a similar meaning as the ‘land of the people’.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

¹⁶¹ JRLM, MSS FA 1/7/2, Adams to Freeman, 7 February, 1882.

¹⁶² JRLM, MSS FA 1/7/4a, Adams to Freeman, 24 February, 1882.

Adams also identified a similarity between the Teutonic ancestors and the American Pilgrims. Both were part of the Teutonic immigration wave, invaded new lands, and ‘exterminated’ the natives¹⁶³. When using the word ‘natives’ Adams meant the ancient Britons in the Isles who were demolished by the Anglo-Saxon tribes and the American Indians who perished in the wake of the arrival of the Pilgrims. By this, he adopted the theory of Freeman about the devastating impact of the Teutonic tribes on the native Welsh. The racial differences between the invading people and the ‘locals’ were clear. The invaders of the British Isles who later immigrated into America were required to demolish the autochthonic people, since it was a necessary stage in the establishment of their new communities.

In conclusion, the ‘American’ example demonstrates the flexibility of the term ‘race’ in Freeman’s writings. Whenever it suits his current mainly political goals, race creates a vital bridge between human communities, but in other cases, a great barrier between them. Freeman, according to his words understood the current and future potential of America, wished to emphasize the racial and institutional common ground between England and the New World, since he believed that through their collaboration, their stamp on human society would be strengthened. Thus, he actually preached for merging the old England with the new one. As Freeman declared, after being referred to by an American scholar as having a foreign nationality, ‘I am not of a foreign nationality, but of the same nationality¹⁶⁴.

¹⁶³ JRLM, MSS FA 1/7/9c, Adams to Freeman, 25 December, 1882.

¹⁶⁴ Freeman, *An Introduction to American Institutional History Written for This Series*, p. 21.

Chapter 2: Roman Decline and Teutonic Rejuvenation-The Racial German **/English *Gemeinschaft* of Historians (1850's-80s)**

There is a great difference between nationality and race. Nationality is the principle of political independence. Race is the principle of physical analogy, and you have at this moment the principle of race--not at all of nationality--adopted by Germany...¹⁶⁵.

It is rather ironic that one of Freeman's arch-enemies, the future Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli, stated the above words in a speech he held in the House of Commons on the 9th of August 1848. It was exactly Disraeli who suffered from Freeman's racial terminology after the latter called him, especially in several of his private correspondences, by the derogative connotation of 'Jew'¹⁶⁶. Freeman's racial reference was a consequence of his opposition to Disraeli's persistent support of the British-Ottoman connections in fear of Russian dominance. The attack on Disraeli fits into Freeman's general understanding of race¹⁶⁷. The term 'race,' as shown in the previous chapter, became central in the writings of Freeman, Green and Stubbs, especially in their construction of the English-Teutonic community. What is even more significant is that Disraeli referred to the Germans as attributing physical traits to the term 'race' which allegedly differentiated between nations. Thus, in addition to the discourse of the English scholars who form the backbone of my work, I wish in this chapter to explore the attitudes of several German scholars in regards to the 'Teutonic history', their relations with the 'English-Teutonic' circle and their concept of race.

¹⁶⁵Disraeli in a speech to the House of Commons on Supply to Navy, 9th August 1848, accessed 12 February 2015 at <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/1848/aug/09/supply-navy-estimates>

¹⁶⁶ For instance, the term 'Jew' can be seen in Freeman's letter to Bryce from 27 August, 1876: 'Meetings to denounce the Turk and the Jew are getting common'. See: Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, II:p.141; In another letter to Edith Thompson, Freeman wrote: 'How the Jews, Turks, and Tories do lie! ...Still they need not lie, but I suppose with the "Jew" at their head [Disraeli] they really cannot help it'. See: Ibid., p.144.

¹⁶⁷ It must be noted here that Disraeli also developed a certain racial argument. See for example: Simone B. Borgstede, *'All Is Race': Benjamin Disraeli on Race, Nation and Empire* (Wien, 2011).

One may ask why the German scholars' approach is so vital to the discussion. As will be demonstrated, a close community of British and German scholars emerged during the middle of the nineteenth century. The English-German bond materialized through the friendships of English and German scholars, joined in an effort to construct a common pan-Germanic identity for their nations. This identity emphasized certain ethnic, racial and cultural [linguistic and religious] assumptions. The Pan-German community, which was imagined by the scholars, incorporated a shared common myth based on the Germanic tribal past and also stressed certain unique cultural traits such as the resemblance between the English and the German languages. Some of these aspects appear in Anthony D. Smith's definitions of the nation and of the ethnic community¹⁶⁸. The fundamental aspect of Pan-Germanism hinged upon a cultural imagined ancestry which later, especially from the 1850s, developed certain racial characteristics. Certain features, which appear in Smith's definitions, are absent from the vision of a Pan-Teutonic community, such as a shared homeland or a common economy.

I will not necessarily aim to show that due to these links the German or British scholars influenced each other directly in constructing a certain racial approach since one cannot follow the exact evolution of an idea in the scholars' writings. However, the chapter aims to study the interpretation of these issues by the German scholars and the parallels and possible differences with the concepts of their English colleagues. The main theme will be a twofold one. It will incorporate, in addition to the German comprehension of race and of community, the German scholars' relations and attitudes towards England and their specific appreciation of English scholars. I maintain that a close bond connects these two themes. In the eyes of these scholars,

¹⁶⁸ Smith, *National Identity*, pp.14–21.

the idea of the Teutonic community that had expanded from the wildernesses of Northern Germany to the British Isles was not only an entity rooted in the remote past, but also part of present reality.

Here, another very significant dimension can be identified: many of the scholars in both Germany and Britain were also intertwined with the political, religious and social spheres. They acted as public officials, held religious posts, and wrote regularly for newspapers as public intellectuals. In England, this was reflected as seen in the previous chapter through the activity of Freeman as a regular columnist and activist for the Christian communities in south-eastern Europe, in the role of Stubbs as Bishop of Chester and later Oxford and in Green's social charitable actions in East London. In Germany, as will be discussed, the political roles of Niebuhr and Bunsen and the participation of Müller in state affairs signify a similar mode of involvement in the public sphere. Through those mediums, they tried, and sometimes were able, to strengthen the bond between Germany and Great Britain and to form a thriving community that exchanged mutual ideas. Based on the published works of the scholars adjoined with private correspondence, that in parts has not been studied yet, this chapter will follow the construction of the shared community of historians. The chapter opens with a brief description of other contemporary studies. The next part focuses on the creation of the English–German circle of historians as seen in the works and correspondence of the founding-fathers of the circle: Niebuhr, Thomas Arnold and Baron Bunsen. In the next section, the focus is set on the later racial Teutonic views and relationships between scholars such as Freeman, Reinhold Pauli, Max Müller and Charles Kingsley.

Contemporary Views

In previous works, the connections between British and German historians were researched through several prisms. For instance, McClelland's book, *The German Historians and England*¹⁶⁹, endorses the view that at the end of the eighteenth century, England became almost an obsession for German scholars and they sought to find common ground between Germany and England. After the end of the Napoleonic wars, there was less interest in English scholarship and history. Even though German historians still wrote about England after 1815, their views became less romantic and more critical. Leading German historians ceased to write excessively about England after 1815. By the end of the nineteenth century, England was still a dominant factor for German historians even though they now saw her as a rival state¹⁷⁰. Subsequently a new school of historians emerged whom, unlike their predecessors, emphasised England's leaning on Kant's conception of reason and not on the influence of romanticism¹⁷¹. Later in the century, Ranke observed the German-English affinities as natural, while Lappenberg wrote a pioneering book on Anglo-Saxon England which promoted the notion that the most valuable epochs in English history were found in early Saxon-German history¹⁷². These tendencies, according to McClelland, were primarily racial and derived from the attempt to connect their own 'Germany/ies' with the achievements of the British Empire¹⁷³.

¹⁶⁹Charles E. McClelland, *The German Historians and England : A Study in Nineteenth-Century Views* (London, 1971).

¹⁷⁰ Ibid, p.4.

¹⁷¹ Ibid, pp. 48-9.

¹⁷² Johann M. Lappenberg, *Geschichte von England*, (Hamburg, 1834). Later this book was translated to English in several editions. See for example: Johann M. Lappenberg, *A History of England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings*, ed. Elise C. Otté, trans. Benjamin Thorpe (2 vol., London, 1881) .

¹⁷³ McClelland, *The German Historians and England*, pp.64-5.

A detailed account of the infiltration of the German culture into the Victorian scene appears in Davis's *The Victorians and Germany*. The book focuses on the cultural and religious links between Germany and Victorian England. For instance, in terms of religious developments, Davis shows how the Broad Church Movement, which adopted liberal notions and fused High and low Church tendencies, was influenced by German Protestantism¹⁷⁴. In terms of the development of the study of history, Davis describes the intertwining connections between German and British historians. Davis is more concerned with portraying the wide-ranging links than researching the mutual ideas of certain German and British historians. For this reason, especially in regard to the Teutonic idea and periodization, there is a need for further investigation. For instance, in the case of Freeman, Davis correctly argues that Freeman identified the birth of England with the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons. However, as I will demonstrate later in the work, to claim that Freeman saw the beginning of Modernity in 407 A.D., when the Germanic tribes had entered the empire¹⁷⁵, is only partly true.

The mutual perceptions of German and English historians are also visible in the work of Peter Wende¹⁷⁶, who concentrates mainly on the leading historiographical spheres of the *Historische Zeitschrift* and the *English Historical Review*. In both Journals, there were a handful of reviews of books and studies from Britain and Germany. The Germans, as Wende shows, were in general more interested in the works of French historians than in the work of English

¹⁷⁴Davis, *The Victorians and Germany*, pp. 140-3.

¹⁷⁵ The exact year and the accuracy of this event appear to be uncertain. See: Bryan Ward-perkins, '407 and All That: Retrospective,' *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2, no. 1 (2009): pp. 75-8.

¹⁷⁶ Peter Wende, 'Views and Reviews: Mutual Perceptions of British and German Historians in Late Nineteenth Century', in Benedikt Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds.), *British and German Historiography, 1750-1950: Traditions, Perceptions, and Transfers* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 173-90.

ones. However, the English were more intrigued by German books than by French ones¹⁷⁷. Wende asserts that most British historians acknowledged the supremacy of German scholarship. The Germans themselves criticized the British historians' method of work but still appreciated the fact that their books became, unlike most of their own German publications, very popular also outside the academic sphere¹⁷⁸. In the concluding part of this chapter, several reviews from the *Historische Zeitschrift* will be discussed and in particular the method by which the works of Freeman and Stubbs were reviewed in the *Journal*, especially by Pauli. Wende, like Davis, despite mentioning Freeman and Stubbs as the leading British historians, does not concentrate specifically on the reviews of their work but shows, following the aim of his article, the mutual links between the historians of the two countries.

In an article on the influence of philology on British scholarship, John Burrow demonstrates the significance of scholars like Bunsen and Müller on the infiltration of this field into the English academic sphere and especially into the studies of the English scholars of the *Altertumswissenschaft*. Language, for these scholars, became the key for the understanding of men, history, and religion¹⁷⁹. As I aim to show, according to some of the following scholars, such a racial-linguistic bond linked Germany and England.

Lineage of Historians –Early Influences

Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776-1831), one of the most famous historians in the German speaking lands of the nineteenth century, was especially renowned for his research on the

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., pp.174-5.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., pp.182-3.

¹⁷⁹ John Burrow, 'The Uses of Philology in Victorian England,' in R. Robson (ed.), *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain : Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark* (London, 1967), pp. 199-200.

Roman Republic. Like many of the historians of his age, he became involved in current politics and was the Prussian ambassador to Rome from 1816 until 1823¹⁸⁰. In his *Römische Geschichte*¹⁸¹, he concentrated mainly on republican Rome and was less interested in the imperial era even though in some of his writings one could also notice some reference to the later periods of Rome. In regards to the transformation from Antiquity to the Middle Ages and the theme of the fall of Rome, Niebuhr adopted a similar notion to that of Gibbon and marked the fall with the deposition of the last Emperor, Romulus Augustus. In the third and last volume of his lectures on Rome, in the last chapter, after the description of the events proceeding the year 476, he concluded with the sentence: ‘So endigte das römische Reich’¹⁸². Niebuhr, perhaps, in similarity to the next great historian of Rome, Theodor Mommsen (1817-1903), was also reluctant to write on the later Roman Empire. In the case of Mommsen, as he attested in several places, Gibbon cast a large shadow over the Roman historians of Germany¹⁸³. Perhaps, Niebuhr also feared Gibbon’s shadow and although he studied the Roman Empire, the Republic, which remained untouched by Gibbon, became his foremost topic. This assumption can be corroborated through a comment he stated before the German-American

¹⁸⁰ Walther Gerrit, „Niebuhr, Barthold Georg“, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 19 (1998), [Onlinefassung]; accessed 12 Feb. 2015 at <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118587773.html>

¹⁸¹ Barthold G. Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1827).

¹⁸² Barthold G. Niebuhr, *Vorträge über römische Geschichte, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten* (3 Band., Berlin, 1848), dritter Band - Von Pompejus' erstem Consulat bis zum Untergang des abendländischen Reichs, s.346.

¹⁸³ Theodor Mommsen, *A History of Rome Under the Emperors*, edited by Alexander Demandt, Barbara Demandt and Thomas E. J. Wiedemann (London; New York, 1999), p.21; Jan N. Bremmer, *The Rise of Christianity through the Eyes of Gibbon, Harnack and Rodney Stark : A Valedictory Lecture on the Occasion of His Retirement from the Chair of Religious Studies, in the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, Delivered in Abbreviated Form before the University of Groningen on 29 January 2010* (Groningen, 2010), p.24.

scholar Francis Lieber (1798-1872): ‘If God will only grant me a life so long that I may end where Gibbon begins; it is all I pray for’¹⁸⁴.

One of the greatest contributions of Niebuhr was his separation between the mythic and the historical elements of Antiquity, a separation that resulted in the conclusion that many narratives, like the one on the foundation of Rome, were mere legends with no substantial historical proof. From this, similar to the common periodization between Antiquity, Middle Ages and Modernity, followed the division of Antiquity into three periods: *mythische*-mythic, *Mittelalter* and the last era of the *ächthistorische* - real historical. Poets, such as Homer, had characterized the first period. Later, in between the mythic and the real historical era, the transitional phase of the Middle Ages occurred. The last and most important period, due to its authentic kernel, began in Greece and later in Rome with the realistic historians such as Thucydides and Polybius who left detailed accounts of historical events. Thus, Niebuhr’s division was based upon the quality of the knowledge preserved and the substantial difference between legends and historical evidence¹⁸⁵. For him, periods were not only distinguished by events but also by the sources and the historians who had thrived in them.

Niebuhr had a great interest in the history of the English people, their politics and scholars. In a letter sent to the founding-father of positivism, the French Scholar Auguste Comte (1798-1857), in 1823, he testified to his attachment to England:

... On that country I have a right to form an opinion; I have a right to except against that of the English, and to criticize it, as much as if the question related to my own

¹⁸⁴Francis Lieber, *Reminiscences of an Intercourse with Mr. Niebuhr, the Historian during a Residence with Him in Rome, in the Years 1822 and 1823* (Philadelphia, 1835), p.63.

¹⁸⁵ Gerrit Walther, *Niebuhrs Forschung*, Frankfurter Historische Abhandlungen, (Stuttgart, 1993), Band 35, S.380–3.

country, and the opinion of my fellow-countrymen respecting its state, for I know England as well as if I had been born there. I was taught the language in my earliest childhood, and from the age of ten years I was in the constant habit of reading the English journals; my father sent me there to finish my studies, and to become acquainted with the political and civil life of a free people, as well as to study rural economy, commerce, the application of chemistry to the arts, and lastly, finance...I was as if naturalized there; and, after having quitted it, I continued to watch with the same interest the minutest details of its circumstances, and have followed its moral, political, and financial history...¹⁸⁶.

Niebuhr, following this testimony, defined himself as virtually English. This may also explain why most of the foreigners who visited Niebuhr in Bonn during the last decade of his life were English. His prominent followers in Britain were Conop Thirlwall, Julius Hare and Thomas Arnold, who declared that they tried to differentiate history from myth as their German mentor, Niebuhr, set out to do in his *History of Rome*. Hare and Thirlwall were the ones who introduced Niebuhr to the wider British public through their translation of his work¹⁸⁷. During 1819, both Thirlwall and Hare read Niebuhr in German while they were studying in Trinity College, Cambridge¹⁸⁸. In the above cited letter to Comte, the most significant point concerning the present discussion arises later. According to Niebuhr, England had preserved its institutions and freedom since the Middle Ages and until current times. This uniqueness of England was noticed by Niebuhr as a consequence of his vast engagement with Antiquity: ‘And the more I occupied all my leisure moments with researches into the history of the institutions and laws of the nations of Antiquity, the more I was led to turn my attention to the history of England, among those states, where the free institutions of the Middle Ages have maintained themselves for a more or less lengthened period, and where even important changes - as, for instance, in

¹⁸⁶Christian C J. Bunsen and Barthold G. Niebuhr, *The Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr*, trans. Susanna Winkworth (New York, 1854), pp.432-3.

¹⁸⁷ John Burrow, ‘The Uses of Philology in Victorian England,’ p.183.

¹⁸⁸ The college became a hub for German scholarship. See: Davis, *The Victorians and Germany*, pp.119–20.

the tenure of property-have been brought to pass in the course of their natural development'¹⁸⁹. The history of England also showed strong attachment to the institution of the (unwritten) English 'constitution'. Niebuhr, who lived under French occupation (1806-15) and consequently became a great advocate for the liberation and freedom of the Germanic lands, argued that true liberty is found within the English nation and not with the French who claim to be the 'harbingers of liberty'.

For Niebuhr, Rome and England converged. As he declared, it was during his stay in England that he decided to write on Roman history: 'I never could have understood a number of things in the history of Rome without having observed England. Not that the idea of writing the history of Rome was then clear within me; but when, at a later period, this idea became more and more distinct in my mind, all the observation and experience I had gained in England came to my aid, and the resolution was taken'¹⁹⁰. Hence, Niebuhr was inspired by his personal experience in England, and therefore his words resemble Gibbon's testimony about his decision to write the *Decline and Fall* as a consequence of his personal tour in Italy and especially following his visit to the ruins of the Roman Capitol: 'It was at Rome, on the 15th of October 1764, as I sat musing amidst the ruins of the Capitol, while the bare-footed fryars were singing vespers in the temple of Jupiter, that the idea of writing the decline and fall of the city first started to my mind'¹⁹¹. Niebuhr learnt about English life from the study of the Early

¹⁸⁹Niebuhr, *The Life and Letters*, p.433; in the same year that the letter was written, Niebuhr also published an essay entitled *Ueber England's Zukunft* which following its title described the political possibilities facing England in the near future. See: Barthold G. Niebuhr, *Nachgelassene Schriften: B. G. Niebuhr's nichtphilologischen Inhalts* (Hamburg, 1842).

¹⁹⁰ Lieber, *Reminiscences of an Intercourse with Mr. Niebuhr, the Historian during a Residence with Him in Rome, in the Years 1822 and 1823*, p.61.

¹⁹¹ Edward Gibbon, *The Autobiography of Edward Gibbon* (New York, 1961), p.154.

Roman constitution and the political function of the Republic. For Niebuhr, most nations had a short life-span. They withered away like human beings and did not fulfil their potential. Only two nations throughout history escaped this destiny; Rome in Antiquity and England in Modernity. Rome and England broke the vicious-circle of time and managed to expand and prosper throughout long periods. For this reason, Rome's influence can be observed until our own days. As Niebuhr declared in his introduction to the lectures he held at Bonn: 'In der neueren Geschichte haben nur die Engländer eben solchen Verlauf erlangt wie die Römer; vom kosmopolitischen Standpunkte aus müssen also diese beiden Geschichten immer die wichtigsten bleiben'¹⁹².

In the introduction to the *Römische Geschichte* Niebuhr argued that dominant empires like Rome had integrated many races which became with time an integral part of the Roman entity. Rome united the inhabited world under its law, culture and language. We, Niebuhr asserted, and by that he meant 'his' Germanic tribal ancestors, would not have ceased to be barbarians without Rome¹⁹³. It is exactly this universal aspect of Rome and its continuing influence on world history long after its fall that characterized Niebuhr's conception of Rome and the Germanic tribes [*germanischen Stämme*]. For him, the tribes, despite destroying Rome, were actually constructed upon Rome's foundations. There is more cooperation and continuity than strife.

In general, Niebuhr defined the national aspect rather vaguely. He stressed both universal and patriotic notions as exemplified in his support of Prussia and its territorial

¹⁹² Barthold G. Niebuhr, *Vorträge über Römische Geschichte, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten* (Berlin, 1846), erster Band Von der Entstehung Rom's bis zum Ausbruch des ersten punischen Krieges, s.2.

¹⁹³ Ibid., s.2-4.

aspirations. Perhaps, this patriotic-universal dualism, as some scholars notice, linked him much more to the ideas of the Enlightenment and less to the Romantic tendencies of the nineteenth century¹⁹⁴. As one of his descendants claimed in 1977, marking the 200th anniversary of his birth, Niebuhr could simultaneously be defined as Danish, Prussian and German or simply as a citizen of the world¹⁹⁵.

Nevertheless, a completely different appreciation of Niebuhr is also possible. As Bernal shows, Niebuhr acts as a pillar of nineteenth century racial thinking. Thus, for instance, he maintained that the source of the split between the Patricians and Plebeians in Rome had been a consequence of race and not of class difference. Hence, the racial aspect determined the division into classes. Bernal's conclusion is that the physical aspect of race was crucial for Niebuhr's definition of communities¹⁹⁶. Thus, among researchers there is a debate whether Niebuhr adopted a universal approach or rather a more racial inclination towards history. I maintain that regardless of the debate on Niebuhr's affiliations, the narrative which glorified the early Germanic history and in particular the rise of the tribes that marked and shaped mediaeval Europe was far less important in his writings, yet it became crucial for his successors, since it testified to the historical bond between Germany and England.

At this stage, it must be noted that Niebuhr's historical method was also seen in Britain with unfavourable eyes. For example, in the *Quarterly Review* of 1829, John Barrow launched

¹⁹⁴Peter H. Reill, 'Barthold Georg Niebuhr and the Enlightenment Tradition', *German Studies Review* 3, no. 1 (1980): pp.9–26.

¹⁹⁵ Robert J. Niebuhr Tod, *Barthold Georg Niebuhr, 1776-1831: an Appreciation in Honour of the 200th Anniversary of His Birth* (Cambridge, 1977), p.14.

¹⁹⁶ Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1987), pp.303–5.

an attack against Niebuhr in which he was presented as an ultra-radical liberal thinker who had a destabilizing effect on his students¹⁹⁷. British scholars, especially E. B. Pusey (1800-82), regarded his critical approach to Roman history as dangerous, since if one began to criticize the classical texts then the next phase could be the criticism of biblical sources¹⁹⁸. Despite the disapproval of some scholars, Niebuhr's attitude had its counterpart in the work of Thomas Arnold. Arnold himself learned German in order to read Niebuhr's *History of Rome* and in 1827 he even met Niebuhr. Arnold emphasized a specific national feeling which was linked to a pan-Germanic element that dominated Modernity and was absent in Antiquity: 'Half of Europe, and all America and Australia are German more or less completely in race, language, or in institutions, or in all'¹⁹⁹. According to Arnold, the Germans and the English together with the inhabitants of most of Western Europe and America belonged to a unified race that ruled most of the modern world. Arnold, who travelled extensively, illustrated this when he visited the Rhine on one of his tours. He considered the Rhine not just as a natural boundary but also as a dividing line between two distinct cultures. As he wrote in his journal on June 9, 1828:

... The river itself was the frontier of the Empire — the limit, as it were, of two worlds, that of Roman laws and customs, and that of German. Far before us lay the land of our Saxon and Teutonic forefathers — the land uncorrupted by Roman or any other mixture; the birth-place of the most moral races of men that the world has yet seen — of the soundest laws — the least violent passions, and the fairest domestic and civil virtues. I thought of that memorable defeat of Varus and his three legions, which for ever confined the Romans to the western side of the

¹⁹⁷ John Barrow, 'Dr Granville's Travels: Russia,' *The Quarterly Review* 39, no. 77 (January 1829): pp.8–9; The attack on Niebuhr that consisted only two paragraphs was responded by a lengthy article by Hare and could be considered as another evidence for Niebuhr's influence on English Scholars. See: Julius C. Hare, *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the Charges of the Quarterly Review* (Cambridge, 1829).

¹⁹⁸ Norman Vance, 'Niebuhr in England: History, Faith and Order', in Benedikt Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds.), *British and German Historiography 1750-1950* (Oxford, 2000), pp.89–92.

¹⁹⁹ Thomas Arnold, *Introductory Lectures on Modern History, with the Inaugural Lecture Delivered in Dec. 1841*, 4th edn. (London, 1849 [1843]), p.28.

Rhine, and preserved the Teutonic nation — the regenerating element in modern Europe — safe and free²⁰⁰.

The defeat of the Romans in the Teutoburger forest (9 A.D.) was not only the victory of the Germans but also the triumph of England. It was ‘our forefathers’, as Arnold wrote, that had managed to repel the Romans and had preserved the free element of the German race. This defiance of Roman culture led eventually to the establishment of England, because, had the Romans conquered the German lands, the Anglo-Saxons would never have crossed the channel centuries later²⁰¹.

Bunsen and the Establishment of the Community

Arnold maintained a long and close correspondence with Niebuhr’s protégé, Bunsen. The two met, for the first time, when Arnold visited Rome in 1827 and Bunsen served as the Prussian ambassador to the papal court after replacing Niebuhr in 1823. In 20 of March 1831, Arnold wrote to Bunsen words of condolences on the death of his mentor, Niebuhr. In this letter, he also noted the common interest of Germany and England to defy their common enemy, France:

...Germany will never forget the glorious struggle of 1813, and will know that the tread of a Frenchman on the right bank of the Rhine is the worst of all pollutions to her soil. And I trust and think, that the general feeling in England is strong on this point, and that the whole power of the nation would be heartily put forth to strangle in the birth the first symptoms of Napoleonism. I was at a party in the summer at Geneva, where I met Thierry, the historian of ‘*Les Gaulois*’ and the warlike spirit which I perceived, even then, in the French liberals, made a deep impression upon me²⁰².

²⁰⁰ Thomas Arnold and Arthur P. Stanley, *Arnold’s Travelling Journals, with Extracts from the Life and Letters* (London, 1852), p.28.

²⁰¹ Arnold added that alongside the German race, the Slavonic race which became dominant in Modernity will have a greater effect in the future. See: Arnold, *Introductory Lectures on Modern History*, pp.28.

²⁰² Arthur P. Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., Late Head Master of Rugby School and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford*, 2nd edn., (2 vol., London, 1844), I, p.406

Bunsen stressed the importance of the Teutonic nations to universal history. They revitalised Europe in the wake of the decaying Roman and Celtic eras. By that, he was distinguished from his mentor, Niebuhr, who identified the end of Antiquity with the invasion of the tribes but was less focused on the Teutonic aspect in his line of argument. Indeed, Bunsen functioned as a key-figure in the relations between German and British scholars, and his connection with Thomas Arnold initiated the emergence of the historians' community²⁰³. From 1843, he occupied for over a decade the role of Prussia's ambassador to St. James's Court and was the main carrier of Niebuhr's legacy in England. Bunsen is even one of the few German figures who have an entry in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, and possibly this proves his long-lasting influence on the British scene²⁰⁴.

Bunsen, it appears, promoted the notion of the unity of mankind. He traced, like many other scholars before him, the origin of mankind to the three sons of Noah: Shem, Ham and Japheth. The Semitic race originated from Ham and Shem, while Japheth was the ancestor of the Aryans. The third race was that of the Turanian that mainly included the nations of Asia. This race, even though it was associated with Nimrod the grandson of Ham, evolved in what Bunsen named the ante-Noachian period²⁰⁵. The differentiation into the Semitic, Aryan and Turanian races was above all a consequence of language diversity. The language of Ham,

²⁰³ An evidence of the special connection between the two scholars can be traced in a letter sent by Bunsen to Julius Hare upon the death of Arnold in 1842 and also in a hymn the latter dedicated to the memory of Arnold. See: Frances W. Bunsen, *Memoirs of Baron Bunsen, Late Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary of His Majesty Frederic William IV at the Court of St. James*, 2nd edn., abridged and corr. (2 vol., London, 1869), I, pp.10–13.

²⁰⁴ Susanne Stark, 'Bunsen, Christian Karl Josias von (1791–1860)', *ODNB*, (Oxford, 2004), accessed 11 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/53760>.

²⁰⁵ Christian C. J. Bunsen, *Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History, Applied to the Language and Religion*, (2 vol., London, 1854), I, pp.21–3; 120.

spoken in ancient Egypt, was the primordial tongue of all the Semitic languages, whereas the Aryan/Iranian tongues derived from the Turanian family²⁰⁶. The Semitic stock became the cradle of all monotheistic religions. The Aryan stock generated the leading political powers of history, beginning with Greece, Rome and the Germanic tribes. Throughout history, despite the fact that they possessed different characters, the two races have been undividable and have actually constructed universal history. The merger of the two races was best exemplified in one of Bunsen's main subjects of inquiry, ancient Egypt. According to him, in this ancient civilization the Semitic and Aryan elements converged since the origin of hieroglyphs cannot be directly linked to either of the languages. It was through language that Bunsen classified races and as he testified, it was his attempt to research Romance and Scandinavian tongues which first led him to delve into the differences between races²⁰⁷.

The supremacy, however, was still given to the Aryans since they 'carried on the main stream of history'²⁰⁸. The most noble among the Aryans were the Teutonic tribes, which were, as portrayed by Tacitus and earlier by Cesar, free and independent from their origin. As Bunsen wrote:

The Germans prized and cherished their freedom [*Freiheit*], and were at all times ready to sacrifice themselves for the common cause, and to follow the chieftains of their choice to battle, so soon as the Assembly of the people had declared for war. This was a people after Tacitus's own heart. On the other hand, they were intelligent and susceptible of culture, consequently were destined to acquire ere long a most important influence on the future prospects of the Empire²⁰⁹.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., I:pp.190–1.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., I:pp.3–4 ;Christian C. J. Bunsen, *Egypt's Place in Universal History: An Historical Investigation in Five Books*, translated by Charles H. Cottrell (5 vol., London, 1848-67), I, pp. VIII–X.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., p. IX.

²⁰⁹ Christian C. J. Bunsen, *God in History; Or, The Progress of Man's Faith in the Moral Order of the World*, Translated by Susanna Winkworth (3 vol., London, 1868-70), II, p.392. For the German see: Christian C. J.

Besides the concept of '*Freiheit*' [liberty] that rises once and again in the writings of many German scholars, the argument regarding the future influence of the Germans on the Roman Empire and hence on the history of the world, is most significant. For Bunsen, the German emergence marked the transition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages. One of the main unique traits of the tribes was their racial purity which had a rejuvenating effect on the course of history. The chief term Bunsen used was *Volksmäßigen Grund* [Ethnic Foundation], which denoted the rise of a new epoch with an explicit uniqueness. This, according to Bunsen, was not only a political transformation but was also characterized by a rejuvenating racial aspect. The tribes were not contaminated by the burden of time and embodied a totally new character: 'with the advent of the thoroughly pure-blooded Bactro-Aryan Teutons, a new outgrowth of Humanity in religion, as in all else, should appear upon the theatre of the world. ...The Teutonic tribes were awakened by the Roman Empire and the Celts out of the slumber of national infancy. They stepped out into the arena of history fresh and unenfeebled [*sic*]; the great race-day and its struggles lay before them'²¹⁰.

The tribes possessed a inherent racial superiority over the Romans and Celts and, as Bunsen also told Ernst Moritz Arndt, the 'distinction of race' among the Germans had made them equal to the greatness of the Hellenes and superior to the Celts and Italians²¹¹. In another

Bunsen, *Gott in Der Geschichte, Oder, Der Fortschritt Des Glaubens an Eine Sittliche Weltordnung* (3 Bnd., Leipzig, 1857), II, s.601.

²¹⁰ Ibid., S.603–604.['...mit den durch und durch baktrisch-arischen Germanen eine neue Volksursprünglichkeit, auch im Gottesbewußtsein, auf die Schaubühne der Welt treten mußte.... Die germanischen Stämme wurden vom Römerreiche und den Kelten aus des Schlummer der Völkerjugend aufgeweckt : Sie traten auf den Schauplatz der Weltgeschichte frisch und ungeschmächt : der große weltgeschichtliche Tag und sein Kampf lag noch vor ihnen'...]

²¹¹ Christian C. J. Bunsen, *Signs of the Times: Letters to Ernst Moritz Arndt on the Dangers to Religious Liberty in the Present State of the World*, trans. Susanna Winkworth (New York, 1856), p.170.

letter to Arndt, Bunsen expressed his admiration for the Anglo-Saxon race with even greater praise: ‘...the fact instantly arrests our eye, that the Anglo-Saxon race is that which has exhibited the greatest amount of creative and constructive energy, and, moreover, in a continually increasing ratio of importance to the history of the world at large’²¹². Arndt, it is important to note, maintained close contacts and correspondence with Baron Bunsen. Arndt even dedicated his book on the wanderings with Baron von Stein to Bunsen and it seems that the two had many views in common. Bunsen, Arndt and Stein were all great admirers of the English nation, while, at the same time, they scorned France. For this reason, perhaps, Arndt’s memories were translated in 1879 to English by Sir John Seeley (1834-95), Regius Professor of Modern History in Cambridge²¹³. For Arndt and Bunsen, England and Germany were of the same race. Both the English and the German maintained their purity of race and did not incorporate new races into their realm. The Germanic tribes held their original lands and prevented other foreign races from infiltrating into their domain. The same racial ‘purity’ was maintained after the Anglo-Saxons conquered the British Isles and pushed the Celts to the periphery. These arguments merge three main themes: race, geography and time and denote a prominent example of ‘racial time’.

Bunsen also acknowledged the contribution of the English historians to the research of the Teutonic past. This field, he stated, became rather neglected, except in Germany where the Grimm brothers delved into the research of Teutonic mythology. In England, there were also several scholars who engaged with this topic: ‘How can we wonder, therefore, that, in the rest

²¹² Ibid., pp.55–6.

²¹³ Arndt and Seeley, *The Life and Adventures of Ernst Moritz Arndt*.

of Europe, the greatest ignorance of these monuments, therefore of ancient Teutonic mythology in general, should still prevail; notwithstanding Sharon Turner's praiseworthy efforts to open up these fields of research in England, and Kemble's zealous imitation of him in the same direction'²¹⁴.

There were differences between the various tribes but all were classified under the generic name of Germans. It was already Tacitus who noted, according to Bunsen, that 'the German cantons of Switzerland, the Flemings, and the Hollanders, but also the Scandinavians, belong to the same stock with all the other tribes of historical Germany'²¹⁵. To this list, Bunsen added the Anglo-Saxons who had invaded the British Isles. They were not mentioned in the first place, since in the age of Tacitus the 'Germanic dominion' had not reached the British Isles. Bunsen, however, did not neglect the Anglo-Saxons and later wrote that until his own days the Westphalian peasants and Teutonic England follow the 'Germanic' way of life²¹⁶.

In another letter to Arndt, Bunsen expressed his admiration of the Anglo-Saxon race with even greater laud: 'if we take a comprehensive survey of the development of the human mind and Christian nations during the last eleven centuries, the fact instantly arrests our eye, that the Anglo-Saxon race is that which has exhibited the greatest amount of creative and constructive energy, and, moreover, in a continually increasing ratio of importance to the history of the world at large'²¹⁷. This letter, as in all the other letters to Arndt, focused on the threat posed to religious liberty in Bunsen's and Arndt's contemporary Europe in particular

²¹⁴Bunsen, *God in History*, II, p.406.

²¹⁵ Ibid., p.392.

²¹⁶ Ibid., p.405.

²¹⁷ Bunsen, *Signs of the Times Letters to Ernest Moritz Arndt*, pp.55–6.

following the turbulence of the 1848 revolutions. In the letters, Bunsen argued, through historical and theological explanations, in favour of liberal rights and their essential importance for Christianity. Toleration, for him, did not defy Christian beliefs but actually strengthened and approved them. One of the main clashes of the era occurred between the nation's effort to gain greater freedom and the attempt by the clergy to contain that desire and restrict other opposing religious beliefs. He maintained, after delving into the history of the Anglo-Saxon race, that their tolerance towards religious practices had been unprecedented. The Dutch, or as Bunsen named them by their tribal name the 'West Frisians', had revolted against Spanish dominion and religious fanaticism and had become the first state in Europe to adopt tolerance. Soon afterwards the 'English Anglo-Saxons', (as Bunsen insisted once again on their tribal/Teutonic origin), had sunk the Spanish Armada and brought an end to their religious intolerance and oppression of both England and Holland. This mode of Anglo-Saxon religious liberty continued in 1688 when the Stewarts were banished and the law of religious liberty became part of the constitution²¹⁸.

It must, however, be noted that, according to Bunsen, toleration was not always the rule of the Teutonic races. In other letters, he showed how after their Christianization the Teutonic races had persecuted their religious adversaries with even greater zeal than their heathen forefathers. A trace of their former barbarity, which appeared in the heart of the letters between Bunsen and Arndt, can be observed in the martyrdom of Saint Boniface by the Frisians in 754 A.D.²¹⁹. It seems that one may comprehend from Bunsen's words that even this event, which

²¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 57-8.

²¹⁹ St. Boniface (672/5-5 June 754) was born in England by the name of Wynfreth and was known for his missionary work in the continent. Later he became the archbishop of Mainz and died as a martyr while he was in the midst of a missionary expedition among the tribe of the Frisians. See: Ian N. Wood, 'Boniface [St Boniface]

became a central theme in German history, paled in comparison to some of the atrocities that had been executed by the converted German nations. Nevertheless, despite these remarks, toleration in general developed as a central pillar of the Teutonic nations of Germany, England and Holland.

Before focusing on the next generation of English and German scholars, several conclusions can be drawn . Bunsen's ideas, and this is possibly the most significant point, closely resembled the ideas of several scholars in England at the same period. This school of thought crystallized into a sort of community, on the basis of certain common notions of a racially based shared past. This association of scholars sustained close personal connections and shared ideas. These historians either knew of each other's work and/or also knew each other personally. As seen, Arnold valued his friendship with Bunsen and the former even dedicated his work on Rome to him. They were both influenced by Niebuhr and according to Arnold, his decision to write on Rome was a consequence of Niebuhr's monumental work on the subject²²⁰ .

The Core of the Historians' Community

Arnold also had a vast influence on the historical method of Stubbs and also on the work of Freeman, as the latter attested in one of his lectures. Freeman, as discussed in the previous chapter, emphasized the superiority of the Aryans because they had been unmatched in their elegance and vitality. Among the Aryan nations, the Teutonic people and in particular the

(672x5?–754),’ *ODNB*, (Oxford, 2004), accessed 8 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/2843>.

²²⁰ Ralph A. D. Owen, ‘Christian Bunsen and Liberal English Theology’, (Thesis PhD--University of Wisconsin, 1924), pp.21–2.

Anglo-Saxons were the most distinctive since they have preserved their purity in the most complete way²²¹. The original state of the Anglo-Saxons resulted from the fact that ever since their invasion of the British Isles from their north German homeland during the fifth century A.D., they maintained their Teutonic mores. As seen earlier, Freeman and Stubbs proclaimed that even in the times of the Vikings and later during the Norman invasions, the core Teutonic element was cherished since the Vikings and Normans had also been of Teutonic decent²²². Freeman, Stubbs and others were in contact with the followers of Bunsen and in particularly with another famous ‘Oxfordian’, Max Müller. Thus, as I aim to show now, a community of historians became a vivid reality. Its main uniqueness was not only in the promotion of a shared idea of the Teutonic past but also in the formation of personal ties between these English and German scholars.

Stubbs, as one can observe, referred to language as one criterion for the purity of the Anglo-Saxons. He amalgamated between the notion of race and language and saw them as dependent on each other. Freeman, correspondingly, depended on language but also on race for proving the superiority of the West European Aryan nations. Therefore, he relied on the comparative method devised by Max Müller during the second half of the nineteenth century. According to this method, a primal Aryan linguistic community had been the source of all the European Aryan languages. When staying in Germany at 1872, Freeman wrote to the famous anthropologist E. B. Tylor (1832–1917), about the method of ‘comparative politics’ which he had borrowed from him and Müller:

²²¹ Edward A. Freeman, *The History of the Norman Conquest of England : Its Causes and Its Results* (6 vol., Oxford, 1867-79), I, pp.16–17.

²²² See earlier in the chapter pp. 40, 62-4.

I have taken for my subject one which I think follows very well on Max Müller's and yours, namely what, till I can find a better name, I call 'Comparative Politics'... What I want to do is to carry out the same line of thought which you and others have applied to the language, the mythology, and the customs of different nations to their political institutions, and to show that the forms of government of the Aryan nations...all spring from a common source, an *Urbrunnen*...²²³

Max Müller: Supremacy of Language and Superiority of the Aryan

The German scholar Max Müller was in close connection with Bunsen, as evident in their correspondence that encompassed a large number of letters, lasting until Bunsen's death in 1860²²⁴. Müller spent most of his adult academic life in Oxford and in 1854 was appointed there as the Professor of Modern European Languages²²⁵. In relevance to our discussion, the most noteworthy aspect is their discourse on the themes of language and race. Müller adopted Bunsen's idea of the unity of humankind through the theory of the *Ursprache* [proto-language] that had linked the Aryan and Semitic people. Müller, following this, attacked the Darwinian claim that humanity had been developed from a state of barbarism. He opposed Darwin by claiming that languages and men had been in their purest state already in their creation. He denounced the implication of the evolution theory that language had been only basic and crude in the beginning of humanity. For him, an impeccable language had existed in the origin of human history and since then a process of degeneration occurred²²⁶.

²²³ Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, II, p.57.

²²⁴ Evidence to this close relationship between the two scholars exists in the BL collections that encompass 273 pages of correspondence. See: Bod. MS. German d. 22, Letters from Max Müller to Baron C.J. von Bunsen, in German, 1845-58.

²²⁵ When Müller came to England from Germany, Bunsen introduced him to the local society. He also offered patronage to Müller's academic work, assisted in sponsoring his edition of the *Rig Veda* and sent him his first invitation to lecture Oxford. See: R. C. C. Fynes, 'Müller, Friedrich Max (1823–1900)', *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004), accessed 8 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/18394>.

²²⁶ John Burrow, 'The Uses of Philology in Victorian England,' p.201; Maurice. Olender, *The Languages of Paradise: Race, Religion, and Philology in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), pp. 88-9.

For that reason, he was attacked by the renowned French scholar Ernst Renan (1823-92), who refuted Müller's argument concerning an alleged affinity between the Semitic and Aryan languages. According to Müller, the Semitic and Aryan languages and people had both sprung from the Turanian languages and together they had fought against what he titled the 'language of Tur': 'The Arian [sic.]²²⁷ and Semitic languages occupy but four peninsulas of the primeval continent, — India, Arabia, Asia Minor, and Europe; all the rest belongs to the family of Tur. But the countries reclaimed by Shem and Japhet mark the high road of civilisation, and comprehend the stage on which the drama of ancient and modern history has been acted'²²⁸. Müller accused Renan of criticizing him in an unfair manner²²⁹. In response, he wrote a pamphlet against Renan which, following the advice of Bunsen, would not be published. In this pamphlet, Müller claimed that, contrary to Renan, he did not fuse the physical traits of race with those of language: 'confusion between linguistic and ethnological race runs through all his [Renan's] arguments'²³⁰. Furthermore, Renan, according to Müller, misinterpreted his argument since the common origin of the Aryan and Semitic languages did not mean that a shared racial origin had existed: 'I look upon the problem of the common origin of language, which I have shown to be quite independent of the problem of the common origin of mankind'²³¹. Here one must emphasize that by 'common origin' of mankind, Müller spoke of

²²⁷ Today, Arian (with an "I") only signifies the Christian sect of Arianism. However, here, Müller clearly referred to the Aryan languages/origin and not to the faith.

²²⁸ F. Max Müller and Chevalier Bunsen, *Letters to Chevalier Bunsen on the Classification of the Turanian Languages* (London, 1854), pp. 224–5.

²²⁹ The two scholars were rivals until the middle of the 1850s, but then a certain shift occurred and Renan came closer to both Bunsen and Müller. See: Joan Leopold, 'Ernest Renan From Linguistics and Psychology to Racial Ideology (1840s to 1860s),' *Historiographia Linguistica* 37, no. 1-2 (2010): pp. 31–61.

²³⁰ Bod., Max Müller Papers, Ms. Eng. d. 2358, fol. 1-25, F. Max Müller 'Reply to Monsieur Renan's Remarks.' (London, 1855), p.31.

²³¹ Ibid.

a racial-physical origin which he distinguished from the problem of the origin of language. However, as I will shortly demonstrate, sometimes Müller himself blurred the distinction between language and race and paradoxically stumbled in the same ‘confusion’ as Renan.

As for Bunsen, despite his theory of the unity of humanity, he still maintained that a distinct difference separates one race from the other and that the supremacy was still given to the Teutonic branch of the Aryan race. For Müller, as his criticism of Renan demonstrated and several contemporary scholars claim, the term Aryan comprised a distinctly linguistic meaning and did not refer to racial, physical differences between peoples²³². This may also be illustrated in one of Müller’s letters to Bunsen where he tried to detach the physical element of race from the linguistic one, and classified them under two different titles, ethnology and phonology. Müller argued that scholars wrongly confused these two concepts despite the fact that each of them incorporated a different field of research. One focused on the study of skulls, colour of the skin and additional physical characters while the other concentrated on language. The linguist must not study the physical element and the researcher of physical traits must not study the linguistic origins, since a specialized scholar must only delve into his subject of expertise:

The physiologist should pursue his own science unconcerned about language. Let him see how far the skulls, or the hair, or the colour, or the skin of different tribes admit of classification; but to the sound of their words his ear should be as deaf as the ornithologist's to the notes of caged birds. If his Caucasian class includes nations or individuals speaking Arian (Greek)²³³, Turanian (Turk), and Semitic (Hebrew)

²³² Athena S. Leoussi, ‘Myths of Ancestry,’ *Nations and Nationalism* 7, no. 4 (October 1, 2001): p.475. According to van den Bosch, some wrongly observed Müller as the spiritual father of National Socialism. According to him, it was out of the 19th century context to argue that the term Aryan, following Müller’s definition, was similar in any way to the later perception of the Nazis. See: Lourens van den Bosch, *Friedrich Max Müller : A Life Devoted to Humanities* (Leiden, 2002), pp.204–6.

²³³ See footnote 227.

languages, it is not his fault. His system must not be altered in order to suit another system. There is a better solution both for his difficulties and for those of the phonologist than mutual compromise. The phonologist should collect his evidence, arrange his classes, divide and combine, as if no Blumenbach had ever looked at skulls, as if no Camper had measured facial angles, as if no Owen had examined the basis of a cranium. His evidence is the evidence of language, and nothing else; this he must follow, even though it be in the teeth of history, physical or political²³⁴.

The Teutonic heritage of England was central to Müller's discussions, especially in his correspondence with the English 'Teutonic circle'. The English Teutonic element, according to him, derived primarily from the fact that it belonged to the Low German dialect. The physical expert can claim that the skulls of the ancient English actually prove that the inhabitants of the island were Celtic and not Teutonic, but for Müller, as should be for any other philologist, language, and language alone matters the most: 'if every record were burnt, and every skull pulverized, the spoken language of the present day alone would enable the phonologist to say that English, as well as Dutch and Frisic, belongs to the Low German branch'²³⁵. For Müller, High German adjoined the Scandinavian languages and all together they formed the Teutonic family. This judgment of England's origins was part of a broader argument, which also comprised India, the birthplace of the Aryan languages. Here Müller mentioned all the prominent researchers of the physical racial doctrine, which identified several proto-types of human races. From the reading of Blumenbach, who recognized five different races, to Cuvier (three races) and Prichard (seven races), he concluded that 'it was felt that these physiological classifications could not be brought to harmonize with the evidence of language'²³⁶. Thus, no correlation was to be found between the spoken languages of people

²³⁴Originally, these words were written in a letter to Bunsen (1854). Later in 1891, Müller cited them in an article he published at *Science*. See: F. Max Müller, 'Anthropology Past and Present', *Science*, 18 (September 25, 1891): p.171.

²³⁵ Müller and Bunsen, *Letters to Chevalier Bunsen on the Classification of the Turanian Languages*, p.90.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*, p.91.

and their physical characters. Furthermore, after consulting the writings of the famed philosopher Wilhelm von Humboldt, Müller affirmed that even in terms of physical evidence one could not speak of races but of ‘varieties of men’²³⁷. There was a physical unity of mankind identical to the rest of the natural world, and hence ‘the common origin of the Negro and the Greek admits of as little doubt as that of the poodle and the greyhound’²³⁸.

From Müller’s letters, examined above, it can be concluded that he rejected the core aspects of the physical classification. Therefore, he strove primarily to differentiate between languages and not between races. This was also evident in the notes he wrote for the first course of lectures he held on comparative philology at Oxford (1851)²³⁹. In the original notes, later published in several editions, he named seven sub-branches that all belong to the Aryan family of languages²⁴⁰. Müller argued that one proto-language was the source of all the Aryan languages. Consequently, a long-lasting continuation had existed from pre-historic times until Modernity. Müller reaffirmed this notion in three lectures that he gave in 1888. In his third lecture, Müller focused on the alleged connection between the language people speak and their kinship to each other. In the same lecture, Müller also emphasized that throughout his academic career he declined any such linkage between race and language: ‘I have always...warned against mixing up these two relationships of language and the relationship of blood’²⁴¹. In one of Müller’s letters to Freeman, this previous assertion on race was advocated in definite words:

²³⁷ Ibid., p.92.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Bod., MS. Eng. d. 2353, Notes by Max Müller for his first course of lectures on comparative philology, given at Oxford, 1851.

²⁴⁰ The seven are Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, Latin, Teutonic, Celtic and Slavonic. See: Müller and Bunsen, *Letters to Chevalier Bunsen on the Classification of the Turanian Languages*, p.90.

²⁴¹ F. Max Müller, *Three Lectures on the Science of Language* (London, 1889), p.46

‘Race is built on sand – it may be very learned, but it will not stand a breath of harsh criticism’²⁴².

It is no coincidence that Müller wrote these words to Freeman since the latter was perhaps one of these scholars who, in Müller’s opinion, wrongly merged race with language. Despite this Müller and Freeman, as will be demonstrated shortly, saw eye to eye in regards to political issues such as the Franco-Prussian war or the Eastern question. For instance, following a harsh review of Freeman’s work in one of the newspapers, Freeman wrote the following words: ‘...in this very fortnightly article, though chiefly aimed at me, there is firing at Max Müller also. Now I have learned so much of Max, and therefore feel so much thankfulness to him, that I could never speak of him without the deepest respect, though I thought him never so wrong on any particular point’²⁴³.

In the same corpus of letters, Müller, wrote to Freeman about the term ‘Teutonic’ and its accurate denotation. As seen (see p.59ff.) Freeman used this term excessively also with reference to its racial-physical meaning and was inconsistent in referring to race. Sometimes, the concept reflected a solid scientific fact, yet in other cases, he presented it as a speculative concept. Freeman emphasized the fact that language actually has managed to endure the turbulences of time and merged the communities of Modernity with ancient ones. Race, through blood ties, purports to link the ancestors of the nation with their descendants. Language

²⁴² JRLM, MSS FA1/7/592, Müller to Freeman, 1 June 1870.

²⁴³ Bod. Ms. Bryce 7, fol. 179, Freeman to Bryce, 22 July, 1885; In another letter Freeman told Bryce ‘What reward should be given or love unto Max Müller? If Sir Jumbo is knight and C.B.D. Max must be made R.C.B. the least’. See: Bod. Ms. Bryce 7, fol. 216, Freeman to Bryce, 2 May, 1886.

has a comparable effect because the language once spoken by a certain group of people is still traceable in the present.

Nevertheless, a certain ambiguity surfaces in regards to Müller's approach. In one place he wrote that in the beginning of history a closer bond had existed between language and race, yet now they are detached:

Ethnological race and linguistic race are not commensurate, except in ante historical times, or perhaps at the very dawn of history. With the migrations of the tribes, their wars, their colonies, their conquest and alliances, which if we may judge from their effects, must have been much more violent in the ethnic than ever in the political periods of history, it is impossible to imagine that ethnological race and linguistic race should continue to run parallel²⁴⁴.

The ambiguity is enhanced by the fact that Müller defined the people who spoke the Aryan tongues as belonging to the Aryan race. For example, in his Gifford lectures, he referred several times to Aryan tongue and race: 'if we take the Semitic and the Aryan religions, any coincidences between them can be due to their common humanity only, except in cases where we can prove at a later time historical contact between an Aryan and a Semitic race'²⁴⁵. Only several pages later Müller mentioned the Aryan language: 'The utmost we can say is that there is an Aryan atmosphere pervading both philosophies, different from any Semitic atmosphere of thought, that there are certain deep grooves of thought traced by Aryan language in which the thoughts both of Indian and Greek philosophers had necessarily to move'²⁴⁶. Therefore, one almost inevitably can confuse the physical element with the linguistic one. Müller also spoke in the same lectures in terms of Aryan and Semitic thought. Hence, language embedded

²⁴⁴ Müller cited in Owen, 'Christian Bunsen and Liberal English Theology,' pp.21–2.

²⁴⁵ F. Max Müller, *Theosophy; Or, Psychological Religion ; the Gifford Lectures Delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1892* (London; New York, 1893), p.62.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., p.77.

a deep influence in the mental perceptions of people. For him, it was the fusion of Aryanism and Semitism that created Christianity²⁴⁷. Yet despite this fusion, Christianity was mainly derived from Aryan thought: ‘the very life-blood of Christianity, is exclusively Aryan, and that it is one of the simplest and truest conclusions at which the human mind can arrive...’²⁴⁸. This dominance of the Aryans is also evident in other places within Müller’s writings: ‘In continual struggle with each other and with the Semitic and Turanian races, these Aryan nations have become the rulers of history,...their mission to link all parts of the world together by the chains of civilization, commerce and religion’²⁴⁹. A similar remark could be easily attributed to Freeman who had his share of statements glorifying the supremacy of the Aryan race over other races.

In 1870, when tension between France and Germany grew rapidly, Müller consistently defended the policy of Bismarck in the English public sphere. When the war erupted (19 July 1870), he wrote five letters to *The Times* emphasizing German and English common relations and the right of Germany to annex the territories of Alsace-Lorraine. In the first letter sent to the Times in 29th August 1870, the words of Müller seem rather ironic, especially when one thinks of the bloody future awaiting England and Germany. Nevertheless, this belief in a special English-German bond was a dominant theme throughout the letters:

There need be no formal alliance between England and Germany. The two nations are one in all that is essential, in morality, in religion, in love of freedom, in respect for law. They are both hard workers, hard thinkers, and, when it must be, hard hitters too. In the whole history of modern Europe Germany and England have never been at war; I feel convinced they never will be, they never can be. We have

²⁴⁷ Ibid., p.447.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., p. X.

²⁴⁹ Bosch, *Friedrich Max Müller*, p.206.

both our weak and our strong points, and we know it; but it is neither English nor German to thank God that we are not like other people²⁵⁰.

With the heightened militaristic climate, it is possible to identify a certain more nationalistic stance of Müller regarding Germany's policy and its natural Teutonic superiority. Müller conducted a long correspondence with Gladstone hoping that the Prime Minister would support Germany's effort in the war against France. However, Müller was greatly disappointed as Gladstone rejected the German annexation of Alsace-Lorraine despite the latter's extensive connections with German statesmen and scholars including a personal friendship with Müller himself ²⁵¹. Müller's failure to convince Gladstone that Great Britain had to endorse the just German cause was expressed in a letter to Freeman: 'I am quite miserable about Gladstone - England will never have such an opportunity again - now it is lost...With Germany as a friend, the Black Sea question would have been solved amicably ...now the sin is sinned'²⁵². Müller knew exactly on what chords he was harping when mentioning the Black Sea problem to Freeman. Freeman became almost obsessed with the Eastern question and opposed the continuous alliance of Great Britain with the Ottoman Empire. For Freeman, as he told Bryce, the Ottoman repression of the Slavonic race prevented them from achieving progress and escape their miserable state: 'Now I don't say that Slavs could ever equal Dutchmen; but, poor dears, how can they improve, as long as they have the Turk over them?'²⁵³. Thus, the Teutons were unmatched in their qualities, but other races such as the Slavs could improve if they were only liberated.

²⁵⁰ Theodor Mommsen et., *Letters on the War between Germany and France* (London, 1871).

²⁵¹ Drey M. Schreuder, 'The Gladstone-Max Müller Debate on Nationality and German Unification: Examining a Victorian "controversy"', *Historical Studies* 18, no. 73 (1979): pp.561–2.

²⁵² JRLM, MSS FA1/7/596, Müller to Freeman, 12 November, 1870.

²⁵³ Bod. Ms. Bryce 6, fol. 117, Freeman to Bryce, 12 May, 1876.

Müller emphasized, in his above letter to Freeman, that despite the fact that their liberal associate, Gladstone, was then in power, the British policy in the East continued to take the same wrong path. Alas, Gladstone had not seized the moment and instead of aligning with Germany and gaining its support for the British interests in the East, he had decided to denounce Germany for its conduct in the war. The personal and the public spheres were both mingled in Müller's letter. Müller felt personally discouraged by Gladstone's response and also considered his position a grave strategic mistake for Great Britain and for the future of British-German relations. In another letter to Freeman from 27 November 1870, Müller described Gladstone's wrong approach. Gladstone, he asserted, cherished 'Roman and Romance sympathies' for France and 'He is fully convinced in his heart that every German is a heretic ... Protestant, a barbarian and a villain'²⁵⁴.

The terms 'Roman' and 'Barbarian' appear here for a reason. In Müller's eyes, Gladstone, with his High Church beliefs, argued that a cultural-historical chasm had alienated the Teutonic and the Roman worlds. It was not only a struggle of ancient times. France of the Second Empire symbolized the Roman Empire and Catholicism while Bismarckian Germany represented the Germanic tribes and Protestantism. Müller's perception of Gladstone's views, either true or false, reflected his own understanding of the ancient Teutonic-Roman relations. Furthermore, it is also possible to assume that Müller perceived Gladstone as leaning towards Rome and against the Teutonic tribes.

²⁵⁴ JRLM, MSS FA1/7/597, Müller to Freeman, 27 November, 1870.

Müller approved of the theory that a deep-rooted animosity existed throughout history between the two cultures (the French and German), as he adopted such an explanation even before the deterioration of the Franco-Prussian relations. Through this, he again ‘joined forces’ with the English-Teutonic circle. Müller emphasized the historic alliance between the Anglo-Saxon nations which must have practical ramifications on the policy of both governments. Just before his death, Müller published several letters in the German press supporting the British policy against the Boers in the Transvaal. In his opening remarks, he tried to gain the support of the German public by stressing their blood ties with the English:

Germans, instead of looking for true blood relations and allies for the future in England and America, have sought for them in France and Russia. They may look for a long time. I hope they will discover, before it is too late, that blood is thicker than ink, and that the Saxons of Germany, England and America are the true, manly and faithful allies in all struggles for freedom in the future as in the past ²⁵⁵.

Charles Kingsley and Müller: The Collaboration of Teutonism and Protestantism

Müller’s approach could also be noted in his association with another very prominent figure of the same years, the author and historian Charles Kingsley (1819-75). From the 1850s, Müller and Kingsley exchanged multiple letters. Kingsley was related to Müller through marriage. Kingsley was an Anglican clergyman, novelist and the Regius professor of Modern History in Cambridge (1860-9). His niece, Georgina Adelaide (1834/5–1916), married Müller in 1859 after long years of courtship by Müller whose requests to marry Georgina had been refused again and again by her father. After the final approval of their marriage, preceded by years of disappointment, Müller sent Kingsley, who was deeply involved in the proceedings, the

²⁵⁵ F. Max Müller with rejoinders by Theodor Mommsen, *The Question of Right between England and the Transvaal: Letters* (London, January 1, 1900), p.1.

following words: ‘Can you believe it? I cannot, though I see her with my eyes...you are not angry with me? Do not let us think of the past –it was so dark and awful, and the world around us is so happy and bright...no cloud anywhere...I long to see my dear new aunt, my old dear friend, Mr. Kingsley’²⁵⁶. These words and the personal affinity between the two are significant, since as I will show, it may have determined the evaluation of Kingsley’s work by Müller.

In terms of world-view, Kingsley was an Anglican engaged with the Christian socialists who attacked the Oxford Movement fiercely²⁵⁷. Kingsley because of his favour of Protestantism was admired by Bunsen and Prince Albert, another great supporter of Teutonic notions²⁵⁸. As a result of his admiration of Kingsley, Prince Albert nominated him to be the Queen’s preacher in 1859. A year later, he acted as Kingsley’s main advocate for election to the post of Regius professor in Cambridge²⁵⁹. Bunsen, after reading several of Kingsley’s historical novels, praised him in an unprecedented way: ‘I do not hesitate to call these two works, the Saint’s Tragedy and Hypatia, by far the most important and perfect of this genial writer. In these more particularly I find the justification of a hope which I beg to be allowed to express--that Kingsley might continue Shakespeare’s historical plays. I have for several years made no secret of it, that Kingsley seems to me the genius of our century’²⁶⁰.

²⁵⁶ Bod., Ms. Eng. d. 2362, fols. 124-5, Müller to Kingsley, August 1859.

²⁵⁷ See later discussion on the Oxford Movement, pp. 196-7.

²⁵⁸ Linda Colley famously illustrates how during the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries the significance of Protestantism was vital in the development of ‘Britishness’. This feeling defined the French, Celts and Catholics as the ultimate ‘other’. See: Linda Colley, *Britons : Forging the Nation, 1707-1837* (London, 2003[1992]).

²⁵⁹ Norman Vance, ‘Kingsley, Charles (1819–75)’, *ODNB*, (Oxford, 2004), accessed 10 Dec. 2014 at <http://www.oxforddnb.com/index/101015617/Charles-Kingsley>.

²⁶⁰ Cited by Müller in his preface to Kingsley’s book *The Roman and Teuton*. See: F. Max Müller and Charles Kingsley, *The Roman and the Teuton: A Series of Lectures Delivered Before the University of Cambridge* (London, 1891 [1864]), p. XIII.

Here, however, another major issue arises which is the religious Protestant-Anglican affinity between the scholars. Kingsley on the English side and Bunsen and Müller on the German one, resented Roman Catholic and High Church inclinations. Kingsley, for instance, attacked English women who converted to Catholicism in fierce words and accused them of harming English unity²⁶¹. In Germany, especially after the unification, there was a tendency for homogeneity around the protestant Prussian elements which were the leading force in the unification process. This came at the expense of other groups that were under pressure to assimilate and also caused strife as can be seen in the *kulturkampf* against the Catholics²⁶².

For individuals like Kingsley, Catholicism and the Roman Empire were almost synonyms. For this reason, they depicted the separation from the Catholic Church during the Reformation as the second awakening of the Germanic tribes against the tyranny of Rome. Already during the Reformation, Luther and his predecessors, as will be discussed in the next chapter, spoke in similar terms and elevated the myth of the Germanic tribes as symbolizing the new forces of Protestantism. Catholic France of the nineteenth century signified another version of Imperial Rome and therefore the Anglican/Protestant allies of England and Germany should, in his view, stand united in front of the Roman oppressor.

Müller and Kingsley converge in their shared insights of Protestantism and Teutonism.

In a letter to Kingsley from 1867 Müller wrote:

²⁶¹ Banton, *The Idea of Race*, p.70.

²⁶² There is a debate in the research concerning the true essence of the *Kulturkampf*. The conventional view observes a clear dichotomy and constant strife between Protestants and Catholics. Oliver Zimmer, however, presents a rather more ambiguous reality in which Christianity was key in bridging the gap between the Protestants and Catholics as exemplified in the Corpus Christi Processions in three German towns. See: Oliver Zimmer, 'Beneath the "Culture War": Corpus Christi Processions and Mutual Accommodation in the Second German Empire', *The Journal of Modern History* 82, no. 2 (2010): pp. 293–5.

A man must dare to have friends, and dare to have enemies – and so must a people. The natural ally of England is Germany, that is to say, a united, sensible governed, protestant and Northern German. England and Germany will represent the Teutonic element in Europe, with all that is good and bad in it; and, if united by common objectives, they will stand like a breakwater between the Romans and Roman Catholics in the West and South, and the Slavs and Greeks in the East and North ²⁶³.

Once more, though in this occasion before the Franco-Prussian war, Müller connected England and Germany through their shared Teutonic heritage. These Teutonic nations are destined, as they had in the past, to confront the Roman danger. The Roman ‘enemy’ was embodied both in the ancient empire as well as in its relatively ‘modern’ heirs, the Catholic Church and the nations of France and Italy. The struggle with the Roman power commenced in Antiquity and proceeded into the present. It runs through history and cannot be detached from it. From the above letter, it is evident that the clash was not only against Rome, but also versus the Slavs and Greeks. In another letter to the theologian and Church historian A.P. Stanley (1815–81), Müller repeated these arguments: ‘What Savages we are in spite of all these centuries. But surely the Teutonic race is better than the Latin and Slavonic, and the Protestants are better Christians than the Romans and the German cause is surely thoroughly righteous, and the French fully unrighteous’²⁶⁴. The fact that the Slavonic and the Latin races were part of the Aryan race does not matter, since there was an inner hierarchy within the Aryan race which was also dependent on religious affinities. Consequently, due to their Protestant beliefs the Teutonic nations of England and Germany were superior to the Latin and Slavonic nations.

The exact same ideas appeared in particular in *The Roman and the Teuton*. Müller, due to his personal association with Kingsley, even wrote the preface for the second edition of this

²⁶³ Müller quoted in Bosch, *Friedrich Max Müller*, p.99.

²⁶⁴ Ibid.

book. Kingsley's book began with an allegory about the relations between Rome and the Germanic tribes: within a certain wood lived a group of children, who were nourished and subsisted from the surrounding nature. At one point, the provisions of the wood were not sufficient and the children wished to enter a nearby fenced garden that was inhabited by trolls. The children relentlessly attempted to breach the fence, yet the trolls managed to scatter them. Some children were successful in their mission and settled in the garden. Those inside were spoiled by its richness and wondrous provisions, even though they suffered from the trolls, and became corrupted by their way of life. The rumours from within the garden walls reached the children outside, a fact that only urged the ones outside to reattempt their entry. Eventually the garden walls were breached and the children broke in. Nevertheless, once the abundance of the garden was in their hands, instead of remaining united, the children, to the joy of the trolls, began to fight against each other and were divided into various factions. As a result, all the spoils of the garden were lost, everything remained in ruin, and the children returned to the woods²⁶⁵.

The children signified the Germanic tribes while the Roman Empire was represented by the trolls. The major contrast between the two was of age. The children/tribes were youthful and carried with them great vitality and freshness but also recklessness. Rome was of a different race (trolls), old, corrupted and too accustomed to fortune and wealth, yet it had gained vast experience from years of dominance. The struggle was therefore between the old world and the new one and also between two races. With this fable, Kingsley initiated his first lecture as a Cambridge professor. The primary interpretation of the fable is that the Teutonic

²⁶⁵ Charles Kingsley, *The Roman and the Teuton*, pp.1–5.

tribes acted in a very irresponsible manner. Therefore, Kingsley, despite the fact that he adored the tribes, still criticized them and wished his students to learn a lesson from the ill- behaviour of their ancestors. The tribes had still possessed a certain childish vitality, i.e. promising potential, which allowed them, if guided, to conquer the Roman world: ‘To-day, I wish to impress strongly on your minds this childishness of our forefathers. For good or for evil they were great boys; very noble boys; very often very naughty boys--as boys with the strength of men might well be. Try to conceive such to yourselves, and you have the old Markman, Allman, Goth, Lombard, Saxon, Frank’²⁶⁶. Diverse characteristics were attributed to the various tribes which have been, as in the case of the Franks (France) and Visigoths (Spain), preserved until modern times. According to Kingsley, these definitions included certain truths with one glaring exception; his own Saxons-English were not as cruel as illustrated²⁶⁷.

In terms of racial superiority, Kingsley asserted that previous attempts by Gibbon and others to compare the Teutonic tribes with the Red Indians must be rejected. The Teutons have been in a constant state of growth and expansion: ‘proving their youthful strength and vitality by a reproduction unparalleled, as far as I know, in history, save perhaps by that noble and young race, the Russian’²⁶⁸. While the Indians were ‘a decreasing race’. In addition, the modern Teutonic states and their creeds, as in the case of the English (unwritten) constitution, are founded on Teutonic laws and customs, while the Indians left no heritage. He concluded the comparison with the Indians by writing that: ‘...if Gibbon was right, and if our forefathers in the German forests had been like Powhattan's people as we found them in the Virginian forests,

²⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 6.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., pp.7-8.

²⁶⁸ Ibid., p.8.

the Romans would not have been long in civilizing us off the face of the earth'²⁶⁹. Kingsley here referred back to his fable. He attempted to preserve the vitality of the tribes, while avoiding the corruptive effects of their transformation into rulers. Nevertheless, he wished to prevent their Romanization. The key notions here are those of survival and racial growth. The fact that the 'Teutonic race' was not only able to survive the might of the empire but also to topple it, verifies its racial predominance. The growth of the race, despite the unceasing dangers, just adds a numerical proof that integrates a natural/physical prevalence which is absent from some other races²⁷⁰.

Kingsley, writing this book in 1864 was of course aware of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1858). Before publishing his book, Darwin sent the manuscript to Kingsley and other individuals for a preliminary review. Kingsley's response was very favourable as he stated in a letter sent to Darwin²⁷¹. Later he wrote to his friend and fellow Christian socialist, the reverend F. D. Maurice that 'Darwin is conquering everywhere, and rushing in like a flood, by the mere force of truth and fact'²⁷². Kingsley was also acquainted with Herbert Spencer, whom he already met in the 1850's. Spencer, who also received Darwin's manuscript, coined in 1864

²⁶⁹ Ibid., p.9.

²⁷⁰ The Teutonic ability to expand despite the numerous perils resembles the miraculous experience of the Israelites in Egypt who became stronger and greater in numbers in the face of growing Egyptian oppression. See: Exodus, 1, 12- 'But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew'. 'כאשר יענו אותם, כן ירבה וכן יפרוץ' שמות א, יב, 'כאשר יענו אותם, כן ירבה וכן יפרוץ'.

²⁷¹ Kingsley to Darwin, 'Darwin Correspondence Project » Letter: 2534', 18 November, 1859, accessed 10 Dec. 2014 at <http://www.darwinproject.ac.uk/letter/entry-2534>.

²⁷² Charles Kingsley and Frances Eliza Grenfell Kingsley, *Charles Kingsley; His Letters and Memoires of His Life* (2 vol., London, 1877), II, p.171; in another letter to Huxley the influence of the *Origin of Species* is again noticeable. See: Jonathan Conlin, *Evolution and the Victorians: Science, Culture and Politics in Darwin's Britain*, (London, 2014), p.108.

the phrase ‘the survival of the fittest’. It is, therefore, probable that certain notions in Kingsley's explanation of Teutonic survival were inspired by both Darwin and Spencer²⁷³.

The tribes, according to Kingsley, introduced a new vigorous era, which replaced the waning tyranny of Rome. The decaying Rome should not to be compared with the British Empire but with the contemporary Ottoman and Chinese Empires. In all of these empires, morality was absent while ‘cunning and force’ held the upper-hand. The ill-treatment of slaves, for instance, was unprecedented in comparison to all other historical eras. They were brutalized and exploited in the most horrific method. Thus, Kingsley claimed, to compare the slavery of the blacks in the Southern states of America with those of Rome would be erroneous: ‘Roman domestic slavery is not to be described by a pen of an Englishman. And I must express my sorrow, that in the face of such notorious facts, some have of late tried to prove American slavery to be as bad as, or even worse than, that of Rome. God forbid! Whatsoever may have been the sins of the Southern gentleman, he is at least a Teuton, and not a Roman’²⁷⁴. The fact that the Southern slave-traders were of Teutonic descent reflected a non-transient advantage, reliant on the racial element. For Kingsley, this Teutonic aspect was also the main strength of the British Empire. The empire originated from the early Saxon settlers who created a safe haven of independent Teutonic culture, which was not tangled with the inner struggles that tore the other Teutonic nations apart²⁷⁵.

Müller, as mentioned, wrote the preface to this book and thus showed his endorsement of the essence of the content, notwithstanding his reservations. The beginning of his preface

²⁷³ J. M. I. Klaver, *The Apostle of the Flesh : A Critical Life of Charles Kingsley* (Leiden, 2006), pp.246–8.

²⁷⁴ Kingsley, *Roman and Teuton*, p.20 (footnote 1)

²⁷⁵ Ibid.

was not complimentary: he opened it by stating that Kingsley's lectures include many shortcomings. They are not critical, original or derived from long academic research, nevertheless he declared 'I am not so blinded by my friendship to Kingsley as to say that these lectures are throughout what academical [*sic*] lectures ought to be'²⁷⁶. This may sound like a contradiction, but for Müller this was precisely Kingsley's intention. As the latter declared, he was not pretending to teach history. Kingsley, Müller asserted, was a teacher and a preacher who desired to inspire his students. The apologetic tone of Müller should not be surprising, since the publication of the first edition of the book brought about harsh criticism. Interestingly enough, Freeman led the attack. Freeman, in a scorching critique of Kingsley, argued that he was unsuitable for his professorship in Cambridge as could be proven in *The Roman and Teuton*. In his view, Kingsley lacked sufficient academic tools and professional stature. One detail that Freeman became preoccupied with was that throughout *The Roman and Teuton*, Kingsley referred to the king of the Ostrogoths by the name of Dietrich, instead of Theodoric²⁷⁷. On 25 November 1875, Müller wrote to Freeman following the latter's criticism of the book: '...that the new edition of the Roman and Teuton to which my preface belongs, is not yet out, so please do not strangle the unborn baby. Kingsley was one of my oldest friends and my wife's uncle. If you had known him, you could have understood why so many people were devoted to him'²⁷⁸.

It appears from this letter and from parts of the preface, that Müller 'defended' Kingsley mainly because of their personal ties. However, the main conclusion is that the notion of

²⁷⁶ Ibid., p.X.

²⁷⁷ Edward A. Freeman, 'Mr. Kingsley's Roman and Teuton', *SR* 17, no. 441 (April 9, 1864): pp. 446–8.

²⁷⁸ JRLM, MSS FA1/7/602, Müller to Freeman, 25 November, 1875.

Teutonic supremacy, echoed throughout the book, was far from being alien to Müller. Without a doubt, Müller, in most cases, rejected the physical aspect as segregating people, while promoting the theory that languages were the primary method of classification. Nevertheless as mentioned, racial references can be found in some of his writings too.

Admiration and Criticism

The perception that the German and English were part of the same historic and ethnic community became more and more prevalent among writers like Müller and Kingsley. However, as will be elaborated at this stage, this view was not only relevant to the perception of the past, but formed a present community of historians. Reinhold Pauli, another German historian, also belonged to the same milieu of English and German scholars. Pauli's uniqueness, in comparison to Bunsen, Müller and other German scholars, was that he devoted his main research to English history. His preeminent work depicted the life of the most celebrated individual in the early history of England, King Alfred the Great. Pauli became the leading German historian writing on English historical themes.

In a letter to Freeman, Bryce gave an early account of his first ever meeting with Pauli, who left upon him a great impression as an expert on English affairs: 'coming back through Tyrol we met with a certain Dr. Reinhold Pauli, Professor at Tübingen, author of a history of England which you probably know... . He spoke English perfectly and seemed ... very familiar with the institutions'²⁷⁹. Later Freeman urged Bryce to introduce his work to Pauli, since the latter can assist the positive reception of his (Freeman's) work in Germany: 'Does he [Pauli]

²⁷⁹Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, fol.31, Bryce to Freeman, 17 October, 1863.

know anything about me? It might be no bad thing if he did. I don't know whether my *Hist. Vol.* has been noticed in any of the German (as distinguished from Swiss) reviews, though I know it was sent to several of them'²⁸⁰. In another subsequent letter, Freeman agreed to review Pauli's work in one of the British newspapers following Bryce's request, however, this approval came with a 'price' : 'I shall very glad to do [review] Reinhold Pauli when I come back . . . You may as well introduce my *Norman Conquest* to Pauli. He may help it somewhat in Deutschland'²⁸¹. Eventually Freeman, as he told Bryce, received the praise and recognition of Pauli:

Many thanks for Pauli – may I keep him? If not, how can I get another? That is the sort of thing one really values, though I hope I will do something in the *Zeitschrift* also - perhaps now it may be better for him and for anybody else to wait till vol. II is out ...Ellis told me that he had read some high Dutchman judgment of me, that I was '*ein sehr eingehender Mann*' [a very respectable man], which was very pleasant to know, but he could not tell me who it was or where or what about²⁸².

Thus, Pauli added, probably following Bryce's request, a positive review of Freeman in the relatively newly established *Historische Zeitschrift*, founded by Heinrich von Sybel in 1859. As Bryce wrote to Freeman: 'The last number of Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift* contains a review of the Norman conquest, Vol.I, by R. Pauli which seemed to me, as far as I could make out in the two or three minutes I had to glance at it, very satisfactory'²⁸³. Freeman, despite the positive view and recognition by Pauli, was not satisfied with the fact that his books left a limited impression on the general German academic sphere. As he wrote to Bryce: 'I find my books in several libraries, but I rather think *Fed. Gov.* is the better known of the two.

²⁸⁰ Ibid.

²⁸¹ Bod., Ms. Bryce 5, fol.147, Freeman to Bryce, 7 April, 1867.

²⁸² Bod., Ms. Bryce 5, fol. 179, Freeman to Bryce, 26 January, 1868.

²⁸³ Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, fol. 127, Bryce to Freeman, 14 October, 1868.

[Historical] *Essays* seeing not at all-notwithstanding Pauli's review in Sybel-which I am sorry for'²⁸⁴. Bryce himself, similar to Freeman, also criticized several years earlier the German papers, since they lack sufficient interest in foreign affairs as well as in English politics. He himself considered writing something for a German newspaper in order to 'give them more correct notions of our politics'²⁸⁵.

Pauli, as also seen through the correspondence above, became the leading reviewer of works by English historians especially in the *Zeitschrift*²⁸⁶. Among these reviews, as the one mentioned above of the *Norman Conquest*, quite a few concentrated on the works of Freeman and Stubbs. In his review of Freeman's *Historical Essays* from 1872, Pauli praised the former's interest in German history and politics: 'Auf seine germanistische Grundanschauung, seine Freude auch an deutscher Geschichte und den verschiedenen politischen zwischen Bundes-und Einheitsstaat sich hinziehenden Abwandlungen im Leben aller Germanen ist in diesen Blättern schon öfter hingewiesen worden'²⁸⁷. Pauli, writing the review a short time after the cessation of hostilities between Germany and France, supported Freeman's stance that France promoted a distorted historical narrative. One of the falsifications proposed that Charlemagne was in fact a French-born Emperor and the ancestor of Bonaparte. Another fabrication allegedly proved that parts of Germany belonged historically to the natural boundaries of France. Deriving from these misrepresentations, France had acted violently for hundreds of years, a conduct defined by Pauli as the '*Gewalthandlungen der Franzosen*' [atrocities of the French]²⁸⁸. Pauli actually

²⁸⁴ Bod. Ms. Bryce 6, fol.12, Freeman to Bryce, 9 July, 1872.

²⁸⁵ Bod. Ms. Bryce 9, fol. 127, Bryce to Freeman, 14 October, 1868.

²⁸⁶ Wende, 'Views and Reviews', p.176.

²⁸⁷ Reinhold Pauli, 'Review of Historical Essays by Edward A. Freeman', *Historische Zeitschrift* 28, no. 1 (January 1, 1872):s.156

²⁸⁸ Ibid., s.158.

accentuated here that Freeman affirmed Germany's historical right to the newly acquired territorial possessions of Alsace-Lorraine.

The positive view of Freeman continued also with the German-Jewish historian Felix Liebermann (1851-1925), Pauli's follower and another German historian of Anglo-Saxon England. In an article written two years after Freeman's death, he portrayed him as a most prolific individual. Besides retaining vast knowledge in the history of Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Freeman also held a well-structured ideology that included a strong ethical core with the love of freedom and of his fatherland²⁸⁹. For him, politics and history were welded, and for that reason Freeman should be valued for both his academic and general achievements. Yet, according to Liebermann, it was exactly this amalgamation between the political and the historical that branded some of Freeman's arguments as very problematic. In his introduction to a book about the Anglo-Saxon elders assembly or *Witenagemot*, Liebermann argued that the ultra-nationalistic view of Freeman damaged his historical interpretation: '...the historian of the Norman conquest was seduced by fervent patriotism and democratic bias to vindicate the origin of parliament for the Old English people alone...' ²⁹⁰. Freeman ignored the significance of the *Witan* in other places outside England. Unlike Freeman, Liebermann noted in the same paragraph, both Stubbs and the Anglo-Saxon historian John Mitchell Kemble (1807–57) presented the concept of the *Witan* as an objective, far less nationalistic term.

In his review of Stubbs's *Constitutional History*, Pauli stressed the role of the former as a bridgehead between the two academic spheres, a role that beforehand was fulfilled by the

²⁸⁹Felix Liebermann, 'Review of Historical Essays by Edward A. Freeman,' *Historische Zeitschrift* 72, no. 2 (January 1, 1894): S.295–300.

²⁹⁰ Felix Liebermann, *The National Assembly in the Anglo-Saxon Period* (Halle a.S, 1913), p.2.

scholarship of Kemble: ‘Ueberhaupt hat sich seit Kemble kein englischer Historiker dermassen mit der parallen Deutschen Forschung vertrat zu machen gemußt’²⁹¹. Kemble, himself, was very much influenced by German scholarship. He was in close relationship with Jacob Grimm and became an expert in German philology. He even married Natalie Auguste, the daughter of the German scholar Amadeus Wendt (1783–1836)²⁹². Stubbs, similar to Kemble and contrary to the suspicion of many of his contemporaries, became a great admirer of German scholarship. As he specified, one should ‘not believe that they want to take from us anything...or that they want to engross to themselves by conquest the whole domain of historical knowledge. But I am sure that they have a great object to increase human knowledge ...to perfect the instruments of historical study’²⁹³. Freeman himself was a bit more sceptical about German scholarship. Stubbs probably referred to him, when stating that several English historians questioned the value of German scholarship. One major difference between the two scholars was that Stubbs insisted on adopting the German historical method in full, while Freeman sought to preserve some of the ‘uniqueness’ of English historiography. In a very remarkable passage, Freeman attacked the habit of his era to cherish almost sacredly every German book. He advocated for the independence of English scholars and emphasized their relative advantage over German scholars:

I only demand the right to keep our independence, and to believe that on many matters of historical learning an Englishman — an Englishman on either side of Ocean — is better fitted to judge than a German. A Swiss or a Norwegian may judge of the workings of free constitutions in old Greece, in Italy, in any other land, because he, like the Englishman, has daily experience of their working in his

²⁹¹Reinhold Pauli, ‘Review of The Constitutional History of England in Its Origin and Development by William Stubbs’, *Historische Zeitschrift* 33, no. 1 (January 1, 1875): s.128.

²⁹² John D. Haigh, ‘Kemble, John Mitchell (1807–57)’, *ODNB* (Oxford, 2004), accessed 11 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/15321>.

²⁹³ William Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects*, p.71.

own land. But these things are mysteries to German professors, because they are mysteries to German statesmen also. The German scholar simply reads in a book of things which we are always looking at and acting in. He therefore utterly fails to understand many things at Athens or Rome or anywhere else which come to us like our ABC²⁹⁴.

The free institutions of England, Switzerland and America granted their historians enhanced comprehension of their true meaning. The direct and intimate experience is therefore vital for the historian, and one sometimes must live and grow within a certain historical phenomenon for evaluating its true nature. For instance, the German historian and archaeologist Ernst Curtius (1814-96)²⁹⁵, despite his great knowledge of Greece, misinterpreted the real meaning of the Athenian assemblies, as perceived profoundly by the English scholar George Grote (1794-1871).

From Curtius, Freeman turned his focus to Theodor Mommsen, the man he described as the greatest of all living historians. A great scholar, acquainted with all fields of historical research who wrote a masterpiece on the Roman Republic²⁹⁶. This appreciation of Mommsen can be explicitly seen in an article entitled ‘Mommsen’s History of Rome’²⁹⁷. In an appendix attached to his main article, Freeman identified three primary assets of Mommsen. In terms of the knowledge of the facts, no one can match Mommsen. One can argue against his interpretation of the facts but his learning was almost unprecedented. Furthermore, Mommsen wrote clearly and knew how ‘to tell a story’, a fact that distinguished him from Niebuhr, who

²⁹⁴Edward A. Freeman, *The Methods of Historical Study with Eight Lectures Read in the University of Oxford in...1884, with the Inaugural Lecture on the Office of the Historical Professor* (London, 1886), pp.289–90.

²⁹⁵ Heinz Kähler, ‘Curtius, Ernst’, In: *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 3, 1957, accessed 12 Feb. 2015 at <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/ppn116766557.html>.

²⁹⁶ Freeman, *The Methods of Historical Study*, pp. 291-2.

²⁹⁷ Edward A. Freeman, ‘Mommsen’s History of Rome’, in *Historical Essays: Second Series* (London, 1873; first Published *National Review*, April 1859), pp. 234–65.

‘could not tell a story’. For these reasons, he replaced Niebuhr as the main authority for Roman history in Oxford²⁹⁸.

Nevertheless, Freeman defined Mommsen’s book as extremely dangerous. Among several other less crucial faults, the main fault of Mommsen was that he omitted from his *Roman History* a very important aspect crucial for every historian. This is the moral aspect that distinguishes between right and wrong in history. In other words, in the eyes of Freeman, the fact that Mommsen did not judge the ethical implications of historical events and the deeds of individuals was highly problematic, especially because of Mommsen’s grand stature which prevented or hindered criticism against his judgments. Freeman also stressed in his passage at the *Methods of Historical Study* that Mommsen embraced this immoral vision of history as a consequence of the fact that he, like Curtius before him, never lived under a culture which incorporated free institutions. In both articles, Freeman maintained that Mommsen supported the usage of force by the dominant powers in history, while belittling the aspiration to defy them. For this reason, Freeman, despite his esteem of Mommsen, still classified him as a ‘harmful’ historian. In a letter he sent to Bryce, when visiting Germany, he commented that his criticism of Mommsen was not only his own opinion but reflected the observations of many German scholars: ‘I have been drinking beer with many professors... everybody that I have talked to seems to think of Mommsen as much as I do, ... Waits [Waitz], I take it, is the really great man’²⁹⁹.

²⁹⁸ Edward A. Freeman, ‘Mommsen History of Rome -Appendix from SR, March 28, 1868’, in *Historical Essays: Second Series* (London, 1873), p.267.

²⁹⁹ Bod. Ms. Bryce 6, fol. 12, Freeman to Bryce 9 July, 1872.

Freeman himself was also criticized by German historians and in particular by Pauli. According to the latter, he ignored the work of some pivotal German historians such as Lappenberg, who had already researched Anglo-Saxon England in the 1830's. In addition, he did not implement key methods of German historiography. These methods, conceptualized in particular by the likes of Ranke and Droysen, urged the historian to delve into the research of unintentional sources found principally in the archives. Freeman, nevertheless, hardly consulted with these types of sources and was known for his excessive reliance on his own library³⁰⁰.

Stubbs's stature, on the other hand, remained unscathed. As he once remarked, his works were better received in Germany than in England: 'I can only say that I hope my work has not been unworthy of Oxford, or of England. Judging from the reception accorded to it, I think I should say that it has met with more appreciative and intelligent reception in Germany than in England'³⁰¹. Stubbs integrated the German historical method and was considered a professional historian. In an obituary in Germany, Stubbs's qualities, together with those of Freeman and Thomas Carlyle, were highly praised: 'Seine Berufsgenossen, insbesondere die Deutschen, deren Nationalität seine volle Sympathie wie die Freeman's und ja auch diejenige Th. Carlyle's galt, schätzten Stubbs' Forschungs und Arbeitsweise ungemein hoch, und er geniesst als Historiker einen unerschütterlich Ruhm infolge angedeuteten Gewissenhaftigkeit, Sorgfalt und Objektivität'³⁰².

³⁰⁰ Wende, 'Views and Reviews: Mutual Perceptions of British and German Historians in Late Nineteenth Century', pp.276–7.; Hesketh, *The Science of History in Victorian Britain*, p. 118.

³⁰¹ Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects*, p.32.

³⁰² Ludwig Fränkel, 'Zwei Eben Verstorbene Anglikanische Bischöfe Und Historiker', *Anglia - Zeitschrift Für Englische Philologie* 24, (1901): s.398-9.

Following the reception of Freeman and Stubbs by German scholars together with their own assessment of the German historians, the conclusion is that mutual appreciation thrived between the historians of the two nations. Yet, along with this aspect, there were also traces of criticism and suspicion. This, I maintain, does not shatter the argument that certain German and English historians shaped a shared community that exchanged thoughts directly and indirectly on the foundations of a mutual past and present. Within any community and maybe as a sign of its strength, discrepancies occur. This may testify to the fact that this was a flourishing intellectual community that included a variety of opinions. Thus, a common ground existed and all the members of the community, despite several differences, argued for a joint Teutonic origin.

Stubbs probed into the writings of many leading German historians. The key figures among these, as Pauli noted following Stubbs, were the historian von Maurer and Georg Waitz (1813-86). In 1854, Maurer presented the concept of *Markgenossenschaft* [land companionships]³⁰³. He held that the term *Mark* denoted a public shared land which had been divided in between the members of the tribe. Only with the implementation of Roman law, the idea of privately owned land had arisen. Thus, beforehand no evidence of private ownership existed among the German tribes. Maurer based his thesis on ancient writers headed by Caesar and Tacitus who had mentioned that the tribes lacked any possession of private lands. Therefore, when Tacitus mentioned that the Germanic tribes possessed land, *ager* in Latin, he

³⁰³ As Stubbs wrote when describing the 'Mark' system: 'The great authority on this is G. L. von Maurer, who has collected and arranged an enormous quantity of material on the subject'. See: Stubbs, *The Constitutional History of England*, I, p.49 (footnote 1).

actually meant public land – *ager publicus*, since these two terms had been identical concepts³⁰⁴.

The substantial factor about the *Mark* was that it embodied the core of the Teutonic society. The liberty and communal aspect of the Teutonic nations emerged from the *Mark*. Subsequently, the constitutional system of England had also originated from the marshlands and forests of Germany. For Stubbs, this meant that ‘The history of Germany is bound up with our national and natural identity’³⁰⁵. Rome, therefore, as in Kingsley’s position, remained almost detached from the Teutonic sphere.

Stubbs himself was described by Freeman as the ‘Waitz of Germany’³⁰⁶. This comparison between the two figures resulted from the fact that Waitz’s magnum opus, the *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*³⁰⁷, correlated with Stubbs’s *Constitutional History*. The two works were published almost simultaneously and both authors studied the constitutional history of their own nations. Stubbs also referred repeatedly to Waitz in his *Constitutional*. It is also likely that Stubbs initiated his own research after reading Waitz’s, who concluded his first volumes of the *Verfassungsgeschichte* prior to Stubbs. It appears there was a methodological comparability between the two authors in their works on the constitutions. In his eight-volume book, Waitz presented the history of the growth of the German constitution since Roman times, while depending heavily on *Germania* of Tacitus, till the modern era. He obviously embraced the Teutonic interpretation and linked the Anglo-Saxon branch with the

³⁰⁴ Maurer, *Einleitung Zur Geschichte Der Mark-, Hof-, Dorf- Und Stadtverfassung*, s. 93.

³⁰⁵ Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects*, p.70.

³⁰⁶ Freeman, *The Methods of Historical Study*, p.289.

³⁰⁷ Georg Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*., 3e Aufl. (Kiel, 1880).

early Germans. He held close connections with Stubbs, and the two historians even met several times, especially when Stubbs travelled to Germany. A circle was formed around them that also included Pauli and his disciple Liebermann. Stubbs, for example, as Liebermann attested, met the latter in the library of Göttingen University while he visited Waitz and Pauli³⁰⁸. A letter to Lieberman from June 4th 1883 revealed the intellectual and personal relations between Stubbs and the three German historians. In a letter written a short while after Pauli's death, Stubbs accepted the request to dedicate an article to Pauli's memory. Stubbs also told Libereman about a future work he was involved in with Pauli and Waitz:

When I saw Waitz last year at Würzburg, he told me to correspond with you about it. But I am in total ignorance of Pauli's plan of working; and, as I should be sorry to drop out of my share in the great work, I will ask you to keep me up to the mark in the way of information and preparation. Pauli, in his last letter, told me that he had a set of sheets of the early Anglo-Saxon historians which he had prepared for Waitz, which sheets he would send me when he had an opportunity³⁰⁹.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica

The 'great work' Stubbs mentioned was the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. This project began already in 1819 when Baron von Stein founded the *Gesellschaft für altere deutsche Geschichtskunde* which included many prominent German scholars. In 1823, this became, under the editorship of Georg Heinrich Pertz (1795-1876), the *Monumenta Germanica Historica*³¹⁰. The scholars of the *Monumenta* wished to define the scope of German national history and the geographical range of German cultural influence. This became a national

³⁰⁸ William Stubbs, *Letters of William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, 1825-1901*, ed. by William Holden Hutton (London, 1904), pp.179–80.

³⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 142.

³¹⁰ Patrick J. Geary, *The Myth of Nations : The Medieval Origins of Europe* (Princeton, NJ; Oxford, 2002),p.26.

project which was enhanced following the recognition by statesmen that national history can function as a powerful state tool. The fact that historians like Waitz, who replaced Peretz in 1873 as the editor of the *Monumenta*, were also involved with state affairs contributed, of course, to this comprehension. According to the historical vision of the *Monumeta*, all of Merovingian and Carolingian History actually belonged to German history. The implications in regards to the territorial influence were that historically the German sphere included major parts of the territories of nineteenth century France, Belgium, Italy and Spain. The tribes which had settled around the territories of the Roman Empire, the Visigoths of Spain, the Frisians of the Netherlands, the Lombard's of Italy, were also 'Germanized' by the *Monumenta*³¹¹.

When heading the *Monumenta*, Waitz commenced, together with Pauli, with a plan to merge the Anglo-Saxon history into the project. Following this, Stubbs, whom they regarded as a great authority on English history, also became involved. Their appreciation of Stubbs can be perceived in Stubbs's own testimony. These words which were written as a retrospective reflection of his career, signify the special bond that was constructed between the historians: '...I may add that I believe that I owe to this the honour, and a very great honour I esteem it, of an invitation to take part as a fellow editor in the great series of *German Historical Monuments*, known for the last fifty years under the name of Pertz, which has now passed into the hands of a commission of which Dr. Waitz is the chief. I am proud indeed to be an instrument, in the humblest way, in repaying the debt which English history owes to German scholarship'³¹². The aim of incorporating Anglo-Saxon history into the *Monumenta* followed

³¹¹ Ibid., p.28.

³¹² Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects*, p.32.

the original project's goals to research Teutonic histories. The *Monumenta* actually became a national project that comprised many of the nations of Europe, Nations that were all observed as part and parcel of Germany's national history. As a result, the communities of Germanic-Teutonic historians also grew and connections in between the historians of 'Teutonic Europe' were constructed. These connections created links not only among German and English historians but also among English and other European historians³¹³.

Conclusion

The chapter illustrates the emerging links between several English and German scholars during the nineteenth century beginning with the initial contacts between historians such as Bunsen and Arnold and later in the century with the affinities between Müller, Pauli, Freeman and Kingsley. Through personal ties and common ideas, a *Gemeinschaft* of English/German historians became a vivid reality. Their main source of inspiration revolved around the common Teutonic decent. It was believed that the restoration of a shared Teutonic past would overcome the particularistic differences between England and Germany through common racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic and religious traits. Hence, the historians imagined a universal community of the Teutonic nations. This Pan-German community was mainly aimed at countering the historical enemy of the Germanic tribes: Rome. The Roman Empire, despite its alleged fall in 476 A.D., continued to threaten the Teutonic world through its inheritors - the

³¹³ For instance, these links were evident in a book from 1886 called *Sigfred-Arminius and Other Papers* written by the Icelandic researcher Guðbrandur Vigfússon, (1827-89) and his British colleague, Powell F. York (1850-1904). According to Vigfússon, thanks to the hero Arminius, Germany and England crystallized: 'Arminius The Cheruscan—the man, but for whose heroism and skill Germany would not now be Germany, nor England England'. The nationality of the co-writers is mentioned for a purpose. This shows that the ancient German heritage was not regarded as prevailing only amongst the German researchers, but also amongst scholars from other nationalities. See: Guðbrandur Vigfússon and F. York Powell, *Sigfred-Arminius and Other Papers*, Grimm Centenary (Oxford, 1886), p.6.

Catholic Church and France. In the nineteenth century, with the conflicts between France and the German principalities and later the German state, the need to emphasize the common ground of Protestantism and Teutonism became crucial, since the German historians sought to gain support for their political causes. A question, however, should be asked of the English historians. Why were they so keen to emphasize the Teutonic past? One possible answer which may derive from the chapter is that the creation of a Pan-Teutonic community which linked the English to the Germans enabled the English historians to define the natural identity of the English. With the Teutonic factor they located the beginning of England in the Anglo-Saxon invasions, identified France as the greater 'other' of England and argued that the Celtic communities of the British Isles (Welsh, Irish, and Scots) were not fused with the English nation. This aspect was perhaps intensified with the growing debate over Home Rule in Ireland and the path of the Celtic people towards some kind of sovereignty. In this way, these historians constructed a broad racial/ethnic/cultural alliance in their search for 'collective selfhood' and national identity.

The argument about the Teutonic realm was part of a whole polemic that prevailed in Europe during the nineteenth century around two issues which influenced each other: nationality and borders. One can find its manifestation, amongst others, in the controversy that developed not only between French and German individual researchers but also between the German and Roman schools of historiography. The first maintained that subsequent to the invasions of the Germanic tribes, Europe entered into a new era with unique and more deserving characteristics (the German School); the second argued that a continuum existed between the two periods since the tribes adopted the Roman tradition and continued its heritage without their own substantial and unique contribution (The Romanic Tradition).

The supposed Teutonic collective exclusivity belongs, therefore, to a broader debate, the dispute between the 'Roman' and the 'German' schools. The English Teutonic circle can be placed, without doubt, on the side of the German school. For instance, many English historians supported Germany in the 1870-1 war against France. Yet, the English circle did generate new ideas that distinguished it from the German school. One such idea was the 'unity of history', constructed by Arnold and later in depth by Freeman and Bryce. This idea, in contrast to the 'conservative' periodization of the German school, offered a new interpretation for the end of the Roman Empire. As will be shown in the following chapters, this interpretation situated several English scholars between the Teutonic and the Roman worlds.

Chapter 3: The Race of Time - The Convergence of Race and Periodization

For many Modern historians, as well as for some historians of the Early Modern age and Renaissance, the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. marked one of the most significant watersheds in historical periodization. These centuries were and are still considered by many as the time when the invasions of the Barbarian tribes caused the fall of the Roman Empire³¹⁴. The fact that even before the invasions, Rome fought many battles against various external forces that threatened its stability had not dramatically influenced the accepted periodization of the researchers. Beginning in 386 B.C. Gallic forces sacked the city of Rome. At the end of the second century B.C., the Romans suffered devastating defeats from the Cimbri and the Teutons who managed to advance in their campaigns up to today's northern Italy. At the beginning of the first century A.D., under the rule of Augustus and followed by Tiberius, fierce battles had occurred in the Roman provinces of Germany between the Roman legions and the German tribes. Later, Marcus Aurelius (121-80 A.D.) had to fight off the Marcomanni tribes that posed a real threat to the Roman Empire for more than a decade. These various examples are but a small sample of the confrontations with the Barbarian tribes, but they point to the constant

³¹⁴This view is also advocated by contemporary historians. For example, Bryan Ward-Perkins, *The Fall of Rome and the End of Civilization* (Oxford, 2006). In another book Perkins stresses the transformation of power from Rome to Constantinople: 'Rome, by the early sixth century, was a city living on former, and now decaying, grandeur. Constantinople by contrast was a boom town'. See: Bryan Ward-Perkins, 'Old and New Rome Compared - The Rise of Constantinople', in Lucy Grig and Gavin Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity* (Oxford, 2012), p.27; At the same time, there are substantial examples of opposing views which examine the tribes in a different, far less 'destructive' light. The most influential book that represents this view is Peter Brown, *The World of Late Antiquity: AD 150-750* (London, 1989 [1971]). In his opening pages, Brown summarizes his thesis by writing: 'the theme that will emerge ... is the shifting and redefinition of the classical world after A.D. 200. This has little to do with the conventional problem of the 'Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire'. The decline and fall affected only the political structure of the western provinces of the Roman Empire: It left the cultural power-house of Late-Antiquity-the eastern Mediterranean and the Near East-unsounded. Even in the barbarian states of Western Europe, in the sixth and seventh centuries, as it survived at Constantinople, was still regarded as the greatest civilized state in the world: and it was called by its ancient name, the *Respublica*'. Ibid., p.19.

conflict between the empire and the tribes. As mentioned before, these wars which entailed the deep invasions of the tribes into the empire's dominions and even into the city of Rome itself, were not considered by most eighteenth and nineteenth centuries scholars as marking the end of Antiquity.

In a recent book, Ian Wood, in what could be regarded as the most extensive account of the subject up to date, presents the main views of Modern historians on the beginning of the Middle Ages³¹⁵. Wood delves into the various views in chronological order from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries. Like some of his colleagues and predecessors³¹⁶, Wood divides the views of the historians into three: The Germanist, Romanist and Christian arguments³¹⁷. Dealing with these categories more extensively later, I will recapitulate here the main characteristics of each. The Germanist School emphasized the dramatic change that occurred after the invasion of the tribes. The Romanist School focused on the Roman Empire itself and observed a certain continuity between Rome and the barbaric kingdoms: some of the historians who belong to this school identify a decline in the empire, yet, they did not hold the tribes responsible but considered the social, economic and political problems of Rome as the main reasons for Roman degeneration. Besides these two arguments, another most significant occurrence in the fourth and fifth centuries was marked by the victory of Christianity. When Clovis (466-511), the King of the Franks, was baptized to Catholicism and deserted his Arian beliefs, the church united the Roman with the Barbarian and constructed consequently a whole different era which was later defined as the 'age of faith'. For many historians, this was the

³¹⁵ Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages*.

³¹⁶ Guy Halsall, 'Review Article: Movers and Shakers: The Barbarians and the Fall of Rome', *Early Medieval Europe* 8, no. 1 (1 March 1999): pp.131–45.

³¹⁷ Wood, *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages*, p.8.

substantial development of the period since it overshadowed both the invasion of the tribes and the internal Roman problems. Wood shows how in specific cases the historians followed the Germanist, Romanist or Christian explanations in accordance with their national, religious and professional affiliations. However, and this is a central point, there are many overlaps in between the different schools and one can sometimes see, even in the arguments of those historians who were considered the main representatives of a certain school, a merger between the different views.

In this chapter, I mainly aim to focus on the Germanist/Teutonic school, or more accurately on the nineteenth century reception of the barbaric invasions. I do not intend to survey all the different historians and approaches, but examine whether and how the Germanic invasions influenced the periodization of Antiquity in the writings of several German, British and French historians. The theme of periodization, I argue, although echoed in Wood's book, contains certain significant aspects that deserve further research. The first aspect is what I have already defined as 'racial time'. The Teutonic notions, as demonstrated in the previous chapters, created a community of historians who argued that the common tribal Teutonic past justified a shared present between nations. In this chapter, however, the focus is on the question of how the perceptions of ethnicity and race, in particularly the alleged superiority of the Teutonic nations, define the division of time. In fact, this chapter connects the first part of the work which discusses the historians' argument about the racial dominance of the Teutonic nations, with the second part that focuses on time or periodization.

Another major aspect is the notion of regeneration and degeneration. Gibbon, who, according to Wood, merged the Christian, Germanist and Romanist narratives in one single work, saw the internal Roman problems, the rise of Christianity and the invasion of the tribes

as the causes for the decline of the Roman world³¹⁸. In a famous passage written in the final chapter of his *Decline and Fall* he declared: ‘I have described the triumph of Barbarism and Religion’³¹⁹. However, conversely, the fusion between the Christian and the Germanist elements in the works of Herder and later Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831) depicted revival and not decline. In their view, the German tribes were tools in the hands of God for the distribution of Christianity throughout Europe³²⁰. This split between the regeneration and degeneration approaches emphasizes another central aspect: notwithstanding this split, most historians did not shatter the standard periodization and still observed the fourth and fifth centuries as the eras of transformation between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Thus, the conventional periodization remained intact whether one observed a revival or decline.

I will begin by presenting the case-study of the German invasions and the ways in which the Germanic tribes were depicted by writers of different periods, beginning in Antiquity through the Renaissance and mainly focusing on the nineteenth century³²¹. This part will include both the positive description of the history of the tribes and the negative one. In addition, the discussion will concentrate on the national dispute between France and Germany and its connection with the English-Teutonic historiographical sphere, especially on the leaning of the latter towards the German side.

³¹⁸Ibid., p.8,13.

³¹⁹ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, edited with Notes by J.B. Bury (12 vols., New York, 1906[1776]), XII, p. 191.

³²⁰See elaborated discussion later, p.145ff.

³²¹ For a detailed account of the narratives of the ‘Fall’ in the Renaissance and later in the Enlightenment see the noted research of Pocock, especially volume III: J. G. A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion-The First Decline and Fall* (5 vol., Cambridge, U.K. ; New York, 2003), III.

Early Perceptions -Winning and Waning of Rome

For thousands of years many authors tried to explain the secret of Rome's power, the empire that ruled the Mediterranean Basin for nearly a millennium. Polybius (202 – 120 B.C.) the famous Greek author of Roman history, explained in his *Histories* (sixth book) about the grandeur of the republic in his own times. For him, the ‘compromising’ Roman regime which incorporated democratic, aristocratic and monarchic elements instilled in the republic the strength to project its power over most of the inhabited world (*oikumene*) in the course of about 53 years (between 220 – 167 B.C.). The merging of the different governing systems in Rome was manifested in the public meetings that embodied the democratic element. The Senate represented the will of the aristocracy, and the Consuls spoke for the monarchy. Each of these institutions had the power to restrain the other and thus established a balance between them. For example, the public meetings could restrain both the influence of the Senate and that of the Consuls, because they wielded the power to approve or to override statutes and to decide whether to launch wars. Thus, in the Roman republic a system of ‘checks and balances’ prevented abrupt change of regimes, coups (*stasis*) and instability. During the transitions between regimes, named by Polybius as ‘The Circle of Regimes’ [*anacylosis*], one ruling system replaced the other: democracy led to a tyrannical democracy [*ochlocracy* – government by the mobs], monarchy, tyranny, aristocracy and finally to oligarchy and so forth. According to him, the different ruling systems can be likened to living entities because they grow [*anksesis*], reach a peak [*acme*] and wither away [*phthora*]. Polybius thought that in spite of Rome having a temperate rule that enabled it to be powerful, to spread and to survive it was destined to finally wither away because this process was inevitable. He also wrote about the oncoming fall when citing Scipio Aemilianus who had destroyed Carthage in 146 B.C.:

Scipio, when he looked upon the city as it was utterly perishing and in the last throes of its complete destruction, is said to have shed tears and wept openly for his enemies. After being wrapped in thought for long, and realizing that all cities, nations, and authorities must, like men, meet their doom; that this happened to Ilium, once a prosperous city, to the empires of Assyria, Media, and Persia, the greatest of their time, and to Macedonia itself, the brilliance of which was so recent, either deliberately or the verses escaping him, he said: ‘A day will come when sacred Troy shall perish, And Priam and his people shall be slain’. And when Polybius speaking with freedom to him, for he was his teacher, asked him what he meant by the words, they say that without any attempt at concealment he named his own country, for which he feared when he reflected on the fate of all things human. Polybius actually heard him and recalls it in his history (*Histories*, 38, 22)³²².

In the first century B.C., Sallust (86 – 34 B.C.) depicted Rome's future in sombre colours. This writer, who was much affected by the decline of the republic, used the term *inclinata res publica* [the downfall of the republic], to describe the crisis of his era (Sallust, *epistula ad caesarem*, 10.1). In 410 A.D. the Visigoth ruler Alaric conquered Rome. This conquest became a symbol for that generation and for the later ones, as it had been the first time that a foreign army invaded the domain of the city of Rome since the Gaul invasion in 386 B.C.. Following the invasion of the Visigoths, Augustine wrote his famous essay *The City of God* [*de civitate dei contra paganos*], in which he maintained that the cure for the distress of man could be found in the spiritual city of God and not in the eternal temporality of Rome [*roma aeterna*]. Similar to Augustine, other Christian writers of the same era like Orosius (circa 375 – 418?) and Jerome (346 – 420) claimed that Rome was forever lost. Jerome, for example, explained that the fact that Rome cherished paganism had led to its downfall. In his commentary to the book of the prophet Ezekiel he also claimed that the downfall of the city in

³²²Polybius, *The Histories*, trans. W. R. (William Roger) Paton et al., revised and edited by F.W. Walbank and Christian Habicht (Cambridge, Mass; London, 2010).

410 symbolized the downfall of the whole empire: ‘...the bright light of all the world was put out,...the whole world perished in one city’ (preface, book 1)³²³.

The Greek Historian, Zosimus, of the fifth century A.D., described in detail the decline of Rome. At the beginning of his essay (*historia nova* I), he also mentioned Polybius when claiming that the latter had described the rise of Rome and its glory, while he himself would describe its demise. Zosimus stated that the downfall of Rome admittedly happened in 410 A.D. but the process of the decline had commenced in the first century B.C. when the Republic collapsed. Among the reasons for the decline, he mentioned the worsening of the economic situation, the invasions of the tribes, but especially forsaking the Roman religion and traditions. In his essay *historia romana* (14.2), the writer Paul the Deacon (720 – 99) associated the downfall of Rome with the Hunic, Vandal and Ostrogothic invasions of Rome during the fifth century B.C. both Bede (*Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, Book I, 11) and the anonymous writer of the Franco-Burgundy essay *Passio sancti Sigismundi Regis*³²⁴, presented similar descriptions of the destruction that the various tribes caused in the realms of the empire.

Tribal Degeneration and the Formation of the Middle Ages

Several of the causes for the downfall of Rome that were mentioned by ancient writers were also adopted by later ones. During the Renaissance, attributing the destruction of the ancient world to the tribes became even more prominent. Petrarch (1304 – 74) claimed that the main reason for the collapse of the empire was that competent people did not rule it. According to

³²³Jerome, ‘The Principal Works of St. Jerome’, in Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church : Second Series*, trans. W.H. Freemantle (14 vol., Oxford; New York, 1890), VI.

³²⁴Walter A. Goffart, *Rome’s Fall and after* (London, 1989), pp.114–21.

him, the collapse following the arrival of the tribes, caused the whole of Europe to submerge into a dark and ignorant era. For Petrarch, Rome was the emblem of the acme of human civilization, therefore its occupation by the barbarians led to a dreadful abyss in the history of the world. Petrarch thought that extrication from the darkness [*tenebrae*] that engulfed the entire world will only occur when the greatness of Rome and its culture would be fully realized. In one of his essays, he even wrote that ‘what else, then, is all history, if not the praise of Rome’³²⁵, meaning that history had ceased after the decline of Rome and the invasion of the Barbarians.

In the fifteenth century, the Italian humanists greatly stressed the splendour of Rome in comparison to the meagreness of the Germanic tribes. The historian Flavio Biondo (1392 – 1463) in his book, *Decades of History from the Deterioration of the Roman Empire*, [*Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum imperii*] analysed the disintegration that had taken place between the years 410 and 1453 (the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans). Another Renaissance historian Leonardo Bruni (1369 – 1444) chose, similarly to Biondo, the fifth century as the end of the ancient era. Unlike Biondo, he centred the disaster in the year 455 A.D., when the emperor Valentinian III had been assassinated by his own foreign soldiers. According to Bruni, following the assassination, Odoacer managed to overthrow the last emperor of Rome, Romulus Augustus and to take over. Mistakenly, Bruni attributed the fall of Romulus to the year 455 and not to 475/6, but it is clear that he thought that the fall of the

³²⁵ ‘*Quid est enim aliud omnis historia quam Romana laus?*’ This quote of Petrarch is cited in an article by Theodor Ernst Mommsen, the grandson of the famous Roman historian Theodor Mommsen and the nephew of Max Weber. Mommsen, who specialized in the study of Petrarch, claimed that Petrarch had invented the term ‘The Dark Ages’ in order to define the era after the downfall of Rome. See: Theodore E. Mommsen, ‘Petrarch’s Conception of the “Dark Ages”’, *Speculum* 17, no. 2 (1942): pp.236–7.

empire had occurred in the fifth century. Nonetheless, he wrote that Italy of his own days had managed to restore its greatness as evident in its thriving culture³²⁶.

The argument so far leads to the conclusion that the historical periodization that crystallized during the Renaissance derived from the negative perception of the Middle Ages. The people of the Renaissance regarded themselves as those who managed to reconstruct the glory of Rome and thus regarded the thousand years that passed since the fall of Rome up to their times as an inferior era in the history of humanity. They maintained that the barbarian inferiority was manifested in all areas of life: in government, economics and art. For instance, the Renaissance artist, Filarete (1400-69), who was a fierce adversary of 'Barbarian' Gothic architecture said: 'Cursed be the man who invented this wretched Gothic architecture; only a Barbarian people could have brought it to Italy'³²⁷.

The idea that the Barbarian schism in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. symbolized the end of the ancient period remained central also in the works of the eighteenth century historians. Gibbon wrote that the transfer from the republican system of government to the imperial one was the main impetus that had put the decline of the Roman Empire into motion because it was followed by moral decline. Gibbon similar to Zosimus, 1,400 years before, regards the first century B.C. as the period when Rome began to lose its glory until it reached its lowest ebb during the fourth and fifth centuries. After these centuries, the areas where the

³²⁶ Brunni also stated that the destruction should not be perceived in a catastrophic way: '...we should not be saddened by the things which happened then but rather rejoice for them. They are like the labours of Heracles; he became more illustrious through them than he would have been without them'. Brunni quoted in Santo Mazzarino, *The End of the Ancient World* (London, 1966), pp.82-3.

³²⁷ Filarte quoted in Alfons Dopsch, *The Economic and Social Foundations of European Civilization*, condensed by Erna Patzelt, trans. by M.G. Beard and Nadine Marshall (London, 1937), p.2.

Roman Empire had thrived became wasteland, while the Eastern Empire, with its capital, Constantinople, survived until it was conquered by the Turks and Ottomans in 1453. In light of Gibbon's attitude, as to the failings of the imperial government, one could wonder about his notable statement that the second century A.D. was 'the period in the history of the world during which the condition of the human race was happiest and prosperous'³²⁸. However, one should not be surprised, since the worthy Antonine emperors managed to conceal the shortcomings of the empire by their clever governing. But when by the end of the second century, weak emperors, like Commodus (ruled 180 – 92 A.D.), came to power, the empire suffered a lengthy crisis that together with the rise of Christianity and especially the regime of Constantine led to its fall. Gibbon, quite uniquely, merged what he considered as the negative impact of Christianity and the invasion of the tribes and marked the fourth and fifth centuries as a devastating watershed for the classical tradition of the Greco-Roman world. Many writers did not connect the two but still acknowledged the invasions of these centuries as the beginning of the Middle Ages³²⁹.

Gibbon was perhaps influenced by Voltaire (1694-1778)³³⁰, who pointed to the religious controversies and the conquests of the Barbarians as the reasons for the fall of the

³²⁸Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, p. 99.

³²⁹ The term 'Middle Ages' was incorporated into the major European cultures during the 17th century: *medium aevum* appeared in 1604, *moyen âge* in 1640, and *Mittelalter* in 1684. This, as Lynn Hunt comments, was part of the construction of the notion of progress. Suddenly the scholars had to invent a concept which denoted a middle stage, preceding the progress of their own time. See: Lynn Hunt, *Measuring Time, Making History* (Budapest, 2008), p.51.

³³⁰There is a whole debate whether Gibbon and Voltaire held similar animosity against the Church or, in other words, how 'Voltairean' was Gibbon. See: David Womersley, 'Gibbon's Religious Characters', in Stefan Collini, Richard Whatmore, and B. W. Young (eds.), *History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750-1950*, ed. (Cambridge [England]; New York, 2000), pp.70-1.

Roman Empire³³¹. In his book, '*Essi sur les moeurs et l'esprit des nations*', he described how the Germanic Barbarians had ravished the Latin language, the ancient supreme culture and the material grandeur of Rome:

If we pass from the history of the Roman Empire to that of the peoples who destroyed it in the West, we feel like travellers who leave a splendid city to find themselves in thorny waste. Twenty barbaric dialects are the heirs of the beautiful Latin language, which was spoken from Illyria to the Atlas Mountains. Whereas up to that time, wise laws had rules over half of our hemisphere, now there are only savage customs. All the signs of civilization, amphitheatres, circuses and the rest, which were erected throughout the provinces, are destroyed and lie in ruins, overgrown by grass. The excellent roads, which had led from the capital itself to the distant Taurus, are covered by stagnant pool³³².

According to many thinkers of the eighteenth century, Rome was identified with the ancient era politically, culturally and economically. Therefore, the collapse of the empire in the west during the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. symbolized the end of the ancient era. Citing Voltaire once again: 'A new order of things began with the dismemberment of the Roman Empire in the West, which is called the history of the Middle Ages; barbarian history of barbarian peoples, who on becoming Christians did not become better for it'³³³. This perception was dominant for many years. It led to the accepted historical periodization in which the invasions of the Barbarians became a mythical and formative event that had caused the terrible rift between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Thus, the Scottish historian, William Robertson (1721 – 93) wrote that: 'In less than a century after the barbarian nations settled in their new conquests, almost all the effects of the knowledge and civility, which the Romans had spread

³³¹ Voltaire wrote: 'Two flails at last brought down this vast Colossus: the barbarians and religious disputes' . quoted in Frank W. Walbank, *The Awful Revolution : The Decline of the Roman Empire in the West* (Liverpool, 1969), p.14.

³³² Quoted in Dopsch, *European Civilization*, p. 4.

³³³ Quoted in Hunt, *Measuring Time, Making History*, p.52

through Europe, disappeared. Not only the arts of elegance, which minister to luxury, and are supported by it, but many of the useful arts, without which life can scarcely be contemplated as comfortable, were neglected or lost³³⁴. This argument was still prominent during the nineteenth century. Many researchers emphasized that the ancient era ended with the arrival of the tribes and the collapse of Rome. One prominent example was given in the views of the famous French scholar and politician, François Guizot (1787 – 1874)³³⁵, who named the period after the fall of the empire as ‘The Barbarian Era’ in which colossal chaos occupied Europe: ‘A veritable deluge of diverse nations, forced one upon another, from Asia into Europe, by wars and migration in mass, inundated the Empire and gave the decisive signal for its fall’³³⁶.

The Noble Savage – Regeneration

Together with those who maintained that the Germanic tribes had inflicted havoc all over Europe, there were prominent voices who perceived the tribes in a rather positive method. According to them, the Germanic tribes were the emblem of the spirit of freedom and boldness. Therefore, they freed the West from the ‘dying’ empire and heralded a new era, which was

³³⁴ William Robertson, *The History of the Reign of Charles the Fifth, Emperor of Germany* (2 vol., Philadelphia, 1770), I, p.15; Gibbon was inspired by Robertson's work. Dissimilar to Robertson, he did not only focus on Western Europe but also on the East and on Byzantium. See: J. G. A. Pocock, ‘Edward Gibbon in History: Aspects of the Text in The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,’ in Grethe B. Petersen(ed.), *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values* (Salt Lake City, 1988), XI, p.296.

³³⁵ The French statesman and historian, Guizot, served as the minister of education (1832 –37), minister of foreign affairs (1840–7) and finally as prime minister (1847 –8). He was one of the prominent harbingers of the new order following the revolution of 1830. As minister of education, he introduced a revolutionary system by which the French people received free education from the state. This included lessons in national history from the times of the Gauls until the new era. Guizot promoted the idea of a civilization governed by reason. See: Ceri Crossley, *French Historians and Romanticism : Thierry, Guizot, the Saint-Simonians, Quinet, Michelet* (London, 1993), pp. 81-2.

³³⁶ François M. Guizot and Henriette E. Guizot de Witt, *History of France from the Earliest Times to 1848*, trans. Robert Black (8 vol., New York, 1902), I, p.105.

better than the former one. Thus, the invasions of the tribes into the realms of the empire were defined in the neutral and even positive term– *Völkerwanderung* [wandering of peoples] and not in the more negative meaning.

In 1425, the first copy of Tacitus' (56 – 117 A.D.) essay *Germania (de origine et situ germanorum)* was discovered in the monastery of Fulda, Germany³³⁷. The essay, written at the end of the first century (cir. 98 A.D.), became a very important source, since it supplies a unique ethnographic account of the ancient era. The book's main importance, however, is not necessarily in depicting the Germanic tribes of the first Century A.D., but in the modern reception of *Germania* in the West and the racial and national implications resulting from its rediscovery. For Tacitus, the Germanic tribes belonged to one ethnic group and hence reflected unity. The tribes possessed common characteristics which distinguished them from other groups, such as the Romans:

The tribes of Germany are free from all taint of inter-marriages with foreign nations, and that they appear as a distinct, unmixed race, like none but themselves. Hence, too, the same physical peculiarities throughout so vast a population. All have fierce blue eyes, red hair, huge frames, fit only for a sudden exertion. They are less able to bear laborious work. Heat and thirst they cannot in the least endure; to cold and hunger their climate and their soil inure them (Tacitus, *Germania*, 4)³³⁸.

The fact that Tacitus distinguished the Germanic tribes based on their physical features is of major importance. Following this paragraph, a series of writers and even regimes, most notoriously the Nazis, argued for the racial uniqueness of the Germanic tribes and more

³³⁷ Later, in the middle of the 16th century, it reached Rome for closer examination by Cardinal Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, the future Pope Pius II. See: Joseph T. Leerssen, *National Thought in Europe : A Cultural History* (Amsterdam, 2006), p.39.

³³⁸ Cornelius Tacitus, *The Complete Works of Tacitus : The Annals ; The History ; The Life of Cnaeus Julius Agricola ; Germany and Its Tribes ; A Dialogue on Oratory*, trans. Alfred John Church, William Jackson Brodribb, and Moses Hadas (New York, 1942).

importantly, of the modern German *Volk*³³⁹. Tacitus testified as to the freedom and equality prevalent amongst the tribes: ‘About minor matters - the chiefs deliberate, about the more important - the whole tribe’ (*Ger.*,11). Thus, all the members of the tribe made decisions in a democratic, communal manner. Tacitus added that ‘The chief fights for victory; his vassals fight for their chief’ (*Ger.* 14). (*principes pro victoria pugnant, comites pro principe*).

Nevertheless, alongside his praise, Tacitus mentioned the ferocity of the tribes, some of their bad customs and their yearning for warmongering. According to Tacitus, when the tribes were not fighting against foreigners, they initiated battles with other Germanic tribes (*Ger.* 14) or spent their time in vain without cultivating the land: ‘Whenever they are not fighting, they pass much of their time in the chase, and still more in idleness, giving themselves up to sleep and to feasting, the bravest and the most warlike doing nothing’ (*Ger.* 15). Tacitus considered them as the worst of Rome's enemies because they led to it’s severest defeats. He claimed that: ‘German independence truly is fiercer than the despotism of an Arsaces. What else, indeed, can the East taunt us with but the slaughter of Crassus, when it has itself lost Pacorus, and been crushed under a Ventidius?’ (*Ger.* 38).

In the wake of the ‘discovery’ of *Germania* by German thinkers at the beginning of the modern epoch, the perception of the vital strength of the Germanic tribes that wandered into the realms of Rome developed much further. Indeed, Tacitus wrote three hundred years before the final fall of the Roman Empire, but in the eyes of some of these scholars it made no difference because the tribes that had caused the demise of the degenerate Rome were the

³³⁹ There is an assumption that one of the Nurnberg laws (1936), prohibiting the marriages between Aryans and Jews, was inspired from this paragraph. See: Christopher B. Krebs, *A Most Dangerous Book : Tacitus’s Germania from the Roman Empire to the Third Reich* (New York; London, 2012), p.23.

descendants of the tribes described by Tacitus. Furthermore, these ancient Germanic tribes were also the ancestors of some of the kingdoms and nations in Europe. Thus, the exaltation of the Germanic tribes carries a substantial weight in the argumentation that has developed during the new epoch within Europe. The acme of these discussions or arguments can be identified in relation to the rise of nationalism during the nineteenth century. Before addressing the historiographical discussion in the nineteenth century, I would like to discuss briefly the myth of the ‘savage German’ before the nineteenth century.

In the sixteenth century, vast developments took place in the research of ancient Germanic history (*deutsches Altertum*). Essays were written on the sites, customs and history of the early Germanic tribes. In 1557, the Austrian, Wolfgang Lazius (1514-65), mentioned that the Germanic tribes wandered all over Europe (*de gentium aliquot migrationibus*) and that a connection existed between them and the Austrian king of the House of Habsburg³⁴⁰. Others, such as the German Ulrich von Hutten (1488–1523), emphasized that the ancient Germanic tribes had symbolized the glorious past and present of the principalities of Germany. Von Hutten, one of the early theorists of German nationalism, based his essay on the wonders of the Germanic hero Herman (Arminius), the leader of the tribe of the Cherusci³⁴¹. Arminius led an attack against Publius Quinctilius Varus, the governor of Germania (under Emperor Augustus), who lost three Roman legions and his own life in the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest in the year 9th A.D. Later on, other writers continued nurturing the tribal Germanic myth

³⁴⁰ He was the court historian of Ferdinand I. See: José Rabasa et al., *The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume 3: 1400-1800* (Oxford, 2014), p.309; Goffart, *Rome's Fall*, p.122.

³⁴¹ Ulrich von Hutten, *Arminius, Herrmann, Ein Dialog Und Großpalatinus, Geschichte Des Deutschen Anführers* (Wien, 1815).

epitomized by the figure of Herman, whose character established a whole cult [*Hermannsschlacht*]. The adoration of Herman was based on the perception that the value of freedom as it manifested itself in his revolt against the Romans, should serve as a symbol and model for the entire German people. Von Hutten, who lived at the time of the Protestant Reformation, defied the hegemony of the Roman papal church by glorifying ancient German history.

Martin Luther, the initiator of the Reformation, also denoted the tribes as the ancestors of the Germans and the everlasting fierce enemies of Rome. Luther in his *Commentaries on Psalms* explained the meaning of the name Herman, given to the brave German tribal leader: ‘For we find that our old Germans gave their princes and lords unusually fine names... *Herman*, which the Latins have corrupted into *Arminius*, means “a man of the army”, one who is strong in war and battle, who can rescue and lead his own people, and risk his life in doing it’ (*Commentaries on Psalms*, IV,82)³⁴². Luther was the first one to call Arminius by the name of Herman, the name given to the Germanic hero during Modernity. Luther’s identification of the tribes as ‘our ancient German’ ancestors resurfaces throughout his writings. A noteworthy aspect of his words was the linkage between the role of divinity in the Gothic invasion and in the Reformation. In both events the Germans became the messengers of the wrath of God against a corrupted Roman Empire. The Reformation, hence, signified a second awakening of the German people. In fact, these two German awakenings construct historical periodization.

³⁴² Martin Luther, ‘Selected Commentaries on the Psalms,’ in *The Works of Martin Luther [electronic Resource]*, accessed April 29, 2014 at http://ezproxyprd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2896/xtf/view?docId=luther_w/luther_w.00.xml;chunk.id=div.luther_w.pmpreface.1;toc.depth=2;toc.id=div.luther_w.pmpreface.1;hit.rank=0;brand=default.

The Roman fall and the Middle Ages commenced with the Gothic conquest of Rome and concluded now, in Luther's era, with the Germans second defiance against Catholic Rome. The German people remained throughout this long period one and same, while the Roman Empire fell centuries ago:

There is no doubt that the true Roman Empire, which the writings of the prophets foretold in Numbers 24[:17–19] and Daniel 2[:44], has long since been overthrown and come to an end, as Balaam clearly prophesied in Numbers 24[:24] ...That happened under the Goths, but more particularly when the Muslim Empire arose almost a thousand years ago. Then eventually Asia and Africa fell away, and in time France and Spain. Finally Venice arose, and nothing was left to Rome of its former power (*Christian in Society* , I, 207-8)³⁴³.

Despite the mention of the Goths as the initiators of the Roman decadence, it was the Arabs, whom Luther identified already in the sixteenth century as an even greater force to be reckoned with. Luther's remark is rather important since even though most writers labelled the Germanic invasions as the cause of the Roman downfall, some writers, noted the Arab rise in conjunction with the Roman demise.

Protestant scholars, who mark the invasion of the tribes as a rejuvenating event that replaced the corrupt Rome, were faced with a perennial problem. If a dramatic transformation had destroyed Rome during the wanderings, how was it possible that Rome, through the Church's power, still dominated the sphere for another thousand years? For this reason, many scholars, beginning with Luther, observed the Reformation as another phase of the wandering and as the event that symbolized the final fall of Rome. Thus, the seeds of the revolution had

³⁴³Martin Luther , 'Christian in Society- To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate,' in *The Works of Martin Luther[electronic Resource]*, accessed April 29, 2014 at http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2067/xtf/view?docId=luther_w/luther_w.44.xml;query=Balaam%20;brand=default;hit.rank=2#rank2.

already been planted by the wanderings of the tribes, but Catholic Rome managed to recuperate and only in the Reformation, Germanic freedom was finally attained³⁴⁴. The need to consolidate these two events – the invasions and the Reformation - resurfaces in the writings of many historians as a central aspect of the debate over the significance of the tribes in history. This also sheds light on the theme of periodization. It is exactly these two events, that are central in the tripod division of time – Antiquity, Middle Ages and Modernity. For some, the first event begins the Middle Ages while the second event ends them and marks the commencement of Modernity. The main threads that connect these two formative events according to many scholars are Christianity and Teutonism/Germanism or the merger of the two. In terms of Christianity, a crucial transformation occurred in both events. During the invasions, the barbaric kingdoms converted, neglected Arianism and paganism, and distributed Christianity across Europe. In the Reformation, substantial parts of Europe deserted Catholicism and returned to what Protestant thinkers defined as the original form of Christianity. As for ethnicity, both developments were carried out by the Germanic people. For many, German thinkers, those who promoted the disengagement from the Catholic Church were the descendants of those Germanic tribes who overthrew the Roman Empire. Hence, the two most dramatic events in the history of the world, which in fact determine periodization, were carried out by the same people.

³⁴⁴ In the case of the Anglican historians, if one follows the controversial book of Butterfield this was through the adoption of the Whig interpretation of history. The Whig historians manifested the idea of progress and due to the rule of the Catholic Church they defined most of the Middle Ages as a decadent era preceding the progressive phase of post Reformation Europe. See: Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (London, 1931), pp.12-13.

The Formative Victory of Barbarism and Christianity

Another method of studying the Christian and tribal phenomena was to link the two developments. Two of the most prominent German thinkers of the Modern era, Herder and Hegel, signify this fusion more than any other scholars.

For Herder, the demarcation line between Antiquity and the Middle Ages was still with the migration of the barbarians. Yet, he asserted that the Germanic people had contributed the most to the establishment of the European kingdoms. They took the dominion from the Roman Empire and in fact initiated such a transformation that the history of the world changed its course forever. The Roman Empire became so degenerate [*ausgeartete Rom*] in the end of the fifth century that it could no longer withstand the vitality of the Germanic tribes: ‘Hatte dieses jetzt so ausgeartete Rom einst Völker unterjocht und sich zur Herrscherin der Welt aufgeworfen, warum sollten sie es nicht tun, ohne deren Hände jenes nichts Kräftiges mehr vermochte?’³⁴⁵. Overall, the notions of decline and regeneration in Herder’s argument can appear in every epoch and within any civilization in history. They do not paint the whole history of the nation with a single colour. This was why he asserted that there is no such thing as the happiest nation in history, since every nation had its era of prosperity and fortune³⁴⁶. Alongside the greatness of the nations, there are also major imperfect historical moments, yet greatness is possible even with these deficiencies. Every nation has a period of decline, which eventually leads to its final demise³⁴⁷.

³⁴⁵ Johann G. Herder, *Ideen Zur Philosophie Der Geschichte Der Menschheit*, erster Teil, Sechzehntes Buch (Leipzig, 1842 [1784]), s.240.

³⁴⁶ Johann G. Herder, *Another Philosophy of History and Selected Political Writings*, Ed. and trans. Ioannis D. Evrigenis and Daniel Pellerin (Indianapolis, IN., 2004), p.27.

³⁴⁷ Ibid., p.25.

Each age may manifest progress. However, this does not mean that one civilization surpassed the other. It is essential for the next civilization to learn from the former's civilization achievements³⁴⁸. Like an adult, who must acknowledge the fact that he too was once a child with no experience, so the succeeding civilizations need to acknowledge their early adolescent stages. The Greeks may have been the 'cradle of humaneness' but they were still dependent on the previous achievements of the Egyptians and Phoenicians. For this reason, the Greeks absorbed components of both cultures into their own, despite their belief that they invented everything *ex nihilo*³⁴⁹.

The maturity of humankind became eminent with the Romans. Their greatness was a consequence of their universalization impact on the nations of the world:

It was never the Romans' main concern to compete with Greeks, Phoenicians, Egyptians, and Orientals; but by putting everything that had preceded them to manly use, what a Roman world they created! The name [of Rome] bound peoples and parts of the world together that had never so much as heard of each other before. Roman provinces! In all of them, Romans trod: Roman legions, laws, ideals of propriety, virtues and vices. The walls that separated nation from nation were broken down, the first step taken to destroy the national character of them all, to throw everyone into one mold called 'the Roman people'³⁵⁰.

Since the influence of the Romans was so vast and imposing, their fall from power became a monumental event. History, in fact, 'restarted' after Rome. The tribes were the ones who headed this revolution. If beforehand, there was a clear linkage between the East, Greece and Rome, suddenly the chain of history was broken and time began to reset itself, carried by the Germans and Christianity. The East and the Greco-Roman world remained cohesive, while

³⁴⁸ Ibid.,p.13.

³⁴⁹ Ibid., p.19.

³⁵⁰ Ibid., P.22.

the tribes, Christianity and the Middle Ages represented another distinct phenomenon. This does not mean that there was no connection between the ancient civilizations and the Germanic tribes, since a 'Northern-Southern' world did develop³⁵¹. Still, the mutual common ground between Egypt, the Phoenicians, Greece, and Rome was far more substantial than the connection between the Romans and the Germanic kingdoms.

The order and unity of the new world came from the power of Christianity because it had a civilizing impact on the tribes: 'Indeed, ever since the barbarians themselves became Christians, it gradually became the real order and security of the world. As it tamed the rapacious lions and conquered the conquerors...' ³⁵². Herder observed the tribes as a tool in the hands of God: 'I am speaking of a historical Event, a miracle of the human spirit, and clearly an instrument of Providence!' ³⁵³.

Hegel, similar to Herder, also marked these centuries as the end of Antiquity. Hegel identified rejuvenation and for that, he is considered as one of the 'forefathers' of the Teutonic-Christian periodization. In his *Philosophy of History*, he manifested a nationalistic dogma, based upon the role of the Teutonic tribes in history. Hegel defined three epochs that dominated the world: the first and the one representing the juvenile stage of history or 'the childhood of History' commenced with the civilizations of the Near-East. Then, the world transformed to its adolescence phase, where the formation of the body occurred under the Greek civilization³⁵⁴. The next era of the Romans was that of maturity when the universal goal surpassed individual

³⁵¹ Ibid., p.33

³⁵² Ibid., p.38.

³⁵³ Ibid., p.39.

³⁵⁴ Georg W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (New York, 2007[1899]), pp.105–6.

needs. The last and most complete era was that of the Germans, which began after the fall of the Roman Empire. This era signified the old age of humanity when the spirit of the world became harmonized once again with its source or body³⁵⁵.

Hegel defined this through the concept of *Gemutlichkeit* which represented the purity of the heart within the early Germanic tribes. The German world, by definition, was the freest, most happiest, and superior in comparison to all the others. The history of the world, therefore, moves on a linear timeline of progress through civilizations and geographical spheres: ‘...the world travels from East to West, for Europe is absolutely the end of history, Asia the beginning’³⁵⁶. The notion of freedom is also transformed in between the periods of the world: ‘In the East the one is free in Greece and Rome some are free and in the German world all became free’³⁵⁷. The supreme political form was monarchy since the world moved from the despotism of the East to the democracy and aristocracy of Greece and Rome until it reached the monarchy of the German age. The thread of freedom linked the ancient Germans with the modern ones: ‘The element of freedom is the first consideration in their union in a social relationship. The ancient Germans were famed for their love of freedom; the Romans formed a correct idea of them in this particular from the first. Freedom has been the watchword in Germany down to the most recent times, and even the league of princes under Frederick II had its origin in the love of liberty’³⁵⁸. For Hegel, The concept of fidelity was another feature of the German tribes. This kernel had been absent from the Greco-Roman world. The free Germans

³⁵⁵ Ibid., pp.107–9.

³⁵⁶ Ibid., p.103.

³⁵⁷ Ibid., p.104.

³⁵⁸ Ibid.,p.353.

followed voluntarily one of the prominent individuals in the group and bonded with him, while the Greco-Roman rulers imposed firm control over the people, based on hierarchy and hegemony. These two pillars of freedom and fidelity construct the modern European states³⁵⁹.

Similarly to Herder's notion, God chose the German tribes to carry Christianity into history and spread it among the nations of the world. The Germans acted with great ferocity and barbarism and conducted multiple sins in the age of Clovis and under the Merovingian kings. Hegel, for that matter, did not only idealize them, but also emphasized the fact that they were part of reality. It was exactly this character, which made the tribes such worthy candidates for the distribution of Christianity.

Both Herder and Hegel drew a definite line in between the Romans and the Germans. However, there is a distinction between the two scholars. This distinction is very significant since both scholars denote two main strands in eighteenth and nineteenth centuries' scholarship. For Herder, the Germanic tribes were not the epitome of humankind. They may represent a new, very different period and determine the development of the European modern states, but they did not reflect the most noble stage of humanity. Hegel, in contrast, described the whole period from the fall of Rome until his days as the German epoch. His own people and their spirit symbolized the apex of civilization, they presented the *telos*, since no other age would ever surpass them in the future. This signifies a great distinction between the two. Herder observed a world divided horizontally by nations with certain spirit and uniqueness. For Hegel,

³⁵⁹ Ibid.

the hierarchy between the nations in history was far more evident and the Germanic nations stand on the highest echelon. The important aspect, especially following Hegel, was that the emergence of Christianity and ethnic-Germanic tribes had signified the beginning of a new era. This is a prominent example of how in Modernity the religious and the ethnic-racial time merged. Hegel, by placing the Germans on top of the pedestal, reflected an emerging view among many German, French and British scholars. This view, what I called ‘racial time’, regarded the invasion of the tribes as a racial watershed which separated Antiquity from the Middle Ages.

Roman vs. Germanic

The dispute around the end of the ancient era between the ‘German School’ and the ‘Roman School’, mentioned in the beginning of the chapter, was partially a result of the territorial-national controversy between France and Germany. For many of the German Romanticists the fact that the tribes were depicted as the harbingers of freedom and started a new era in Europe proved the Antiquity and authenticity of the German nation. For them, there were two historical events which defined the German nation since times of Antiquity: the German tribal independence as it was expressed in the resistance to Rome especially under the leadership of Arminius, and the *Völkerwanderung* during the 4th and 5th centuries³⁶⁰. This enchanted German past was entwined with the main events of the nineteenth century: the wars of German liberation from Napoleon (1813 –15) and, of course, the unification of Germany in 1871. The German-French dispute in the nineteenth century led some representatives of the German

³⁶⁰ Martin Thom, ‘Unity and Confederation in the Italian Risorgimento-The Case of Carlo Cattaneo,’ in Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan, and Kevin Passmore (eds.), *Writing National Histories : Western Europe since 1800*, (London, 1999), p. 77.

School to attribute supreme importance to the tribes because they were the ones that had separated the Ancient era from the Middle Ages and thus influenced the future historical development. The Roman School, on the other hand, headed by Fustel de Coulanges (1830-89), opposed this claim. De Coulanges himself combined in a very pronounced way the issue of periodization and the territorial-national tendencies. The fact that he discarded the importance of the German tribes and regarded them as wild tribes, which had spoiled the Roman heritage, derived to a large extent from his drive to reject the German nationalistic claims of the nineteenth century, especially concerning Alsace-Lorraine.

In spite of the tendency to present the Roman-German dispute as a dichotomy and totally as part of the nationalistic French-German controversy, it is important to note the fact that sometimes the differences between the two camps were not so vast. In both France and Germany during the nineteenth century there was a return to ancient tribal myth. In France, it was the revival of the tribes of the Gauls led by Vercingetorix following their glorious battles against the legions of Julius Caesar in the land of Gaul (Gallia). As mentioned, in Germany too, the revolt of the Germanic tribes against the Romans was considered as a courageous and noble act. Thus, the ancient tribes became an important component in the historic national narrative of both countries. On both sides, an attempt was made to prove the possession of a certain area relying on historical-cultural evidence, and therefore the thinkers used events from the past to justify the present reality. The return to the past as an authoritative source and the search for the 'ancient ancestors' caused the two sides to glorify the battles of the Gauls and Germanic tribes against the Roman Empire, to elevate the founding of the Frankish kingdom by Clovis and that of the Carolingian kingdom ruled by Carl the Great. Most importantly, in both the Romanist and the Germanist schools, race played a central part in constructing the

division of time and the construction of the national community. As typified, scholars from both schools spoke of a prominent racial aspect determining the periodization of history.

The question is why, in spite of the monumental stature given to the ancient Gauls, there developed in France a school of thought that emphasized the lasting influence of the Roman Empire. At the same time, in the Germanist school Rome was almost neglected and the German tribes were the pure carriers of history. The answer to this, I think, derives from the historical narratives that took root in the research of those French and German thinkers who belonged to these different schools. According to the *Commentaries on the Gallic War* by Julius Caesar, around 50 B.C. all the area of Gaul was conquered by Caesar's legions in spite of the fierce fighting of the local tribes. From the Roman conquest, Gaul remained under Roman rule for about five hundred years until the arrival of the German tribes. The Roman impact on Gaul was evident in many fields from the paving of roads, building fortifications/institutions and cultural and ideological influences. According to some historians, like Augustin Thierry, a unique Gallic-Roman society that combined Roman and Celtic characteristics existed for many centuries, since the Romans first came to Gaul. But in the 5th century with the arrival of waves of German tribes, there began to abide in Gaul two different communities that were based on different histories and cultures: the Gallic-Roman and the German communities. In some of his writings, Thierry remarked that the Gallic-Roman community had settled in towns and developed trade and culture, while around them prevailed

the illiteracy and ignorance of the wild barbaric German tribes. The offspring of this superb Gallic-Roman society were the Third Estate who led the French Revolution in 1789³⁶¹.

There is a possibility that this perception of the ethnic-territorial situation as a struggle coexisted with the historic periodization of the Roman School. It actually started a new historical narrative according to which the Romans and the native people of Gaul had created a new splendid culture. This historical continuity was not diminished when the German tribes arrived but remained part and parcel of French society and defined its development up to the new epoch. On the basis of this narrative, the Roman School could argue that there had been a Roman continuity from Antiquity to the Middle Ages and therefore the German tribes had not played an important part in the transition between the two periods. In other words, the Roman Empire was not necessarily perceived as a conqueror because the Gallic-Roman culture, which embraced authentic Gallic traits, emerged from it. Thus, one can regard the Roman heritage as an integral part of the national history of France, in contrast to the German tribes that had not contributed to the economic and cultural development of Gallia and later France.

Thierry developed his perception due to his research on the Norman Conquest of the British Isles. His conclusions can be found in his publication written in 1825, *Histoire de la Conquête de l'Angleterre par les Normands* that the confrontation between thoughtHe ³⁶². these two ethnic groups in Gaul had been similar to the confrontation between the Anglo-

³⁶¹Augustin Thierry, *The Formation and Progress of the Tiers État or Third Estate in France*, trans. from the French by the Rev. Francis B. Wells (London, 1859), pp.16-20.

³⁶²Augustin Thierry, *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans: Its Causes, and Its Consequences, in England, Scotland, Ireland, & on the Continent*, trans. from the 7th Paris ed., by William Hazlitt (2 vol., London, 1847).

Saxons and the Normans. The first were ‘the conquered’ and they represented for hundreds of years the lower echelons of the English society, while the latter were ‘the conquerors’, and they wielded the reins of government and possessed the land³⁶³.

Towards a New Periodization?

In 1973 the famous Italian historian, Arnaldo Momigliano, wrote that since the eighteenth century writing on the fall of Rome had become some kind of obsession in historic research³⁶⁴. As I demonstrated throughout the chapter, numerous writers and researchers dedicated to this historic phenomenon many words. Along with those who defined the tribes and the fifth century in negative words, there were others who regarded this era as a huge change for the better and observed the tribes as contributing to Europe. The latter can be all grouped under the wider term, ‘The German School’. The way these tribes were perceived as alternatively wild or harbingers of freedom, did not influence the historical periodization because, in any case, the tribes were regarded as playing a very significant role as their wanderings and invasions brought an end to the Roman Empire. Furthermore, the racial aspect became associated, especially in Modernity, with the fall of the Roman Empire. For many of the historians from the German school, race marked the ultimate proof for the decline of Rome and the rise of the Germanic kingdoms. Thus, during the nineteenth century, the ‘Roman

³⁶³The Italian historians Alessandro Manzoni, (1785 – 1873) and Carlo Troya (1784 – 1858) adopted this theory as to the ethnic and stratus struggle that develops between the conqueror and the conquered and applied it to the Lombardian conquest of Italy. They were of the opinion that the Lombards enslaved the local community, did not manage to assimilate in it and therefore failed in their struggle against the Franks. See: Martin Thom, ‘Unity and Confederation in the Italian Risogimento-The Case of Carlo Cattaneo’, pp.73–4; Wood, ‘Barbarians, Historians, and the Construction of National Identities’, pp.66-8.

³⁶⁴ Arnaldo Marcone, ‘A Long Late Antiquity?: Considerations on a Controversial Periodization’, *Journal of Late Antiquity* 1, no. 1 (2008): pp.7–8 (note no. 13).

School' began to strive to minimize the importance of the German tribes. According to it, the Roman Empire continued to exist and to have an actual influence on the future of Europe in all kinds of ways, so that the role of the Barbarian kingdoms that inherited it was to adopt certain characteristics of Roman culture. Therefore, the historiographical dispute during the nineteenth century was about the question whether there had been continuity in the transition from the Ancient Era to the Middle Ages (according to the Roman School) or whether there was a rupture (the German School). As was shown before, this dispute branched out to racial, national, territorial and cultural questions that were, in fact, related to the political confrontations of the nineteenth century between France and the principalities of Germany (later on, the united Germany). In that century, most historians adopted the conventional periodization and placed the fall of Rome in the fifth century. Even so, one can assume that those who backed the notion of continuity would have also supplied a different periodization and suggest a different dating and not that of the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. Thus, if there is continuity, why, according to the Roman School, do the 4th and 5th century still epitomize the end of Antiquity?

At this point, after surveying the main approaches, I would like to suggest one possible answer. As long as there existed a dispute between 'The German School' and 'The Roman School', those who belonged to the latter focused on the question of historic continuity alongside the national aspect that accompanied it. Their search was not directed outside, to possible global explanations and to changing their conceptions in regard to different historical periodization. These 'introvert' researchers spent their time primarily in refuting the German claims as to the uniqueness and contribution of the German tribes. I argue that this historic-national dispute that continued for many years created some sort of smoke-screen that

prevented these researchers from arriving at new conclusions as to the accepted historic periodization that had been accorded in the passage of time, an almost sacred status.

The above discussion sets the framework for the following chapters, which concentrate on several distinct periodizations that were framed during the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. These were the historical schemes of E.A. Freeman, James Bryce and J.B. Bury, who, I argue, did not follow the conventional periodization but created new interpretations for the transformation between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Despite Freeman's, Bryce's and Bury's innovative approaches, it was only in the twentieth century that several new periodizations became deep-rooted especially in the academic sphere. The most famous periodization was the one constructed by the Belgian historian Henri Pirenne. In 1922, a few years after the end of World War I, Pirenne published his work, *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, that included an innovative research called 'Mohammed et Charlemagne'. The research that was later published as a book³⁶⁵, created a significant change in the accepted historical periodization. Pirenne claims that Antiquity did not end with the migration of the Barbarian peoples in the 4th and 5th centuries A.D., but with the Arab Muslim conquests, in the 7th century.

According to Pirenne's approach, during the era following the barbarian invasions, one cannot find any proof of a vast transformation in the Roman world. According to him, Roman society, language (Latin), law, administration and economy were still prevalent in the Roman West. Pirenne did recognize the tribes as the ones responsible for the collapse of the imperial unity in the West, but, in his eyes, the core-structure of the empire and above all the unity of

³⁶⁵ Henri Pirenne, *Mahomet et Charlemagne*, 11e édition (Paris; Bruxelles, 1937).

the Mediterranean remained intact. In other words, the political change that fragmented the Western Empire into several barbaric kingdoms did not establish an 'iron curtain' in the Mediterranean. The Roman economic and mercantile unity was maintained and the Mediterranean was still the Roman *mare nostrum*³⁶⁶. Until the Arab conquests, the Mediterranean basin was the centre of the ancient world both commercially and culturally. However, with the arrival of the Arabs, the geographic connection between the different parts of the Mediterranean was severed. From that stage onwards, the Christian/European centre of gravity moved to the North, while Islam ruled most of the Mediterranean domains, excluding a few. The Arab rapid conquests should be attributed to their new religion. Unlike the German tribes that were assimilated into Christianity because they did not possess a strong faith, the Muslims countered Christianity with strong defined beliefs. The Arabs, as Pirenne writes, 'broke the past' and transformed their new territories into '*Dar al Islam*', the domain of Islam³⁶⁷. The Arab conquests formed a border in the Mediterranean and the unity of the old Roman world was shattered. The Muslim influence was felt in the eastern, southern and western parts of the basin, while the north was still under the grip of Byzantium³⁶⁸. As a consequence of the Arab rule, the Carolingian monarchy came into being, as Pirenne wrote: 'It is therefore strictly correct to say that without Mohammed, Charlemagne would have been inconceivable'³⁶⁹.

³⁶⁶The British Isles, according to Pirenne, offered a unique example since a different culture evolved there. See: Pirenne, *Mohammed and Charlemagne*, p.140-4.

³⁶⁷ Ibid, p.152.

³⁶⁸ Ibid, pp.163-5

³⁶⁹ Ibid, p.234

For a good reason, Pirenne extricated himself from the national disputes and suggested a different periodization that did not rely on European history but on the Arab conquests. Pirenne, being Belgian, was not preoccupied in his research with the ethnic and territorial problems that had influenced to such an extent the French and German historians. It should be noted that Belgium had always stood between France and Germany both geographically and culturally so that Pirenne could see beyond accepted historical conventions and look for special explanations that would form a new historical periodization³⁷⁰. Until the publication of this thesis, the majority of historians, but not all, as I aim to demonstrate, considered the 4th and 5th centuries as the period of the fall of the Roman Empire. As the next chapter will show these historians (Freeman, Bryce, Bury) still cherished certain aspects of the conventional periodization, but also adopted an innovative periodization.

³⁷⁰Dan Diner, 'Neutralisierung durch Gesellschaft-Henri Pirennes-Muhammed und Karl der Grosse', *Gedächtniszeiten: über jüdische und andere Geschichten* (München, 2003), s.85-8.

Chapter 4: Freeman and Bryce- History without Periods?

‘The history of civilized man goes on in one unbroken tale from Theseus to our own day’³⁷¹.

Freeman maintained that the Teutonic tribes were the ancestors of the Aryan European nations and in particular of the English people. He identified a viable link between the past and the present: ‘Of the Franks arose the modern kingdoms of Germany and France, and out of the settlement of the Goths arose the various kingdoms of Spain’³⁷². His use of the term ‘Modernity’ was relatively unique since the tribes, in Freeman’s eyes, had been the founders of the Modern European nations, initiating the modern era. One may ask why the correlation between the tribes and Modernity was only ‘relatively unique’. The answer is that other Victorian historians, who also belong to the ‘English Teutonic Circle’, such as Stubbs and Green, also viewed the tribes as initiating Modernity. Freeman’s historical theory about the ‘unity of history’ can further illuminate what Freeman meant when he argued that the whole period since the time of the tribes up to his own days had denoted one continuous period named ‘Modernity’.

Nevertheless, these two terms of unity and Modernity seem to contradict each other, since if there was a unity in history why did Freeman identify the beginning of Modernity in a certain event. If he actually saw one chain of events, linking the whole of human history, why did he adopted historical periodization and signified the tribes as the carriers of Modernity. Hence, a certain clarification is necessary for comprehending Freeman’s conception of historical time. It is essential because Freeman, I argue, constructed a certain

³⁷¹ Freeman, *Historical Essays: Second Series*, p.234.

³⁷² Edward A.Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe*, p.88.

innovative approach to periodization. An approach, which demonstrates his attempt to merge between his esteem for the Teutonic tribes together with his hatred towards the Semitic race and the Ottoman Empire.

Thomas Arnold and the Origin of the Idea

Freeman testified, similar to Green, that Thomas Arnold was the one who influenced him to adopt the idea of the 'unity of history': 'It was from Arnold that I first learned the truth which ought to be the centre and life of all our history studies, the truth of the unity of history'³⁷³. Therefore, I wish, at this stage, to trace the root of the concept in Arnold's writing. Even though Arnold, as he admitted in one of his letters³⁷⁴, was very fond of the discipline of history, his main occupation was in the social, political, religious and educational fields. He wrote extensively on these issues especially from 1827, when he began his role as the head master of Rugby school. It is hard to trace the implementation of the idea of 'unity of history' in the writings of Arnold partly because he did not write broadly on historical issues. His historical titles include the *History of Rome* (3 vol.), *Thucydides* and *Lectures on Modern History*³⁷⁵. The fact that Arnold died in the relative young age of forty-seven was another reason for the limited number of his historical works. For instance, although his prior intention was to write

³⁷³Freeman as an undergraduate in Oxford heard Arnold in 1842 (Not long before Arnold died) and adopted the idea of the unity of history. Cited in: Arnaldo D. Momigliano, 'Two Types of Universal History: The Cases of E. A. Freeman and Max Weber', *The Journal of Modern History* 58, no. 1 (Mar., 1986), p.237.

³⁷⁴'How grand a subject, if it could be written worthily! And how vast a variety of knowledge is required to do it worthily! I constantly feel how overpowering the labour is, and how many advantages I want; yet I feel, too, that I have the love of history so strong in me, and that it has been working in me so many years, that I can write something which will be read, and which I trust will encourage the love of all things noble and just, and wise and holy'. See: Stanley, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold*, II, p.71.

³⁷⁵ Thomas Arnold, *History of Rome*, new ed. (3 vol., London, 1857 [1838]); Thomas Arnold, *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, Collected and Republished* (London, 1845).

seven volumes of the history of Rome, he unfortunately, completed only three³⁷⁶. For this reason, Arnold, despite his notion of the ‘unity of history’, did not present it in full extant. As will be shown, Freeman became the one that embraced the term and employed it in his historical method. In regards to this discussion, one has to try and explain the real meaning of the idea of the ‘unity’. Is it valid to all of history or is it only applicable to a certain era? Does it include all nations, races or only limited to certain ones? Moreover, was there a difference between Arnold and Freeman in the understanding of the ‘unity of history’?

For Arnold, two periods existed in history: Antiquity and Modernity. If events were the only parameter that separated between periods, then the beginning and end of periods can be determined in an arbitrary way. Various events like the fall of the Babylonian Empire, the discovery of America and the Reformation can signify the change from ancient to modern times. However, according to Arnold, only in one era a real substantial transformation occurred. This happened when the Western Roman Empire fell and the Germanic tribes inherited the empire’s dominions. Arnold, who defined himself as a ‘modern’ historian (focusing on the age from the fall of the Roman Empire onwards), argued that the Modern age was the most complete age in history and that no other future age will replace it. For him, Modernity combined the heritage of Greece, Rome, Christianity and the German race. Accordingly, in the modern age, when the entire world has already been explored, a new race cannot emerge anymore and open a new third age in the history of men. This was dissimilar

³⁷⁶ In his letter to J.C. Platt, Arnold wrote: ‘If I live I hope to carry on the history till the sixth century, and end it with the foundation of the modern kingdoms out of the wreck of the Western Empire’. Ibid, p. 366; William Arnold, the grandchild of Thomas and nephew of Matthew, wished to continue his grandfather’s work. Eventually, he only managed to reedit the part on the Punic War. See: Linda Dowling, ‘Roman Decadence and Victorian Historiography’, *Victorian Studies* 28, no. 4 (Summer, 1985), p. 579.

to the Roman era, when the tribes East of the Rhine were unknown to the Romans and eventually replaced Rome as the new vital force of Modernity³⁷⁷. As can be seen, the conquest of the tribes signified the beginning of Modernity. This, of course, is identical to the argument of Freeman identifying the tribes as commencing Modernity. One must assume that the adoption of this idea by Freeman was again a direct influence from Arnold. As will be discussed later, it is possible that the ‘unity’ and the beginning of Modernity with the tribes were in fact identical concepts and when referring to Arnold’s ‘unity’, Freeman actually meant ‘unity’ within Modernity (excluding Antiquity).

Yet, the precise end of Antiquity according to Arnold was not as clear as it seems. In his *history of Rome*, Arnold identified the fall of Rome in a different later date. In the preface, he wrote that his intention in these volumes was to present the history of Rome to the English reader and by that continue the masterpiece of Niebuhr, who had a great influence on him. In terms of the scale of the work, Arnold saw the end of Rome (and the end of his work) with the coronation of Charles the great in 800 A.D.. He did mention that one could also consider the Roman Empire of the East as a continuity of the Western Roman Empire. Yet, in his mind, the link was not direct and only several elements from the Western Roman Empire had been preserved in the eastern one³⁷⁸.

A clear plan of his inner division of the *history of Rome*, which also presented his perception of time, appeared in a letter Arnold sent to Justice Coleridge in 1837:

The natural divisions of the subject appear to me to be the Gaulish Invasion; the Conquest of Italy, after the repulse of Pyrrhus; the Conquest of the World, or of all that could offer any effectual resistance, in the Punic and Macedonian wars;

³⁷⁷ Arnold, *Introductory Lectures on Modern History*, pp. 22–3.

³⁷⁸ Arnold, *History of Rome*, I, pp. VII–VIII.

the Civil Wars from the Gracchi to Actium; the Maturity of the Empire from Augustus to M. Aurelius; the Decline of the Empire and of Paganism from Commodus to Honorius; the chaos out of which the new creation of modern society has come, from Alaric to Charlemagne³⁷⁹.

From this letter, it seems that Arnold defined the period between the arrival of the tribes and the coronation of Charles as one period symbolizing the end of Rome and the beginning of Modernity. It is possible then that Arnold observed the four centuries between the two events as a transitional stage from Antiquity to Modernity.

In his opening Appendix chapter 'On the Social Progress of States' in his 1830 version of *Thucydides*, Arnold tried to conceptualize a theory that will be applicable to all of history³⁸⁰. The theory was an elaboration to the concepts of the famous Italian scholar Giovanni Batista (Giambattista) Vico (1668-1744). It is founded on the idea that the role of events in history is deemphasized since those cannot inform us about the real condition of states/civilizations. In order to comprehend the authentic state of a certain nation one has to observe its social evolution. As Arnold wrote in his introductory pages:

Now states, like individuals, go through certain changes in a certain order, and are subject at different stages of their course to certain peculiar disorders. But they differ from individuals in this, that though the order of the periods is regular, their duration is not so; and their features are more liable to be mistaken, as they can only be distinguished by the presence of their characteristic phenomena. One state may have existed a thousand years, and its history may be full of striking events, and yet it may be still in its childhood: another may not be a century old, and its history may contain nothing remarkable to a careless reader, and yet it may be verging to old age. The knowledge of these periods furnishes us with a clue to the study of history, which the continuous succession of events related in chronological order seems particularly to require³⁸¹.

³⁷⁹ Arnold, *Arnold's Travelling Journals, with Extracts from the Life and Letters*, p.28.

³⁸⁰ Thomas Arnold, *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold*, pp. 81 ff.

³⁸¹ Ibid.

For Arnold, events only hand us an artificial division but do not reveal the essence of the historical process:

...in our own history we are apt to take certain artificial divisions, such as the accession of the different lines of kings, or an event like the restoration, which is rather a subdivision of one particular period, than the beginning or termination of a period in itself. And in this manner we get no distinct notions of the beginning, middle, and end of the history of a people, and often appeal to examples which are nothing to the purpose, because they are taken from a different stage of a nation's existence from that to which they are applied³⁸².

When one speaks of the 'unity of history' in the context of these words another explanation surfaces: the 'unity of history' was not the linkage between events in history and their alleged reoccurrence, but the unity was apparent within an amalgamated model that existed in all historical societies. According to the model, states go through a three-stage evolution process from their 'childhood to manhood'. In the first stage, the nobility controlled the state through blood ties, conquest, wisdom or 'false' religion³⁸³. In the second stage, the commons, including the servants and assistants of the ruling noble class, seize control by the acquisition of funds and resources. Arnold titled this stage as the 'class of property', since the commons managed to gain control through the acquisition of property³⁸⁴. In the last most matures stage, representing the liberal and popular elements, the control was in the hands of the masses or as Arnold called them the 'numbers'³⁸⁵. The different stages were not dependent on the regular historical periods. Some entities in Antiquity actually belonged to a different more advanced age, while some modern entities fit to a less advance stage. This fact had direct influence on the conception of periodization in history:

³⁸² Ibid.

³⁸³ By this Arnold means, a religious doctrine that prefers one group/class/ethnic origin to the other.

³⁸⁴ Arnold, *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold*, pp. 87-8.

³⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 104-5.

We may learn also a more sensible division of history than that which is commonly adopted of ancient and modern. We shall see that there is in fact ancient and a modern period in the history of every people; the ancient differing, and the modern in many essential points agreeing with that in which we now live. Thus, the largest portion of that history which we commonly call ancient is practically modern, as it describes society in a stage analogous to that in which it now is; while, on the other hand, much of what is called modern history is practically ancient, as it relates to a taste of things, which has passed away. Thucydides and Xenophon, the orators of Athens, and the philosophers, speak a wisdom more applicable to us politically than the wisdom of even our own countrymen who lived in the middle ages; and their position, both intellectual and political, more nearly resembled our own³⁸⁶.

Again, it appears that the real unity is between societies, no matter in what historical age they dwelt. Therefore, history can bond England of the nineteenth century with the philosophers and authors of ancient Greece. This is also the reason why Arnold added this appendix to his discussion on Thucydides. He began the whole debate on the social progress of states with the following quotation from Thucydides: ‘But as the power of Hellas grew, and the acquisition of wealth became more an object, the revenues of the states increasing, tyrannies were by their means established almost everywhere...’ (*Peloponnesian War*, 1.13).

There is still an unresolved question of how Arnold observed historical time. On the one hand, as mentioned above, he claimed that there were two periods in history, divided by the emergence of the barbarian kingdoms. On the other hand, he did not identify any ruptures in history and promoted the model of the social progress of states that actually disregarded the existence of periods. This question will also arise in connection to Freeman and it seems that in the case of the two historians the idea of ‘unity of history’ was not completely attuned with the rooted conventional divisions of time. Freeman’s case, as will be extensively discussed, involves his historical as well as his political views. One possible explanation for the

³⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 109.

differences within Arnold's writings is the tension that may surface between the attempt to present a general theory to history and with particular historical events. That is to say, between a general model and perceived historical reality. The problem is that one model, comprehensive as it may be, cannot explain all historical phenomena's. The model on the progress of states through time might include the development of several societies in history but one must also explain the effect of particular formative events especially when those signify a critical change as the end of Rome. For this, and despite his general model, Arnold acknowledged the monumental event of the invasion of the tribes as the partition line between Antiquity and Modernity. This event was most significant since it marked the creation of the modern nations in Europe including England. In our 'island', as Arnold named Britain, the beginning of modern history had been with the coming of the Anglo-Saxons. The Romans and Celts, which lived in the island previously, were not the ancestors of the nation. The national sentiment of Arnold was not consistent with his model on the progress of states. His model was general to all of history and did not signify particularistic national events as influencing historical periodization. It seems that in this case, the national sentiment acquires the upper hand, and for Arnold the time of England's birth was a crucial event in the transformation from Antiquity to Modernity.

It seems that, according to Arnold, the German tribes held a bigger role than Rome in shaping history especially in modern times. If this is the case then one must ask why Arnold, who defined himself as a 'modern' historian, focused in his historical works on Greece and Rome and not on the research of the German tribes. A possible answer is that together with his emphasis of the German influence, Arnold also identified Christianity as another crucial factor of Modernity. Arnold, a devoted Anglican Christian, advocated regularly for the learning of

history and Classical texts together with the bible in order to ‘arrive to the truth as it is in Christ’³⁸⁷. In a different place, Arnold testified that one of the aims of his Roman volumes, based on the works of Niebuhr, was to oppose Gibbon’s conclusions against Christianity: ‘to make the reverse of Gibbon’³⁸⁸. Thus, since Christianity had emerged from the Greco-Roman and Jewish civilizations of Antiquity it influenced Arnold to focus on Antiquity.

Freeman and the *Unity of History*

Freeman summarized the ideas of the ‘unity of history’ in a lecture he held at Cambridge University during 1872³⁸⁹. The theory itself acknowledged the historical process as a unified and coherent process. The traditions and most importantly the political institutions intertwine ancient and modern cultures. The ‘unity’ came to life through language and culture and there was no such thing as a ‘dead’ language or an obsolete civilization. The past was alive and vivid in the present. Perhaps, the most vital aspect of this theory was that Freeman apparently abolished the conventional divisions between Antiquity, the Middle Ages and Modernity. For this reason, he also defied the notion of the superiority of Classical civilization and of the Renaissance. As known and shortly portrayed in the previous chapter, during the Renaissance, the Middle Ages were regarded as a worthless period that was overshadowed by the great achievements of both the Classical era and the Renaissance. Freeman attacked the historians who were unable to see the long-lasting and sustainable links of the Aryan civilization, which had reappeared during the Middle Ages³⁹⁰. As he mentioned in his lecture on the ‘unity of

³⁸⁷ Thomas Arnold, *Sermons* (3 vol., London, 1834), III, p. XIX.

³⁸⁸ Dowling, ‘Roman Decadence and Victorian Historiography’, pp. 382-3.

³⁸⁹ Edward A. Freeman, *The Unity of History: The Rede Lecture Delivered in the Senate-House before the University of Cambridge on Friday, May 24, 1872* (London, 1872).

³⁹⁰ Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, I, pp. 104–5.

history’: ‘My position then is that in all our studies of History and Language ...we must cast away all distinctions of ancient and modern, of dead and living and must boldly grapple with the great fact of the unity of history³⁹¹.

The prime example for this ‘unity’ was embedded in Greece, a land that Freeman cherished for its exemplary culture, language and history. The collapse of the Greek political entities led mistakenly to the conclusion that it signified also a cultural or even spiritual deterioration. Nevertheless, one must differentiate between the political and the cultural spheres. Although politically Greece declined, when Philip II of Macedonia won the battle of Chaeronea (338 B.C). or later when Corinth was burnt to the ground, the essence of Greece has survived through the ages. Greece endured in the days of the Roman Empire, later in the ‘New Rome’ and until its national revival of the nineteenth century. The same notion was applicable to Rome. The idea of Rome and the Latin language was deep-rooted in the European sphere: ‘The History of Rome is the history of the European world. It is in Rome that all the states of the earlier European world lose themselves; it is out of Rome that all the states of the later European world take their being’³⁹².

The identification of this historical unity was impossible ‘to those who break up the unity of history by artificial barriers of ancient and modern’³⁹³. Therefore, one must cast the bonding limitations away and embrace a new understanding of history. Freeman was actually transmitting an educational and even a moral message here. Like Polybius his admired Greek historian, who wrote his *Histories* for pragmatic reasons (*pragmatike historia*), Freeman also

³⁹¹Freeman, *The Unity of History*, p.11.

³⁹² Ibid., p. 43.

³⁹³ Ibid., p.41.

manifested the idea of the ‘unity’ as beneficial for the sake of society. The most important lesson he wished to teach historians was to embrace a different approach, enabling them to perceive the true meaning of history. In the practical sense, the historian must not yield to common fixed dates but analyse the authentic essence of historical times. This applies, among other eras, to the mistreatment of the Middle Ages as a significant period: ‘Man study what they call Greek and Roman history; they study again the history of the modern kingdoms of England and France. But they end their Roman studies at the latest with the deposition of Augustulus’³⁹⁴.

How did Freeman adapt this theoretical historical model to his own understanding of the ‘time border’ between Antiquity and Middle Ages? Did he differentiate between the two periods? In order to answer these questions, it is essential to elaborate on Freeman’s views on this matter. As I will show, this is not an easy task. Firstly, because Freeman wrote extensively and one can find numerous seemingly divergent accounts, books and articles by him that focus on this subject. From these vast collections, as in the case of other historians, it is very difficult to define if a certain meaningful event ended Antiquity or whether Rome continued into Modernity. Secondly, following the first caveat, the variety of views emerging in his works is sometimes inconsistent or even contradictory, and in order to extract his conclusion regarding the framing of historical time, it is essential to observe what Freeman’s real opinion was in regards to the end of Antiquity . Thirdly and last, the fact that Freeman promoted the theory of the ‘unity’ led him to disregard the conventional division between Antiquity, the Middle Ages and Modernity. It appears sometimes that the notion of different periods did not exist in his

³⁹⁴ Ibid., p.43.

writings. Hence, history is one long continuum. Hence, the conceptions relevant to other historians were not applicable in Freeman's case, since 'the history of man is one in all history'³⁹⁵.

In *The Chief Periods of European History*³⁹⁶, Freeman took issue with Gibbon's assertion that the decline had commenced when Rome was in its prime. Freeman stated that the Western fall had begun a short time before Gibbon thought it had occurred and unlike the latter, he thought that the fall ended centuries later. Although he did not agree with Gibbon, Freeman stated his criticism in a cautious and courteous manner. For Freeman, the sign that Roman decline had commenced when it re-conquered its lost territories from the tribes. Although in this period Rome managed to drive the invaders out, this was not an indication of Rome's strength but of a growing weakness³⁹⁷. In another book, Freeman delved into the description of the tribes beginning with the *Marcomanni*, which had fought against Marcus Aurelius' in the second century A.D.. According to him, the *Marcomanni* were not vital to the history of Europe. However, their war against Rome signalled the future developments in the third century A.D. when other German tribes penetrated the Roman territory. This development, allegedly, commenced a new era that linked the beginning of Modernity with the invasions of the tribes: 'in the third and fourth centuries the history of modern Europe begins'³⁹⁸. I.e. Modernity is the advent of Teutonism.

³⁹⁵ Ibid., p.11.

³⁹⁶ Edward A. Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History : Six Lectures Read in the University of Oxford in Trinity Term, 1885, with an Essay on Greek Cities under Roman Rule* (London ; New York , 1886).

³⁹⁷ Ibid., pp.74-6.

³⁹⁸ Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe*, p.88.

Freeman, it seems, identified the fifth century A.D. as the century in which the Roman crisis had been most apparent. The crossing of the Rhine at the end of December 406 marked the beginning of the process. This was not necessarily due to the tribes that crossed (Vandals, Suebi etc.), since those tribes did not leave a long-lasting mark on the continent, but these invasions led other tribes, such as the Franks and the Goths, to act in a more audacious manner against the Romans. This new attitude was represented in the most decisive event of the century, the invasion of Alaric the Goth of Italy (410 A.D.). This event, together with the previous crossing of the Rhine, formed a chain-reaction that eventually instigated the conquest of Gaul and Iberia. In this aspect, Freeman disagreed with the conservative argument that the end of the Ancient world had occurred in 476. : ‘So it was with that other event of the latter half of the century in which so many have so strangely seen the end of the Roman Empire, the boundary line between ancient and modern history’³⁹⁹. In another letter Freeman sent to J.R. Green, while visiting Rome, he reaffirmed this idea: ‘I made a sudden leap from Licinius and Sextius to Belisarius and Narses. I am most interested in the two ends of the story-I say end-for the Gothic War is really the end of that Rome. As far as I see, 476 made no practical difference here at all; the events of the next age as of the age before made a great deal’⁴⁰⁰. For Freeman, the Western Empire was not demolished in 476 A.D. but only united with the Eastern one. The Senate decided that the emperor of the West was incapable and the succeeding warlords or kings that ruled the West after 476 were actually under the influence of the East. Freeman also accentuated this point to the British historian George Finely, who delved into the research of the Eastern Roman Empire:

³⁹⁹ Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History*, p.95.

⁴⁰⁰ JRLM, MSS FA1/8/95a, Freeman to Green, 24 April, 1881.

. . . On Sir F. Palgrave's *Normandy and England*. Are you up in his writings? I do not remember that either of you ever refers to the other; I am not sure that you would appreciate one another **but you always go together in my mind. I make my historical system out of a union of you two, you work out the fact that the Roman Empire did not die in 476, but lived on as long as you please after [my emphasis].** You do the East, which has been forgotten, he the West, which has been misconceived. But he does it only by hints and fragments, and in his present book, he has gone half –wild in the form of his composition. I should rather like to write the history of the Western Empire myself; i.e. not so much the history of Germany or of Italy as the history of the Imperial idea...⁴⁰¹.

Palgrave, as a matter of fact, represented a very significant study case which may shed light on Freeman's historical view. Similar to Arnold and Freeman, Palgrave acknowledged the Teutonic tribes together with Rome as the two main forces of history. However, as Roger Smith demonstrates, there was an alteration in Palgrave's views⁴⁰². In the first phase, until 1827 when his book was published, Palgrave argued for the importance of the Teutonic element in the establishment of the European states and in particular in the foundation of England. For him, most of the people of Europe and institutions originated from the Teutonic race⁴⁰³. In these years, and through the influence of German scholars like the Grimm brothers and the poet F. H. von der Hagen (1780 –1856), he also adopted an anti-French stance deriving from his Teutonic view and especially from the German resistance against the armies of Napoleon. Yet, then a drastic shift occurred, and from now on he identified the Roman element as the most dominant carrier in the history of Europe. In his introduction to *The History of Normandy and England*, Palgrave commented that the German tribes had perhaps ruined the physical Rome but in fact they 'humbly knelt before their Captive' by embracing Rome's

⁴⁰¹ Stephens, *The life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, I, p.237.

⁴⁰² Roger Smith, 'European Nationality, Race, and Commonwealth in the Writings of Sir Francis Palgrave, 1788-1861', in Alfred P. Smyth (ed.), *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe* (Basingstoke, Hampshire, 2002), pp. 233–53.

⁴⁰³ Ibid., p.234.

culture and heritage: ‘This devolution of authority from Rome, this absorption of Roman authority by the Barbarians, this political, and more than political, this moral unity, this confirmation of a dominion which they seemed to subvert,..., is the great truth upon which the whole history of European society, and more than European society, European civilization, depends’⁴⁰⁴.

The primary cause for this transformation was that Palgrave, a Jew who converted to Anglicanism, adopted the famous prophecy from the book of Daniel about the four kingdoms which signify the four ages of the world. According to him, the four monarchies had been Assyria, Persia, Greece and Rome. Thus, Rome represented the last of the monarchies and the era from its establishment until Palgrave’s own days was in fact one single period of Roman dominance. The tribes according to this argument preserved the essence of Rome, but did not commence a totally new period. Palgrave in his *History of the Anglo-Saxons* even criticized the beacons of the eighteenth century, Robertson and Gibbon, for not noticing the linkage between the fourth monarchy/Rome and modern Europe⁴⁰⁵. Palgrave, however, did praise in the next sentence the works of Dubos, Savigny and Allen, who all identified the continuous influence of Rome. From Palgrave’s observations, several conclusions may be drawn. Primarily, it is understandable why Freeman, as he attested in his letter to Finlay, named him as a source of inspiration. Indeed, Palgrave’s mergence between Rome and the Teutonic elements became very central in the historical perception of Freeman. Freeman, as will be shown, devised his periodization following these two forces (Rome and Teutonism). Furthermore, if Palgrave did in fact recognize Rome and not Teutonism as the great source of

⁴⁰⁴ Francis Palgrave, *The History of Normandy and of England* (4 vol., London, 1851), I, p.8.

⁴⁰⁵ Francis Palgrave, *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, a new edn. (London, 1876 [1867]), p.X.

Europe, then one long historical era had merged Rome with Modernity. Through the adoption of the four monarchies scheme, the coming of the Germanic tribes in the fifth century became less prominent and suddenly the whole time span from the Roman Empire until contemporary times was homogenous and unified. This, in fact, is another version of the ‘unity of history’. But a major difference still separated Palgrave from Arnold and Freeman. The former, in conjunction with the Book of Daniel, mentioned four periods in the world, while they allegedly spoke of a unity which was separated into two sub-divisions of Antiquity and Modernity.

Back to 476 A.D.

In another letter from Freeman to Finlay, the insignificance of 476 A.D. reappears: ‘It is strange how people do not realize the existence of the Roman Empire at all after when? Perhaps 476. They always talk as if Charlemagne ‘restored’ something defunct. Turn to a mediaeval writer and the phrase always is that he transferred the Roman Empire from the Greeks to the Franks’⁴⁰⁶. Following these remarks over the relative insignificance of the year 476, one can assume that Freeman observed 407 or 410 A.D. as the decisive years in the transition between the empire and the Barbarian kingdoms. In one of his books, he wrote that the sack itself ‘...was the sign that an old day was passing away and that a new day was coming’⁴⁰⁷. From now on, Rome was in danger and her sack was the first step in the ‘beginning of the modern powers of the modern world’⁴⁰⁸. This date was mentioned again later, when

⁴⁰⁶ Stephens, *The life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, I. p.240.

⁴⁰⁷ Freeman, *Western Europe in the Eighth Century & Onward*, p.12.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid., p.13.

Freeman as Regius professor, told Bryce that he intended to give a talk ‘on the revolution of 406-419, the beginnings (if any) of modern European history’⁴⁰⁹.

The significant point to note is not in which specific year in the fifth century Freeman thought that the shift from Antiquity to Modernity had taken place, but the fact that he identified the Germanic tribes as the force that had symbolized this transformation. He was of the opinion that the tribes had commenced Modernity. This converged with his theory of the Teutonic dominance in the course of history. The tribes were the ones who received and carried on the torch from the Romans and the Greeks: ‘As the Roman everywhere carried Greece with him, so the Teuton everywhere carried Rome with him’⁴¹⁰. The tribes also passed this legacy into the future and they were the direct ancestors of the European Aryan powers and the moving force of Modern history.

The important role of the Teutonic tribes was not surprising, to say the least, according to Freeman’s approach. He stressed the idea that the ‘Aryan race’, including England of course, had been the greatest of the World’s races. Aryans were unmatched in their elegance and vitality and are fundamentally superior. Freeman, as elaborated in the first part, based his ideas regarding the superiority of the Aryan western nations on the ‘comparative method’ devised by Müller and Tylor during the second half of the nineteenth century. Freeman stated the significance of the method by comparing the Aryan achievements to the era of the Renaissance:

I do not for a moment hesitate to say that the discovery of the Comparative Method in philology - let me add in politics and history and the whole range of human thoughts - marks a stage in the progress of the human mind at least as great and

⁴⁰⁹ Bod. Ms. Bryce 7, fol.162, Freeman to Bryce, 14 June, 1885.

⁴¹⁰ Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History*, p.93.

memorable as the revival of Greek and Latin learning. The great contribution of the nineteenth century to the advance of human knowledge may boldly take its stand alongside the great contribution of the fifteenth⁴¹¹.

For Freeman, as seen, this was not only applicable to language but also to other fields including the construction of racial communities. Therefore, all of the Aryan nations originated from one primal linguistic and racial source. Freeman advocated the superiority of the West, and in particular of the Aryans, over the East. The popular assemblies and the democratic institutions, invented by the early Aryan tribes and inherited by the modern European nations, characterize this superiority.

As I will demonstrate, according to Freeman the claim that Antiquity ended with the tribes is only partly true. There is no doubt that the penetration of the Germanic tribes into the Roman territories was a colossal development for Freeman, yet it is only one brick of a very high wall. In other words, he defined the process of the fall as a gradual one. In his opinion, Rome did not fall in 'one day', and one could even argue that for Freeman it never fell but has continued to thrive until his own times. This also points to a problematic aspect in Freeman's account of the tribes, since if he dismissed the notion of periods in history and followed the path of the unity, why did he still create a rupture between Antiquity and Modernity. Why did he use periods at all? Did the unity not prevail and from the classical Greeks through the Roman Holy Empire and even up to modern Germany or Britain there was only one long sequence? There is no definite answer here, but only several possible explanations that I will discuss in the course of the subsequent discussion. It needs to be questioned whether Freeman considered his division of periods and his theory of unity as contradictory. Maybe the two can

⁴¹¹ Freeman, *The Unity of History*, p.9.

live together, since one should differentiate between unified ideas that exist in the meta-historical level and the circumstantial vicissitudes on the historical level.

One possible explanation was given by the historian William Stephens (1839–1902) who wrote Freeman's biography. He argued that Freeman located the real beginning of Modernity in the 'earliest records of Aryan Europe'. This was dissimilar to Bunsen who began Modernity with the 'call of Abraham' and with one of Freeman's colleagues who identified Modernity with the French revolution. Freeman, according to Stephens, was obliged to follow certain rules of general history and for that reason stressed the significance of the tribes as commencing Modernity⁴¹². Nevertheless, these explanations may not be sufficient especially when one takes into accounts the importance that certain epochs like the fifth century A.D. had in the eyes of Freeman.

When Rome was at its zenith, the tribes transformed gradually from their state of freedom into subjection. Later, in the fifth century, these tribes turned from being subjects of Rome to free nations: 'it was step by step that the world became Roman; it was step by step that it ceased to be so'⁴¹³. In addition, during the sixth century, most of the empire except Britain, Gaul and northern Spain was reunified under the leadership of Justinian: '...in the West the empire was broken in pieces in the fifth century, but that it was largely put together again in the sixth by a reaction from the East'⁴¹⁴. The official language was still Latin as can be seen in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*. Freeman spoke of a Christian unity that had stretched from the Atlantic to Mount Taurus and had remained intact after the arrival of the Germans.

⁴¹² Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, II, pp.282–3.

⁴¹³ Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History*, p.83.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid., p.79.

Nevertheless, Egypt and Syria had not been part of this unity because they adopted a different Christian belief based on unique national affiliations⁴¹⁵.

Although one can argue that Freeman promoted the notion of unity from Rome to Modernity, several significant time-borders still surface in his historical narrative. There is no doubt that the fifth century was most momentous for him, since in this century the ancient world had separated from the modern one. The common ground of the Aryan spirit that diffused from Greece to Rome and then moved to the European nations was a powerful force in the course of history, and for this reason, the tribes carried their spirit onwards and there was no real division in their history. This force was mainly founded upon the racial superiority of the Aryans, and in particular of the Teutonic stock. Other events, like the Norman Conquest, were perhaps monumental but most of them did not shatter the 'unity of history'. A real split in the unity, as I will explain, can only materialize from the emergence of a foreign racial, political and religious powers, like the Arabs or Ottomans.

East, Islam and the Ottomans

For Freeman, Western history was defined by core-values: progress, law, monogamy and Christianity. The East, on the other hand, was 'stationary, arbitrary, polygamous and Mahometan'⁴¹⁶. The East, according to Freeman, was the exact opposite of the West, which has a history that was far richer in knowledge than the Eastern one. For this reason, the most tremendous change in the Roman-Christian world happened in the seventh century A.D. with

⁴¹⁵ Edward A. Freeman, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens*, 3rd ed., with new preface (London, 1876), pp.14–17.

⁴¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.3.

the rise of the Arabs. From then on, a struggle between ‘Aryan and Semitic man’ had begun⁴¹⁷. The immensity of this event derived from the fact that until then the conquering people had been mostly Christian-Aryans, but now (in Freeman’s era) the course of history changed and the East together with parts of the West ‘became the possession of men altogether alien and hostile in race, language, manners and religion’⁴¹⁸.

In an article published in 1855, during the beginning of Freeman’s career, he emphasized the differences and the struggle between the East and the West. The article entitled ‘Mahometanism in the East and West’ argued that an inherent difference had separated the two domains from ancient times, long before Mohammad had begun to preach his creed among the tribes of the Arabian Peninsula and even prior to Jesus wanderings in the Galilee and Judea:

The Struggle which for so many centuries arrayed the Christian and the Mahometan against each other, was but the continuation, under altered circumstances, and with altered motives, of a struggle which had been waged for ages before the promulgation of either faith, and whose commencement has to be looked for in times far beyond the reach of authentic history. It is the old internecine war between East and West, between despotism and freedom, between a progressive and a stationary social state⁴¹⁹.

The accounts of Herodotus on the wars between the Greeks and the Persians testify about this long-lasting struggle. Later, it was Polybius and his description of the Punic wars between Rome and Cartago that symbolized the continuing clash between the two spheres. Here, in this early publication of Freeman, perhaps the true meaning of the ‘unity of history’ becomes known since, as Freeman stated, the ‘torch had passed’ from Greece, to Macedon, to Rome and eventually to the new nations of Europe, which had replaced the empire. All of this

⁴¹⁷ Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe*, p.112.

⁴¹⁸ Ibid.

⁴¹⁹ Edward A. Freeman, ‘Mahometanism in the East and the West’, *North British Review* 23 (1855): p.450.

new entities were the guardians of western ideals and fought against the barbarity and tyranny of the East. Yet the struggle reached its zenith with the establishment of religions in both the East and the West. With Islam and Christianity, it became to be not only a political or an ethical conflict but also a religious one. This transformation had ripped the world apart:

From the seventh century to the present time two religions have divided the nations which have played the most prominent part upon the field of history. The Roman Empire was broken up, and her inheritance was divided among the states which arose upon her ruins. But her political, and still more her religious influence, did not die with the fabric of her external power. In the East her name, her laws, her political traditions, and the unbroken identity of her long line of despots, survived for a thousand years on the Shores of the Propontis; in the West, every ruler who acquired some portion of her territory, was proud to deck himself with some shred of her dissevered purple⁴²⁰.

Gibbon and his ‘school’, as Freeman named them, tried to demonstrate that the Arabs had been subdued during history. For Freeman, this view was promoted as part of the general hostility of Gibbon against the Church, since the latter wished to show how the Church led her believers astray. Although the Church, following *Genesis*, prophesised that Ishmael ‘shall dwell in the face of all his brethren’ [יִשְׁמָעֵל, כָּל-אֶחָיו, 16, 12], attesting about the eternal liberty of the sons of Ishmael (Arabs), history and the subjection of the Arabs proved it to be wrong. In contradiction to Gibbon but similar to the Christian prophecies, Freeman wrote that the Arabs had succeeded in gaining independence during the course of history. No other nation throughout history was free as the Arabs, whose holy cities of Mecca and Medina were never under the control of other foreign power⁴²¹.

Following this notion of the Arab historical independence, I wish to argue that, according to Freeman, the Arabs were the main but not the only force that destroyed the unity

⁴²⁰Ibid., p.452.

⁴²¹ Freeman, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens*, p.21.

of Rome, Christianity and of the West⁴²². Freeman concurred that most parts of the West had been under the control of the Roman Empire. However, with the arrival of Islam the ‘old World order’ was shattered: ‘it as indeed a moment for Mahomet and his Saracens to change the face of the earth’⁴²³. The catalytic agent initiating the change was perhaps external, but, with the coronation of Charlemagne, a new era began and from then on there were three major powers: Arabs, Franks and Romans. This was the core of the future division between the nations and the real emergence of a new period⁴²⁴. By this, Freeman made the distinction between the old Rome and the new one. Both the East and the West were no longer Roman and the division between them became eternal. They both began to acquire a national character, which was contradictory to the universal aspect of Rome. One empire became German and the other one Greek. A similar process took place in the Muslim world when the caliphate of Cordova established its kingdom alongside and in rivalry to the one in Baghdad. From these four powers, the nations of the Mediterranean have developed⁴²⁵.

The conclusion is that until the time of Charlemagne the Roman Empire still held a certain unity. Nevertheless, with the rise of the Arabs and the era of Charlemagne, there occurred another and almost final separation between the East and the West, which was mainly caused by the Arab invasions. In those times, the lands outside the control of the empire, as

⁴²² For Freeman’s anti-Arab and Ottoman approach see: Vicky Morrisroe ‘Eastern History with Western Eyes’: E.A. Freeman, Islam and Orientalism, *Journal of Victorian Culture* 16, 1, (2011), pp.25-45; the article, nevertheless, does not emphasize Freeman’s unique periodization and especially the direct link between his anti-Eastern/ Arab stance and his division of time.

⁴²³ Freeman, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens*, p.30.

⁴²⁴ Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe*, p.122; M. De Sanctis, *Freeman and European History* (Farnborough, 1990), p.6.

⁴²⁵ Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe*, pp.124-6.

Britain and Scandinavia, were already in the midst of the process of transforming into nations and states. In Europe, this process began with the division of the Carolingian Empire⁴²⁶.

As mentioned, Freeman adopted a different view of the end of Antiquity and regarded the church in much more favourable eyes. This positive view can be understood perhaps through Freeman's attraction to the ideas of the Oxford movement or Tractarianism. Freeman, after his first arrival to Oxford as a student, became acquainted with this movement in the 1840's⁴²⁷. The Oxford movement evolved from the beginning of the 1830's through the activity of several Oxford scholars, headed by Henry Newman (1801-90). Newman in particular pointed to the similarities between the Roman Catholic belief and Anglicanism and strove to adopt sacramental worship⁴²⁸. The Church, for them, continued Rome: 'when the apologists had defended the church against the pagans by out-thinking them and the martyrswhen although the Roman Empire fell into decay, the *imperium in imperio*, the Christian society, triumphed over its grave'⁴²⁹. Newman also tried to demonstrate the lineage between the Church of the first centuries and the English Church and emphasized the notion of the apostolic succession. The state, hence, has no power over the church and should not interfere with its issues. Like Burke's concept of the 'state', the church was developed throughout the ages as an organism⁴³⁰. Freeman, although impressed by the movement, did not join in and was more akin to the ideas of the Broad Church which included many other liberal thinkers from his close

⁴²⁶ Ibid., pp.132-3.

⁴²⁷ Arnaldo D. Momigliano, 'Liberal Historian and Supporter of the Holy Roman Empire: E.A. Freeman', in G.W. Bowersock and T.G. Cornell (eds.), *A.D. Momigliano Studies on Modern Scholarship*, (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 197-8.

⁴²⁸ S. A. Skinner, *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement* (Oxford, 2004).

⁴²⁹ Quoted in Richard D. Altick, *Victorian People and Ideas* (New York ; London, 1973) p.212.

⁴³⁰ Ibid, p. 213. .

circle. Momigliano argued that Freeman's final detachment from the Oxford Movement was due to the fact that Thomas Arnold through Teutonism and Protestantism 'showed the young Freeman a way out' of Catholicism⁴³¹. However, some ideas of the Movement may have marked their influence on the young Freeman⁴³². For instance, unlike other historians, who attacked the early Church for its deeds, Freeman (together with his biographer Stephens) pointed out the vital role of the early Church in the creation of the European nations⁴³³. For this reason, Freeman was much interested in, and very knowledgeable of the history of the Church. Freeman considered the Church as the true successor of the empire in the West. In the East, the Emperor was dominant and fought for the sake of the cross, while in the West the Emperor was absent, so the Bishop of Rome took his place⁴³⁴. In any case, according to him, the church was a positive force and not a negative one. From the fourth century A.D., Rome was unified under the Church and not divided by its growing influence, an approach that, in his eyes, stood in contrast to Gibbon's monumental theory about the destructive force of the Church and of the Germanic tribes. For Freeman the unity created by the Church and especially its political and institutionalized contributions to the Roman Empire faced a grave danger in the seventh century when an opposite or alien ideological and political force rose in the East. The rise of Islam transformed the empire and created a 'new order'. The idea of Rome as embedded in

⁴³¹ Momigliano, "Liberal Historian and Supporter of the Holy Roman Empire: E.A. Freeman", p.199; Bryce mentioned, in a footnote in his short biographical sketch of Freeman's life, that the aversion against High Church tendencies began after one of his tutors in Trinity argued that since the Reformation the ordering of some priests in Sweden was wrong and for that reason no Swede could ever be salvaged. See: Bryce, *Studies in Contemporary Biography*, p. 264 (footnote).

⁴³² In his Oxford days at Trinity College, Freeman became a devoted believer going twice a day to chapel and visiting St. Mary's church every Sunday. See: Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, I, pp. 46-7; 58; 68-9;

⁴³³ Ibid., p.112.

⁴³⁴ Ibid., pp.156-9.

culture, institutions and even the Teutonic race, kept on living in the West, but as a political entity Rome changed forever.

The occurrences in the European-world dominion of the nineteenth century can further explain why Freeman saw the Arabs as the main force that had instigated a new era in the history of the Western Roman Empire. In contrast to the general British foreign policy, supporting the Turkish cause especially in fear of the Russian expansion, Freeman defined the Turks and not the Russians as the archenemy. The prime example of this British support of the Ottomans was apparent in the Crimean war in which the empire fought alongside the Turks against the Russians. Nevertheless, this was not the only case, and for the most of the nineteenth century, British governments maintained a similar foreign policy. For instance, during the first half of the 1870's the Turks fought and massacred insurgents and civilians in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia. In 1876, the Bulgarians joined the mutiny against the Porte and in response, the latter commenced a bloodbath of Bulgarian communities, especially in the city of Batak. Despite this, Britain did not change its official stance towards the East and maintained its support of the Porte. In response, William Gladstone published a paper about the need to reassess the British strategy in the East, in particular following the bloodshed in the Balkan. The name of the paper *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*⁴³⁵ gave an indication as to its content. Gladstone himself laid part of the blame on the British, and especially at the doorstep of Disraeli's government: 'so far as appears, we have been involved, in some amount, at least, of moral complicity with the basest and blackest outrages upon record within the present century, if not within the memory of man'⁴³⁶. He then continued and further stressed

⁴³⁵William E Gladstone, *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East* (London, 1876).

⁴³⁶ Ibid., p. 12.

the British responsibility: ‘The moral and material support, which during the year has been afforded to the Turkish Government, has been given by the Government of England on behalf of the people of England’⁴³⁷.

On the 8th of September 1876, Freeman, like Gladstone, wrote harsh comments in *The Times* against the Turkish atrocities: ‘Europe is astounded to find that it has within its confines a race...capable of worse things than even the African or the Red Indian...the Bulgarian details are a new chapter in human nature - new, that is to say, to those who happen not to be versed in Tartar or Turkish history’⁴³⁸. This resentment, I argue, and even hatred or racism towards the Turks, together with the theory of unity, led Freeman to embrace a negative view of the Arab conquerors. For Freeman, the Arabs represented an earlier version of the Ottomans. According to him, the Ottomans were the most dangerous and destructive power in history and because of this, also their predecessors, the Arabs of the seventh century, had been a malicious force that broke Christian unity. The Ottomans prevented the Eastern Christian lands of Serbia, Greece etc. from uniting with the rest of the Christian world. The Arabs, similarly, had been the first that separated the East from the West and actually created the division between the two parts of Christendom. The theory of the ‘unity of history’ fitted the proposed linkage between the Arabs and the Turks because of the long-term, religious, cultural and political affiliations that were transmitted in the course of history from one civilization/culture to the next. In this case, as in the example of the modern European Aryan nations and their tribal ancestors, the Turks were another manifestation of the conquering Arabs. Islam and

⁴³⁷Ibid., p.13.

⁴³⁸ Edward A. Freeman, ‘The Turkish Atrocities: Mr. Gladstone and the Turkish Empire’, *The Times*, September 8, 1876.

Christianity had been developed under the Saracen and Roman Empires, yet later, the new forces of history, the Turks and the Franks continued the Imperial heritage and the almost eternal struggle between East and West:

But the East was to supply a further spectacle, exactly analogous to what had already taken place in the west. What the Roman Empire was to Christianity, that of the Saracen was to Islam, its birthplace, its nursery, the vehicle of its extension to other nations, but not the power which should itself supply its most permanent or its most zealous devotees. When the two creeds waged the fiercest struggle, when the strife was most openly and consciously for the faith of each, when the Cross and the Crescent met in the most deadly conflict for the land held sacred alike by the votaries of both, the warfare was no longer between the Roman and the Saracen, but between their respective disciples, the Frank and the Turk...⁴³⁹.

The intertwinement between the developments of Freeman's days and his view of the past is most explicit and can explain Freeman's most renowned saying, that 'history is past politics and politics are present history'⁴⁴⁰. In any case, Freeman did follow the teaching of this saying, since he amalgamated between the two spheres, the political and the historical. This was seen in his assessment of the Eastern Question and his interpretation of Antiquity and of the fall of the Western Roman Empire.

For a certain reason or reasons, that I will explore in the next passages, Freeman's observation was not perceived as a breakthrough concerning the end of Antiquity. The question that must be asked is: if Freeman regarded the Arabs and not the Teutonic tribes

⁴³⁹ Freeman, 'Mahometanism in the East and the West', pp.453–4.

⁴⁴⁰ Richard Evans maintains that the saying should be attributed to Sir John Seeley, who was the Regius Professor of Modern History in Cambridge from 1869-95. However, in a recent article it was proven that Freeman actually coined it. See: Richard J. Evans, *In Defence of History*, [New ed.]. (London, 2000), p.337.; I. Hesketh, "'History Is Past Politics, and Politics Present History': Who Said It?", *Notes and Queries* 61, no. 1 (March 1, 2014): pp. 105–8; The saying appeared in several of Freeman's publications. For instance, Edward A. Freeman, *Lectures to American Audiences* (Philadelphia; London, 1882), pp.207–8.; After H.B. Adams heard Freeman's lecture, it became the motto of the John Hopkins History faculty: 'His portrait hangs in the library of the University, and hard by it his favourite motto, "History is past politics, politics are present history", is inscribed on the wall, just over the newspaper cabinet'. See: Stephens, *The Life and Letters*, II, p.181.

as the ones who had destroyed the Western Empire, why did he not alter his views concerning the end of Antiquity? After all, he identified the Arabs and their century of conquests as the cause for the Roman Western fall. By this, he preceded other scholars, such as Henri Pirenne and Christopher Dawson, who raised a similar periodization only four decades later⁴⁴¹.

Because of the scope of Freeman's work and his multiple and even conflicting causes for the end of Antiquity, it is not clear and is still debatable what was Freeman's 'real' periodization. More significantly, Freeman, as a nineteenth century scholar, expressed occasionally racist and anti-Semitic stances. This fact, especially after the Second World War, has labelled him, by some, as another irrelevant racial scholar that did not contribute anything new to the discipline of history. Sometimes this labelling could be justified, but it has the negative effect of placing out of view the originality of his views on the end of Antiquity. Furthermore, it is possible that the explanations he named for the end of Antiquity are the cause for his relative obscure periodization. After all, Freeman based his thesis mainly on the transformation of political powers and institutions. This attitude was shared with other nineteenth century historians. They stressed the political features rather than the social, economic or cultural aspects that have become such a vital part of twentieth century historical

⁴⁴¹ For Pirenne, see short discussion before (p.159ff.); Christopher Dawson (1889-1970) was a Catholic scholar who stressed the continuity between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. He stated that the barbaric kingdoms carried Roman customs and traditions into the Middle Ages. For Dawson, the Middle Ages contained Roman, Eastern and barbarian-tribal motifs, which formed the cultural and religious life of the Middle Ages and also of modern Europe. The Middle Ages were defined by three basic elements that had originated in Antiquity, Christianity, the Roman Empire and the classical heritage. Christianity offered Europe the spiritual base. Rome ordered it the political and administrative core, while the classical heritage set the foundations of the intellectual thinking. The role of the German – tribal factor was not absent from this tripod and Dawson regarded the tribes as signifying the ethnic-national dimension of Europe. The interesting fact is, as Dawson claimed, that this merging process and with it the Middle Ages came to life only in the seventh century when the Arabs began their conquests: 'It is in the seventh century, and not in the fifth, that we must place the end of the last phase of ancient Mediterranean civilization - the age of the Christian empire- and the beginnings of the Middle Ages'. See: Christopher Dawson, *The Making of Europe : An Introduction to the History of European Unity* (London, 1932), p.137.

circles. It is not necessarily the new dating of the end of Antiquity that marked several twentieth century historians, like Pirenne, as leading figures in the periodization of Antiquity, but the explanations they offer for their new division. The next reason, perhaps, is that Freeman was chiefly an English historian. His most famous books and probably his prime but not sole interest, were dedicated to England, especially during the Middle Ages. His books on the Norman Conquest, William Rufus⁴⁴², William the Conqueror⁴⁴³, the English Constitution⁴⁴⁴ and English architecture⁴⁴⁵ characterize Freeman as an English historian. This caused perhaps his other works to be less known in comparison to his rather known English narratives.

Lastly, in connection to the former reasons and following the earlier discussion about the English Teutonic historians, Freeman was close in his ideas to the German scholars that have emphasized the role of the German tribes in their historical approach. He promoted Teutonic themes and identified a certain Germanic sphere that had formed modern Germany as well as of other nations. This emphasis of the tribes can lead to the assumption that Freeman actually argued that with the coming of the tribes, Antiquity had ended. Thus, Freeman did not diverge from many other nineteenth century historians. I maintain otherwise, although the tribes were important for Freeman, they do not symbolize a break but a continuation and were another, yet very important, component of the ‘Aryan legacy’. His perception of the tribes, as seen, may have directed Freeman to adopt a positive approach towards Germany, especially

⁴⁴² Edward A. Freeman, *The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First* (Oxford, 1882).

⁴⁴³ Edward A. Freeman, *William the Conqueror* (London, 1888).

⁴⁴⁴ Edward A. Freeman, *The Growth of the English Constitution : From the Earliest Times* (London, 1872).

⁴⁴⁵ Edward A. Freeman, *A History of Architecture*. (London, 1849).

during its unification process, and simultaneously, a negative perception of France. This is perhaps another case where his merging of current politics and history can be observed.

The French Enemy

Regarding France, Freeman maintained that ‘some Aryans were more Aryans than others’ and by this he meant that Germany, for instance, was more ‘Aryan’ than France. During the war of 1870-1 Freeman supported the German cause ardently, yet he maintained that England should not be involved directly in the war:

As to the war I hope we may manage to keep out of it...I need not tell you, that my sympathies go wholly and unreservedly with the ...Dutchmen. It is one of the very rare cases in which one can go wholly and unreservedly with one side in a war. I want people not to talk about Prussians, which give a false idea. I have no love at all in Prussia as Prussia but this in Germany, which is quite another thing.... But is loathsome to see that there are people here and there who take the French side, I say go ...push them back behind Somme, Rhone and Seine. Hurrah to natural boundaries⁴⁴⁶.

The distinction Freeman made here between Prussians and Germans should be noticed since for him they do not symbolize the same thing. Thus, Freeman was not in favour with all of the Prussian policy. For instance, in a different place he argued that even though he saw the victory of Prussia with great enthusiasm, Prussia must be cautious with some of its actions and withdraw from North Sleswick⁴⁴⁷.

Another significant point is in Freeman’s referral to the idea of natural borders and the fact that Germany finally retained the control of the Rhine while dismissing the French claims to their territorial rights in Alsace-Lorraine. As he stated during a visit to Aachen shortly after

⁴⁴⁶ Bod. Ms. Bryce 5, fol. 253, Freeman to Bryce, 22 July, 1870.

⁴⁴⁷ ‘Are you not delighted of what is going on in Prussia? I am just telling Pauli that they have now only to give up that bit of North Sleswick, which cannot in any way profit them’. See: Bod. Ms. Bryce 6, fol.16, Freeman to Bryce, 17 November, 1872.

the end of the war : 'So grand, on this left bank to see the moon rise over the Free Dutch Rhine and to think that the enemy are beaten back for ever⁴⁴⁸. In a different place he elaborated on the ill historic conduct of the French in regards to their Rhine policy:

The present war has largely risen out of a misconception of history, out of the French dream of a frontier of the Rhine which never existed. The war on the part of Germany, is, in truth, a vigorous setting forth of the historical truth that the Rhine is and always has been, a German river. It is practically important to make people understand that the combined fraud and violence by which Philip 'the Fair' seized Lyons, by which Louis XI seized Provence, by which Henry VII seized Metz, by which Louis XIV seized Strasburg, by which the elder Bonaparte seized half Europe, and the younger seized Savoy and Nizza, are all parts of one long conspiracy against the peace of the world, a conspiracy against which it has ever been the first duty of every European nation to stand on its defence, and which it is now the high mission of Germany to render hopeless for the future⁴⁴⁹.

His opposition to France was mainly directed against the Emperor Louis Napoleon whom he labelled as a tyrant and a Pseudo-Caesar who threatened Europe for years. Napoleon III, according to Freeman, even acted against his own French people. For England, however, no good came out of Napoleon's ill policy against his own people since the 'wrong Frenchmen' were attacked: 'Years ago Owen argued on behalf of the tyrant that he had done the good work of killing many Frenchmen. To this I answered that the killings of Frenchmen was of times a good work, but that it was not so with L.N.B [Louis Napoleon Bonaparte] who had killed the wrong Frenchmen'⁴⁵⁰. Yet, now, following his removal from power the continent could finally be set free. According to Freeman, the title 'Emperor' was not appropriate or lawful for French rulers such as Louis Napoleon and his uncle. Freeman also linked his argument to the appropriation of the title 'Emperor' by the two French rulers, to ancient Rome. He asserted that

⁴⁴⁸Bod. Ms. Bryce 5, fol. 281, Freeman to Bryce, 4 October, 1871.

⁴⁴⁹This letter appeared originally in the *Pall Mall*, 25 November, 1870 quoted in Stephens, *life and letters*, II, p.3.

⁴⁵⁰ Bod. Ms. Bryce 6, fol.43, Freeman to Bryce, 24 August, 1873.

France was not a lawful inheritor of the Roman Empire and its rulers have no justification for using the title. Already in 1858 he told Finlay that: ‘I confess the *Romanorum Imperator semper Augustus*, impresses me with considerable awe - wherefore I have the more loathing for these miserable pseudo-Caesars in Austria and France...’⁴⁵¹. German sovereigns, unlike the French ones, were entitled to this title, since the Holy Roman Empire, reigning over the principalities of Germany with the consent of the princess, was in fact the legitimate inheritor of the empire. Again, the notion of unity is coming to life through the transmission of political ideas and the fusion of the ancient with the modern.

In a letter written to Bryce in the midst of the Franco-Prussian war, Freeman linked his hatred towards the French with his idea of the ‘unity of history’. As he wrote: ‘I have a dream. If I hear that ...this is possible and safe – of going to see the Dutch troops enter Paris – doing what was left undone in 476. Can you come too, if I do’⁴⁵². In this letter, Freeman identified the French with imperial Rome while the Dutch/German troops signified the ancient Teutonic tribes. Freeman argued that in 476 A.D. the final destruction of Rome had not occurred. Nevertheless, now history offered a chance for redemption and Rome (or Paris) in its new form can finally be destroyed. Hence, this is another clear example of the way in which Freeman merged ancient history with current politics through his theory of the unity.

Rome - From Antiquity to?

Freeman argued that we, in the nineteenth century, live in an age which is ‘*Rome-less*’. Rome as a city and as a political force with its dramatic role in world-history (by this he mainly means

⁴⁵¹ Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, I, p.237.

⁴⁵² Bod. Ms. Bryce 5, fol.269, Freeman to Bryce, 20 February, 1871.

European history) lost it all. For Freeman, both the Greek Empire in the East and the German Empire in the West preserved Roman elements. However, at a certain point, these elements disappeared. In the West, the end came with the reign of Frederick the Second (who ruled as the Roman Holy Emperor 1220-50). In the East, the circumstances were slightly different and the Roman tradition ceased to dominate the sphere in 1204 when the crusaders captured the city of Constantinople leading to the deposing of Alexius IV and to the proclamation of Alexius V as emperor⁴⁵³. Despite the fact that after the raid of the crusaders, a line of Byzantine rulers maintained their rule in the East, for Freeman this signified the end, and from then on only the fragments of the Eastern Empire existed⁴⁵⁴.

In an apparent contradictory opinion, Freeman commented in several places that even though the world is 'Rome-less', the spirit of Rome was still alive. In order to comprehend the full extent of Rome's clout, one must observe history from the prime days of Rome through many centuries later. A glimpse at a specific event will not reveal the true nature and extent of Rome's influence. Every nation in our times, Freeman wrote, attempted to achieve the same dominance as Rome had retained. However, none of these powers has been successful, and similar to the city-states of Greece they have not seized total hegemony. The main cause for the rise of Rome, as reported in the *Histories* of Polybius, was the constant internal fighting of the Greek cities and the Hellenistic kingdoms, whereas Rome, especially from the second century B.C., exploited this situation in order to gain its dominance⁴⁵⁵. From this, it may be

⁴⁵³ Freeman, *The Chief Periods of European History*, pp.140–1.

⁴⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 181-2.

concluded that, according to Freeman, if a specific power acts in a similar method then eventually its dominance will be akin to the Roman hegemony.

The significant aspect that arises from Freeman's argument is that the history of Rome was not only the history of the past but also that of the present and the future. Our world constantly echoes Roman culture and laws:

...if the historian of Rome is bound to look back, still more is he bound to look onwards. He has but to cast his eye upon the world around him to see that Rome is still a living and abiding power. The tongue of Rome is the groundwork of the living speech of south-western Europe; it shares our own vocabulary with the tongue of our Teutonic fathers. The tongue of Rome is still the ecclesiastical language of half Christendom; the days are hardly past when it was the common speech of science and learning'⁴⁵⁶.

Rome did not confine its grasp only to the West, but also retained a strong impact on the East: 'We made war but yesterday upon a power whose badge is the Roman eagle, on behalf of one whose capital has not yet lost the official title of New Rome'⁴⁵⁷. The two mentioned powers were of course Russia and the Ottoman Empire that fought against each other in the Crimean War. A fact, which did not prevent them both from manifesting their links with Rome. The main heritage of Rome continued in the Church where 'The successor of the Fisherman still in very truth sits on the throne of Nero, and wields the sceptre of Diocletian'⁴⁵⁸.

To a certain extent, one can conclude from Freeman's words that Rome never diminished. Roman and European history were one and the same as well as identical with the history of the world:

Look back to the first dim traditions of the European continent, and we look not too far back for the beginnings of Roman history. Ask for the last despatch and

⁴⁵⁶ Freeman, *Historical Essays*, Second Series, p.235.

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid., p.236.

⁴⁵⁸ Ibid.

the last telegram, and it will tell us that the history of Rome has not yet reached its end. It is in Rome that all ancient history loses itself; it is out of Rome that all modern history takes its source. Her native laws and language, her foreign but naturalized creed, still form one of the foremost elements in the intellectual life of every European nation; and, in a large portion of the European continent, they not only form a foremost element, but are the very groundwork of all⁴⁵⁹.

In regards to the termination date of Rome, when Freeman first wrote this article in the *National Review* of 1856, he was unable to place his finger on the exact date of the fall of Rome. He was, however, certain that the fall had occurred far into the Middle ages and long after the ‘invented’ date of 476: ‘The history of Rome dies away so gradually into the general history of the middle ages, that it is hard to say at what point a special Roman history should end. Arnold proposed to carry on his History to the coronation of Charles the Great. Something may doubtless be said for this point, and something also for other points, both earlier and later...’⁴⁶⁰. Interestingly enough, when this article was republished in 1873, in an edited version under the title of *Historical Essays*, Freeman, at this point of his discussion, added a footnote. In the footnote he confessed that when the article first appeared he was still reluctant to accept the view of Arnold, yet now he came to terms with him and supported his opinion that with the coronation of Charles the Great a new political entity had arisen. By name it was maybe Roman but in essence it reflected Germanic political characteristics:

I now feel that Arnold was right, and that the coronation of Charles is the proper ending for a strictly Roman history. Before that point it is impossible to draw any line. The vulgar boundary of A.D. 476 would shut out Theodoric the Patrician and Belisarius the Consul. But when the Roman Empire practically becomes an appendage to a German kingdom, the old life of Rome is gone. The old memories

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid, p.237.

⁴⁶⁰ Edward A. Freeman, “Mommsen’s History of Rome,” *National Review*, 8/16 (1859), 313–39, at 315.

still go on influencing history in a thousand ways, but the government of Charles was not Roman in the same sense as the government of Theodoric⁴⁶¹.

This footnote may settle the question of when Freeman thought that the Roman Empire ended, since it was one of the rare times where he actually named a specific date for this. Nevertheless, the idea of Roman fall or continuity was much more composite in Freeman's arguments.

Freeman identified a very long continuum of Roman characteristics in the West and East, a fact that marked his opinion as unique among historians. Yet he acknowledged the fact that the ending-line was very much arbitrary and one could mark the end of Roman influence in the West and East in a different era, depending on one's ideas. Maybe, because of this notion, it is possible to find in Freeman's writings various views about the end of Rome/Antiquity⁴⁶². He himself, as demonstrated, emphasized in several of his books that the Muslim invasions and the inauguration of the Carolingian Empire had been a significant era that had symbolized the end of Rome in the West. However, in other cases he spoke of a lasting Roman heritage. Following these divergent accounts, Freeman could be criticized, since sometimes it seems that his views fluctuate and alter from one book to the next. In addition, his linkage between contemporary events and the past was very problematic and even anachronistic. As I tried to claim, Freeman's views or inconsistency can sometimes be settled through the distinction between the political institutional legacy and the conservation of it as a historical idea. Namely, a distinction between the circumstantial political changes that occurred during history and the continuation of the unity of the Roman idea.

⁴⁶¹ Freeman, *Historical Essays*, Second Series, p. 237 (footnote 1).

⁴⁶² Freeman, *The Chief Periods*, pp. 138-9.

At this point one should also distinguish between two other notions: the end of Antiquity and the beginning of Modernity. It is possible to argue that they both actually mark the same period since the end of one is the beginning of the other. However, I maintain that for Freeman, these two concepts did not always converge. Freeman, without a doubt, acknowledged the tribes as the force commencing Modernity. However, the coming of Modernity does not necessarily mean that Antiquity ended. Principally, Freeman detected some Roman components far into the Middle Ages and even up to his own lifetime. This implies that even though Modernity began already in the fifth century, ancient culture did not perish with it but because of the concept of the unity, it continued to thrive. Modernity and Antiquity, therefore, lived side by side. This brings us to the main contribution of Freeman, which is the originality of his perception of historical time. His unique division of time was not common among many European scholars in the nineteenth century. Most of them preserved the long-lasting view that history was divided into three separate epochs, unlike the long vivid connection which was the core of Freeman's argumentation.

The Unity and the Study of History

The fact that Freeman was nominated (October 1884), during the last decade of his life, to the post of Regius professor of Modern History in Oxford offered him the opportunity to structure the Oxford curriculum according to his historical perception. For many years, he advocated for the theory of the unity of history and now, when he ceased to be a 'man of letters' and became an 'institutionalized historian', his method could finally be implemented within the core program of the university. Freeman was delighted by the fact that his predecessors in the chair of Modern history did not establish a fix date in which Antiquity had ended and Modernity commenced. By that they left the teaching of history in Oxford in a more malleable state and

were not swayed by the fallacy of certain historic dates⁴⁶³. In a series of letters, between Freeman and the reverend and historian, Mandell Creighton (1843-1901), the latter expressed his consent with Freeman's historical method and urged him to apply it in his teaching. In a letter from November 2 1884, written just several weeks after Freeman's inaugural lecture, Creighton wrote: 'I quite agree with you that the great danger of the history school in Oxford is the tendency to become too modern'⁴⁶⁴. Students and scholars embraced modern history and neglect the study of earlier periods: 'The first period for 476 A.D. is dead. The second period is dying. The third is gradually being replaced for the fourth. I hope you may be able to stop the further decline and bring back men to earlier times'⁴⁶⁵. Creighton regarded Freeman as an ultimate expert for the 'unity' method, whom many were not knowledgeable of: 'when one tries to find people capable of uniting history one is beset with difficulties'⁴⁶⁶. Because of Freeman's expertise, Creighton asked him to write a book in the Longman series on the themes of Christianity and Islam. The plan for the book, according to Creighton, encompassed a handful of subjects such as the emergence of Islam, its expansion, its struggle against Byzantium and the Eastern Church and its emperors. The book aimed to delve into the four concluding centuries of the first millennium A.D., a task only fitting for a 'unity' historian, such as Freeman.

Freeman and the idea of the 'unity of history' became almost inseparable. For many, as Creighton, he was the prophet of the method. Freeman, nevertheless, despite his relative late

⁴⁶³ Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, II, p.282.

⁴⁶⁴ JRLM, MSS FA1/7/120, Creighton to Freeman, 2 November, 1884.

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁶ JRLM, MSS FA1/7/122A, Creighton to Freeman, 5 March, 1885.

success to acquire the chair in Oxford, admitted that his mission to promote the unity theory will bear fruit only after a long and laborious process, probably after his lifetime:

I have been told more than once, and in more shapes than one, since I began my work in this chair, that I have been waging a battle which there is no need to wage, seeing it is already won. Nobody, I am told, disputes my doctrine, let me rather say Arnold's doctrine, of the Unity of History. I should be very glad to believe this; but I cannot see the signs of it. A little time back that doctrine had certainly not won for itself universal acknowledgement either in Oxford or elsewhere, and I am not vain enough to think that a lecture or two here can have carried this general conviction even throughout Oxford, much less throughout the whole world⁴⁶⁷.

Signs of Freeman's 'struggle' to promote his 'unity' theory were evident through his lectures in Oxford which apparently, at least in their initial stage, were not very popular among Oxford students. In a series of lectures, focusing on the history of Sicily from Antiquity until the times of Garibaldi, the attendance in class was so low that Freeman was unable to deliver all of his planned lectures. As the military historian Charles Oman (1860-1946), who attended these lectures as a young student, wrote:

He never got further than Frederic of Hohenstaufen, because no continuous audience could be found. Freeman did not deliver a short general sketch, but lingered lovingly over details of the Athenian expedition of 414 B.C. or the exploits of Roger the Norman. In the fourth or fifth term the audience had dwindled to four – one of whom was a middle-aged clergyman from North Oxford, with a taste for general information. This cleric was compelled to break off his attendance in the middle of the term, but rose to explain to the professor that 'to keep up the quorum' he must send his daughter, a very intelligent girl of fourteen. Freeman, who was growing more and more indigent as the term went on, and the hearers went off, broke off the series with an inarticulate groan⁴⁶⁸.

Nevertheless, despite several obstacles, Freeman perceived the spread of his method (or as he emphasized once and again Arnold's method) as his main task. All those who assured

⁴⁶⁷ Freeman, *The Methods of Historical Study*, p.190.

⁴⁶⁸ Quoted in Alon Kadish, *Historians, Economists, and Economic History (Routledge Revivals)* (London; New York, 2010 [1989]), pp.41–2.

him of his accomplishment, defied the practical consequences of the theory. The dissidents of the theory still cherished the old periodization and insisted on separating between Antiquity and Modernity. Their claim was that the distinction simplified the work of the historian and any attempt to replace the conventional division will be too arduous. Freeman's responded to this claim by arguing that every great change in the history of the world, paving new paths in the thinking of mankind, encompassed a great effort. However, this did not mean that the historians must pledge their affinity to an erroneous system:

it will be found that there is no real convenience in keeping up arrangements which, however much trouble they may save, have the slight inconvenience of being wholly inconsistent with any clear views of the history of the world. Meanwhile there is nothing to be done but to show in every shape and at every opportunity how much is lost by a division which tempts the students of one period to try to begin where there is no beginning, and which tempts the students of another period to make an end where there is no ending⁴⁶⁹.

The consequence is clear. Students who study a certain period should not restrict their interest to the artificial boundaries of periodization. They need to perceive history as a continuous narrative. The example, Freeman focused on, was the false distinction between the authors of Antiquity and those of the Middle Ages. Both 'types' of authors had written in Latin and preserved the legacy of Rome. Therefore, despite the alleged difference between them, they had actually belonged to the same cultural and political sphere⁴⁷⁰.

Following Freeman's disapproval of the alleged artificial boundaries and in particular his criticism of the significance attributed to 476 A.D. as a year separating Antiquity from Modernity, one would think that once Freeman would be nominated to the post of Regius professor, the Oxford history curriculum would be transformed drastically. In another letter

⁴⁶⁹ Freeman, *Methods of Historical Study*, p.192.

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid., p.194.

from Creighton to Freeman, it seems that the issue of the Exam Curriculum became an important issue for Freeman. In the letter, sent in 1885 while Freeman was already Regius Professor, Creighton described the Cambridge Curriculum. The Cambridge scheme was divided to nine sub-subjects⁴⁷¹. The main problem Creighton identified was the generalization and superficiality of the Cambridge exam program:

The Ancient history period is a mere delusion it is a scrap of Greek and Roman History...The subject is scarcely studied at all: no one attempts more than the most rudimentary knowledge. A man who did well in his Tripos came to me a few days before his exam to ask something about the tribunes. The question was so elementary that I said, 'Come tell me what you know about tribunes'. His Answer was: 'why, they were men who could put anybody in prison ...'. So much for the Ancient history. The Medieval is like unto to it: This year for instance the subject is European history from 1024-1254. You may imagine how much original work this calls for. The Modern period is similarly, The Age of Frederick the Great. I see no method in the thing at all. It seems to have arisen as a compromise between those who wanted to teach philosophy and politics and those who wanted some history. Each side went for all it could without considering how the result would hang together. An undergraduate was reading for it wrote to me. 'It is fragment[ar]y and leads to no real knowledge. The abstract subjects are too large. The historical subjects are...over a large space and the materials are not covered. We skim a few textbooks. The exam gives no encouragement to sound reading of any one of the subjects'⁴⁷².

From Creighton's words, it is apparent that the students did not identify the links and differences in between historical events and failed to learn one comprehensive method. The fact that Creighton wrote these words to Freeman implies that he thought that the Oxford scheme presented a more compatible scheme for the study of history, mainly because Freeman headed the study of history. Following this, it would be important to examine the Oxford

⁴⁷¹ English history, Constitutional laws and history, Political philosophy, Political economy, International laws and treaties, Essays and the periods of Ancient history, Medieval history and Modern history.

⁴⁷² JRLM, FA1/7/122a, Creighton to Freeman, 5 March, 1885.

scheme under Freeman and study whether he really implemented his vision of the ‘unity of history’ in the Exam Curriculum.

After a study of all the examination statuses of Modern history from the early 1870’s, when Stubbs held the position of Regius Professor (1866–84), through the years of Freeman (1884–92), James Anthony Froude (1892–4) and York Powell (1894–1904) several conclusions arise. Primarily, the exams in modern history during all of these years and until 1907 begin with the monumental year of 476 A.D.. There was no alteration during Freeman’s professorship, despite stating harsh opposition against the significance given to this specific year and to ‘artificial’ historical periodization in general. Furthermore, the division into periods and sub-periods remained at the heart of the Oxford exam system even in Freeman’s era. In the entire exam books, one of the main requirements from the students of the honour school in Modern history was ‘To name certain periods of General history, and to fix their limits’⁴⁷³. This demonstrates that Freeman was right in his statement that the implementation of the ‘unity of history’ would be applied only after his lifetime. Furthermore, he was also correct about his view that some people, although they showed their sympathy towards the unity theory, were still sceptical about its adoption. Hence, even Freeman as Regius Professor could not alter the system.

Nevertheless, between the last year of Stubbs’s professorship (1883) and the first year of Freeman’s (1884), a certain change occurred in the Exam Curriculum. The general history in Stubbs’s era was divided by the following four periods: 476-1272 A.D; 1000-1559; 1400-

⁴⁷³ University of Oxford, ‘The Examination Statutes, Together with the Decrees of Convocation and Regulations of the Boards of Studies 1877-1968’ (Oxford, 1884).

1648 and 1600-1815, while the periodization of the British history was not presented. In 1884, when Freeman took up his post, suddenly British modern history received a separated periodization commencing in 449 A.D., the year when the Anglo-Saxons first came to the isles. The English periodization appeared in a parallel column next to the general periodization, divided between seven periods until 1848. In addition, the periodization of the general history or more accurately, of the Western European history, was transformed. Everything still began with 476 A.D. but from now on the scheme was separated into seven sub-divisions⁴⁷⁴.

It is unclear what the modifications between Stubbs and Freeman really signify and whether they denote a critical difference in their historical periodization. After all, both were great advocates of English national history and therefore there was no real reason for the absence of a detailed English periodization in Stubbs's time. Freeman wished, perhaps, to emphasize the importance of English history in the curriculum by awarding it an equal space, next to the general periodization. Without a doubt, Freeman's intention was to compare between the development of English history and the history of the continent, and for that reason both histories appeared side by side. Through this comparison, the similarities and dissimilarities between the British and general European histories became clear. Yet, there were still open for interpretations. For instance, the fact that English national history originated with the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in 449 A.D. could mean that the foundation of England only marked another stage in the wandering of the nations. At the same time, it may also indicate that England was rather independent from the occurrences in the continent, since the nation's establishment preceded the alleged fall of Rome and the construction of the new

⁴⁷⁴ The divisions were [476-1085 A.D., 936-1272, 1272-1519, 1414-1610, 1610-1715, 1715-1815 and 1763-1848]. See: *Ibid.*, p.102.

Germanic kingdoms in Western Europe. When comparing the two charts it is evident that the dates of the English and the general periodization are sometimes identical but in most cases, a clear difference appears, stressing the uniqueness and independence of English history.

A certain reoccurring factor, evident in the periodization of the general history during Freeman's professorship, is that many of the chosen dates represented political developments in the German lands/Holy Roman Empire. In 936 A.D., Otto founded the Holy Roman Empire and became the first king of Germany to be crowned in Aachen. The date of 1085 A.D. was the first year of Henry IV as the Holy Roman Emperor and king of the Germans. 1272 A.D. marked the last year of the *interregnum* in the Holy Roman Empire⁴⁷⁵. 1272 also denoted the year of the ninth crusade, the last of all the crusades. Yet, since this internal era had commenced in 936 when Otto was crowned as Emperor, it is probable that the year was chosen because of its relevance to the occurrences in the Holy Roman Empire. 1519 continued the German 'Imperial' sequence. In this year, Charles I, king of Spain, became Charles V, the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. This year might also signify the emergence of the reformation through the actions of Martin Luther, a development that of course occurred in the German lands. 1714 signified the year when the wars of Spanish succession ended and the treaties of Rastatt and Baden had been signed with Philip VI and France. The only period in this division that may have been only dependent on religious reasons, rather than political events, was between 1414 and 1610. The first year signified the end of the split within the papacy (the

⁴⁷⁵ This had been the era between the deposition of the last Hohenstaufen Emperor, Frederick II, by Pope Innocent IV in 1254 and the election of Rudolph I of the Habsburg family as the *Rex Romanorum* in 1273.

Avignon papacy 1378-1414) and the second year might symbolize the time when Galileo had published his revolutionary arguments on the solar system.

Even though one must take a cautious approach and not overstate the significance of this periodization it should not be belittled. The fact that the German history or that of the Holy Roman Empire was the reoccurring theme in the proposed periodization does imply that one continuous history had stretched between 476 A.D. and the nineteenth century. This history, despite the division into sub periods, presented a unity within 'modern' history. This unity was primarily that of the Holy Roman Empire and consequently, one could even argue that the modern school of History, especially from Freeman's professorship, actually advocated for a comparison between the histories of the Roman Empire and England. Again, this does not mean that Stubbs was less keen on German themes. The contrary might be true, since Stubbs advocated a constitutional Teutonic vision of history that in some extent even surpassed the Teutonism of Freeman, who still cherished the legacy of the Roman Empire. Freeman, however, decided to emphasize the link between the European periodization and the developments in the Holy Roman Empire with greater vigour. The European periodization in Stubbs's era was based on more general events, not solely connected with the Holy Roman Empire. The years 1000, 1400 and 1600 were generic dates in his curriculum. They were not signifying a specific event but allegedly, each of them, opened a new era in European history, e.g., the new millennium had signified another stage in the Middle Ages. Contrary to this, the years 1559 and 1648 mark two important events. In 1559, Elizabeth I was crowned and the 2nd act of supremacy authorized, while on 1648 the peace of Westphalia was signed. The last year of 1815 symbolized the congress of Vienna, ending the Napoleonic wars and marking the

establishment of new European order. These dates, dissimilar to the periodization in Freeman's era, were not only 'German' but presented a more general framework.

In conclusion, the question why Freeman altered the Exam Curriculum could be attributed to several reasons. One reason derived from his own wish to express the uniqueness of English history together with its connection to the General history. The second reason originates from his Teutonic tendencies and the idea that Teutonism actually defined Modernity. Lastly, and maybe most significantly, the bond between the General history and the Holy Roman Empire pointed to the continuum between Antiquity and Modernity and the fusion between the Roman element and the German one. The Holy Roman Empire was, on the one hand, an inheritance of the Roman Empire since it maintained the name and more importantly the notion of a central imperial power. On the other hand, it also included the Germanic component, since, after all, the core of the Holy Roman Empire was based on the German speaking lands and on the German successors of Rome. Thus, the Holy Roman Empire bridged the artificial gap between Antiquity and Modernity.

Bryce : Imperialism and Roman-German Unity from Augustus to 1804 A.D.

Freeman's conception of the Holy Roman Empire emerged already in his early writings and correspondence. In November 5, 1865, Freeman told Bryce: '...I have believed in the H.R.E [Holy Roman Empire] much as you do for years. Of course it was [Francis] Palgrave who first set me really thinking about ...'⁴⁷⁶. From the letter, one could once again learn about the influence of Palgrave on the historical perception of Freeman. Palgrave, as discussed before,

⁴⁷⁶ Bod. Ms. Bryce 5, Fol. 62, Freeman to Bryce, 5 November, 1865.

amalgamated between the Roman and the Teutonic elements and observed them as the most significant forces in history. Freeman, following him, advocated for a similar historical argument. Bryce, as I aim to show, was, alongside Palgrave and Freeman, another scholar who identified Roman and Teutonic institutions and ideas as decisive. In his works, the prominence of the Holy Roman Empire [here after H.R.E.] was even more evident than in the case of Freeman, especially since he dedicated an entire book to the history of the H.R.E.

Freeman, himself, regarded Bryce as an authority on the history of the H.R.E in general and modern Germany in particular. In a letter from 22th of October, 1864 Freeman gave Bryce his general impression on Bryce's *History of the H.R.E.* which became alongside his *American Commonwealth*⁴⁷⁷ one of his most famous works and was published in multiple editions⁴⁷⁸. In general, Freeman referred to Bryce's book in favourable eyes. This was not surprising since a year and so before it was Freeman himself who encouraged Bryce to submit an essay to the Arnold Essay Prize competition on the subject of Imperial Germany. This essay won eventually the first prize and led to the publication of the *H.R.E.*⁴⁷⁹. However, Freeman did have two reservations, one concerning the style of the reference and the other concerning Bryce's 'Germanism' which was 'better anyhow than a Gallicism'⁴⁸⁰.

For Freeman, Bryce was an authority on German history. Following Freeman's request, Bryce introduced the former with many German books. For instance, when Bryce travelled Germany in 1863, he wrote to Freeman several letters reviewing the contemporary German

⁴⁷⁷ James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (London ; New York, 1888).

⁴⁷⁸ James Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1864).

⁴⁷⁹ Seaman, *A Citizen of the World*, pp.40–1.

⁴⁸⁰ Bod., Ms. Bryce 5, fol.13, Freeman to Bryce, 22 October, 1864.

research on federalism and the system of the German *Mark*. Among the many German works Bryce mentioned, one can find the names of scholars such as Eichorn, Waitz, Grimm, Von Maurer and others⁴⁸¹. Because of Bryce's expertise on German affairs, Freeman consulted him when researching German history: 'I wanted you specially to look over my German books and guide me somewhat'⁴⁸². In a certain letter, Freeman also urged Bryce to visit him in his house at Wales, so Bryce could assist him with his study on Germany. In the same letter, Freeman considered himself as an English expert on Swiss federalism, 'but for the German part I am still at sea, hardly knowing what to read and what not'⁴⁸³.

Subsequent to an anonymous review of Freeman's second volume of *Historical Essays*, Freeman complained to Bryce, that the reviewer, probably 'a narrow sort of classical man'⁴⁸⁴, did not comprehend their shared notion of the 'unity of history'. Freeman, therefore, asserted that he and Bryce saw eye to eye in terms of the unity theory. In addition, the reviewer did not understand Freeman's sources of inspiration. They were not, as mentioned in the review, Bossuet, Lessing or Carlyle, 'who seemed such unintelligible ...that I never read anymore'⁴⁸⁵, but rather Palgrave and Seeley. In the review itself, the same classical author praised Freeman for his first volume of the *Historical Essays* focusing on the Medieval world, an under-researched subject that Freeman was an expert in. The reviewer also acknowledged correctly that Freeman following Thomas Arnold 'was fed upon Niebuhr'⁴⁸⁶. This fact emphasized again the German influence on Freeman. Nevertheless, the reviewer criticized Freeman's new

⁴⁸¹ Bod., MS. Bryce 9, fol. 28, Bryce to Freeman 2 August, 1863.

⁴⁸² Bod., MS. Bryce 5, fol. 15, Freeman to Bryce, 30 October, 1864.

⁴⁸³ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁴ Bod., MS. Bryce 9, fol. 27, Bryce to Freeman, 13 April, 1873.

⁴⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁶ 'Mr. Freeman's Historical Essays', *The Pall Mall Gazette*, April 10, 1873, 2254 edition.

volume since while concentrating on Antiquity Freeman had ‘lost his way’. For example, Freeman was wrong in criticizing the Western scholars for neglecting the Macedonian period, since there had been other more significant periods, like that of classical Greece as well as Republican and Imperial Rome. In regards to the unity theory and the long duration of the H.R.E., the reviewer claimed it was not an original argument of Freeman but already appeared in the writings of former historians.

In another letter, Freeman, following a review of Bryce, stressed once again that they both shared a common perception of the ‘unity’ theory:

As for the unity of history, I can see no difference between what you say in the second paragraph of the article and what I say in the *Rede* lecture [Given in Cambridge, 1872]... I make here just the same limitations which you do. I confess my ignorance of Egyptian history: only is there any to be ignorant of? But I will not believe that Egypt had any effect upon Greece. Surely you don’t believe in Curtius *Uinim* or whatever the name is⁴⁸⁷.

In Bryce’s review of Freeman’s *Historical Essays*⁴⁸⁸, Bryce did not agree with all Freeman’s arguments of the unity theory. According to Bryce, the unity theory required vast, almost unattainable, knowledge of the whole of history. Furthermore, the division between periods may still possess a certain quality:

It is quite true, for instance, that all history ought to be regarded as one, and as far as possible studied as one, but there are limits to this possibility, and for many purposes ancient, medieval, and modern history may be treated of as worked out apart. Admirable service has been done in mediaeval history by men who knew very little either about Athens or under Pericles or about Massachusetts under Governor Andrew. Mr Freeman’s views are sometimes so broadly expressed on this matter that we feel inclined to ask him whether he finds that his ignorance of the early history of Egypt and Asia Minor - countries which certainly had a great influence on Greece - prevents him from understanding Homer and Herodotus⁴⁸⁹.

⁴⁸⁷ Bod. Ms. Bryce 6, fol.59, Freeman to Bryce, 19 January, 1874.

⁴⁸⁸ James Bryce, ‘Freeman’s Historical Essays’, *SR* 35, no. 912 (April 19, 1873): pp.521–2.

⁴⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p.521.

From these comments, an important point surfaces that may signify a difference between Bryce and Freeman not only in terms of the ‘unity of history’ but also perhaps in regard to their perception of race. Freeman, it seems, did not identify a unity or even an important connection between two of the greatest civilizations of history, Egypt and Greece, while Bryce identified a viable linkage between them. As Bernal tries to show in his very controversial book *Black Athena*, this debate became prominent among the historians of the era. The significance of the debate was that it contained a prominent racial discourse. If there was a certain mutual influence between the two civilizations of Egypt and Greece, this meant that the Greeks who allegedly belonged to the Aryan race were not as pure and innovative as some portrayed them, since they originated from the African Egyptians. However, if one denied the influence of the Egyptians, then the Greeks and the whole Aryan race preserved their uniqueness. Bernal argues that due to racial reasoning, especially during the nineteenth century the leading opinion was that Egypt had no influence over Greece⁴⁹⁰. Yet, beforehand, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there was a recognition of Egyptian influence over the Greeks. Some scholars in the nineteenth century, like the mentioned above Ernst Curtius (1814-96) and Baron Bunsen, promoted the notion that Egypt and Greece had been in contact and that in fact Greece had been the successor of Egypt⁴⁹¹. For this reason, Freeman, in response to Bryce’s criticism, stated the fact that he

⁴⁹⁰ There is a lengthy and even ‘harsh’ debate concerning Bernal’s *Black Athena*. See: Mary R. Lefkowitz, and Guy MacLean Rogers, *Black Athena Revisited*. Chapel Hill ; London: University of North Carolina Press, 1996; For the most convincing criticism see: Suzanne Marchand and Anthony Grafton, ‘Martin Bernal and His Critics’, *Arion* 5, no. 2 (1997): pp. 1-35; Bernal dedicated an entire book for answering some of his many critics. See: Martin Bernal and David Chioni Moore. *Black Athena Writes Back : Martin Bernal Responds to His Critics*. (Durham NC ; London, 2001); Several scholars, however, endorse some of Bernal’s arguments. For instance, the anthropologist Goody even claims that the ‘breach’ between the Aryan-European culture and the East was not a consequence of 19th century racialism but had commenced already in the 7th century, following the Arab invasion. See: Goody, *The Theft of History*, pp. 60-5.

⁴⁹¹ Curtius and Bunsen identified Egyptian influence but were in a disagreement about when the Unimim, which they asserted denoted the Ionians of Greece, had appeared in Egypt for the first time. See: Ernst Curtius, *The History of Greece* (Cambridge, 2011[1857]), pp. 475–6.

rejected the theory of Curtius about the impact of Egypt over Greece. In a letter written about a decade later, Freeman confessed to J.R. Green that the latest findings in the field had ‘shaken’ his strong belief in the Aryan origin of the Greek civilization:

...but I sometimes get a little troubled as to any possible influence of Egypt on Greek art. When I first learned things the old notion about Kadmos, Kekrops had come out, and [Archibald Henry] Sayce and the Hittites had not come in nor even [Austen Henry] Layard and the Ninevites. So we believed that everything Greek was original, pure Aryan - at most we learned our letters from the Jews cousin. I want to believe the same still, but all these new dodges puzzle me, and I don't well know how to weigh them. But I don't believe that isolated columns from Beni Hassan looking like Doric ...There are plenty of accidental likenesses⁴⁹².

It seems that Freeman, despite the new evidence, was still reluctant to alter his opinion. The main point is that the discourse over the unity of history was amalgamated with questions of race and the origin of humanity. Hence, for Freeman the unity of history did not necessarily designate the unity of humanity. On the contrary, there is a unity of history but mainly within the same race. Bryce himself, despite the fact that following this article seemed to differ from Freeman in the perception of the unity theory, adopted such a unity in his *H. R. E.* This was explicit already from the opening pages of the book where he included a list of the Emperors and Popes from Augustus in 27 B.C. and until the nineteenth century. In the first editions, the list ended with the abdication of Francis II⁴⁹³, while in later editions, as the sixth edition of 1904, the list concluded with the German emperors and William II⁴⁹⁴. In any case, a long imperial continuum of almost 2000 years had dominated Western Europe. In all editions, next to the name of Romulus Augustulus and the year 476 A.D. Bryce wrote: ‘End of the Western line in

⁴⁹² JRLM, FA1/8/95A, Freeman to Green, 24 April, 1881.

⁴⁹³ James Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 4th ed. (London, 1873[1864]), p. XXVII.

⁴⁹⁴ James Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, A new ed. enlarged and revised throughout, with a chronological table of events and three maps (London ; New York, 1904), p. XXIX.

Romulus Augustus. Henceforth, till 800 A.D., Emperors reigning at Constantinople⁴⁹⁵. According to Bryce, the West had merged with the East until their final division occurred when Carl the Great re-established the Western Roman branch. For that reason, since the imperial lineage had continued in the East, Bryce presented a list of the ruling Emperors of Constantinople, beginning with Anastasius and ending in 797 A.D. when Irene deposed Constantine VI in the East and Charles was crowned in the West. From this stage on, the Emperors of Byzantium were omitted from the list and Bryce only named the rulers of the West. Thus, in 800 A.D., the East and the West finally departed into their separate ways. For Bryce, the same Roman Empire continued to dominate the West. This *longue durée* of imperial rule was also apparent in another list illustrating the central events of the empire from the Battle of Pharsalus, when Cesar became tribune for life (48 B.C.), and until the war of 1871 between France and Germany.

For Bryce, the tribal leaders, who conquered the West in 476 A.D. were not an integral part of the empire. Accordingly, they were absent from the list of Imperial rulers. For instance, there was no mention of Odoacer or Clovis as legitimate heirs of the emperors. This was very common and most scholars did not identify the barbarian rulers as continuing the legacy of the empire in the West. Freeman, in one of his early letters to Bryce, asked why Bryce mentioned Odoacer as the king of Italy⁴⁹⁶. Bryce in response, admitted the error: ‘Odoacer was merely *rex...*, not [*rex*] *Italiae*, -I don’t know how that can have been in, unless it was copied from Gibbon when I just wrote the essay and never corrected after’⁴⁹⁷. Freeman continued the

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁶ Bod., Ms. Bryce 5, Fol. 14, Freeman to Bryce, 22 October, 1864.

⁴⁹⁷ Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, Fol. 50, Bryce to Freeman, 28 October, 1864.

discussion and responded that the barbaric kings who had conquered Rome remained tribal kings and had no other title: 'I cannot find that either Odoacer or Theodoric formally called himself king of Italy. They were kings, I.E, kings of their own people, and imperial lieutenants as well, but not territorial kings. You don't find historical titles for ages ...'⁴⁹⁸.

Bryce maintained in his handwritten comments, preceding the publication of his *H.R.E.*, that the tribes had a great part in the crisis of the West: they damaged the political structure, inflicted general havoc and a total vacuum. This conclusion was recapitulated thirty and so years later, when Bryce studied the fall of Rome and of other empires. Interestingly enough he mentioned the Germanic and the Arab invasions as part of the same Western decline⁴⁹⁹. Yet, the tribes were only the symptom and the main causes for the decline were internal financial reasons which effected Rome for a long time. These financial impediments originated from inefficient governance and exhaustion of resources. In addition, there was a general 'social feebleness', which became evident in the absence of a true aristocracy, growing poverty and want of troops. The tribes, hence, only waved the final blow⁵⁰⁰. Bryce identified several barbarian waves: One had been the northern wave, including the Germanic and the Slavonic tribes. The other was the eastern wave mainly with its Muslim tribes. Both waves lasted for several centuries and constantly threatened the empire until 'the north and the east ultimately destroyed Rome'⁵⁰¹. All of these causes and in particular the tribal invasion, were

⁴⁹⁸ Bod., Ms. Bryce 5, Fol. 15, Freeman to Bryce, 30 October, 1864.

⁴⁹⁹ James Bryce, *Studies in History and Jurisprudence* (2 vol. Oxford, 1901), I, pp.81–2.

⁵⁰⁰ Bod., Ms. Bryce 345, Notes possibly for *The Holy Roman Empire* (1864), c.1863.

⁵⁰¹ Bryce, *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, I, p. 15.

not a new development of the fifth century A.D., but had effected the Western Empire for a long time.

Nevertheless, following the ‘fall’, there was a ‘disintegration rather than destruction’ of the West, a fact that led to its assimilation with the East⁵⁰². In a letter from 1862, when Bryce only set the fundamental notions of his future publication, he described a fusion between the Romans and Teutons: ‘I think of beginning with an attempt at changing the relation of Roman and Teuton in the fifth century: How to trace penetration of Romans from in Teutonic Kingdoms’⁵⁰³. Bryce, as he himself mentioned, observed his view as unique since instead of strife he adopted a less dichotomist approach. The tribes, hence, did not destroy everything, and as Bryce emphasized later in his book, they had adopted the Roman law, titles and certain institutions:

But the idea of a Roman Empire as a necessary part of the world's order had not vanished: it had been admitted by those who seemed to be destroying it... the Teuton endeavouring everywhere to identify himself with the system he overthrew. As Goths, Burgundians, and Franks sought the title of consul or patrician, as the Lombard kings when they renounced their Arianism styled themselves Flavii, so even in distant England the fierce Saxon and Anglian conquerors used the names of Roman dignities, and after a time began to call themselves *imperatores* and *basileis* of Britain⁵⁰⁴.

Most importantly, the tribes embraced the official Roman religion and neglected their Aryan beliefs. Christianity became the main force preserving the Imperial kernel in the West. Consequently, the popes in Bryce’s list appeared in a parallel line to the Emperors, since for him the Church and the Empire had marched side by side from their establishment. The two, despite years of rivalry, could not have existed separately and both symbolized the pillars of

⁵⁰² Bod. , Ms. Bryce 345, Notes possibly for *The Holy Roman Empire* (1864), c.1863.

⁵⁰³ Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, fol. 1, Bryce to Freeman, 25 August, 1862.

⁵⁰⁴ Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 1873, pp. 44-5.

Rome. It was a gradual development but eventually ‘Christianity as well as civilization became conterminous with the Empire’⁵⁰⁵. This unification of state and church reached its zenith in the year of Charles’s coronation. When the king of the Franks arrived to the city of Rome, the West came together again with the Church and with the Empire: ‘The Frank [Charles] had been always faithful to Rome: his baptism was the enlistment of a new barbarian auxiliary. His services against Arian heretics and Lombard marauders, against the Saracen of Spain and the Avar of Pannonia, had earned him the title of Champion of the Faith and Defender of the Holy See. He was now unquestioned lord of Western Europe...’⁵⁰⁶.

This reunification signified another historical development in which the Teutonic and the Roman elements, instead of engaging in a constant strife, finally joined forces and enhanced the power of the Empire. For Bryce, one of the main causes for the sustainability of the H.R.E. was this amalgamation of Rome and Germany under the roof of the Church. From his coronation, Charles became the heir of Augustus and subsequently there was a ‘...union, so long in preparation, so mighty in its consequences, of the Roman and the Teuton, of the memories and the civilization of the South with the fresh energy of the North, and from that moment modern history begins’⁵⁰⁷. The coronation of Charles and the restoration of Rome, as Bryce named them, had been the most dramatic events of history. Other monumental events such as the assassination of Cesar, the conversion of Constantine and the reformation of Luther were significant but would have happened anyway even without these individuals. The convergence of Teuton and Roman, however, was only possible through the acts of the new

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid., p.13.

⁵⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 47.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid., p.49.

Emperor. Bryce spoke of the restoration of the Roman West. Hence, a certain changed had occurred with the invasion of the tribes, but now with Charles the Roman Empire regained its control in the West.

A direct line linked the Roman Empire and the Holy Roman Empire. Still, from the coronation, a new era begins which Bryce defined as the beginning of Modernity. This last point is crucial for the discussion. As in the case of Freeman and Thomas Arnold, Bryce located 800 A.D. as a transformative event in the days of Europe. Similar to Freeman, Bryce also asserted that too much importance had been awarded to 476 A.D. Still, Bryce identified certain crucial developments that had begun in the fifth century such as the integration of the Western Empire into the Eastern one: ‘To those who lived at the time , this year (476 A.D.) was no such epoch as it has since become, nor was any impression made on men’s mind commensurate with real significance of the event. For though it did not destroy the Empire in idea, nor wholly even in fact, its consequences were from the first great’⁵⁰⁸.

When visiting Aachen, the coronation site of 31 Holy Roman Emperors, Bryce expressed to Freeman the longevity of the empire and the linkage between Charles, Otto I and the rest of the dynasty: ‘The basilica at Aachen, the stone bright under the dome inscribed Carlus Magnus, the sarcophagus where his bones lays, the marble chair in which Otto III formed his sitting ...which every king of the Romans was crowned till Ferdinand I it is a singular building at every way’⁵⁰⁹. The Cathedral in Aachen connected not only between

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid., p.27.

⁵⁰⁹ Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, fol.24, Bryce to Freeman, 13 May, 1863.

Charles and Otto I, despite the hundred and so years which separated them, but also between Charles and Ferdinand I, who were crowned in 1521. For Bryce, they were all 'Romans'.

Bryce stressed in his hand written comments that the Carolingians had revived the Teutonic assemblies. For him, the empire had signified a Teutonic rather than a French kernel and he even used the term 'race' to describe the 'pure' Teutonic kernel of the empire. Subsequently, he identified the French claim concerning Carl's French origins as an absurdity. As he mentioned, Carl's empire had been 'European not French' and it had symbolized a 'new spirit' and the 'end of decaying civilization'⁵¹⁰. Bryce in his resentment towards the French, as also seen earlier, shared several of Freeman's views.

Yet, in terms of his Teutonic observations, he still offered a slightly more restrained approach. He did identify a certain contradiction between the Teutonic and the Roman-Celtic races: 'The tendency of the Teuton was and is to the independence of the individual life ...as contrasted with Keltic and so-called Romanic peoples, among which the unit is more completely absorbed in the mass...' ⁵¹¹. Although he viewed a merger of Roman and Teutonic elements in the H.R.E. the two components were not equal and the Teutonic kernel of the empire was far more dominant throughout history: 'The inheritance of the Roman Empire made the Germans the ruling race of Europe, and the brilliance of that glorious dawn has never faded and can never fade entirely from their name'⁵¹². Contradictory to the claim about the French origin of Charlemagne, Bryce argued that Carl, as the Germans named him, was primarily a Teutonic king, who founded a Teutonic legacy. Due to their tribal Teutonic ancestry while

⁵¹⁰ Bod., Ms. Bryce 345, Notes possibly for *The Holy Roman Empire* (1864), c.1863.

⁵¹¹ Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 1873, p.379.

⁵¹² *Ibid.*, p.383.

advocating the notions of freedom and equality, the German states 'have been little more successful than their neighbours in the establishment of free constitutions'⁵¹³. Bryce, nevertheless, was still respectful towards the French since they preserved the imperial Roman tradition in the most natural way:

No one can doubt that France represents, and has always represented, the imperialist spirit of Rome far more truly than those whom the Middle Ages recognized as the legitimate heirs of her name and dominion. In the political character of the French people, whether it be the result of the five centuries of Roman rule in Gaul, or rather due to the original instincts of the Gallic race, is to be found their claim, a claim better founded than any which Napoleon put forward, Political to be the Romans' of the modern world⁵¹⁴.

Hence, similar to his perception of the Teutonic people, Bryce linked the ancient past with the development of the modern German and French nations. The Germans acquired their constitutions from the tradition of their Teutonic tribal forefathers, while the imperialist tradition of France was a result of the long Roman conquest in Gaul. One still has to note the accusation of Bryce against the false Napoleonic attempt to promote the Roman heritage of France. An accusation that Bryce, like Freeman, also observed in the fabricated 'Roman' legitimacy of Austria and other modern empires that tried to identify themselves as the successors of Rome. Still his view of the Roman/French, despite the 'advantage' of the Teutonic/Germans, was relatively moderate in comparison to other historians from the English-Teutonic circle. This, as I will try to show in the following discussion, might have stemmed from his universal view of the Roman Empire.

⁵¹³ Ibid., p.380.

⁵¹⁴ Ibid., p.379.

A Tale of Two Empires: Rome and Britain

In Bryce's *The Roman Empire and the British Empire in India*⁵¹⁵, there is a clear example of how he merged in one publication his views on civilization, race and the unity of history. Beginning with the latter aspect of the unity, it is clear that Bryce noted the similarity between the Roman Empire and the British Empire in India, despite the thousand and so years that set the two empires apart. Rome, dissimilar to other empires and monarchies from Antiquity like Persia, was the only empire with some resemblance to the empires of Modernity. In regards to British or English Empire (as Bryce constantly switched between the two terms), Bryce chose to focus on the British rule in India because it resembled the Roman control of the provinces⁵¹⁶. Naturally, some differences existed between the two empires. Rome, a territorial power, conquered the lands bordering the Italian peninsula and gradually expanded to other areas. England, on the contrary, was a naval force and its focus was on distant regions such as India, 6,000 miles away. Both Rome and England did not intend to conquer such a vast land. Their advancement was more accidental. Yet through their expansion, they civilized the 'barbarous or semi-civilized races', as Bryce entitled them, so those neglected their foul customs. Some claim that Bryce really viewed the civilizing mission of the Roman and the British Empires as a positive policy which reinvigorated the life of the autochthonic inhabitants: 'There is an imperialism which is rash, boastful, and aggressive and there is also an Imperialism which is

⁵¹⁵ James Bryce, 'The Roman Empire and the British Empire in India', in *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, I, pp. 1–71.

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

reasonable'⁵¹⁷. The point is that for Bryce the innate superiority of some races over others was a natural notion⁵¹⁸.

In the age of Rome, through law and culture, the empire transformed gradually to be a unified entity. A process, which was intensified by the spread of Christianity that united the empire by religion and morality. This development contributed to the 'backward races' because they were elevated to the 'level of the more advanced [races]'⁵¹⁹. Nevertheless, Britain dissimilar to Rome could never fully assimilate the inhabitants of India. This was due to the difference in race which prevented India, unlike other parts of the empire, to become totally integrated into the British Empire⁵²⁰. The Teutonic tribes, after defeating Rome militarily in the fifth century A.D., had been assimilated into the empire, while the Indians, due to racial and cultural differences, were never fully blended. A homogeneity of race, it seems, played for Bryce a major role. Racial inequality was linked to cultural, religious and in particular to class structure⁵²¹, yet, and this is a significant point, Bryce asserted that it was also dependent upon physical aspects:

All the races of India are dark, though individuals may be found among high caste Brahmins and among the Parsis of Poona Gujarat who are as light in hue as many Englishmen. Now to the Teutonic peoples, and especially to the English and Anglo-Americans, the difference of colour means a great deal. It creates a feeling of separation, perhaps even of a slight repulsion. Such a feeling may be deemed unreasonable or unchristian, but it seems too deeply rooted to be effaceable in any time we can foresee. It is, to be sure, not nearly so strong towards members of the more civilized races of India, with their faces often full of an intelligence and refinement which witnesses to many generations of mental

⁵¹⁷ Quoted in Seaman, *A Citizen of the World*, p.174.

⁵¹⁸ This was also seen earlier in the discussion, regarding Bryce's treatment of the races of Scandinavia, where the superiority of the southern Northman over the Lepps of the North was undisputed.

⁵¹⁹ Bryce, 'The Roman Empire and the British Empire in India,' p.3.

⁵²⁰ Seaman, *A Citizen of the World*, pp.174–5.

⁵²¹ J. Stone, 'James Bryce and the Comparative Sociology of Race Relations', *Race & Class* 13, no. 3 (1972): pp.317–18.

culture, as it is in North America towards the negroes of the Gulf Coast, or in South Africa towards the Kafirs. Yet it is sufficient to be, as a rule, a bar to social intimacy, and a complete bar to intermarriage⁵²².

Following Bryce's comment and other evidence from his writings⁵²³ it seems that such a racial-physical typology contradicted his own moral/Christian values. Yet, 'colour' or 'blood' were still central in Bryce's vision of the intrinsic inequality between the races. As he wrote later in the same article: 'even if colour did not form an obstacle to intermarriage, religion would. Religion, however, can be changed, and colour cannot'⁵²⁴. 'Colour', dissimilar to religion, included an inherent stamp that divided human groups. Race, thus, in its physical form was not omitted from his dogma⁵²⁵. Similar to Freeman and Kingsley, Bryce could be a nineteenth century liberal opposing slavery but at the same breath retain certain racial observations.

However, dissimilar to Freeman, Kingsley and Stubbs, and despite his usage of a certain racial-physical classifications, race, for Bryce, was less crucial in the history of the Roman Empire and the Germanic tribes. Perhaps, due to his Scottish Presbyterian origin from Ulster, his personal attachment to Teutonic themes was less 'natural' in comparison with the English historians and their Anglo-Saxon 'imagined' ancestors. In any case, the longevity of the Roman Empire, which persisted until Modernity, had not been breached by the racial uniqueness of the tribes. No continuous conflict persisted between the Teutonic and Latin races. Instead, there was a fusion of Teuton and Roman and a unified Roman Empire survived

⁵²² Bryce, 'The Roman Empire and the British Empire in India,' pp.52–3.

⁵²³ J. Stone, 'James Bryce and the Comparative Sociology of Race Relations', p.316 (especially footnote).

⁵²⁴ Bryce, 'The Roman Empire and the British Empire in India', p.56.

⁵²⁵ This racial perception is also evident in Bryce's correspondence with his friend, the famous philosopher Henry Sidgwick. See: Bart Schultz, Henry Sidgwick, Eye of the Universe: An Intellectual Biography (Cambridge, 2004), 642–7.

throughout the ages. The empire did suffer from a military and political destructions following the tribal invasions. Rome, however, remained intact and continued to prosper after the fifth century A.D. Rome symbolized a utopian model of just governance which could never be demolished due to its universal characteristics 'it [Rome] was imperishable because it was universal'⁵²⁶. The ideas constructing the empire were far more powerful than its military might. Paradoxically when its political power diminished, its culture and values only became stronger: 'When the military power of the conquering city had departed, her sway over the world of thought began...her language, her theology, her laws, her architecture made their way where the eagles of war had never flown. And with the spread of civilization have found new homes on the Ganges and the Mississippi'⁵²⁷.

The Roman Empire continued in the West only under the roof of the H.R.E. Bryce, contradictory to Freeman, did not identify the eastern Empire or Byzantium, especially after the coronation of *Carlos Magnus*, as Rome's successor. In September 14, 1891, Bryce told Freeman that: 'As for the South Slavs I cannot agree with your view that Byzantium was the newest Rome - It was always an inferior place in religion as well as in politics and all the churches that look to it seem to be practically quite dead. Little as we may love the pope, he was better than Patriarchus'⁵²⁸. Here Bryce, as in other places, emphasized the heritage of Rome in the West, which had been absent in the East. Only in the H.R.E., such durability existed. Through this, Bryce was also distinct from the view of John Bagnell Bury, another Irish protestant (although not Presbyterian) scholar who can be regarded as a follower of Freeman.

⁵²⁶ Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 1968, p.370.

⁵²⁷ Ibid.

⁵²⁸ Bod., Ms. Bryce 9, fol. 308, Bryce to Freeman, 14 September, 1891.

Bury, who will be the subject of the next chapter, adopted and developed Freeman's view about the fusion of western Rome into the Eastern Empire. While Bryce identified no institutional longevity in the East, Bury acknowledged a religious, administrative and legislative endurance between the West and the East, which lasted until the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453. Freeman, as will be discussed, can be situated between Bryce and Bury in his perception of the continuous heritage of the Roman Empire in the East. Nevertheless, Freeman, as seen, also held a strong racial Teutonic view differentiating him especially from the ideas of J.B. Bury. The latter sought, like Bryce, after other more institutional and cultural explanations for the long persistence of the Roman Empire in the wake of the invasion of the Germanic tribes.

Chapter 5: Bury, Freeman and the Unity of the East

In the following chapter, I will examine the ideas of J.B. Bury and how he departed from the ‘old’ and even conservative perception of Rome, illuminating the shaded Eastern Roman Empire. I commence with exploring the relations of Bury with E.A. Freeman and in particular with the similarities and distinctions between the two historians. As mentioned, the main reason why Freeman, Bryce and Bury were chosen derives from the innovative periodization which they offered. They all devised a method, which comprised a certain departure from the accepted and almost ‘sacred’ division between Antiquity, the Middle Ages and even Modernity. In the previous chapters, I discussed the ultra-nationalistic and racial theories of Freeman and other writers from the Teutonic circle. Bury, however, seemed to signify a different example of a late nineteenth and early twentieth century scholar. Bury represented a certain ‘scientific’ method to history, while departing from the literary approach of certain Victorian historians⁵²⁹. In addition to the positivistic aspect, central in Bury’s writing, I will refer later to Bury’s ‘flexibility’ and his less scientific approach. Bury represents an interesting study-case since on the one hand he was linked through personal connections and notions, such as the ‘unity of history’ to the English Teutonic circle. On the other hand, as far as his Teutonic and racial inclinations are concerned, he was not an integral part of the circle.

Bury, Freeman’s Follower?

Between E.A. Freeman and J. B. Bury one can identify a viable link but also at the same time several major differences in both their general historical approach and in their view of

⁵²⁹ Dowling, ‘Roman Decadence and Victorian Historiography’, pp. 601-5; Hesketh, *The Science of History in Victorian Britain*, pp. 161-2.

Antiquity. Bury, was in some respect, a follower of Freeman and was vastly influenced by him. In 1893, Bury edited Freeman's second edition of *The History of Federal Government*⁵³⁰. Later in 1903 Bury edited Freeman's *Geographical History of Europe*⁵³¹. In addition to editing several of his works, a fact that demonstrated Bury's approval of some of Freeman's works, the latter also wrote, in 1892, two reviews of Freeman's *History of Sicily from the Earliest Times*. A short while before the publication of Bury's reviews, he explained to Freeman that in distinction from him, he was not an expert on Sicilian history, but still recognised an urgent necessity to review Freeman's work. In addition, Bury assured Freeman that he does not expect any reward for his favourable review of Freeman's book: 'I have been thinking a good deal about you lately as I have been writing two notices of your Sicily...perhaps you may think me audacious to write on a subject which I have not had my own speciality,...at all events my say will not be on the model of Isaac of York'⁵³². In these reviews, Bury remarked that the history of Sicily had been always regarded as fragmentary and lacking coherence mainly because the island constantly passed from the possession of one conquer to the next. Freeman, despite this alleged fragmentation within Sicilian history, argued, according to Bury, that Sicily had a unified history: 'Mr. Freeman, taking it as his text, created a completely new view of Sicilian history. He showed that Sicily has a drama of her own, and that her history has a unity beyond

⁵³⁰ Edward A. Freeman, *History of Federal Government in Greece and Italy*, 2d ed, edited by John B. Bury (London ; New York, 1893).

⁵³¹ Edward A. Freeman, *The Historical Geography of Europe*, 3rd ed., edited by J.B. Bury (London, 1903) ; Bury also edited an Atlas which was attached to this book. See: Edward A. Freeman, *Atlas to the Historical Geography of Europe*, 3rd ed., edited by J. B. Bury (London, 1903).

⁵³² JRLM, MSS FA1, Bury to Freeman, 15 November, 1891; Isaac of York is a character in Sir Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe*. He is a Jewish moneylender who always expects a great return of favour/money. See: Scott, *Ivanhoe*, l,pp.215-20.

the mere geographical unity. She is land of historical cycles. Her early history foreshadows her later history...⁵³³.

Unity, once again, encompassed the central theme in regards to Freeman's historical vision. The 'unity of history' was also seen in the history of Sicily. The island functioned as a hub between East and West, between the Aryan world and the Semitic one. The struggles among the Phoenicians and the Greeks in the classical period over the control of Sicily continued later in a new form during the eleventh century A.D. through the battle of the Saracens against the Normans⁵³⁴. The conflict over the island was not an isolated event but reoccurred in the European and Mediterranean history. Bury wrote that the great British scholar George Grote already manifested this idea of the cyclical history of Sicily. For Bury, the greatest achievement of Freeman in this work was portrayed in the ability to produce a unified history of Sicily that was not attached to one period but reflected the entire history of the Island.

When Bury was in the midst of writing his review of the third volume of the *History of Sicily*⁵³⁵, he heard about the death of Freeman in Alicante, Spain. Therefore, he dedicated the first pages of the review to a general account and evaluation of Freeman's work. Through these pages, one can obtain a different, less formal and a rather more authentic view of both Bury and Freeman. This was mainly because of the short time that elapsed between the death of Freeman and the time of the publication. Bury insisted that his opening remarks were not a eulogy to Freeman. In some sense, he remained faithful to his promise. Bury stressed to his

⁵³³ John B. Bury, 'ART. II.--Freeman's History of Sicily Vol.I-II', *The Scottish Review* 19 (January 1892): pp.26–7.

⁵³⁴ Ibid., p. 28.

⁵³⁵ John B. Bury, 'ART. IV.--Freeman's History of Sicily vol. III', *The Scottish Review* 20 (February 1892): p.301.

readers about the critical approach of Freeman's 'diffused' style. By this he meant that Freeman used a lengthy, indirect style. Bury himself protected Freeman from these allegations, but still understood their reasoning, since Freeman's style, as Bury admitted, was not a conventional one. Nevertheless, the praise for Freeman was notable in these pages. Freeman, according to Bury, had the ability to 'awaken a sense of history' and alongside Bishop Stubbs, he must be regarded as one of the beacons of English historiography. Freeman's central asset was his foundation of a certain historical discipline merging between the study of geography and history. His work on Sicily was, of course, a prime example for the implementation of this method.

In a letter from 1892, Freeman showed his gratitude to Bury's review of his *History of Sicily*: 'I don't know how to thank you enough for it. It is absurd to say that it is the best that has appeared: for there has been no other of the same class nothing but newspapers... You understand me as nobody else does. I specially thank you for what you say about my supposed diffuseness, and repetition. They just say it because it is the regular thing to say'⁵³⁶. Bury's appreciation of Freeman was also seen eleven years later, in 1903, when he gave his inaugural lecture for the position of Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge. He regarded Freeman as one of the great historians of England in the nineteenth century especially because he advocated the notion of continuity in history through the idea of the unity. Continuity was very significant, because it emphasized the importance of the whole historical process. Bury refuted the 'eclectic view', as he named it, that focused on certain periods in history while

⁵³⁶ Stephens, *The life and letters of Edward A. Freeman*, II, p.453.

neglecting other periods because of their insignificance⁵³⁷. It is no coincidence that Bury recognized the element of continuity as the most valuable in Freeman's work. As I will demonstrate, Bury, similar to Freeman before him, partly adopted the notion that 'time borders' do not exist in history and one must see the wholeness of history. As Bury stated, 'He [Freeman] broke down the venerable wall of partition between ancient and modern history'⁵³⁸.

Bury endorsed the unity of history since it handed historians with a concept that broadened their perception and enabled them to delve into less explored periods of history. For instance, the continuation of the Roman Empire handed great significance to the centuries after the so-called 'fall'. Through the idea of the unity, the primary common ground between Bury and Freeman comes to light. The former continued the latter's work in regards to the research of the Eastern or late Roman Empire. The empire, which was regularly observed by many historians, like Bryce, as an insignificant factor in the periphery of Europe, became, following the work of historians like Freeman and Bury, a vital force in the historical development of Europe, North Africa and the East. Similar to Sicily, the late Roman Empire, had connected the East with the West and functioned as a cultural, economic and political convergence point. For both Freeman and Bury, the Roman Empire had been continued in the East.

George Finlay - the British 'Father' of the Eastern Roman Empire

As Bury acknowledged, George Finlay (1799-1875) was another prominent historian who delved into the Eastern Empire in a thoughtful method. According to Bury, Finlay had become

⁵³⁷ John B. Bury, *An Inaugural Lecture: Delivered in the Divinity School Cambridge on January 26, 1903* (Cambridge, 1903), p.22.

⁵³⁸ Bury, 'ART. IV.--Freeman's History of Sicily vol. III', p.301.

forgotten even though he was one of the firsts to identify the uniqueness of the East. In a sense, Freeman and Bury exalted Finlay's stature and signified him as one of their major sources of inspiration. Finlay's *magnus opum* was the history of Greece in seven volumes from the Roman conquest of 146 B.C. to the mid-nineteenth century⁵³⁹. The research focused on the history of Greece under 'foreign occupation' and the first five volumes were alternatively labelled by Finlay as the *History of Greece under Foreign Dominion*. The inherent meaning of these volumes indicated how an almost cohesive phase stretched throughout the time when Greece was under foreign occupation. This phase combined between the revival of Greek independence in the nineteenth century and the ancient age of Hellenic freedom before 146 B.C.. The Greeks, as Finlay noted, had usually referred to their history without independence as insignificant, since they regarded it as inferior to the glorious days of classical and Hellenistic Greece. Yet, Finlay asserted that this period of suppression should be treated with much more esteem:

The records of enslaved Greece are as much a portion of her national existence as her heroic poetry and her classic history. The people who sent out a hundred colonies, and who fought at Salamis and Plataea, were the ancestors of the men who fled before the Romans, and who yielded up their own land to be peopled by Slavonians and Albanians. The ancient Greeks purchased foreign slaves to labour in their fields, the modern Greeks delivered up their own children to form the janissaries, who held them in a state of slavery. The modern Greeks turn with aversion from the study of their own history. They take no interest in the fortunes of their ancestors, but they claim an imaginary genealogy to connect their national existence with the extinct races of privileged aristocratic tribes, whose existence ceased as Paganism expired⁵⁴⁰.

⁵³⁹ George Finlay, *A History of Greece : From Its Conquest by the Romans to the Present Time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864*, A new ed. : rev. throughout and in part re-written with considerable additions by the author / and edited by the Rev. H.F. Tozer (7 vol., Oxford, 1877).

⁵⁴⁰ Ibid., I, p.XVI.

Finlay inspired Freeman and Bury, not only through his writings, but also because he played an active role in the struggle for Greek independence. He lived most of his adult life in Greece, wrote regularly on Greek issues for British newspapers and tried to stimulate public awareness for the Greek struggle to sovereignty. By that, he preceded the ideology, which Freeman endorsed concerning the Eastern question. They both acted as historians and as public figures, thus operating in a similar method in the academic and the public spheres. They commute between these two worlds, which for them were virtually unified, since politics and history intertwine. Freeman and Finlay resembled in another aspect. Finlay argued, as Freeman did subsequently, that the demise of Rome came with the Saracen invasions during the seventh century. According to Finlay, the Saracens wrought a major blow to the Eastern Roman Empire. After their conquest, the empire ceased to be Roman and had to lean on the Byzantine-Greek component: 'the Saracen conquests had severed from the empire all those provinces which possessed a native population distinct from the Greeks, by language, literature, and religion, the central government of Constantinople was gradually compelled to fall back on the interests and passions of the remaining inhabitants, who were chiefly Greeks'⁵⁴¹. A prime example of how Finlay's theory functioned as the basis for Freeman's thesis can be demonstrated in the fact that Freeman dedicated his book on the Saracens to Finlay⁵⁴². In this book, as discussed in the previous chapter, Freeman presented very explicitly how the Saracens had caused Rome to fall. Thus, the impact of Finlay on Freeman is notable.

The Late Roman Empire

⁵⁴¹ Ibid., I:p.352.

⁵⁴² Freeman, *The History and Conquests of the Saracens*.

In the preface to his first book *A History of the Later Roman Empire*⁵⁴³ Bury illuminated why he named this period in this specific title and not under other possible titles such as the ‘Byzantine’ or the ‘Eastern Roman Empire’:

There is no period of history which has been so much obscured by incorrect and misleading titles as the period of the later Roman Empire. It is, I believe, the import of that period is so constantly misunderstood and its character so often misrepresented. For the first step towards grasping the history of those centuries through which the ancient evolved into the modern world is the comprehension of the fact that the old Roman Empire did not cease to exist until the year 1453. The line of Roman Emperors continued in unbroken succession from Octavius Augustus to Constantine Palaeologus⁵⁴⁴.

A whole debate between Bury and his publisher Alexander Macmillan, preceded Bury’s previous argument about the true essence of the empire. As Bury told Macmillan, he concluded his book in the beginning of the ninth century since: ‘It would be less indefensible, if the period [of the book] were from 800-1205 A.D., when there are rival empires in the West, and the empire of the East had become more Greek in character’⁵⁴⁵. Bury, as a result, limited the scope of his study to the years when the unity of the Roman Empire had been more visible. As he later stated: ‘There was only one Roman Empire until 800 - that is just the year in which I stop’. Macmillan rejected Bury’s proposal to label the book by the general name of the ‘Roman Empire’ since in the former’s view, it was not ‘distinctive enough’. Bury, in response, did not approve with the names Byzantine Empire or the French title the ‘Lower Empire’ [*Bas-Empire*] as ‘they put out of sight the continuity of history and suggest a break between the Earlier Roman Empire and the Late Roman Empire, which never existed’⁵⁴⁶. Furthermore, the

⁵⁴³ John B. Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire : From Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.)* (2 vol., London ; New York , 1889).

⁵⁴⁴ Ibid., I, p.V

⁵⁴⁵ BL., Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55120 ff.. Bury to Macmillan, 1 June, 1888.

⁵⁴⁶ Ibid.

name Byzantine Empire was a modern invention and never existed in Antiquity, while the Late Rome Empire 395-800 A.D. denoted both the original name of the empire and the continuity between the earlier and the later empires. In the book himself, Bury proceeded by attacking those historians who detached the Roman Empire from the Eastern Roman Empire. In his opinion, no difference existed between the two: ‘...and the historian who adopts one line of division cannot assert that the historian who adopts a different line is wrong. For all such lines are purely arbitrary. No Byzantine Empire ever began to exist the Roman Empire did not come to an end until 1453’⁵⁴⁷. Thus, he maintained that there had been many transformations in the Roman Empire but the end befell upon it only in 1453: ‘Every century of the Roman Empire differed from the preceding and from the succeeding, but the development was continuous; the empire was still the Roman Empire, and I am not aware that it is usual to give a man a new name when he enters upon a new decade of life’⁵⁴⁸.

Freeman, as elaborated in the previous chapter, was a very different historian from Bury. He was considerably involved within political debates and retained very strong views especially on the foreign policy of the British government. He believed that his knowledge of history granted him capabilities that were not attained by others. His obligation was to voice his views, since he must act for the sake of society. Freeman was also a nationalistic writer that stressed the uniqueness of the English people and their role in history. While Freeman, as I demonstrated, located a major breach in Antiquity during the times of the Saracen invasions of

⁵⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁸ Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, p.VI.

the seventh century A.D., Bury draw the ultimate line in 1453, even though he accepted the tremendous changes of the fifth century A.D. and later around 800 A.D..

Freeman, and here one can detect the major difference between him and Bury, classified the Germanic or Aryan tribes as the ancestors of the English people. Consequently, the English and German nations belonged to one unified extended family. Their racial origin determined their destiny as great nations. Bury, however, neglected the usage of the racial connotations. The term 'Aryan' was almost omitted from his writings and he did not link the modern English with the Germanic tribes. While Freeman esteemed the tribes repetitively, Bury, as I aim to demonstrate, ascribed to them fewer merits and alongside positive remarks, he referred to their barbarity. However, and this is an important clarification, although Bury was less 'Teutonic', he did acknowledge some aspects of the historical significance of the tribes.

Bury also criticized Freeman for his racial tendencies and his attempt to construct a unified Aryan race based on the Indo-Germanic tongues. In his prefatory note (1903), as the editor of the third edition of Freeman's *Historical Geography*, Bury 'warned' the readers with the following words:

... if Mr. Freeman were here to edit this book himself he might have been induced to modify his language. It is his use of the word Aryan. Though 'Aryanism' was, if I may say so, one of the pillars of his construction of history, I think he might have been induced to substitute the phrase 'of Aryan speech' in many cases when he committed himself to 'Aryan'. For the truth is that, in designating a people as Aryan, speech was his criterion, and the inference from Aryan speech to Aryan stock is invalid. How the Indo-Germanic tongue spread is still an unsolved problem, but it is certain that all the European peoples who spoke or speak tongues

of this family are not of common race, and many of them probably have very little 'Aryan' blood⁵⁴⁹.

These words of Bury emphasize again the points raised in the first part of this work concerning the fusion between race/blood and language. As observed, Freeman and other scholars consistently mixed the Aryan tongues with the Aryan races. Bury noticed the term 'Aryan' as problematic. Even if Freeman only referred to the Aryan languages, in many instances his habit to use the term 'Aryan' was almost immediately linked to the racial discourse and not limited to the philological investigation.

The 'Decline and Fall?' Gibbon and Bury

Returning now to Bury's review of Freeman's *History of Sicily*, another very important name that resurfaced in the article was the name of Edward Gibbon. Bury compared between the work of Freeman and the work of Gibbon and it is obvious that both writers were most significant for him. According to Bury, the *History of Sicily* was comparable to *the Decline and Fall* in the sense that both books include a very long time span. The second resemblance point was that they both research the occurrences of many nations and do not focus on one nation⁵⁵⁰. For Bury, the important conclusion was that Gibbon and Freeman tried to promote a continuous view of history that was not limited to one era but included a long historical process. As Bury contended, in his introduction to one of the most popular editions of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*: 'Not the least important aspect of the *Decline and Fall* is its lesson in the unity of history, the favourite theme of Mr. Freeman'⁵⁵¹.

⁵⁴⁹ Freeman, *Historical Geography*, 1903, p. VI.

⁵⁵⁰ Bury, *History of Sicily* I-II, pp. 28-9.

⁵⁵¹ Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 3rd ed. edited in seven volumes with introduction, notes, appendices and index by J.B. Bury (7 vol., London, 1901), p. XIV.

It was not so clear when Gibbon really marked the end of Rome in the *Decline*. The common argument, discussed previously, was that Gibbon observed the ‘end’ of the empire in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. when Christianity had arisen simultaneously with the invasions of the barbarian tribes. This is, of course, a view that was acceptable by most historians. Nevertheless, there could be another interpretation. Gibbon, as known, concluded his enormous book with the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453. Now, if Gibbon held the view that the decline of the empire had been in the fifth century A.D., why did he continue his *magnum opus* until the fifteenth century A.D.? Maybe Gibbon actually maintained that the Roman Empire had still kept its flame in the East while only its Western branch had fallen. Thus, a more appropriate method would have been to separate Gibbon’s book into two parts under two titles. The first would be named *The Decline and Fall of the Western Empire* and the second *the Rise and Decline of the Eastern Roman Empire*.

Bury, regardless of this last interpretation, claimed that Gibbon detected the end of Rome in the fourth and fifth centuries and criticized him for that matter:

No Empire fell in 476; that year only marks a stage, and not even the most important stage, in the process of disintegration which was going on during the whole century. The resignation of Romulus Augustulus did not even shake the Roman Empire; far less did it cause an Empire to fall. It is unfortunate, therefore, that Gibbon spoke of the fall of the Western Empire, and that many modern writers have given their sanction to the phrase⁵⁵².

Nevertheless, Gibbon, Bury stated, was one of the only historians who, at least in the title of their work, preceded his (Bury’s) view by showing a continuation between the West

⁵⁵² Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, p. VII.

and East⁵⁵³. However, ‘When reading the last chapters [of the *Decline*] one is apt to forget what the title is about’⁵⁵⁴.

One of the differences between the two historians was that unlike Gibbon, who placed his weight on the Western fall, Bury was one of the first historians to delve into the history of the later period of Rome in a very comprehensive way. Bury, in his portrayal of Gibbon in the *Britannica Encyclopaedia* of 1911⁵⁵⁵, warned the readers from the imbalanced character of the *Decline and Fall*. He divided Gibbon’s book into two parts. The account from 180 A.D. until 641 A.D. (that included 460 years) was detailed and based upon multiple sources and evidence. The second part, nevertheless, was lacking proof and details, although it described a much longer period, since it stretches from 641 A.D. until 1453 A.D.. Furthermore, Gibbon wrongly defined the second period as a time of decadence and wretchedness. The greatness of the Eastern Empire and its function as ‘the bulwark of Europe against the East’⁵⁵⁶ was absent from this part and almost remained unrecognized by Gibbon: ‘His eye rested only on superficial characteristics which have served to associate the name Byzantine with treachery, cruelty, bigotry and decadence’⁵⁵⁷.

The two opening chapters of Bury’s *Later Roman Empire* were dedicated to the Christian revolution of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.. Christianity straddled and had one leg rooted in the pagan past while the other one was heading towards the future and heralding

⁵⁵³ Bury as editor of the *Cambridge Medieval History* wrote in his introduction that ‘it was one of Gibbon’s services to history that the title of his book asserted clearly and unambiguously this continuity’. See: John B. Bury, ‘The Eastern Roman Empire (717-1453)’, in John B. Bury, Henry M. Gwatkin and J.P. Whitney and (eds.), *The Cambridge Medieval History* (8 vol., Cambridge, 1923), IV, p. VII.

⁵⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p.VI

⁵⁵⁵ John B. Bury, ‘Gibbon Edward’, *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, (Britannica, 1911), pp.927-35.

⁵⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p.935.

⁵⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

a new phase. Bury acknowledged the contribution but also the faults of Christianity. The faith promoted the notion of friendship and the responsibility of the individual for the community. In addition, it gave hope for salvation and elevated human life to a sacred degree, unlike the pagans who participated in gladiatorial displays disgracing human lives. However, Christianity also possessed an ‘...ugly, inhuman side, from which the humanism of the fourteenth and fifteenth century revolted, manifested in extreme and grotesque asceticism, a sort of war with the instincts of humanity’⁵⁵⁸. Bury, it seems, still recognized the Christianity of the first centuries A.D. as symbolizing a positive phase in the progress of mankind. Bury accepted that the universal nature of the Roman law presented an opposing model to the particularistic and individual traits of the Christian religion. Yet, he concluded that Christianity should not be blamed for the end of the Western Empire: ‘And when we remember that in the East the Church allied itself closely with the imperial constitution, and that this union survived for many centuries, we must conclude that Christianity did not contribute to produce what is loosely called the Fall of the Western Empire. Its spirit revolutionized the condition of the whole Roman world’⁵⁵⁹. As he marked in the end of his first chapter of the *Later Roman Empire*, only Gibbon together with Rousseau, had maintained that the ‘cost (of Christianity) was greater than the gain’⁵⁶⁰.

Bury agreed with the argument that Gibbon’s animosity towards the Church and especially the collision of the Church with the ideas of the enlightenment urged him (Gibbon) to name Christianity as the cause of the fall. The mergence between his personal stance and his

⁵⁵⁸ Bury, *A History of Later Roman Empire*, p.12.

⁵⁵⁹ Ibid., p.34.

⁵⁶⁰ Ibid., p.16.

interpretation of the past were not unique to Gibbon. Other great historians throughout history inserted their personal, political and cultural affiliations into their historical narratives: ‘The indictment of the Empire by Tacitus, the defence of Cesarianism by Mommsen, Grote’s vindication of democracy, Droysen advocacy of monarchism...’⁵⁶¹. Bury even implied that Gibbon deliberately ‘forgot’ to research the Roman East, since it had presented an ‘inconvenient’ opposite example. According to Bury, Christianity protected Rome and acted as a force that assisted the creation of a vibrant empire and community in the East. Gibbon, by focusing on the ‘New Rome’, feared that he might reveal a positive side of Christianity, conflicting with his general resentment of the Church⁵⁶². One must note that Bury’s view of Gibbon reflected a certain, rather prevalent, interpretation that Gibbon was hostile towards Christianity. This question, however, is still debatable in the research. Gibbon was perhaps more ambiguous in his view of religion in general and Catholicism in particular⁵⁶³. As I will show such ambiguity did not exist in the case of Bury, who was very hostile towards the Catholic denomination.

⁵⁶¹ Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, (1901), I, p.XLI.

⁵⁶² As seen, for instance, in the end of his famous 16th chapter: ‘The church of Rome defended by violence the empire which she had acquired by fraud; a system of peace and benevolence was soon disgraced by the proscriptions, wars, massacres, and the institution of the holy office’. See: Ibid., (1906), III, p.87

⁵⁶³ In his youth Gibbon for a short period even converted to Catholicism. Besides his negative comments in the *Decline and Fall*, there are also more neutral and even appreciative remarks. For example: ‘While that great body [Rome] was invaded by open violence, or undermined by slow decay, a pure and humble religion gently insinuated itself into the minds of men, grew up in silence and obscurity, derived new vigour from opposition, and finally erected the triumphant banner of the Cross on the ruins of the Capitol’. See: Ibid, II, (1906), p.1; For Gibbon’s ambiguity see: Brian W. Young, ‘Preludes and Postludes to Gibbon: Variations on an Impromptu by J.G.A. Pocock’, *History of European Ideas* 35, no. 4 (2009): pp. 421–2.

Bury's Anti-Catholicism

For Bury, Catholicism was without a doubt the bitterest enemy of human progress. This approach became noticeable especially during the second decade of the Twenties, when Bury seemed to fuse his personal anti-Catholic approach with his historic analysis. In works such as *A History of Freedom of Thought* (1913)⁵⁶⁴ and *The Idea of Progress* (1920)⁵⁶⁵ Bury, in his perception of Gibbon, aligned himself with the latter as the enemy of the Catholic Church. For instance, in the midst of his *Freedom of Thought* he praised Gibbon's view against the inquisitors of the Church who 'defended nonsense through cruelties'⁵⁶⁶. Bury observed himself as a pure rationalist. He wrote against the divine source of Christianity and refuted its supernatural influence on history:

The success of Christianity has depended upon the transformation of the original doctrines and upon the character and strength of the Christiane organization. The history of the Church is unique. So was the Roman Empire; so is the British Empire; and so are many other things. None of them is miraculous. And if they are all miraculous, Christianity ceases to be privileged, and the argument from its success disappears⁵⁶⁷.

In his eyes, Reason and reason alone stood at the core of his perspective: 'There is nothing for it but to trust the light of our reason. Its candle power maybe low, but it is the only light we have'⁵⁶⁸.

⁵⁶⁴ John B. Bury, *A History of Freedom of Thought* (London; New York, 1913).

⁵⁶⁵ John B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress : An Inquiry into Its Origin and Growth* (London, 1920).

⁵⁶⁶ Bury, *A History of Freedom of Thought*, p.51.

⁵⁶⁷ John B. Bury, 'The Success of Christianity', *RPA Annual*, 1915, p.5; The *RPA Annual* was founded by Charles Albert Watts during 1884-5. The journal, as the whole association, fostered the publication of secular books and ideas. Today the Rational Association still exists and publishes a magazine entitled *New Humanist*. See: 'New Humanist', accessed 22 Feb. 2014 at <https://newhumanist.org.uk/>.

⁵⁶⁸ John B. Bury, 'Playing For Safety', *RPA Annual*, 1920, p. 19.

The fundamental argument in the *Freedom of Thought* defines all religions as obtaining an uncreative and even a destructive role throughout history. Bury's rage, as a member of the Christian sphere, mostly turned against the control of the Catholic Church. Under its oppressing rule, progressive, free and innovative ideas were omitted, since people lacked the essential feeling of freedom and liberty. Nevertheless, it was not Catholicism alone that stood as a bulwark in the progress of humanity, but also all the other Abrahamic religions. Bury also attacked the Old Testament and the Jewish scriptures as reflecting the ideas of a low stage civilization full of savagery⁵⁶⁹. The pagan world, unlike monotheistic religions, did not suffer from these limitations: 'The Greeks fortunately had no Bible, and this fact was both an expression and an important condition of their freedom'⁵⁷⁰. The liberty of the pagan world can also be seen in the policy of Rome, which tolerated a variety of religions and beliefs across the empire. When Christianity became widespread and many around the empire adopted it, several (and not many) Roman Emperors began to persecute the Christian communities. Christianity threatened the religious freedom by abolishing the beliefs of other religions. The early Christians, promoting religious tolerance before becoming rulers, abandoned this approach after coming to power. For them, salvation was possible only through Christianity and no other dogma could redeem the individual or the community⁵⁷¹. The Christian subjugation was not limited to a certain period in history. Again, maybe as a result of Bury's acceptance of the long-lasting effects of ideas in history or following the notion of 'unity of history', he characterized Christianity as practicing a destructive effect on the progress of mankind through the ages.

⁵⁶⁹ Bury, *Freedom of Thought*, p.53.

⁵⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 24.

⁵⁷¹ Ibid., p. 52.

The darkness of the Middle Ages was lifted slightly during the thirteenth century when the men of the Renaissance endorsed the concept of free thought. ‘The individual began to feel his separate individuality, to be conscious of his own value as a person apart from his race or country ... and the world around him began to emerge from the mists of mediaeval dreams’⁵⁷². The Renaissance men differentiated between religion and humanism and promoted a unique, unprecedented, perception. Nevertheless, Bury maintained, the Renaissance man had remained under the Church’s dome and had not refuted Christianity. Later, in the sixteenth century, during the reformation, the repression of freethinking persisted. Both the Catholic and Protestant doctrines remained intolerant: ‘They replaced one authority by another. They set up the authority of the Bible instead of that of the Church, but it was the Bible according to Luther or the Bible according to Calvin’⁵⁷³. However, the authority of the Catholic Church was challenged, and led, without the intention of the reformation, to the rise of rational and secular thinking. The significant change came only in the seventeenth century when the clash between religion and reason finally erupted. It reached its most critical point in the nineteenth century, when it was finally proved that science and Christianity can no longer coexist: ‘...the Christian scheme based on the notions of an unscientific age and on the arrogant assumption that the universe was made for man, has no suitable or reasonable place’⁵⁷⁴.

This Anti-Catholic stance of Bury was refuted in fierce words by the Anglo-French writer and poet Hilaire Belloc (1870–1953). In his pamphlet entitled the *Anti-Catholic History*

⁵⁷² Ibid.,p.72

⁵⁷³ Ibid., p. 77.

⁵⁷⁴ Ibid.,p.190.

– *How is it Written*⁵⁷⁵, he condemned the false authority of some ‘experts’ such as Bury who exploit their academic stature to attack the Catholic Church⁵⁷⁶. While Bury identified the Church as the source of all evil, Belloc admired the Church’s contribution to the Roman Empire and defined it as ‘the soul of our Western civilization’⁵⁷⁷. Bury’s book, according to Belloc, included inaccuracies, numerous errors and improbabilities. The greatest fallacy was Bury’s generalizations who totally misunderstood the atmosphere of the times he was writing about. For instance, the Church was not only about miracles and superstitions but contained prolific works of Church figures such as Thomas Aquinas⁵⁷⁸. There is no wonder that Belloc, following his support of the Church, also attacked Gibbon, although adoring his literary skills⁵⁷⁹.

As discussed earlier, Bury did not observe the Church as accountable for the fall of the Western Empire. For him, the reality was quite different. He featured the Church as the core bonding the Eastern Empire after the calamities of the fifth century A.D.. In addition, following Bury’s view, it seems, at least in regards to the West, that he too embraced the tripod common division of history. The Middle ages were no longer a time of great accomplishments, but a period of decline and backwardness. In this age, Bury declared that ‘reason is in prison’ and the long hands of the Church had strangled freedom. Modernity, nevertheless, symbolized for him the emblem of progress.

⁵⁷⁵ Hilaire Belloc, *Anti-Catholic History: How It Is Written. (An Examination of Prof. Bury’s A History of Freedom of Thought, Adapted from an Article in the Dublin Review.)* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1914).

⁵⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp.1–3.

⁵⁷⁷ Quoted in Bernard Bergonzi, ‘Belloc, (Joseph) Hilaire Pierre René (1870–1953)’, *ODNB*, (Oxford, 2004), accessed 30 November 2014 at <http://ezproxyprd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/30699>.

⁵⁷⁸ Hilaire Belloc, *Anti-Catholic History*, p.19.

⁵⁷⁹ Bergonzi, ‘Belloc’.

The Dominance of Modernity

In *The Idea of Progress*, Bury reaffirmed the notion that during the Middle Ages, Christianity had dominated the sphere. Progress became inconceivable, since the ultimate goal was the after-life and not the enhancement of present society. Augustine of Hippo established the basis of this doctrine through the belief in providence and the original sin. Bury, despite this, defined the Middle Ages as shaping two important ideas that enabled the notion of progress to be planted in Modernity: the uniqueness of humanity and the idea of the universe/ecumenical community⁵⁸⁰. The transformation of history and the full enforcement of progress came to life in the seventeenth century. Progress and freedom went hand in hand. Once freedom became a reality, progress followed. Descartes was the most influential figure in this process. The transformation he initiated depended upon several conditions, which came to life in this century: the breaking of the authority of the ancient, and even obsolete, thinkers, the need to achieve improvement in the human condition and the establishment of science on solid foundations⁵⁸¹.

Besides Christianity/religion, Bury also ‘attacked’ Antiquity. As he commented, in Modernity (from the sixteenth century) man began to ‘rebel against the tyranny of Antiquity’⁵⁸². He claimed that the ancient Greeks had lacked the idea of progress. The reason for this was partly since they did not possess sufficient evidence on the past and could not determine whether they achieved substantial progress. In addition, the Greeks developed the

⁵⁸⁰ Bury, *The Idea of Progress*, pp.21-4.

⁵⁸¹ Ibid., p.66.

⁵⁸² Ibid.,p.33.

concept that the Gods created a perfect world that will last for 72,000 solar years. Yet, as any other living organism, once the world will pass to the second half of this period it will be in a state of decadence⁵⁸³. The fact that the Greek thinkers saw change as a symptom of decline and corruption, further explains why progress was omitted from Antiquity especially since: ‘Time was regarded as the enemy of society’⁵⁸⁴. The concept of *Moirai* [fate], dominant among the Greeks, also defied the idea of progress. *Moirai*, separating humans from the Gods by fate and order, would have been shattered by the idea of progress since the borders between the two worlds would have been demolished⁵⁸⁵.

Even though, one may wonder how a historian, who specialized in Antiquity and in the Christian Early Middle Ages, was slightly sceptical about his subjects of inquiry. The main significance of the above discussion is that it clarifies why Bury preferred Modernity. He identified with modern writers and considered figures like the French author Fontenelle (1657-1757) as the agents of secular and freethinking. Bury claimed that the latter had been the first scholar to fully define the notion of progress, since he had focused on the future. Fontenelle maintained that the achievements of any period were dependent on the period itself and on the existing circumstances. Thus, throughout the ages there was no essential change in the nature of men. The extensive admiration of the ancient scholars raised a major obstacle for progress. Yet, the famed ancient history of humanity did not denote its present decline. On the contrary, throughout the ages until Modernity, humanity gained experience and knowledge that

⁵⁸³ Ibid.,pp.9-10.

⁵⁸⁴ Ibid.,p.11.

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid.,p.19.

surpassed the ideas of the ancients. Bury supported this argument especially because of its secular leitmotif and the fact that it was founded upon nature⁵⁸⁶.

In his lecture *The Place of Modern History in the Perspective of Knowledge*⁵⁸⁷, at the Congress of Arts and Sciences in St. Louis (1904), Bury announced explicitly that Modernity must be at the centre of the historical research. Unlike Hegel, who promoted the theory that mankind fulfilled its destiny during Modernity due to the supremacy of reason, Bury identified a promising future for mankind and therefore the end of history is yet to come: 'Hegel thought that the final form of political constitution was something closely resembling the Prussian state, that the final religion is Christianity, that the final philosophy is his own'⁵⁸⁸. There was no fixed model that humankind was bound to and the future presents numerous possibilities. This argument, I maintain, derived from Bury's argument about the historical contingency. According to which models cannot be applied to history because of its dominating casual and random essence. The great advantage of Modernity is that it presents sufficient data and proofs that are not attainable in the research of Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Modernity also sets a clear boundary to time. It ends in the present, and distinctly from other historical periods, the termination point is not arbitrary but stands as a clear line. It is obvious why Bury, as an historian, elevating the importance of evidence, characterized Modernity as the most vital asset for the understanding of the historical process. The richness of knowledge in Modernity broadens the understanding of history in general. This does not indicate that history concludes with Modernity, but only that we have to begin from Modernity and only then move to the

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid., pp.107-9.

⁵⁸⁷ John B. Bury, 'The Place of Modern History in the Perspective of Knowledge', in *Selected Essays of J. B. Bury* (Cambridge, 1930), pp.43-59.

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid., p.50

past: ‘The interpreter of the movement of history must proceed backward, not forward; he must start from the modern period’⁵⁸⁹.

Historical Time

Throughout *The Idea of Progress*, Bury illustrated how other scholars conceptualize the division of time. It is important to sketch several of these theories since they convey a deeper understanding of Bury’s scheme and how through the notions of progress/freedom he endeavoured to organize historical time. Bury recognized Jean Bodin (1529/30–96) as one of the initiators of the new progressive thinking. Bury concluded that Bodin divided history into three periods. During the first era, the Near East nations dominated the earth (Assyrians, Egyptians, Phoenicians). In the second era, the middle Mediterranean nations (Greece, Rome) ruled. The last era belonged to the nations of the north, which took the supremacy from Rome⁵⁹⁰. Bodin also disapproved of the prevailing division of the four monarchies of Daniel and especially to the German claim that the Holy Roman Empire was in fact one of the monarchies⁵⁹¹. As Bury remarked, Bodin’s division was very similar to the thesis of Hegel, separating between the Oriental, Greek-Roman and Germanic periods. Bodin denied the notion of humanity’s constant decline from a certain mythical golden age. He recognized the inventions of his own time as superior to those of Antiquity. Nevertheless, Bodin was not

⁵⁸⁹ Ibid., p.51.

⁵⁹⁰ Bury, *The Idea of Progress*, p.38 ;Jean Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History* (New York, 1969), pp.21–4.

⁵⁹¹ Bodin dedicated a chapter for this issue entitled ‘Refutation of those who Postulate Four Monarchies and the Golden Age’. See: Ibid., 291 ff.; Mario Turchetti, ‘Jean Bodin’, in Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, Fall 2014, accessed 27 November 2014 at <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/bodin/>.

positive that future achievements will exceed the inventions of his own era (compass, printing etc.)⁵⁹².

Bacon also divided historical times into three: Antiquities, the mid-era that included Greece and Rome and Modernity (together with the Middle Ages). For him, the improvement of the state of mankind in the world was the prominent goal of science and through inventions the well-being of humanity was achieved. Bacon shattered the dominance of Antiquity and asserted that Antiquity had signified only the beginning or the youth of the world. For this reason, Antiquity defined the time that elapses until his own age, since it represented history until the days when inventions became practical for human beings. But, alas, Bacon, like Bodin, did not necessarily identify progress as characterizing future history⁵⁹³. For Bury, the theories of both Bodin and Bacon were significant since they had departed from Antiquity and concentrated on the achievements of humanity in later periods and especially in their own days. This demonstrated how a certain progressive process occurred in history. In addition, Bodin and Bacon separated the religious time from the ‘earthly’ one and by that usurped periodization from the sole control of the Church⁵⁹⁴. This, of course, appealed to Bury and he saw both scholars as sources of inspiration. Nevertheless, for him, their view lacked a central factor. They, to the ‘disappointment’ of Bury, did not recognize the continuing improvement of humanity.

Bury disapproved of locked historical schemes which frame history according to a definite end, leaving no place for future developments or progress. For him, history is open-

⁵⁹² Bodin, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*, pp.301–2; Bury, *The Idea of Progress*, pp.39–40.

⁵⁹³ Ibid., pp.52–7.

⁵⁹⁴ Arieli, ‘Modernity and the Problem of Secularization’, pp.153–4.

ended. These theories usually conclude in the present or more precisely in the time when the writer operates. They were prevalent among historians and philosophers and seen, for instance, in the writings of the French scholar, Comet. Comet, through a set of tripod laws that correspond with three periods, established the notion that the world had moved from the theological phase, lasting until the fifteenth century, to the metaphysical phase. The latter phase concluded with the French revolution and after it, the world began its last, third period. This period bears the name the 'positive age' and will be based upon laws proving that the 'science of society is possible'⁵⁹⁵. Although Comet endorsed the progressive impetus, Bury dissociated himself from Comet's third future period. For Bury, this period was too well structured, fixed upon strict and inevitable laws and lacking any causality.

It seems that the theory about the third Hegelian 'German phase' did have some effect on Bury's historical perception. In a very interesting passage from his first book *The Late Roman Empire*, he acknowledged the invigorating influence of the German spirit in the era following the collapse of the Roman West and later during the Reformation:

The formation of independent Teutonic kingdoms in the earlier period corresponds to the Reformation in the later; in both cases the German spirit produced a mighty revolution, and in both cases the result was a compromise or division between the old and the new. The Roman Empire lived on in south-eastern Europe, even as the Catholic Church lived on, confined to a limited extent of territory; and there was a remarkable revival of strength, or reaction, in the fifth and sixth centuries at Constantinople, which, following out the parallel, we may compare to the Counter-reformation. And this analogy is not a mere superficial or fanciful resemblance; the same historical principle is involved. Christianity and the Renaissance performed the same functions; each meant the transformation of the spirit of the European world, and such a transformation was a necessary precursor of the disintegration of European unity, whether political or ecclesiastical. In the strength of ancient ideas lay the strength of the Roman Empire; Christianity was

⁵⁹⁵ Ibid., p.307

the solvent of these ideas, and so dissolved also the political unity of Europe. In the strength of medieval ideas lay the strength of the Roman Church; the spirit of the Renaissance was the solvent of medieval ideas, and therefore it dissolved the ecclesiastical unity of western and northern Europe⁵⁹⁶.

Although Bury wrote this passage many years before discussing Bodin and Hegel in his *Idea of Progress*, his words here corresponded with their model and especially the significance they had attributed to the third and last North/Germanic age of the world. Bury acknowledged the impact of the two 'Germanic' revolutions which had occurred a thousand years apart. The beginning of the Middle Ages (or the end of Rome) and the beginning of Modernity (or the end of the Middle Ages) were in fact a consequence of the same 'German' need, to regenerate the European world with new ideology. Thus, the Teutonic element embedded a significant historical kernel. Furthermore, following this passage and the reading of the *Idea of Progress*, Bury seems to adopt the conservative division of history into three periods. For him, and this is an important point, the division was mainly applicable to the West, since the Roman Empire continued in the East and there was no division between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. However, also in regards to the West, Bury presented a more moderate approach recognizing the transformation from Rome to the tribes as a gradual and even natural process.

The Tribal Role in the 'Fall'

Bury, unlike Gibbon, claimed that the Teutonic invasions had not caused a colossal destruction. Ever since the times of Arminius, the 'saver of Germany' in the beginning of the first century A.D., the Teutons fought alongside the Romans, until they revolted and demanded greater

⁵⁹⁶ Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, p.1.

rights, privileges and especially land. The 'invasions' were actually inner rebellions within the Roman sphere and not external threats. Teutonic-Roman lords like Alaric, Odovacar and Stilicho signified the fusion of the two cultures: 'These Romanized Teutons formed a link between Romania and Germania'⁵⁹⁷. The Teutons even contributed to the course of European history, in distinction to the external threat of the Huns and their leader Attila who sought to destroy, plunder and exploit the empire⁵⁹⁸. Therefore, the 'Germanization' of the Roman army was not such a negative process, since the tribes have added an invigorating dose to the decaying Roman system:

...it was just the fresh German spirit which was able to give some new life to the old forms and throw some enthusiasm into the task of maintaining the Roman name of which they were really proud. And it was this coalition of Roman and German elements in the army which made the dismemberment of the empire in the West less violent than it might have been⁵⁹⁹.

Bury, in his *Life of St. Patrick*, besides describing the life of Ireland's most prominent saint and the infiltration of Christianity into his homeland, explained that the tribes had a great admiration for Rome:

The observant student who follows with care the history of the expansion of Germany and the strange process by which the German kingdoms were established within the Empire in Western Europe, is struck at every step by the profound respect which the barbarians evinced for the Empire and the Roman name throughout all their hostilities and injuries. While they were unconsciously dismembering it, they believed in its impregnable stability; Europe without the Empire was unimaginable; the dominion of Rome seemed to them part of the universal order, as eternal as the great globe itself. If we take into account this immeasurable reverence for Rome, which is one of the governing psychical facts in the history of the 'wandering of the nations',...

⁵⁹⁷ John B. Bury, 'Art V.--the Wandering of the Nations', *The Scottish Review* 21 (April 1893), p. 343.

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid., p.345.

⁵⁹⁹ Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, p.35.

⁶⁰⁰ John B. Bury, *St. Patrick : The Life and World of Ireland's Saint* (London, 2010[1905]), p.8.

This fact had actually led the tribes to adopt and cherish Christianity. Without the Roman recognition of Christianity the barbarians, so Bury claimed, would have never adopted it as their faith:

Could a people find any more powerful protector than the Deity who was worshipped and feared by the greatest “nation” on earth ?... It did not occur to them that the Eternal City had achieved her greatness and built her empire under the auspices of Jupiter and Mars...if the step taken by Constantine had been postponed for a hundred years, we should not find the Goths and the Vandals professing Christianity at the beginning of the Fifth century⁶⁰¹.

This observation of the tribes reaffirms, to some extent, the ideas of another famous British historian. In the second half of the nineteenth century, Thomas Hodgkin (1831-1913), a banker by profession, wrote a work of eight volumes under the title *Italy and her Invaders*⁶⁰². Bury himself reviewed the first four volumes of this book⁶⁰³. In his review, Bury separated between the two leading views of the tribes in the process of the Western Fall. The differentiation was a general one and it was between the student of the classical era and the student of the general European history. The first admired the achievements and thinking of the Greco-Roman world and regarded the history of 500 B.C. until the ‘alleged’ fall, as the most significant one in the age of humanity. The student of European history, however, looked from the fall onwards and did not regard it as a catastrophic phase but as a new beginning, paving the way out of a decaying world:

When he sees a Roman Augustus trifling with theological puzzles in a synod-chamber, or beholds Rome herself under the mercy of a barbarian’s army, he murmurs ‘But oh, the heavy change! And soon his interest unawakened by the doings of the Goths and Vandals, he turns back to those brighter ages in which the Goth did not yet trouble the shores of the Midland sea, and the Vandal was still at

⁶⁰¹ Ibid., p.9.

⁶⁰² Thomas Hodgkin, *Italy and Her Invaders* (8 vol., Oxford, 1880).

⁶⁰³ Bury, ‘Art V.--the Wandering of the Nations.’

rest in his northern home...The student of Teutonic - or the wider student of European - history starts with hope to elate from the same group of events, amid which the student of Classical history can hardly bear up against a feeling of weariness and depression. Were the one is benighted and knows that the end is near the other can see the dawn faintly quickening in the east, and knows that a long day is still before him. Where the classical student looks back to Pericles and Julius Cesar, the historical student looks forward to Charles and Frederik⁶⁰⁴.

Gibbon was the ultimate representative of the classical type since 'he is ever looking back'⁶⁰⁵, while Hodgkin symbolized the student of European history. For him, the tribes represented an essential phase in the development of the great European Middle Ages and were the carriers of a new future and life. Hodgkin did not deny that the tribes had inflicted a horrible havoc on the classical world. Yet, as Bury wrote, Hodgkin only dropped a 'tear of a conqueror' over the destruction of the Empire⁶⁰⁶. The titles of the two books reflect the variance in opinion: Gibbon spoke of 'Decline' while Hodgkin concentrated on the tribes and their wanderings.

Hodgkin's view, most importantly, despite his positive assessment of the tribes, did not alter the periodization of Antiquity. By this, he followed most of the scholars who wrote after Gibbon. The fact that the tribes contributed to the European civilization did not mean that they should not be blamed for the fall. On the contrary, their significance was in the fact that they conquered a decaying empire and ushered a new and better historical phase. Bury, however, minimized, as I showed, the influence of the tribes. In his eyes, the fall of the West was almost a false concept. The invasions were not as traumatic or dramatic as they seemed to most scholars.

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid., pp.329-30.

⁶⁰⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid., p.331.

Bury, therefore, defined himself as a student of the Teutonic history and by that he followed Hodgkin. He retained no interest in early Roman history and observed this era as unfruitful and uncreative: ‘...From Augustus to Augustulus, poverty of ideas, incapacity for hard thinking, and excessive deference to authority, characterized the Roman world...⁶⁰⁷’. Nevertheless, a great difficulty appears to surface in Bury’s argument. By defining the insignificance of the early imperial period between the first Emperor Augustus and the last Emperor of the West, Augustulus, he actually accepted the regular periodization that terminated the Western Empire in 476 A.D.. Therefore, it can be argued that according to Bury, a new period had commenced after the fall of the West and no real linkage existed between the Western Empire and the Eastern Empire. This also contradicted Bury’s own words against Gibbon that ‘no Empire fell in 476 A.D.’.

Additionally, in Bury’s *The Later Roman Empire*, despite arguing against the theory of the ‘fall’ and in favour of the continuation in the East, he dedicated his third chapter to the subject ‘Elements of disintegration in the Roman Empire’⁶⁰⁸. Bury noted several major causes that had instigated the fall of the Roman Empire. The most crucial element had been the shortage in manpower. Bury, in resemblance to the explanation of his German contemporary Max Weber⁶⁰⁹, wrote that: ‘The most obvious element of weakness in the Roman Empire was

⁶⁰⁷ John B. Bury, ‘Art. VII--Rome and Byzantium’, *Quarterly Review* 192, no. 383 (June 1900): p.134.

⁶⁰⁸ Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire*, pp.25-36.; For a similar assessment on the ‘dismembering’ of Rome, see: Bury, ‘Art V.--the Wandering of the Nations’, p. 339.

⁶⁰⁹ In his 1896 book *Die Sozialen Gründe des Untergangs der antiken Kultur*, Weber wrote that the shortage in slaves during the third century had been the cause for the Roman decline, since slaves were the locomotive of Roman economy. Until the crisis, he argues, Rome developed several capitalist characteristics, but the slave shortage combined with the termination of the Roman territorial expansion generated a crisis that began the decay. See: Max Weber, ‘The Social Causes of the Decay of Ancient Civilization’, in *Max Weber, Essays in Economic Sociology*, trans. Richard Swedberg (Princeton, 1999), pp. 138–53.; John R. Love, *Antiquity and Capitalism: Max Weber and the Sociological Foundations of Roman Civilisation* (London, 1991), pp.233-7.

the increasing depopulation. The vitality of a state depends ultimately on the people, and from the time of Augustus, who was obliged to make special laws to encourage reproduction, to the time of Marcus Aurelius the population steadily decreased...⁶¹⁰. The shortage in manpower was worsened by the slave system that damaged the condition of the small estates. This was apparent especially in times of war when the owners of the small estates left their fields while the slaves maintained the big/rich estates. The owners of the small and medium estates became serfs and could not be detached from their land. These evils in the Roman economic system were deep-rooted. The original sin began with a law issued by the plebiscite of Claudius from 218 B.C.. The law banned senators from investing their money in trade. Therefore, the senators, who became wealthier and wealthier because of the new acquisitions of Rome, had no other option but to invest their money in land. By this, they gradually seized control of many small estates and worsened the conditions of the Roman free middle class⁶¹¹. The grain imported from the provinces also added to the problems of the free estates. The imported grain lowered the revenues of the estates since it was bought for a cheaper price than the local grain grown in Italy. In conclusion, the whole Roman system deteriorated by these causes, since the majority of the citizens suffered from harsh conditions and poverty leading to the depopulation of the empire.

In response to this shortage of manpower, the empire incorporated barbarians into its administration. These barbarians together with their families, and in some cases even the whole

⁶¹⁰ Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, p.25.

⁶¹¹ Bury, 'Art. VII.-Rome and Byzantium', p. 136.

tribe were gradually assimilated into the Roman Empire. Eventually, because of this development, the empire collapsed:

The significance of these semi-barbarians is that they smoothed the way...for the invaders who dismembered the Empire; not being attached by hereditary tradition to Roman ideas and the Roman name, but having within them the Teutonic spirit of individual freedom, directly opposed to the Roman spirit of tyrannical universal law, they were not prejudiced sufficiently strongly in favour of the Roman Empire to preserve it, although they admired and partook of its superior civilization⁶¹².

These words seem to contradict the statement of Bury several pages later, where he stated that the integrated Germanic tribes had functioned as a 'bridge' between the Roman and Germanic civilizations. Is there any explanation for these apparent inconsistencies? When, if ever, did the empire fall according to Bury? Was there a continuation between the Eastern and the Western Empires or were there two separate entities?

The Merit of Inconsistency

The answer is that some unexplained themes do appear within Bury's arguments. However, in the case of many historians, as can also be seen in regards to Freeman, one can identify some contradictions especially if the historian publishes so prolifically. Furthermore, as Bury, himself, maintained, the obligation of the historian was to amend his views occasionally⁶¹³:

One of the most important things that people have to learn, and one of the hardest, is that consistency is not a reasonable rule of life...How irredeemably dull people would be if they were all consistent, in thought, in speech, and in action! ...The great charm of Mr. Gladstone as a politician is that he has made inconsistency a fine art...For the false idea of consistency leads to the false idea of immutability,

⁶¹² Ibid.,p.33.

⁶¹³ George Huxley, 'The Historical Scholarship of John Bagnell Bury', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 17, no. 1 (Spring 1976), p. 98.

of never changing one's mind. Perhaps one should rather count that year as misspent in which one has not modified all one's opinions⁶¹⁴.

If the historian is a true follower of the scientific method, he must act accordingly and fluctuate. Archaeological, archival and any other new evidence must be the foundation of the historical analysis. Nevertheless, these are, perhaps, insufficient explanations for Bury's inconsistencies. Sometimes, as in this critical question of the fall of the empire, Bury, it seems, presented two different opinions in the course of the same book.

There is a middle way that may pacify these vacillations in Bury's opinion. Primarily, the fact that in several exceptional times, Bury allegedly accepted the 'normal' periodization was meant mainly to emphasize his disapproval of the glorification of the early Roman Empire. For instance, in an article at the *Saturday Review*, he attacked the Early Roman Empire with harsh words. He stressed that excluding Roman law the empire had not acquired even one worthy achievement. The article's main goal was to compare between the accomplishments of the Roman and British Empires and the conclusion was that the British Empire was far superior⁶¹⁵. In addition, the fact that Bury discarded the date of 476 A.D. did not mean that he thought that the Western Empire had not declined in the fifth century A.D.. On the contrary, he wrote several times in different publications about the deterioration of the West. Yet, for him, dissimilar to other historians, the fall of the West did not signify the end of the whole

⁶¹⁴ John B. Bury, 'The Insurrection of Women. A Criticism', *Fortnightly Review* 52, no. 311 (November 1892): p.654.

⁶¹⁵ 'The Romans of the Empire had not a trace of that highest order of mental faculty which creates and originates. Their intelligence was solid and common place, moving rigidly on old lines; they were incapable of striking a new vein or of conceiving a new idea. From the days of Augustus to the triumph of Christianity they invented absolutely nothing in political science or in finance, in warfare or in mechanics, in religion or in literature or art...In Fact under the early Roman Empire the human mind sluggishly vegetated on its own past. Contrast this with the brain power which has operated in England during the present century and helped to transform the world'. See: John B. Bury, 'The British and the Roman Empire,' *SR* 81, no. 2122 (June 27, 1896), p. 645.

empire. There was a clear distinction between the two parts of the empire. For Bury, the heart of the empire was positioned in the East. The civilization of the later Roman Empire denoted a continuation of ancient Greece together with Rome⁶¹⁶. In a certain way, in the East the fall had never occurred and the empire just moved to its new metropolis in Constantinople, until its final fall a thousand and so years later. The inherent economic problems of the West were the root of its gradual fall. ‘Gradual’ is a very substantial term here, since the fall was not a consequence of a singular event or even related to the occurrences of an entire century, but it must be attributed to basic faults of the Western system. Following this, Bury deemphasized the corrosive influence of Christianity and Barbarism, but rather elevated other reasons: depopulation, heavy taxation, the corruption of the Roman administration and the ‘demolishing’ of the small estates.

The Rise of the East

The key question, which is also one of Bury’s innovative historical examinations, is why these problems did not affect the East? Why did the Eastern Empire survive and did not suffer from a similar fate? If the decline during the Middle Ages originated from the role of Christianity in restraining freedom, how could Bury claim that, at exactly the same period, a thriving Christian culture existed in the Roman East? The East, as the West, should have also been bounded by the limitations of the Church on freedom. Bury mentioned several basic reasons for this. The principal one was that the foundation of the city of Constantinople or the ‘new Rome’ bestowed a dramatic advantage to the East. The city operated as a hub merging East and West. The geographic location enabled Constantinople to grow as a new thriving centre and most

⁶¹⁶ Bury, *Cambridge Medieval history*, IV, p.VIII.

importantly to withstand the barbarian invasions. Before ravaging Rome, the barbaric tribes passed through the eastern parts with a clear aim to sack the East, but the location of the city on the Bosphorus together with its high walls prevented them from achieving their plan. The failure in the East drove different tribal leaders, like Alaric the Goth and Attila the Hun, to select more 'suitable' targets, the Western provinces and the city of Rome⁶¹⁷.

The East also embraced one united religion and developed a national coherent identity: 'Christianity and the influence of the Church acted as a cement'⁶¹⁸. In the West, inner struggles occurred due to religious and social variables. The Christians with their Catholic doctrine, the Germans with their Arian dogma and the pagan Romans were all thrown into the same melting pot. To this, one should add the fact that the East gained greater wealth than the West and also achieved a population growth while the population of the West underwent a decline⁶¹⁹. The capability of the Eastern Emperors of the fifth century in comparison to the weakness of the Emperors of the West signified another major advantage of the East. In the West, German 'advisors' assisted the Caesars and the ranks of the army were 'flooded' with German soldiers. The Eastern Emperors, however, led an economic reform and managed to prevent the hazards of the West. As Bury argued, the latter disaster could have been prevented 'if an Adam Smith had arisen' among the Western Emperors⁶²⁰. In his *Later Roman Empire*, Bury made another clear distinction between the two parts:

The western suffered more than the eastern provinces, a fact which we must attribute primarily to a different economic condition, resulting from a different history. The distribution of property was less uneven in the East, and the social

⁶¹⁷Bury, 'Art. VII.-Rome and Byzantium', pp.147-9.

⁶¹⁸ Ibid., p.152.

⁶¹⁹ Ibid., P. 146.

⁶²⁰ Ibid., p. 151.

character of the people was different. For while the East was under the more genial and enlightened rule of Alexander's successors, the West was held by the cold hand of Rome. After the division of the Empire, 395 A.D., the state of the West seems to have become rapidly worse, while the East gradually revived under a government inclined to reform⁶²¹.

From this passage, one should notice that the separation between the East and the West was already rooted in the Hellenistic era of the third and second centuries B.C.. The Greek East benefited following the death of Alexander from a greater degree of freedom, in contrast to the shackles of Rome. Thus, Bury adopted a certain continues historical scheme similar to Freeman's theory of the 'unity in history'. He observed a long linkage from the early split to the much later East-West division in 395 A.D.. Following this, another significant conclusion comes to light. Bury, despite attacking other historians for their arbitrary division of the past, handed us with a similar method. A new era in the history of Rome begun after Theodosius I (347-95 A.D.) died and his two sons, Arcadius (377-408) and Honorius (384-423) ruled the two parts of the empire. Bury, for this reason, also commenced his *Later Roman Empire* with the division of 395 A.D.. The division marked a different stage in Rome's history, but it did not signify the end of Rome. The linkage between the East and the West still existed and the fundamental change was that the centre of gravity moved eastwards. Until 800 A.D., sustainable relations between the two parts still lasted. Bury demonstrated how the Germanic lords of the West had treated the Eastern Roman Emperor as their superior lord. For instance, Theodoric invaded Italy with the order of Zeno the Emperor of the East⁶²². In addition, Justinian managed to conquer vast parts of the West and tried to establish a unified empire. Justinian's

⁶²¹ Bury, *The Later Roman Empire*, p. 29.

⁶²² Bury, 'Art V.--the Wandering of the Nations', p. 339; Zeno even nominated him to be a Roman consul, a Patrician and to the position of head of soldiers (*magister militum*). See: Maurice Dumoulin, 'The Kingdom of Italy Under Odovacar and Theodoric'. In John B. Bury, Henry M. Gwatkin and J.P. Whitney (eds.), *The Cambridge Medieval History* (8 vol., Cambridge, 1911), I, pp. 438–9.

attempt did not last for many years, but it still indicated that the two empires were not totally detached. This could also be proved through the joint issuing of laws by the two empires. Although Bury recognized the language split between the Latin West and the Greek East, he still maintained that these two parallel centres of control had not been totally divided: 'The two parts are often loosely spoken of as if they were two distinct empires-the Eastern and the Western. That is a mistake against which we must be on our guard'⁶²³.

The final separation between the two empires only followed five hundred years later in 802 A.D. with the deposition of the Empress Irene (752-803). This date had also marked the point where Bury concluded his book on the *Later Roman Empire* (1889). Hence, he provides a termination date for the late Empire. From this date on, a totally new period had commenced and Bury depicted its course in his *History of the Eastern Roman Empire*⁶²⁴. Bury's justification for the division between the two periods was that in 800 A.D. a final split between East and West had occurred when Charlemagne had been crowned as Emperor. Finally, a worthy counterpart rose in the West and the domination of the East became constrained. As he mentioned, Bury actually accepted the periodization of Thomas Arnold adopted later by Freeman ending Antiquity with Charlemagne⁶²⁵. For Bury, Unlike Arnold, 800 A.D. only symbolized the absolute separation between the West and East, but the final destruction of the Roman Eastern Empire had occurred in 1453.

⁶²³ John B. Bury, *The Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians* (New York, 1967), p.29.

⁶²⁴ John B. Bury, *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire: From the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802-867)* (London, 1912).

⁶²⁵ Bury, *A History of the Later Roman Empire*, I, p. X.

Bury presented a complex view in the transformation of Rome and of the ancient world. He stressed several even contradictory historical arguments. Primarily, he acknowledged the destruction of Western Rome in the fifth century A.D. together with the continuation of the empire in the East. One can question how Bury related to the era before and after the destruction as belonging to the same period. Furthermore, how, on the one hand, he emphasized that the East and the West had maintained close links until the ninth century and, on the other hand, assert that the basic dissimilarities between the two had caused the West to fall and the Eastern Empire to linger.

The Rule of Contingency

The comprehension of Bury's interpretation of the Roman history could be traced in a different place. Within his writings, Bury perceived history as controlled by contingencies. The casual, random and thus unpredictable component determines the course of history and therefore the ability to explain events was limited and cannot be dependent upon a broad theory or summarized by several general laws. There are so many variants in history. The role of the individual, together with psychological, geographical, environmental and other conditions, encompasses the power to transform history's path at any given moment. The evolution theory of Charles Darwin was, as Bury admitted, the basis for this historical method, since he identified the randomness of nature as also existing in history:

The truth is that Darwinism itself offers the best illustration of the insufficiency of general laws to account for historical development. The part played by coincidence, and the part played by individuals—limited by, and related to, general social conditions—render it impossible to deduce the course of the past history of man or to predict the future. But it is just the same with organic development. Darwin (or any other zoologist) could not deduce the actual course of evolution from general principles. Given an organism and its environment, he could not show that it must evolve into a more complex organism of a definite predetermined type; knowing what it has evolved into, he could attempt to

discover and assign the determining causes. General principles do not account for a particular sequence; they embody necessary conditions; but there is a chapter of accidents too. It is the same in the case of history⁶²⁶.

Contingencies are the core of history and ‘make history so interesting and so baffling’⁶²⁷. Some explain events in history as dependent on a predestined course controlled by providence or attached to reason (as Hegel asserted). Bury, however, supported the notion of chance created by the collision of independent arbitrary causes or events. Several contingent events also defined the destiny of the Western Roman Empire. The invasion of the Huns into the realms of the Germanic tribes forced the latter to invade into the Roman territory. The Huns invaded the West because of independent internal developments in the East. Namely, the German tribes, even though they were for centuries on the brink of entering the empire, invaded only because of an external threat as the coming of the Huns. To this, one should add the ill management of the Visigoth settlement, the weakness of the young Emperor Honorius and finally and most importantly the power of Stilicho the Roman General of German origin and Emperor in practice. For Bury, the dismembering of the West was a matter of contingency, since several independent factors collided and converged in order for the subsequent consequences to come to pass.⁶²⁸

This theory was distinct from his previous publications since 1889 (*The Later Roman Empire*) and 1900 (*Rome and Byzantium*). In his 1923 new version of the *History of the Later Roman Empire*, he wrote that there was no sole and grand reason that could explain the fall of

⁶²⁶ Bury, ‘Darwinism and History,’ pp.38–9.

⁶²⁷ Quoted in Norman Hepburn Baynes, *A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury* (Cambridge, 1929), p. 75.

⁶²⁸ The contingent explanation for the ‘fall’ appears in Bury, ‘Cleopatra’s nose’, pp. 62-3; John B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian (A.D. 395 to A.D. 565)* (London 1923), pp. 311–13.

the Roman Empire: 'The truth is that the success of the barbarians in penetrating and founding states in the western provinces cannot be explained by any general considerations. It is accounted for by the actual events and would be clearer if the story were known more fully. The gradual collapse of the Roman power in this section of the Empire was the consequence of a series of contingent events. No general causes can be assigned that made it inevitable'⁶²⁹. This book, mainly focusing on the developments in the West, did not present inherent economic reasons for the Western destruction. Bury's emphasis was on a domino effect that validated the operation of the accidental aspect in triggering the Western fall.

These contingent occurrences, can also explain, why Bury frequently altered his opinions. As one of his later reviewers noted:

'...he was sometimes hasty in changing his own views, and to staid observers seemed inconsistent. But consistency as a virtue had no charm for him....and indeed its only value to a historian is as a check on over-hasty conclusions. The subject-matter of human history is so dominated by the bias of witnesses and the accidents of survival that without continual revision no progress toward truth is possible'⁶³⁰.

His perception of Roman history also provides a glimpse into Bury's general historical method and to its uniqueness. Bury, unlike the ancient Greek historians Thucydides and Polybius, did not believe that history was only designated for the teaching of practical lessons for statesmen: 'the statesman of the present cannot employ the distant past to help his prognostications, because all decisive circumstances ...must of necessity be different'⁶³¹. For him, as he mentioned in his most famous quote from his inaugural lecture, 'History is a Science,

⁶²⁹ Ibid., p.311.

⁶³⁰ W.E. Heitland, 'A Bibliography of the Works of John B. Bury and James Smith Reid', *The Classical Review* 44(1) (1930): p. 38.

⁶³¹ Bury, 'The British and the Roman Empire', p. 645.

no less and no more'⁶³². Thus, History is not an art or a kind of literature but a science enriching us with factual accounts of the past⁶³³. The question is how could Bury assert that history could be both scientific and contingent. Are these not contradictory terms? One explanation is that Bury's altered his position and followed once again his 'rule of fluctuation'. He coined this quote in 1902, while his major writings on the contingent aspect in history were written a decade and so later. In his *life of St. Patrick*, Bury revised, to a certain extent, his famous 'scientific' statement: 'In vindicating the claims of history to be regarded as a science or *Wissenschaft*, I never meant to suggest a proposition so indefensible as that the presentation of the results of historical research is not an art, requiring tact and skill in selection and arrangement which belong to the literary faculty'⁶³⁴. In a lecture given during 1909 on ancient Greek historians, Bury was asked if he abandoned his view on the scientific kernel of history. The question resulted from a very different portrayal of history which Bury presented in the lecture. Bury's answer was that he would be unfaithful to his profession if he would not have changed his opinion from time to time⁶³⁵. Furthermore, as Doris Goldstein shows, for Bury the fact that history was contingent was exactly what made it scientific, since it was natural and part of this world. The accidental, Goldstein writes, 'was not outside the realm of cause and effect'⁶³⁶. Bury, therefore, offered a scientific method for explaining contingencies in history and for example differentiated between what he called 'pure' and 'mix' contingencies. The

⁶³² Bury, *Inaugural lecture*, p. 7.

⁶³³ The famous British historian George Trevelyan, who was present in the lecture and who later replaced Bury as Regius Professor at Cambridge, was one of the biggest adversaries of this notion. For him, history was also an art and not only a science. See: Evans, *In Defense Of History*, pp. 37-9; Goldstein, 'J. B. Bury's Philosophy of History', p. 897; Hesketh, *The Science of History in Victorian Britain*, pp. 161-4.

⁶³⁴ Quoted in J. P. Whitney and J. B. Bury, 'The Late Professor J. B. Bury', *Cambridge Historical Journal* 2, no. 2 (1927): p.195.

⁶³⁵ *Ibid.*, p.192.

⁶³⁶ Goldstein, 'J. B. Bury's Philosophy of History', p.900.

former being solely dependent on chance, while the latter merged chance and human or prior intention⁶³⁷.

From these arguments, several major peculiarities surface distancing Bury from other historians including Freeman. First and foremost, in regards to the teaching of practical lessons, Bury was not involved in daily debates over state's issues. He was not writing regularly for the newspapers or voicing his political views on every possible platform. Science and reason were the key terms for Bury. To a certain extent he continued the long tradition of certain German positivistic historians. These German historians developed a new method in the study of history. Ranke, following his famous dictum that history must be studied '*blos zeigen, wie es eigentlich gewesen*', focused especially on early modern Europe. He stressed the importance of archival work in the understanding of the historical reality. Mommsen adopted a similar method by emphasizing that one of the keys for researching the Roman republic was through the material evidence, and especially the Roman Latin inscriptions. In his inaugural lecture, Bury even praised Mommsen for his new method in historical investigation. '...his greatness as a historian is to be sought far less in that dazzling work (*Roman History*) than in the *Corpus* and the *Staatrecht* and the *Chronicles*'⁶³⁸.

Bury's anti-Catholic stance verified that he did not omit religious-national tendencies from his writings. Consequently, his Irish-Protestant origin was emphasized as part of his historical argumentation. One thing is certain, dissimilar to his proud national predecessors Freeman, Stubbs etc. constantly stressing the English Teutonic roots, Bury departed from

⁶³⁷ Ibid.

⁶³⁸ Bury, *Inaugural Lecture*, p.17.

extreme Teutonic and racial inclinations. He did not detect an eternal link between the modern English and the ancient Germanic tribes and was also less keen about the ‘special’ connection of Britain and Germany.

Opposing Germany

During 1914, a short while after the eruption of the Great War, Bury published a manifest under the title *Germany and Slavonic civilization*⁶³⁹. The manifest criticised the German government’s aggression and held it responsible for the hostilities. In the manifest, also published in another shorter version as an article in the *New York Times*⁶⁴⁰, Bury refuted the German claims that the war was actually a struggle between Teutonic and Slavic ‘Barbarism’. Some Germans ‘spokesman’, as Bury entitled them, argued that the British have betrayed their historical and natural allies by joining the Eastern-Slavonic barbarism led by Russia. Bury began by showing the historic links between Russia and Prussia which had been established and strengthened since the separation of Poland in 1772. These connections were intensified through the family connections of the Czars with the Prussian monarchs. The policy of Prussia throughout the nineteenth century and especially under Bismarck’s rule was to acquire new territories and to ‘Germanize’ areas such as Silesia. There was a convergence of interests in regards to this Prussian policy, as the Russians also wished to amplify their influence in Poland and in the Balkan. Germany, however, especially from the end of the nineteenth century, feared Russia’s new liberal tendencies. In addition, the interest of the two nations in regards to the

⁶³⁹ John B. Bury, *Germany and Slavonic Civilization* (London, 1914) ; this manifest also appeared in Italian and French. See: John B. Bury, *La Germania e la civiltà slava* (London, 1914); *l’Allemagne et la Civilisation slave*.

⁶⁴⁰ John B. Bury, Regius Professor Of Modern History At Cambridge University, ‘SAYS GERMANY’S FIGHT IS SELFISH; Struggle of Teutonic Culture Against Slav "Barbarism" a Myth’, *The New York Times*, November 29, 1914, accessed at 5 October 2014 at <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9901E1D71738E633A2575AC2A9679D946596D6CF>.

Slavonic states under the rule of the Ottoman Empire were no longer compatible. Russia, in general, according to Bury, became more and more 'European'. He even quoted the words of the racist writer Houston Stewart Chamberlin (1855-1927) to testify on this Europeanization process: 'I may refer to a writer, with most of whose views I disagree, but whose work *Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, has enjoyed a large popularity in Germany. His subject is the *Kultur* of the Germanic peoples, and among the Germanic peoples he includes the Slavs...He means that the Slavs are one of the races which are bearers of what is commonly called Western civilization'⁶⁴¹. Hence, even a racist and 'philo-Teutonic' writer like Chamberlin regarded Russia and the Slavs as part of Europe and not as a foreign eastern foe. For Bury, Germany itself departed from Western values. The allies, already from the beginning of the nineteenth century, fostered, although not flawlessly, the idea of self-definition as seen in the establishment of Greece, Bulgaria etc. Germany, however, never promoted this notion. On the contrary, it opposed this on many occasions and joined interest and forces with the declining Ottoman and the Austro-Hungarian empires. In that sense, Russia belonged much more to the West than Germany.

It is possible that not only the war but also the Irish-Protestant background of Bury prevented him from emphasising the Teutonic narrative. The Teutonic heritage was predominantly, the 'reserved territory' of several historians, who wished to construct the English community upon an ancient Germanic past. For Bury, the Teutonic myth was less applicable. Remarks such as 'our Germanic forefathers' which reappear once and again in the notions of the English-Teutonic historians, are totally absent in Bury's writings. His Irish-

⁶⁴¹ Ibid.

Protestant origin also explains why the strife with Catholicism was far more pertinent for him. As elaborated in the chapter, his ‘personal’ anti-Catholic opinions infiltrated his works especially during the second decade of the Twenties. Bury’s anti-Catholicism might also clarify his argument about the long continuation of the empire in the East. Bury stressed the way in which the Catholic Church prevented the development of the West during the Middle Ages, while depicting the opposing example of the Eastern revival. In the West the grip of Catholicism was only broken with Modernity, whereas in the East the imperial heritage and the Orthodox Church empowered development and prosperity. Bury actually aimed to refute the common notion that Catholicism had saved Rome following the fall. According to him, the contrary was true and the ‘true saver’ of Rome was actually situated in Constantinople.

The *illusion of finality*, the title given to this thesis, was the phrase Bury used to describe the fallacy that many obtain. Every generation believes that their era fulfils the highest accomplishments in the history of the world and no following age can ever surpass their deeds since there is no option for further progress. The finality appears also within religious circles that attribute to their faith the dichotomy of either imminent salvation or destruction. For Bury, progress founded on chance dominated history. History is less stable and much more fascinating. Bury, the scientific historian, considered by some as dull, through his theory of contingency actually tried to transform the static perception of history. Bury tried to move beyond this pattern of thought and offer a new, less firm concept. This, as I have tried to portray, was not only seen in his writings on the philosophy of history, but also in his innovative perception of the eastern continuity of the Roman Empire, dominating the European world many years after its ‘alleged’ fall.

Conclusion

‘Past is past not because it happened to others but because it forms part of our present

...because, in short, it is our past’⁶⁴².

The need to construct a shared English-German past based on a common narrative was a primary objective of the English-Teutonic historians. This attempt was faced with certain difficulties since the various historians had to bridge the gap between unique entities (namely England and Germany) separated by geographical, national and religious boundaries. As argued in the dissertation, one of the means for overcoming the distinctiveness of each entity was through the formation of a new time-line, one that was not founded on particularistic aspects but on rather broader collective traits. Most of the historians discussed, in particularly Freeman, Stubbs and Kingsley, stressed the racial Teutonic past as a primary apparatus for merging the history of the two nations. Thus, they tried to present the Teutonic history as an integral part of their nation’s ‘own’ history.

Their interpretation has relevance for the more recent historiographical debate surrounding the nature of Anglo-German relations during the second half of the nineteenth century. Some, like Paul Kennedy, have stressed the hostility that allegedly prevailed between the two nations between 1860 and the First World War⁶⁴³. Others have challenged this negative, and rather one-dimensional, perception of Anglo-German relations⁶⁴⁴. As demonstrated

⁶⁴² José Ortega y Gasset, ‘History as a System’, in *The Philosophy of History in Our Time : An Anthology Selected, and with an Introduction and Commentary by Hans Meyerhoff* (Garden City, NY, 1959), p.58.

⁶⁴³ Paul M. Kennedy, *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism, 1860-1914* (London ; Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1987).

⁶⁴⁴ Heather Ellis and Ulrike Kirchberger, *Anglo-German Scholarly Networks in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Leiden ; Boston, 2014).

throughout this dissertation, Freeman, Bryce and Stubbs or the English Teutonic historians expressed affinity towards the Germans. This affinity derived from two main sources: shared origins - the supposed Aryan and particularly Teutonic heritage, which emphasized the cohesion of the two nations and was founded upon linguistic, racial and religious traits. Hence, for these historians this was a natural and inherent structural bond. The other source was situational, the result of political contingency: British-German affinity originated by what Freeman and others observed as the shared political interests of the two states, and the threat presented by France, their mutual enemy.

Thus, two main and perhaps distinct forces coexisted in the English-Teutonic circle during the second half of the nineteenth century: one was based on cultural-racial innate traits and the other was founded on contemporary political interests. Did the political interests hinge on the cultural-natural link or maybe the geo-political circumstances determine the development of a shared cultural-racial sphere? Which of these ‘forces’ was the dependent variable and which was the independent one? It seems that the two were intermingled in the conception of the English-Teutonic circle and that neither of them embodied a prior significance. In short, the common inherent values were fused with the shared political interests of the two nations.

There was a generational shift between the age of Freeman/Stubbs and the later age of Bryce/Bury. While Germany was still an emerging nation, many British scholars supported it and were encouraged to exchange ideas mainly based on the German academic methods. Yet, towards the end of the century the impact of the Teutonic message seemed to wane and a certain estrangement gradually developed among scholars from both countries. Even Freeman,

as described before, resented some German influences during the 1880's⁶⁴⁵. This generational shift resulted from Germany's ascendancy as a significant world power and of course, the outbreak of WWI.

Bryce offered a clear example for the transformation from affinity to estrangement since he lived in both periods. Until the 1890's and even later he was an admirer of Germany, wrote on the Teutonic themes and promoted the connection between British and German scholars. This could be explicitly observed in the association Bryce made in the 1860's between the H.R.E. and the newly established German state which he admired: 'Then suddenly there rises from these cold ashes a new, vigorous, self-confident German Empire, a state which, although most different, as well in its inner character as in its form and legal aspect, from its venerable predecessor, is nevertheless in a very real sense that predecessor's representative⁶⁴⁶'. Just before the Great War, Bryce also argued that the Germans have the right to defend themselves against Russian aggression which was 'rapidly becoming a menace to Europe'⁶⁴⁷. Even after the war commenced, Bryce, in a letter to his close friend the jurist A.V. Dicey (1835-1922), exonerated Germany from some of the blame and claimed that Great Britain also held some responsibility for the war: 'it is not on Germany that all the blame can fall, badly as she behaved...Why should England so far back as 1905-6 have made a special friendship with

⁶⁴⁵ Davis, *The Victorians and Germany*, pp.188-9.

⁶⁴⁶ Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, 4th ed., p.399.

⁶⁴⁷ Quoted in Trevor Wilson, 'Lord Bryce's Investigation into Alleged German Atrocities in Belgium, 1914-15', *Journal of Contemporary History* 14, no. 3 (July 1, 1979): 369-83, *Journal of Contemporary History* 14, no. 3 (1979): pp.370-1

France and begun to cultivate a special hostility against Germany?...ever since 1906 we have been working against her'⁶⁴⁸.

However, during the war, the general attitude of Bryce towards Germany, especially following her conquest of Belgium, became more hostile. In a pamphlet he issued a year after the eruption of the war, he declined the assumption that Britain wished to weaken Germany because of the economic threat she posed. The reality, he claimed, was completely different since Britain prospered due to her thriving trade with Germany. Britain, he stressed, stood for five core values: freedom, national self-definition, respecting treaties, moral conduct, and peace⁶⁴⁹. Bryce admitted with honesty that some people in Britain acted against these values⁶⁵⁰. However, they were few, especially in comparison with the barbarity displayed by Germany in the war. Its invasion of neutral Belgium violated all of Britain's core values and for that reason the latter had no choice but to declare war. Bryce, himself, even chaired a committee which investigated the German atrocities in Belgium which eventually found the Germans guilty of war crimes⁶⁵¹. For Bryce, one of the last remnants of the Teutonic historians, the war presented a certain dilemma. His 'adored' Germany became the ultimate enemy of Great Britain, and the national British interests clashed with his native kinship towards Germany. Freeman and Stubbs, if they would have lived to see the war, might have been faced with a

⁶⁴⁸ Quoted in Gary S. Messinger, *British Propaganda and the State in the First World War* (Manchester, 1992), p.72.

⁶⁴⁹ James Bryce, *The Attitude of Great Britain in the Present War* (London, 1916).

⁶⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p.23.

⁶⁵¹ *Report of the Committee on Alleged German Outrages Appointed by His Britannic Majesty's Government and Presided over by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce* (London, 1915).

similar cognitive dissonance derived out of the clash between their innate organic attachment to Germany and their loyalty to the political interests of Britain.

The changing attitudes in Britain towards Germany might explain Bury's diminished Teutonic stance. Throughout his writings, he never showed enthusiasm for the Teutonic narrative. He valued the tribes and their historical significance and was greatly influenced by the German historical method. Yet, unlike Freeman, Bryce etc., Bury had not identified the tribes as the mythical ancestors of the nation. For him, there was no acute conflict between British interests and essentialist ideas of a shared Anglo-German past and present. By this he was distinct from the rest of the discussed historians. For him, unlike Bryce, the perception of Germany was less dependent on the war or on a certain generational shift and more concerned with his aloofness from essentialist notions about the Teutonic race.

The generational shift can be also exemplified in the general attitude of the *Saturday Review*. For many years the paper promoted the Anglo-German relations and became a central writing stage for the Teutonic historians. Then, during the 1890's, also resulting from the German support of the Boers in their struggle against the British, the newspaper adopted an anti-German stance. This stance may be epitomized in a sentence taken from one of the newspaper's article: 'be ready to fight Germany, as *Germania delenda est* [Germany must be destroyed]' ⁶⁵². In its ancient original form this saying was attributed to Cato the elder who declared during the Punic wars the impending end of Cartago- *Carthago delenda est*, Cartago must be eliminated⁶⁵³. The article was a racial manifest, a comparison between the expansion

⁶⁵² A Biologist, 'A Biological View of Our Foreign Policy', *SR* 81, no. 2101 (1896): p. 120.

⁶⁵³ The full verse was '*Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam*' or '*Ceterum autem censeo Carthaginem esse delendam*'.

of species in nature and the foreign relations of the world's nations. If Britain wished to preserve its Anglo-Saxon racial superiority, the races which threatened it the most had to vanish. Comparable to nature, these were the races that lived in the same habitat and were intent on expansion. France, one would assume, answered to this criterion, yet the author defined it as an ally which had limited expansion interest. The real enemy was Germany mainly because it was so akin to Britain in race and power. The two, therefore, could not coexist, and Britain like Rome had to annihilate its Cartago⁶⁵⁴.

The article in the *Saturday Review* oscillated between past and present. The British Empire like ancient Rome must crush its strongest adversary, Germany-Cartago. This point reflects a prominent theme that was a central pillar of my dissertation, the idea of the 'unity of history'. This idea, I argue, transformed the conventional periodization, presented new patterns and amalgamated constantly between contemporary reality and ancient history. The English Teutonic historians, although less renowned for their innovative periodizations, altered the historiographical debate about the end of Antiquity. They created new historiographical approaches towards the Roman, Byzantine and even Muslim past. Most of these historians, excluding Bury, aimed to validate the historical dominance of the Teutonic race through various institutional, religious and most importantly racial explanations. Race, for that matter, was a reoccurring theme throughout the thesis and its mergence with periodization was crucial in the construction of an authentic English-German Teutonic community.

⁶⁵⁴ A Biologist, 'A Biological View of Our Foreign Policy', pp.118–20.

Race pointed to the founding of a complete and complex Teutonic civilization that had not copied and imitated other heritages and cultures but formed its own culture. This enabled the historians to rely on an independent historical identity that together with other ideas and developments assisted to 'reinvent' or 'reimagine' their own communities in the nineteenth century. Thus, it is no wonder that they referred to the Germanic tribes as to their ancient forefathers. The research into the past, therefore, created a certain historical narrative, which served as an historical and moral foundation for the establishment of the community. This also led historians to the conclusion that the Germanic heritage was not limited to the geographical realm of the German principalities, because, already during the times of the tribes, the Germanic spirit was prevalent in many places in Europe. The deeper meaning of this definition is that the realm of the German race, language and culture – and not the geography of the nineteenth century – defines the boundaries of a community that, as well as being authentic, was large, powerful, and destined to rule.

Bibliography

Manuscript and Archival Sources

Bod.

Max Müller Papers. MS. Eng. d. 2353. Notes by Max Müller for his first course of lectures on comparative philology, given at Oxford, 1851,

Max Müller Papers. MS. Eng. d. 2358 (fols. 1-25).. Müller, Max. 'Reply to Monsieur Renan's Remarks'. London, 1855.

Max Müller Papers. Ms. Eng. d. 2362, fols. 124-5

Ms.Bryce 5: fol.13,14, 15, 62, 127, 147, 179, 253, 269, 281, 282; 6: 12, 16, 43, 59, 76, 117; 7: 162, 179, 216; 8: ; 9: 1, 24, 27,28, 31, 39, 50, 109, 127, 173, 253, 306, 308.

Ms.Bryce 345, Notes possibly for The Holy Roman Empire (1864), c.1863.

BL.

Macmillan Archive, Add Ms 55120 ff.

JRLM.

Freeman Archive, MSS FA 1/7/2; 1/7/4a; 1/7/9c; 1/7/120; 1/7/122A; 1/7/592; 1/7/596; 1/7/597; 1/7/602; 1/8/6A; 1/8/7A;1/8/21A; 1/8/57; 1/8/58A; 1/8/94A

Printed Primary Sources

Arnold, Thomas. *Arnold's Travelling Journals, with Extracts from the Life and Letters*. London: BFellowes, 1852.

Bunsen, Christian C J. and Niebuhr, Barthold G. *The Life and Letters of Barthold Georg Niebuhr with Essays on his Character and Influence*. Trans. Susanna Winkworth. New York, 1854.

Bunsen, Christian C. J. *Signs of the Times: Letters to Ernst Moritz Arndt on the Dangers to Religious Liberty in the Present State of the World*. Trans. by Susanna Winkworth. New York: Lond, 1856.

Bunsen, Frances W. *Memoirs of Baron Bunsen, Late Minister Plenipotentiary and Envoy Extraordinary of His Majesty Frederic William IV at the Court of St. James*. 2nd edn., abridged and corr. 2 vol. London: Longmans, Green, 1869.

Bury, John B. 'Regius Professor of Modern History At Cambridge SAYS GERMANY'S FIGHT IS SELFISH; Struggle of Teutonic Culture Against Slav "Barbarism" a Myth'. *The New York Times*, November 29, 1914.

<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=9901E1D71738E633A2575AC2A9679D946596D6CF>.

Carlyle, Thomas; Mommsen, Theodor; Müller F. Max; and Strauss, David Friedrich. *Letters on the War between Germany and France*. London: Trübner and Co., 1871.

Green, John R, and, Leslie, Stephen. *Letters of John Richard Green*. London; New York: Macmillan and Co., 1901.

Kingsley, Charles. 'Darwin Correspondence Project '» Letter: 2534, November 18, 1859. <http://www.darwinproject.ac.uk/letter/entry-2534>.

Kingsley, Charles, and Kingsley G., Frances Eliza. *Charles Kingsley; His Letters and Memoires of His Life*. 2 vol. London: H.S. King & Co., 1877.

Lieber, Francis. *Reminiscences of an Intercourse with Mr. Niebuhr, the Historian during a Residence with Him in Rome, in the Years 1822 and 1823*. Philadelphia: Carey, Lea & Blanchard, 1835.

Müller, F. Max and Bunsen, Chevalier. *Letters to Chevalier Bunsen on the Classification of the Turanian Languages*. London : A. & G.A. Spottiswoode, 1854.

Pinkerton, John. *The Literary Correspondence of John Pinkerton*. Pr. from the Originals in the Possession of D. Turner. 2 vol. London, 1830.

Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn. *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D., Late Head Master of Rugby School and Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford*. 2nd edn. 2 vol. London: BFellowses, 1844.

Stephens, William R. W. *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*. 2 vol. London Macmillan, 1895.

University of Oxford. *The Examination Statutes ... Together with the Decrees of Convocation and Regulations of the Boards of Studies 1877-1968*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884.

Printed Secondary Works

A Biologist. 'A Biological View of Our Foreign Policy'. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 81, no. 2101 (1896): pp. 118–20.

Alföldi, Andreas. 'The Moral Barrier on Rhine and Danube'. In Eric Birley (ed.), *The Congress of Roman Frontier Studies*. Durham, England: University of Durham, 1949, pp.1–16.

Altick, Richard D. *Victorian People and Ideas*. New York; London: Norton, 1973.

"Anglo-Saxonism, n.". *OED Online*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. June 2015. Accessed 15 July, 2015, at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2355/view/Entry/7608?redirectedFrom=anglo-Saxonism%5C>.

Arieli, Yehoshua. 'Modernity and the Problem of Secularization'. In *History and Politics*, 135–200. Tel-Aviv: Am Oved Publishers, 1992. (In Hebrew)

Arndt, Ernst Moritz. *Ueber Volkshass und über den Gebrauch einer fremden Sprache*. Leipzig, 1813.

Arndt, Ernst Moritz, and Seeley, John Robert, Sir. *The Life and Adventures of Ernst Moritz Arndt, the Singer of the German Fatherland*. Boston: Roberts brothers, 1879.

Arnold, Thomas. *Sermons*. 3 vol. London, 1834.

———. *The Miscellaneous Works of Thomas Arnold, Collected and Republished*. London: BFellows, 1845.

———. *Introductory Lectures on Modern History : Delivered in Lent Term, MDCCCLII, with the Inaugural Lecture Delivered in December, MDCCCXLI*. 4th edn. London: BFellows, 1849 [1843].

———. *History of Rome*. New edn. 3 vol. London: BFellows, 1857 [1838].

Banton, Michael. *The Idea of Race*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1977.

Barrow, John. 'Dr Granville's Travels: Russia'. *The Quarterly Review* 39, no. 77 (January 1829): pp.1–41.

Baynes, Norman Hepburn. *A Bibliography of the Works of J. B. Bury*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1929.

Beasley, Edward. *The Victorian Reinvention of Race : New Racisms and the Problem of Grouping in the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2010.

Bede, (the Venerable). *The Reckoning of Time*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1999.

———. *Historical Works*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Belloc, Hilaire. *Anti-Catholic History: How It Is Written. (An Examination of Prof. Bury's A History of Freedom of Thought, Adapted from an Article in the Dublin Review)*. London: Catholic Truth Society, 1914.

Bergonzi, Bernard. 'Belloc, (Joseph) Hilaire Pierre René (1870–1953)'. ODNB. Oxford University Press, 2004, January 2008. Accessed 30 Nov. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/30699>.

Berlin, Isaiah, and Hardy, Henry. *Selected Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Bernal, Martin. *Black Athena : The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization*. 3 vol. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1987.

Bernal, Martin, and Moore, David Chioni. *Black Athena Writes Back: Martin Bernal Responds to His Critics*. Durham NC; London: Duke University Press, 2001.

Bodin, Jean. *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History*. New York: Norton, 1969.

Borgstede, Simone B. 'All Is Race' : Benjamin Disraeli on Race, Nation and Empire. Wien: Lit, 2011.

Bosch, Lourens van den. *Friedrich Max Müller : A Life Devoted to Humanities*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Breisach, Ernst. *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval, and Modern*, 3rd edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Bremmer, Jan N. *The Rise of Christianity through the Eyes of Gibbon, Harnack and Rodney Stark : A Valedictory Lecture on the Occasion of His Retirement from the Chair of Religious Studies, in the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, Delivered in Abbreviated Form before the University of Groningen on 29 January 2010*. Groningen, 2010.

Brown, Peter. *The World of Late Antiquity : AD 150-750*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1989[1971].

Brundage, Anthony. *The People's Historian: John Richard Green and the Writing of History in Victorian England*. Studies in Historiography, no. 2. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1994.

Bryce, James. *The Holy Roman Empire*. Oxford: T& GShrimpton, 1864.

———. *The Holy Roman Empire*. 4th ed. London: Macmillan, 1873, 1903, 1968.

———. 'Freeman's Historical Essays'. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 35, no. 912 (April 19, 1873): pp.521–22.

———. *The American Commonwealth*. London ; New York: Macmillan, 1888

———. *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*. 2 vol. Oxford, Oxfordshire: Clarendon Press, 1901.

———. ‘The Roman Empire and the British Empire in India’. In *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1901, pp.1–71.

———. *Studies in Contemporary Biography*. London: Macmillan, 1903.

———. *The Attitude of Great Britain in the Present War*. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1916.

Bunsen, Christian C. J. *Egypt's Place in Universal History: An Historical Investigation in Five Books*. Trans. by Charles Herbert Cottrell. 5 vol. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1848.

———. *Outlines of the Philosophy of Universal History, Applied to the Language and Religion*. 2 vol. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1854.

———. *Gott in Der Geschichte, Oder, Der Fortschritt Des Glaubens an Eine Sittliche Weltordnung*. 3 Band. Leipzig, 1857.

———. *God in History; Or, The Progress of Man's Faith in the Moral Order of the World*. Trans. by Susanna Winkworth. 3 vol. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1868.

Burleigh, Michael. *The Racial State : Germany 1933-1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Burrow, John W. ‘The Uses of Philology in Victorian England’ in R. Robson (ed.), *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain : Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark*. London: Bell, 1967, pp.180-204.

———. *A Liberal Descent : Victorian Historians and the English Past*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Bury, J. B. *A History of the Later Roman Empire : From Arcadius to Irene (395 A.D. to 800 A.D.)*. 2 vol. London ; New York : Macmillan and Co., 1889.

———. ‘ART. II.--Freeman's History of Sicily, Vol.I-II’. *The Scottish Review* 19 (January 1892): pp.26–54.

———. ‘ART. IV.--Freeman's History of Sicily, Vol.III’. *The Scottish Review* 20 (February 1892): pp.300–21.

———. ‘The Insurrection of Women. A Criticism’. *Fortnightly Review* 52, no. 311 (November 1892): pp.651–56.

———. ‘Art V.--the Wandering of the Nations’. *The Scottish Review* 21 (April 1893): pp.329–49.

———. 'The British and the Roman Empire'. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 81, no. 2122 (June 27, 1896), p.645.

———. 'Art. VII--Rome and Byzantium'. *Quarterly Review* 192, no. 383 (June 1900): pp.129–55.

———. *An Inaugural Lecture [The Science of History] Delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, on January 26, 1903*. Cambridge: The University press, 1903

———. 'The Eastern Roman Empire (717-1453)'. In John B. Bury, Henry M. Gwatkin and J.P. Whitney (eds.), *The Cambridge Medieval History*. 8 vol. IV. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.

———. 'Gibbon Edward'. *The Encyclopedia Britannica*. 1911

———. *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire : From the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I (A.D. 802-867)*. London: Macmillan, 1912.

———. *A History of Freedom of Thought*. London;New York: Williams and Norgate, 1913.

———. *La Germania e la civiltà slava*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1914.

———. *Germany and Slavonic Civilization*. London, 1914.

———. 'The Success of Christianity'. *RPA Annual*, 1915, pp.3–7.

———. 'Cleopatra's Nose'. *RPA Annual*, 1916, pp. 16–23.

———. *The Idea of Progress : An Inquiry into Its Origin and Growth*. London: Macmillan, 1920.

———. 'Playing For Safety'. *RPA Annual*, 1920, pp.13-19.

———. *History of the Later Roman Empire from the Death of Theodosius I to the Death of Justinian (A.D. 395 to A.D. 565)*. London: Macmillan, 1923.

———. *The Invasion of Europe by the Barbarians*. New York: Norton, 1967 [1928].

———. 'Darwinism and History'. In *Selected Essays of J. B. Bury*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1930, pp.23–42.

———. *St. Patrick : The Life and World of Ireland's Saint*. London: Tauris Parke Paperbacks, 2010 [1905].

Butterfield, Herbert. *The Whig Interpretation of History*. London: G Bell and Sons, 1931.

- Cannadine, David. *The Undivided Past : History beyond Our Differences*. London: Allen Lane, 2013.
- Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*. London: Pimlico, 2003 [1992].
- Conlin, Jonathan. *Evolution and the Victorians: Science, Culture and Politics in Darwin's Britain*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Crossley, Ceri. *French Historians and Romanticism : Thierry, Guizot, the Saint-Simonians, Quinet, Michelet*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Curtius, Ernst. *The History of Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011[1857].
- Davis, John R. *The Victorians and Germany*. Oxford ; Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Dawson, Christopher. *The Making of Europe : An Introduction to the History of European Unity*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1932.
- De Sanctis, M. *Freeman and European History*. Farnborough: Norton, 1990.
- Diner, Dan. 'Neutralisierung durch Gesellschaft-Henri Pirennes-Muhammed und Karl der Grosse', *Gedächtniszeiten: über jüdische und andere Geschichten*. München: C.H.Beck, 2003.
- Dopsch, Alfons. *The Economic and Social Foundations of European Civilization*. Condensed by Erna Patzelt, trans. by M.G. Beard and Nadine Marshall. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, 1937.
- Dowling, Linda. 'Roman Decadence and Victorian Historiography'. *Victorian Studies* 28, no. 4 (Summer, 1985): pp. 579-607.
- Drinkwater, John. 'Maximinus to Diocletian and the "crisis"'. In Alan Bowman, Averil Cameron, and Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp.28–66.
- Dumoulin, Maurice. 'The Kingdom of Italy Under Odovacar and Theodoric'. In John B. Bury, Henry M. Gwatkin and J.P. Whitney (eds.), *The Cambridge Medieval History*. 8 vol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911.
- Eliade, Mircea. *The Myth of the Eternal Return, Or, Cosmos and History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1971.
- Ellis, Heather, and Ulrike Kirchberger. *Anglo-German Scholarly Networks in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill Nijhoff, 2014.
- Evans, Richard J. *In Defence of History*. [New edn.]. London: Granta Books, 2000.

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. 'Reden an Die Deutsche Nation Achte Rede -Vierte Rede, Hauptverschiedenheit Zwischen Den Deutschen Und Den Übrigen Völkern Germanischer Abkunft'. *Sämmtliche Werke*. Band 7. Berlin, 1845.

Finlay, George. *A History of Greece : From Its Conquest by the Romans to the Present Time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864*. A new ed. : rev. throughout and in part re-written with considerable additions, by the author / and edited by the Rev. H.F. Tozer. 7 vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1877.

Fränkel, Ludwig. 'Zwei Eben Verstorbene Anglikanische Bischöfe Und Historiker'. *Anglia - Zeitschrift Für Englische Philologie* 24 (1901): s.395–400.

Frantzen, Allen J., and Niles, John D. 'Introduction: Anglo-Saxonism and Medievalism', in Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles (eds), *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity*. Gainesville, Florida: University Press of Florida, 1997, pp.1-16.

Freeman, Edward A. *A History of Architecture*. London: Joseph Masters, 1849.

———. 'Mahometanism in the East and the West'. *North British Review* 23 (1855), pp.449-80.

———. 'Mommsen History of Rome -Appendix from Saturday Review, March 28, 1868'. In *Historical Essays: Second Series*. London : Macmillan, 1873, pp. 266–71.

———. 'Mommsen's History of Rome'. In *Historical Essays: Second Series*. London : Macmillan, 1873 (first Published *National Review*, April 1859), pp.234–65

———. 'The Landesgemeinde of Uri'. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 15, no. 396 (May 30, 1863): pp.686–7.

———. 'Mr. Kingsley's Roman and Teuton'. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 17, no. 441 (April 9, 1864): pp.446–8.

———. 'The Landesgemeinden of Uri and Appenzell'. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art* 17, no. 447 (May 21, 1864): pp.622–4.

———. *The History of the Norman Conquest of England : Its Causes and Its Results*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1867.

———. *Old English History for Children*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1869.

———. *The Unity of History: The Rede Lecture Delivered in the Senate-House before the University of Cambridge on Friday, May 24. 1872*. London: Macmillan, 1872.

———. *The Growth of the English Constitution : From the Earliest Times*. London: Macmillan, 1872.

- . *Historical Essays. Second series.* London : Macmillan, 1873.
- . ‘The Turkish Atrocities: Mr. Gladstone and the Turkish Empire’. *The Times*, September 8, 1876.
- . *The History and Conquests of the Saracens.* 3rd edn, with new preface. London: Macmillan, 1876.
- . ‘Race and Language’. In *Historical Essays: Third Series.* London: Macmillan, 1879.
- . *The Historical Geography of Europe.* 2 vol. London : Longmans, Green, and co. ; New York : Scribner and Welford, 1881.
- . *Lectures to American Audiences.* Philadelphia: Porter & Coates; London, 1882.
- . *The Reign of William Rufus and the Accession of Henry the First.* Oxford: Clarendon press, 1882.
- . *An Introduction to American Institutional History Written for This Series.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1882.
- . *The Methods of Historical Study; Eight Lectures Read in the University of Oxford in...1884, with the Inaugural Lecture on the Office of the Historical Professor.* London: Macmillan and Co., 1886.
- . *The Chief Periods of European History : Six Lectures Read in the University of Oxford in Trinity Term, 1885, with an Essay on Greek Cities under Roman Rule.* London ; New York ; Macmillan and Co, 1886.
- . *William the Conqueror.* London: Macmillan, 1888.
- . *History of Federal Government in Greece and Italy.* 2nd edn. Edited by J. B. Bury. London ; New York: Macmillan and Co, 1893.
- . *Atlas to the Historical Geography of Europe.* 3rd edn. Edited by J. B. Bury. London: Longmans, Green, 1903.
- . *The Historical Geography of Europe.* 3rd edn. Edited by J.B. Bury. London: Longmans, Green, and Co, 1903.
- . *Western Europe in the Eighth Century & Onward : An Aftermath.* London: Macmillan, 1904.
- Fynes, R. C. C. ‘Müller, Friedrich Max (1823–1900)’. *ODNB*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, May 2004. Accessed 8 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/18394>.

Gasset, José Ortega y. 'History as a System'. In Hans Meyerhoff (ed.) *The Philosophy of History in Our Time : An Anthology Selected*, and with an Introduction and Commentary by Hans Meyerhoff. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1959.

Geary, Patrick J. *The Myth of Nations : The Medieval Origins of Europe*. Princeton, NJ; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Gibbon, Edward. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, 3rd edn. Edited in seven volumes with introduction, notes, appendices and index by J.B. Bury. 7 vol. London: Methuen, 1901 [1776].

———. *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. Edited with Notes by J.B. Bury with an Introduction by W.E.H. Lecky. 12 vol. New-York: Fred de Fau and Co., 1906 [1776].

———. *The Autobiography of Edward Gibbon*. Meridian Books, 1961.

Gladstone, William E. *Bulgarian Horrors and the Question of the East*. London: Murray, 1876.

Goffart, Walter A. *Rome's Fall and After*. London: Hambledon, 1989.

Goldstein, Doris S. 'J. B. Bury's Philosophy of History: A Reappraisal'. *The American Historical Review* 82, no. 4 (1977): pp.896–919.

Goody, Jack. *The Theft of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Great Britain. *Report of the Committee on Alleged German Outrages Appointed by His Britannic Majesty's Government and Presided over by the Right Hon. Viscount Bryce*. London: H.M. Stationery Off., 1915.

Graetz, Heinrich. 'The Reaction and Teutomania. In *History of the Jews*. 6 vol. V. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1898, pp. 510-35.

Green, John R. 'Professor Stubbs's Inaugural Lecture'. *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, 23, no. 592 (March 2, 1867): pp.278–80.

———. *A Short History of the English People*. New ed., thoroughly rev. Toronto: Copp, Clark, 1888 [1874].

Guizot, François M., and de Witt Guizot, Henriette E. *History of France from the Earliest Times to 1848*. Trans. by Robert Black. 8 vol. New York : P.F. Collier & son, 1902.

Haigh, John D. 'Kemble, John Mitchell (1807–57)'. *ODNB*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed 11 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/15321>.

Halsall, Guy. 'Review Article: Movers and Shakers: The Barbarians and the Fall of Rome'. *Early Medieval Europe* 8, no. 1 (March 1, 1999): pp.131–45.

Hare, Julius C. *A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the Charges of the Quarterly Review*. Cambridge, 1829.

Hegel, Georg W. F. *The Philosophy of History*. New-York: Cosimo, Inc., 2007 [1899].

Heitland, W.E. 'A Bibliography of the Works of John Bagnell Bury and James Smith Reid'. *The Classical Review* 44, no.1 (1930): pp.38–40.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. *Ideen Zur Philosophie Der Geschichte Der Menschheit*. erster Teil, Sechzehntes Buch. Liepzig, 1842 [1784].

Hesketh, Ian. *The Science of History in Victorian Britain*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 2012.

_____. "“History Is Past Politics, and Politics Present History”: Who Said It?”. *Notes and Queries* 61, no. 1 (March 1, 2014): pp.105–8.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. *Victorian Minds*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968.

Hodgkin, Thomas. *Italy and Her Invaders*. 8 vol. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1880.

Horsman, Reginald. 'Origins of Racial Anglo-Saxonism in Great Britain before 1850'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 37, no. 3 (1976): pp. 387-410.

_____. *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1981

Hunt, Lynn. *Measuring Time, Making History*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2008.

Hutchinson, John, and Smith, Anthony D. *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hutten, Ulrich von. *Arminius, Herrmann, Ein Dialog Und Großpalatinus, Geschichte Des Deutschen Anführers*. Wien, 1815.

Hutton, Christopher. 'Race And Language: Ties of “Blood And Speech”, Fictive Identity and Empire in The Writings of Henry Maine and Edward Freeman'. *Interventions* 2, no. 1 (2000): pp.53–72.

Huxley, George. 'The Historical Scholarship of John Bagnell Bury'. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 17, no. 1 (Spring 1976): pp.81–104.

Jerome. 'The Principal Works of St. Jerome'. In Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (eds.), *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Second Series. Translated by W.H. Freemantle. 14 vol. Oxford and New York: Parker, 1890.

Jordheim, Helge. 'Against Periodization: Koselleck's Theory of Multiple Temporalities', *History and Theory* 51, no. 2 (2012): pp. 151-71.

Kadish, Alon. *Historians, Economists, and Economic History* (Routledge Revivals). London: Routledge, 2010.

Kähler, Heinz. 'Curtius, Ernst'. In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*. 3, 1957. Accessed 12 Feb. 2015 at <http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/ppn116766557.html>

Kaufmann, Eric P. "American Exceptionalism Reconsidered: Anglo-Saxon Ethnogenesis in the "Universal" Nation, 1776-1850." *Journal of American Studies* 33, no. 3 (1999): pp. 437-57.

———. *Rethinking Ethnicity : Majority Groups and Dominant Minorities*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Kennedy, Paul M. *The Rise of the Anglo-German Antagonism, 1860-1914*. London ; Atlantic Highlands, NJ: The Ashfield Press, 1987.

Kingsley, Charles. *The Roman and the Teuton : A Series of Lectures Delivered before the University of Cambridge*. Cambridge: Macmillan, 1864.

Kingsley, Charles, and Müller, F. Max. *The Roman and the Teuton: A Series of Lectures Delivered Before the University of Cambridge*. London; New-York: Macmillan and Co., 1891.

Klaver, J. M. I. *The Apostle of the Flesh : A Critical Life of Charles Kingsley*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Kohn, Hans. *Nationalism, Its Meaning and History*. Rev. ed. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1965.

Reinhart Koselleck, 'Über die Theoriebedürftigkeit der Geschichtswissenschaft' [1972], in Reinhardt Koselleck, *Zeitschichten: Studien zur Historik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000.

———. *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts. Cultural Memory in the Present*. Trans. by Todd Samuel Presner and others; foreword by Hayden White. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2002.

Krebs, Christopher B. *A Most Dangerous Book : Tacitus's Germania from the Roman Empire to the Third Reich*. New York, NY; London: WWNorton, 2012.

Lake, Marilyn. “‘Essentially Teutonic’: E A Freeman, Liberal Race Historian. A Transnational Perspective’. In Catherine Hall and Keith McClelland (eds.), *Race, Nation and Empire: Making Histories, 1750 to the Present*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010, pp. 56-73.

Lappenberg, Johann M. *A History of England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings*. Edited by Elise C. Otté. Trans. by Benjamin Thorpe. 2 vol. London: George Bell and Sons, York Street, Covent Garden., 1881, 1894.

———. *Geschichte von England*. Hamburg, 1834.

Leerssen, Joseph Th. *National Thought in Europe: A Cultural History*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006.

———. ‘Englishness, ethnicity and Matthew Arnold’. *European Journal of English Studies* 10, no. 1, (2006): pp. 63-79.

Lefkowitz, Mary R., and Rogers, Guy MacLean. *Black Athena Revisited*. Chapel Hill; London: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Leopold, Joan. ‘Ernest Renan From Linguistics and Psychology to Racial Ideology (1840s to 1860s)’. *Historiographia Linguistica* 37, no. 1–2 (2010): pp.31–61.

Leoussi, Athena S. ‘Myths of Ancestry’. *Nations and Nationalism* 7, no. 4 (October 1, 2001): pp.467–86.

Liebermann, Felix. ‘Review of Historical Essays by Edward A. Freeman’. *Historische Zeitschrift* 72, no. 2 (January 1, 1894): s.295–300.

———. *The National Assembly in the Anglo-Saxon Period*. Halle a. S: Max Niemeyer, 1913.

Lord Acton. ‘Nationality’. In Gopal Balakrishnan (ed.), *Mapping the Nation*. London: Verso, 1996, pp.17–38

Love, John R. *Antiquity and Capitalism: Max Weber and the Sociological Foundations of Roman Civilisation*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Löwith, Karl. *Meaning in History*. Chicago ; London: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Luther, Martin. ‘Christian in Society - To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation Concerning the Reform of the Christian Estate’. In *The Works of Martin Luther* [electronic Resource]. Accessed 29 April 2014 at http://ezproxy.ouls.ox.ac.uk:2067/xtf/view?docId=luther_w/luther_w.44.xml;query=Balaam%20;brand=default;hit.rank=2#rank2.

———. ‘Selected Commentaries on the Psalms’. In *The Works of Martin Luther [electronic Resource]*. Accessed 29 April 2014 at http://ezproxyprd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2896/xtf/view?docId=luther_w/luther_w.00.xml;chunk.id=div.luther_w.pmpreface.1;toc.depth=2;toc.id=div.luther_w.pmpreface.1;hit.rank=0;brand=default.

MacDougall, Hugh A. *Racial Myth in English History: Trojans, Teutons and Anglo-Saxons*. Montreal: Harvest House, 1981.

Mandler, Peter. *The English National Character : The History of an Idea from Edmund Burke to Tony Blair*. New Haven, Conn; London: Yale University Press, 2006.

Manias, Chris. *Race, Science, and the Nation : Reconstructing the Ancient Past in Britain, France and Germany*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Marchand, Suzanne, and Anthony Grafton. ‘Martin Bernal and His Critics’. *Arion* 5, no. 2 (1997): pp. 1-35.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. *The Communist Manifesto*. Trans. by Samuel Moore. London: Pluto Press, 2008.

Maurer, Georg Ludwig von. *Einleitung Zur Geschichte Der Mark-, Hof-, Dorf- Und Stadtverfassung Und Der Öffentlichen Gewalte*. München: Kaiser, 1854.

Mazzarino, Santo. *The End of the Ancient World*. London: Faber, 1966.

McClelland, Charles E. *The German Historians and England; a Study in Nineteenth-Century Views*. Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press, 1971.

Melman, Billie. “Claiming the Nation's Past: The Invention of an Anglo-Saxon Tradition”. *Journal of Contemporary History* 26, no. 3/4 (1991): pp. 575-95.

Momigliano, Arnaldo D. ‘Two Types of Universal History: The Cases of E. A. Freeman and Max Weber’. *The Journal of Modern History* 58, No. 1 (Mar., 1986): pp. 235-46.

———. “Liberal Historian and Supporter of the Holy Roman Empire: E.A. Freeman”, in G.W. Bowersock and T.G. Cornell (eds.), *A.D. Momigliano Studies on Modern Scholarship*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994, pp. 197-208.

Mommsen, Theodor. *A History of Rome under the Emperors*. Edited by Alexander Demandt. London ; New York: Routledge, 1999.

Vicky Morrisroe, “‘Sanguinary Amusement’: E.A. Freeman, the Comparative Method and Victorian Theories of Race” , *Modern Intellectual History*, 10, no.1 (2013): pp. 27-56.

———. “‘Eastern History with Western Eyes’: E.A. Freeman, *Islam and Orientalism*, *Journal of Victorian Culture* 16, no.1, (2011): pp. 25-45.

Mosse, George L. *Toward the Final Solution : A History of European Racism*. London: Dent, 1978.

‘Mr. Freeman’s Historical Essays’. *The Pall Mall Gazette*, April 10, 1873, 2254 edition.

Müller, F. Max. ‘Anthropology Past and Present’. *Science* 18, no. 451 (September 25, 1891): pp. 169-72.

———. with rejoinders by Theodor Mommsen. *The Question of Right between England and the Transvaal: Letters*. London, January 1, 1900.

———. *Theosophy; Or, Psychological Religion; The Gifford Lectures Delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1892*. London; New York: Longmans, Green and co., 1893.

Niebuhr, Barthold Georg. *Römische Geschichte*. Berlin: G.Reimer, 1827.

———. *Nachgelassene Schriften: B. G. Niebuhr’s nichtphilologischen Inhalts*. Hamburg :Friedrich Perthes, 1842.

Niebuhr, Barthold Georg und Meyer Isler. *Vorträge über römische Geschichte, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten*. 3 Band, Berlin: G. Reimer, 1846-48.

Norman, Edward R. *The Victorian Christian Socialists*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Olender, Maurice. *The languages of Paradise: Race, Religion, and Philology in the Nineteenth Century*. Trans. by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Oxford German Dictionary: German-English, English-German. Edited by Werner Scholze-Stubenrecht, , J. B. Sykes, M. Clark, and O. Thyen. 3rd edn. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Palgrave, Francis. *The History of Normandy and of England*. 4 vol. London: J. W. Parker and son, 1851.

———. *History of the Anglo-Saxons*. A new edn. London: W. Tegg, 1876 [1867].

Parker, C. J. W. ‘The Failure of Liberal Racism: The Racial Ideas of E. A. Freeman’. *The Historical Journal* 24, no. 04 (1981): pp. 825–46.

Parker, Joanne. ‘The Dragon and the Raven’. *European Journal of English Studies* 13, no.3, (2009): pp. 257-73.

Pauli, Reinhold. 'Review of Historical Essays by Edward A. Freeman'. *Historische Zeitschrift* 28, no. 1 (January 1, 1872): pp. 154–62.

———. 'Review of The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development by William Stubbs'. *Historische Zeitschrift* 33, no. 1 (January 1, 1875): s.126–39.

Pinkerton, John. *A Dissertation on the Origin and Progress of the Scythians or Goths. Being an Introduction to the Ancient and Modern History of Europe*. London: printed by John Nichols, for George Nicol, 1787.

Pirenne, Henri. *Mahomet et Charlemagne*. 11e édition. Paris; Bruxelles: Félix Alcan; Nouvelle Société d'Éditions, 1937.

———. *Mohammed and Charlemagne*. London: Unwin, 1939.

Pocock, J. G. A. 'Edward Gibbon in History: Aspects of the Text in The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire'. In Grethe B. Petersen (ed.), *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*. vol. XI. Salt Lake City, 1988, pp. 289–364

Polybius. *The Histories*. Trans. by W. R. Paton, F. W. Walbank, C. Habicht, and S. Douglas Olson. Revised by F.W. Walbank and C. Habicht. Cambridge, Mass; London: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Pomian, Krzysztof. 'Franks and Gauls'. In Pierre Nora and Lawrence DKritzman (eds.), *Realms of Memory : Rethinking the French Past*. vol. 3. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.

Reardon, Bernard M. G. 'Maurice, (John) Frederick Denison (1805–72)'. *ODNB*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, May 2004. Accessed 10 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/18384>

Reill, Peter H. 'Barthold Georg Niebuhr and the Enlightenment Tradition'. *German Studies Review* 3, no. 1 (1980): pp.9–26.

Schmidt, Barbara Q. 'Cook, John Douglas (1808? – 68)'. *ODNB*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed 5 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/6145>.

Schreuder, D. M. 'The Gladstone-max Müller Debate on Nationality and German Unification: Examining a Victorian 'controversy''. *Historical Studies* 18, no. 73 (1979): pp. 561–81.

Schultz, Bart. *Henry Sidgwick, Eye of the Universe: An Intellectual Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Scott, Walter. 'Ancient History of Scotland.' In *The Prose Works of Sir Walter Scott, Bart: Periodical Criticism*. Edinburgh: Cadell, 1835.

Scott, Walter. *Ivanhoe: A Romance*. 3 vol. Edinburgh: Printed for Archibald Constable and CoEdinburgh; and Hurst, Robinson, and Co. London, 1820.

Seaman, John T. *A Citizen of the World : The Life of James Bryce*. London ; New York: Tauris Academic Studies ; New York, 2006.

Sime, James. *History of Germany*. Ed. by E.A. Freeman and Sir A.W. Ward. London: Macmillan and Co., 1874.

Skinner, S. A. *Tractarians and the 'Condition of England': The Social and Political Thought of the Oxford Movement*. Oxford: Clarendon Press Oxford Historical Monographs, 2004.

Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity*. London: Penguin, 1991.

Smith, Roger. 'European Nationality, Race, and Commonwealth in the Writings of Sir Francis Palgrave, 1788-1861'. In Alfred P. Smyth (ed.), *Medieval Europeans: Studies in Ethnic Identity and National Perspectives in Medieval Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002. pp. 233–53

Spangenberg, H. 'Die Perioden der Weltgeschichte'. *Historische Zeitschrift* 127, no. 1 (1923): s.1–49.

Stone, J. 'James Bryce and the Comparative Sociology of Race Relations'. *Race & Class* 13, no. 3 (1972): pp.315–28.

Stubbs, William. *The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development*. 3 vol. Oxford, Clarendon press, 1874.

———. *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Modern History and Kindred Subjects*. Oxford : The Clarendon press, 1887.

———. *The Early Plantagenets*. 6th edition. London: Longmans, Green, 1889.

———. *Letters of William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford, 1825-1901*. Ed. by William Holden Hutton. London: Constable, 1904.

Tacitus, Cornelius. *The Complete Works of Tacitus : The Annals ; The History ; The Life of Cnaeus Julius Agricola ; Germany and Its Tribes ; A Dialogue on Oratory*. Trans. Alfred John Church, William Jackson Brodribb, and Moses Hadas. New York: The Modern Library, 1942.

The Oxford History of Historical Writing: Volume 3: 1400-1800. Edited by José Rabasa, Masayuki Sato, Edoardo Tortarolo and Daniel Woolf (eds.). Oxford: University Press, 2014.

‘Teutonism, n’. *OED Online*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. June 2015. Accessed 15 July, 2015, at

<http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2355/view/Entry/199965?redirectedFrom=teutonism>.

Thierry, Augustin. *History of the Conquest of England by the Normans: Its Causes, and Its Consequences, in England, Scotland, Ireland, & on the Continent*. Trans. from the 7th Paris edn. by William Hazlitt. 2 vol. London: David Bogue, 1847.

———. *The Formation and Progress of the Tiers État, or Third Estate in France*. Trans. from the French by the Rev. Francis B. Wells. London: H. G. Bohn, 1859.

Thom, Martin. ‘Unity and Confederation in the Italian Risogimento-The Case of Carlo Cattaneo’. In Stefan Berger, Mark Donovan, and Kevin Passmore (eds.), *Writing National Histories : Western Europe since 1800*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Tod Niebuhr, Robert James. *Barthold Georg Niebuhr, 1776-1831 : An Appreciation in Honour of the 200th Anniversary of His Birth*. Cambridge: Printed by Nicholas Smith at the University Library, 1977.

Turchetti, Mario. ‘Jean Bodin’. In Edward N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. Fall 2014. Accessed 27 November 2014 at <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/bodin/>.

Turner, Sharon. *The History of the Anglo-Saxons : From the Earliest Period to the Norman Conquest*. 6th edn. 3 vol. London : Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longman, 1836.

Vance, Norman. ‘Kingsley, Charles (1819–75)’. *ODNB*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. May 2004. Accessed 10 Dec. 2014 at <http://www.oxforddnb.com/index/101015617/Charles-Kingsley>.

———. ‘Niebuhr in England: History, Faith and Order’. In Benedikt Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds.) *British and German historiography 1750-1950: traditions, perceptions and transfers*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 83-98.

Vick, Brian. ‘Arndt and German Ideas of Race: Between Kant and Social Darwinism’. In Walter Erhart and Arne Koch (eds.), *Ernst Moritz Arndt (1769-1860): deutscher Nationalismus--Europa--transatlantische Perspektiven*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2007.

Vigfússon, Guðbrandur, and Powell, F. York. *Sigfred-Arminius and Other Papers*. Grimm Centenary. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886.

Waitz, Georg. *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*. 3e Aufl. Kiel, 1880.

Walther, Gerrit. *Niebuhrs Forschung. Frankfurter Historische Abhandlungen*, Band 35. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1993.

Walton, Susan. 'Charlotte M. Yonge and the 'historic harem' of Edward Augustus Freeman'. *Journal of Victorian Culture* 11, no. 2, (2006), pp. 226-255.

Ward-Perkins, Bryan. '407 and All That: Retrospective'. *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2, no. 1 (2009): pp.75–8.

———. 'Old and New Rome Compared -The Rise of Constantinople'. In Lucy Grig and Gavin Kelly (eds.), *Two Romes: Rome and Constantinople in Late Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, pp. 53-78.

Wawn, Andrew. *The Vikings and the Victorians: Inventing the Old North in Nineteenth-Century Britain*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2000.

Weber, Max. 'The Social Causes of the Decay of Ancient Civilization'. In Max Weber, *Essays in Economic Sociology*. Trans. by Richard Swedberg. Princeton, 1999, pp.138–53.

Wende, Peter. 'Views and Reviews: Mutual Perceptions of British and German Historians in Late Nineteenth Century'. In Benedikt Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds.), *British and German Historiography, 1750-1950: Traditions, Perceptions, and Transfers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, pp.173–90

Whitney, J. P., and J. B. Bury. 'The Late Professor J. B. Bury'. *Cambridge Historical Journal* 2, no. 2 (1927): pp.191–7.

Williams, Howard. 'Anglo-Saxonism and Victorian Archaeology: William Wylie's Fairford Graves'. *Early Medieval Europe* 16, no. 1 (2008): pp. 49-88.

Wilson, Trevor. 'Lord Bryce's Investigation into Alleged German Atrocities in Belgium, 1914-15'. *Journal of Contemporary History* 14, no. 3 (July 1, 1979): pp.369–83.

Womersley, David. 'Gibbon's Religious Characters'. In Stefan Collini, Richard Whatmore, and Brian W. Young (eds.), *History, Religion, and Culture: British Intellectual History, 1750-1950*. Cambridge [England]; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Wood, Ian N. 'Boniface [St Boniface] (672x5?–754)'. *ODNB*. Oxford University Press, May 2004. Accessed 8 Dec. 2014 at <http://ezproxy-prd.bodleian.ox.ac.uk:2167/view/article/2843>.

———. *The Modern Origins of the Early Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Young, Brian W. 'Preludes and Postludes to Gibbon: Variations on an Impromptu by J.G.A. Pocock'. *History of European Ideas* 35, no. 4 (2009): pp. 418–32.

Young, Robert. *The Idea of English Ethnicity*. Blackwell Manifestos. Y. Malden, MA ; Oxford: Blackwell, 2008.

Zimmer, Oliver. “‘A Unique Fusion of the Natural and the Man-Made’: The Trajectory of Swiss Nationalism, 1933-39”. *Journal of Contemporary History* 39, no. 1 (January 1, 2004): pp.5–24.

———. ‘Beneath the “Culture War”: Corpus Christi Processions and Mutual Accommodation in the Second German Empire’. *The Journal of Modern History* 82, no. 2 (2010): pp.288–334.

Unpublished Theses

Owen, Ralph A. D. ‘Christian Bunsen and Liberal English Theology’. Thesis PhD--University of Wisconsin, 1924.

Internet Sites

‘New Humanist’. Accessed at 22 Feb. 2015 at <https://newhumanist.org.uk/>

‘Uni Ohne Arndt’. Accessed April 30 2014 at <http://www.uniohneardt.de/>