

THE EMIGRATION OF GERMAN SINOLOGISTS 1933–1945: NOTES ON THE HISTORY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY OF CHINESE STUDIES

MARTIN KERN

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

During the times of the National Socialist regime, the great majority of the young, and also some of the well-established, German scholars in Sinology and East Asian art history left their country to continue their academic careers elsewhere, notably in the United States. The present international state of Chinese studies is hardly explainable without reference to the broad loss of expertise and creativity in Germany, on the one hand, and to the balancing energetic development of new academic opportunities in the United States, on the other—that took place fifty years ago. But despite their enduring aftermath—still multiplying through the emigrants' students—these dramatic shifts have never been a topic of analysis and discussion. The collective, voluntary silence of five decades has made for increasing difficulties in reconstructing the details of the emigration in Sinology and East Asian art history. At the same time, the continuing failure of historiographical self-reflection appears itself as a lingering historical phenomenon, that is, a critical issue for scholarly self-perception.

I

In 1949, HELLMUT WILHELM (1905–90), professor of Chinese history at the University of Washington, began his article "German Sinology Today"¹ with a critical observation:

In contrast to the general tendency of resurgence of academic life in Germany, which has been reported from all the former academic centers and even from an additional one at Mainz, the pace of the recovery of German Sinology has been rather slow. Some of the main former

seats of Far Eastern studies still remain unoccupied. The reason for this special development is, in the first place, lack of personnel.

Where had the academic teachers gone? As Wilhelm makes clear, they had left in very different directions, revealing different consequences of the rise and fall of Nazism: several scholars had passed away, some of them directly or indirectly because of the war and its aftermath; others were still to return from abroad, mainly from China where they had gone during or even before the twelve years of the Third Reich, not as emigrants but with German scholarships or on official or professional missions; a third group were those who, as a result of their entanglement with the Nazis, had been removed from their chairs after 1945 and were not (yet) reinstated by 1949; and finally, most substantially, both in terms of their number and of their established or emerging scholarly reputation, there were those who had been dismissed from the universities—on the basis of the infamous "Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtentums" of April 7, 1933²—and, threatened by the Nazi

The present article has grown out of a contribution to the eighth annual meeting of the German Association for Chinese Studies (DVCS) in Berlin, October 24–26, 1997. The German paper, "Die Emigration der Sinologen 1933–1945: Hinweise zur ungeschriebenen Geschichte der Verluste," may be found in the conference volume, *Chinawissenschaften, Deutschsprachige Entwicklungen: Geschichte, Personen, Perspektiven*, ed. Helmut Martin and Christiane Hammer (Hamburg: Institut für Asienkunde, forthcoming). I wish to thank Maren Eckhardt (Bochum), Christiane Hammer (Bochum), Prof. Martin Gimm (Köln), Dr. Hartmut Walravens (Berlin), Prof. Lothar von Falkenhausen (Los Angeles), Dr. Ernst Wolff (Seattle), Dr. Thomas Jansen (Leipzig), Dr. Bernhard Führer (London), Prof. Donald Holzman (Paris), and Prof. Knut Walf (Nijmegen) for their valuable suggestions, bibliographic information, as well as for generously providing me with important materials.

¹ *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 8 (1949): 319–22.

² This "Act to Restore Permanent Civil Service" served as the formal basis to dismiss all those from the German civil service (including the universities) who were regarded as "non-Aryan," especially Jewish; a sufficient criterion for this designation was, for example, that one grandparent had belonged to the Jewish community. The act was also used to dismiss political opponents, e.g., Socialists.

terror after 1933, had left the country as opponents of the regime. It is this last group to which the present article is devoted. A record of their names, their positions, and the consequences of their emigration, both in Germany and in their new homes offers insights into the institutional history of Chinese studies—insights without which we can hardly comprehend the development of these fields in Western academia during the last five decades.

The lists of political emigrants and of those who left Germany immediately after World War II reveal that the emigration, as a whole, was the single most significant hiatus in the short history of professional Chinese studies in Europe. The exodus not only of individual scholars but of whole fields and new approaches of scholarship is particularly obvious with regard to the study of Chinese (and East Asian) art history, social and economic history, ethnology, and linguistics; to a substantial degree it is apparent even in the study of the Central Asiatic aspect of Chinese history. In addition to scholars working in the several areas of Chinese studies, German Sinology lost museum directors, librarians, and the journal *Asia Major*, at the time of its suspension in 1935 “the only German professional journal of international rank”³ in Chinese studies. To understand the effects of this exodus, it is also crucial to realize that it took place at a time when Sinology, as “our science” (as Hellmut Wilhelm was wont to say) with its own niche at German universities, had been in existence for little more than two decades and was still a young and very small field, especially when compared, for example, to the traditional “Oriental Studies” of the Near and Middle East. Hans Georg Conon von der Gabelentz (1840–93), for example, was professor of general linguistics (in Leipzig from 1878 to 1889, and afterward in Berlin) when he wrote his pioneer work *Chinesische Grammatik, mit Ausschluß des niederen Stiles und der Umgangssprache* (1881). The two most distinguished German Sinologists at the turn of the century, Friedrich Hirth (1845–1927) and Berthold Laufer (1874–1934), did not find employment in Germany but rather in the United States: Hirth at Columbia University, Laufer at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. When juxtaposed to the rather lengthy list of emigrants, the small number of teaching institutions with chairs in Sinology established before 1933 is indeed astounding. The first German chair in Chinese studies was established as late as 1909 at the Kolonialinstitut der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg, the forerunner of Hamburg University,⁴ and it was followed by

only three other chairs: 1912 in Berlin,⁵ 1922 in Leipzig,⁶ and 1925 in Frankfurt.⁷ In addition, Sinological seminars and lecturer positions were established at Göttingen and Bonn, and research on East Asian art history was conducted at museums in Berlin, Cologne, Leipzig, and Munich. No professorships were added under the National Socialists; the fifth German Sinological chair was founded only in 1946 at Munich.⁸

As the scholarship of many of the emigrants defined distinctively new areas and approaches in Chinese studies, the life and work of a scholar like Hellmut Wilhelm—son of Richard Wilhelm—also reflects the disruption of an all too brief tradition. Contrary to what some earlier state-of-the-field reports try to suggest, after 1945 there was much less a continuity than a disjunction, only gradually to be followed by a new beginning in German Sinology. In this context, the loss to Germany of teachers like Wilhelm or Wolfram Eberhard (1909–89) may be regarded as even more severe than their loss as researchers.

Although I will trace in part III of this paper the emigrants' careers outside Germany, the perspective from which they are viewed here is essentially the German one. Dealing with a phenomenon that consists of two parts, emigration and immigration, I am more concerned with the former than with the latter, more with loss than with gain, more with the umbra than with the shining side of our common history. A general appreciation of the post-war achievements of German scholars in Chinese studies and in East Asian art history, in particular in the United States and the United Kingdom, may be found elsewhere.⁹ Here I wish to ask also how and to

⁵ First professor: J. J. M. de Groot (1854–1921).

⁶ First professor: August Conrady (1864–1925).

⁷ First professor: Richard Wilhelm (1873–1930).

⁸ See Herbert Franke, *Sinology at German Universities* (German version: *Sinologie an deutschen Universitäten*; both Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1968), 11–12, 46. For an overview on the situation in 1942, see the official “Bericht des Reichsministeriums über die Lage der Sinologie und Japanologie in Deutschland, 1942,” annotated and reprinted in the *Newsletter Frauen und China* 7 (1994): 1–17.

⁹ For the United States see, e.g., Laura Fermi, *Illustrious Immigrants: The Intellectual Migration From Europe 1930–41*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1971), 352–57, passim; for England see Norman Bentwich, *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars: The Story of Displaced Scholars and Scientists 1933–1952* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1953), 70, 87, passim. A general assessment of the significance of the intellectual emigration to the United Kingdom has been presented by J. M. Ritchie, “German Refugees from Nazism,” in *Germans in Britain since 1500*, ed. Panikos Panayi (London:

³ Herbert Franke, *Sinologie* (Bern: A. Francke, 1953), 10.

⁴ First professor: Otto Franke (1863–1946); see below.

what degree the fact that so many scholars of Chinese studies and East Asian art history left their country has been acknowledged and perceived within German Sinology itself (part II). I suggest in what follows that this question is crucial not only for the historiography of our field but also for the self-perception of German scholars in Chinese studies, if they recognize the present state of the field as the result of historical development. In my concluding remarks (part IV), I will try to relate chosen aspects of the double phenomenon emigration/immigration to one another, considering some of its consequences for the whole of our now international field.

There are a number of difficulties involved in this undertaking which require preliminary considerations. First of all, I will not attempt to present a comprehensive picture of Chinese studies in Nazi Germany, although this would help us to understand the various dimensions of the individual emigrants' decisions to leave their country. In a number of cases, like those of Jewish scholars or Marxists, who were mostly dismissed from the universities very soon after 1933 (or never gained access to a scholarly position), the motive for emigration is clearly identifiable. Other scholars who do not immediately fall into the religious, racial, or political categories that were regarded by the National Socialist regime as hostile to German society and who therefore did not experience the direct threat of persecution may have had a variety of reasons to leave. Here, it seems impossible and also inappropriate to identify one single motive, unless it has been made explicit by the individual emigrant himself. The decision to emigrate—or not to emigrate—was in many cases based on the interplay of many problems and questions, and I will resist the temptation to reconstruct simplistic solutions.

In the historical event of the emigration—an event that spans a number of years and is bound to individual biographies, but which nevertheless constitutes a single historical phenomenon—a number of lines intersect: the rise of Nazism as a political phenomenon; the general situation of German universities after 1933; the role of Chinese studies and East Asian art history within aca-

demia at that time; the individual problems and perspectives—private, political, academic—which differed in every case. A comprehensive picture of the situation would comprise these different aspects, and it would need to be based on both institutional and biographical history. Therefore, to unfold the many facets of the emigration, we need first to consult the archives of all universities and other scholarly institutions both whence the emigrants left and whither they arrived.

As the following overview shows with sufficient clarity, the great majority of German scholars in Chinese studies and East Asian art history left their country after the Act of 1933: in addition to professors Ferdinand Lessing (1882–1961) and Walter Simon (1893–1981), most of the promising young lecturers and recent Ph.D.s departed. We might therefore expect that this most important single event would have been publicly recognized and discussed in the years directly after 1945, so that we could draw on a rich fund of sources and studies. This is not the case. There is no systematic account of the issue, and I take this very fact itself as part of an ongoing history. The almost total historiographical failure to recognize the immediate past in our fields is therefore part of the problem: an issue to discuss and, at the same time, the central obstacle to understanding the historical phenomenon of the emigration.¹⁰ As a result, what follows is a preliminary but late attempt, one that is far from complete but which provides a framework of names and dates that may be supplemented by future contributions. The accounts of individual scholars are rather unbalanced: I provide more information on the most famous scholars, because they have sometimes been honored with a *Festschrift*, their careers are summarized in biographical handbooks, and, for those who have passed away, we may have access to one or more obituaries that provide valuable and reliable information.

Hambledon Press, 1996), 147–70. The emigration of scholars in Chinese studies is, of course, part of the overall intellectual emigration between 1933 and 1945, and the work of the emigrants in their new places was often related to that of their colleagues in other academic disciplines. For the situation in art history, see Fermi, 247–53, and Colin Eisler, "Kunstgeschichte American Style: A Study in Migration," in *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930–1960*, ed. Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1969), 544–629.

¹⁰ It should be noted that this situation is not representative of all German academia, humanities, or even East Asian studies. For an account of Japanese studies under the National Socialist regime, see Herbert Worm, "Japanologie im Nationalsozialismus," in *Formierung und Fall der Achse Berlin-Tokyo*, ed. Gerhard Krebs and Bernd Martin (Munich: Iudicium, 1994), 153–86. A first, recent approach to the history of Chinese studies has been undertaken by Roland Felber, "Zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand: Notizen über Schicksale von Ostasienwissenschaftlern in der NS-Zeit," *Berliner China-Hefte* 10 (1996): 80–86. As indicated by the title, Felber's account consists of notes on a relatively small number of persons; its value lies primarily in the fact that the author has used the archives of Humboldt University (Berlin) and other institutions.

For less well-known scholars, on the other hand, it is sometimes difficult to reconstruct the key dates of their biographies. In these cases, my occasional silence is enforced by the scarcity of remnant sources; whereas the silence of those who could have done the work three or four decades ago—when most of the emigrants were still alive and could have been personally consulted—was voluntary.

A question I will not approach here in detail is the political orientation and role of those few Sinologists (and would-be Sinologists) who stayed in Germany during the time of the National Socialist regime. Some of them, although not all, were early party members and outspoken supporters of Nazism¹¹ who gained immediate profit from the fact that more talented scholars had been forced into emigration, leaving room for persons able to display timely qualifications for what was regarded as National Socialist scholarship.¹² Not too surprisingly, the post-war silence on the emigration was not

¹¹ On the party members, see the information provided in the "Bericht des Reichsministeriums." The only Sinological professor who maintained his position without ingratiating himself to the Nazis was Erich Haenisch (1880–1966). Haenisch occupied the chair at the Berlin Friedrich-Wilhelms University from 1932 to 1945, when he reached the age of formal retirement; throughout this time, he was able to keep himself and his seminar decidedly distant from the party. In 1944, he was alone in appealing to the German authorities to release his French colleague Henri Maspero (1883–1945), who eventually, on March 17, 1945, died from exhaustion in the Buchenwald concentration camp near Weimar—those German Sinologists whom Haenisch asked for support refused his plea; see Herbert Franke, "Chinakunde in München: Rückblick und Ausblick," in *Chronik der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München 1967–1968* (Munich: Die Universität, 1970), 113. According to Wolfgang Franke (obituary of Walter Fuchs, *Oriens Extremus* 27 [1980]: 148), Haenisch was the only politically uncompromised scholar of East Asian studies in West Germany immediately after the war. On Haenisch's noble behavior under the National Socialist regime, see Erika Taube, "Erich Haenisch: Ein Beispiel für Zivilcourage," in *Sinologische Traditionen im Spiegel neuer Forschungen*, ed. Ralf Moritz (Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 1993), 179–89 (with further references). Haenisch himself wrote the obituary on Maspero for the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 101 (1951): 1–2.

¹² For this question, cf. the remarks by Felber, "Zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand," as well as the "Bericht des Reichsministeriums," 1–17. The latter source leaves no doubt that a clear National Socialist orientation in scholarship was an explicit criterion of evaluation.

only frosty towards the emigrants; after some initial but temporary suspensions during the early post-war years, it was also warmhearted towards the entangled National Socialist party members. Therefore, beyond some overall conclusions, the definite role that certain Nazis—actively or passively, secretly or openly—played in individual cases to force a colleague or student into emigration seems by now difficult to pinpoint,¹³ again, the question certainly deserves thorough work in the archives. Where servility towards the National Socialist regime appears to be related to the historiographical question, as with some of the earlier state-of-the-field reports, it will be individually addressed.

II

Hellmut Wilhelm's observation that Chinese studies were much slower to recover after the war than other disciplines has been supported by others. In 1960, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft attempted a comprehensive inventory of West German "Oriental Studies" and its most urgent needs at the universities. The preface of the *Denkschrift zur Lage der Orientalistik*—the first *Denkschrift* in the humanities, following a number of others dedicated to the medical, natural, and applied sciences—states:

Die schweren personellen Verluste nach 1933 haben sie [the Oriental Studies] stärker als andere Fächer betroffen [. . .] die Lücken, die der Krieg besonders in den Reihen des wissenschaftlichen Nachwuchses schlug, die Zerstörung vieler Seminar- und Universitätsbibliotheken [. . .] bestimmten die Jahre seit der Wiedereröffnung der westdeutschen Universitäten.¹⁴

In his introductory remarks to the recently published first volume of Wolfgang Franke's autobiography, Helmut Martin points out that the number of personnel working in German East Asian Studies in 1942—when the emigrants were already being replaced—was not regained in West Germany until the early 1960s.¹⁵ Nevertheless,

¹³ It is therefore all the more valuable that Hartmut Walravens makes a concrete point with regard to Ruth Krader's (1911–96) emigration; see below.

¹⁴ Adam Falkenstein, ed., *Denkschrift zur Lage der Orientalistik* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1960), 2.

¹⁵ Helmut Martin, "Der Graben und die Einebnungsbestrebungen," in Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas: Autobiographie eines Sinologen 1912–1950* (Dortmund: Project Verlag, 1995 [Edition Cathay, vol. 11]), iii.

apart from Hellmut Wilhelm's remarks and the perhaps implied hint in the preface of the *Denkschrift*, the very fact of the emigration seems to have been a non-issue at least for some of those scholars who were contemporaries of the emigrants and who published reports on Chinese studies in Germany. Only Eduard Erkes (1891–1958) in 1948 and Herbert Franke in 1968 identified some of the most distinguished scholars as emigrants and explicitly acknowledged the loss that German Sinology had suffered.¹⁶ In Franke's summary we read:

Political events after 1933 inflicted extremely grave losses on German Sinology, losses which in part could never be made up. The National-socialist régime drove a great number of scholars out of Germany—we will mention here only Walter Simon, William Cohn, Stefan Balázs, Gustav Haloun, Bruno Schindler, and Wolfram Eberhard as representative of many more. Military action then destroyed a series of important libraries, the seminars at Berlin, Leipzig, and Göttingen, and the China-Institut, Frankfurt; the political division after 1945 dispersed the greatest collection of Chinese books, that of the Prussian State Library in Berlin, over several occupation zones.¹⁷

According to Eduard Erkes, the dismissal and emigration of scholars had brought German Sinology to a standstill under the Nazis.¹⁸ Yet, other articles written between 1937 and 1968 intending to summarize the circumstances of Chinese studies in Germany almost completely withheld information on the general phenomenon of the emigration, to say nothing of concrete data and examples.¹⁹

¹⁶ Eduard Erkes, "Die kulturpolitische Bedeutung der deutschen Sinologie," *Die Weltkugel* 1948: 38–40. At the time of this article, Erkes had just been named professor at Leipzig, returning to the seminar from which he had been dismissed by the Nazis in 1933; see Johannes Schubert, "Das Ostasiatische Institut der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig: Tradition und Perspektive," in *Nationaler Befreiungskampf und Neokolonialismus* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962), 412–13; Herbert Franke, *Sinology at German Universities*, 30. Franke was professor at the University of Munich.

¹⁷ Herbert Franke, "Sinology at German Universities," 30. In his earlier, purely technical "Far Eastern Studies in Germany," *JAS* 18 (1959): 535–40, Franke had not said a word about the emigration and its aftermath, divesting the status quo of any historical context.

¹⁸ Erkes, "Die kulturpolitische Bedeutung der deutschen Sinologie," 39.

¹⁹ In 1937, the first German summaries on Chinese studies appeared which were written under the aegis of the Nazi re-

From some of these latter accounts, unknowing readers would hardly discern any significant break in the apparently continuous development of Chinese studies in Germany. Even if the losses German Sinology suffered from 1933 through 1945 may have been balanced in terms of the sheer number of scholars at work some twenty years later, many of those who originally showed the most talent and who after the war became the most distinguished scholars had left once and for all, thus involuntarily undermining the young tradition of German Sinology. The only attempt till now towards a comprehensive account of the emigrants is a list published by Hartmut Walravens in 1990, covering the fields of Chinese, Japanese,

gime. I have chosen the year 1968 as an artificial terminus because it marked the appearance of Herbert Franke's monograph mentioned above. Again, by this date the academic careers of most of those emigrants who had left Germany as renowned scholars had been completed or were approaching their end. In addition to the reports mentioned above, I note the following summaries: Fritz Jäger, "The Present State of Sinological Studies in Germany," *Research and Progress* 3 (1937): 96–99 (German version: "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Sinologie in Deutschland," *Ostasiatische Rundschau* 17 [1936]: 561–63); Otto Franke, "Sinology in Germany," *Research and Progress* 5 (1939): 257–67 (German version: "Die Chinakunde in Deutschland," *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 15 [1939]: 85–88); Wolfgang Franke, "The Younger Generation of German Sinologists," *Monumenta Serica* 5 (1940): 437–46; Hans O. H. Stange, "Die deutsche Chinakunde," *Deutsche Kultur im Leben der Völker* 16 (1941): 49–56; Wolfgang Franke, "Die Entwicklung der Chinakunde in den letzten 50 Jahren," *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 72 (1952): 8–18; Wolfgang Franke, "Probleme und heutiger Stand der Chinaforschung in Deutschland," *Moderne Welt* 1 (1960): 409–29, rpt. in Wolfgang Franke, *Sino-Malaysiana: Selected Papers on Ming & Qing History and on the Overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia, 1942–1988* (Singapore: South Seas Society, 1989), 546–66. Another important document is the above-mentioned "Bericht des Reichsministeriums über die Lage der Sinologie und Japanologie in Deutschland, 1942." Articles on individual institutions include—besides Schubert's report on Leipzig mentioned above—Erich Haenisch, "Der Aufbau der ostasiatischen Studien in München," *ZDMG* 103 (1953): *45–48*; Wolfgang Franke and Oscar Benl, "Der Aufbau der ostasiatischen Studien in Hamburg," *ZDMG* 104 (1954): *15–20*^{*}; Erich Haenisch, "Die Sinologie an der Berliner Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in den Jahren 1889–1945," in *Studium Berolinense: Aufsätze und Beiträge zu Problemen der Wissenschaft und zur Geschichte der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin*, ed. Hans Leussing et al. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1960), 554–66.

and Altaicist studies, as well as East Asian art history.²⁰ This list of forty-three names—including librarians and some amateurs of East Asian studies—certainly justifies Walravens's introductory remark:

Die deutschen Ostasienwissenschaften haben durch die 1933 einsetzende Emigration einen schweren Rückschlag erlitten; zugleich aber wurden Anregungen und Schwerpunkte der Arbeit deutscher Gelehrter für andere Länder fruchtbar gemacht und führten dort in Verbindung mit der einheimischen Wissenschaftstradition zu neuen Forschungsansätzen.²¹

The summaries of German scholarship that were published between 1937 and 1968 betray evidence of their different circumstances, in particular with respect to the critical historical break of May 1945. Authors who wrote in Germany before this date had to take account of a framework of political presuppositions that was fundamentally different from that which prevailed afterwards; and the latter framework itself differed with respect to whether an article was published in East or West Germany. Historiographically, we therefore need to recognize a variety of rhetorical strategies as well as the differing scholarly and political functions of these articles. Those scholars writing state-of-the-field reports between 1933 and 1945 include Otto and Wolfgang Franke, Fritz Jäger (1886–1957), and Hans O. H. Stange (1903–78). In his survey of 1939, meant to be “a short sketch of all work dealing with Sinology in the widest sense carried on in Germany since 1930,”²² Otto Franke, by

²⁰ Hartmut Walravens, “Deutsche Ostasienwissenschaften und Exil (1933–1945),” in *Bibliographie und Berichte: Festschrift für Werner Schochow*, ed. Walravens (München, etc.: K. G. Saur, 1990), 231–41.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 231–32.

²² Otto Franke, “Sinology in Germany,” 257, note. Only in the German version (“Die Chinakunde in Deutschland,” 85) this note continues as follows: “In der Erwähnung oder Nichterwähnung von Werken liegt kein Werturteil. Arbeiten, die von Deutschen im Auslande oder in fremder Sprache veröffentlicht sind, sowie solche von Nichtdeutschen, auch in deutscher Sprache, mußten der Raumersparnis halber unberücksichtigt bleiben.” The term “Raumersparnis” (“saving space”) deserves careful attention: on the same page of his article, Franke refers to the bibliography on East Asian studies which was regularly prepared by Hans Praesent at the German Library in Leipzig and published in the *Ostasiatische Rundschau*. Franke points out that several journals had been excluded from this bibliography “aus Gründen der Raumersparnis” since 1933 (the quotation marks were used already by Franke). When Franke now

then already formally retired,²³ mentions the works of Karl Wittfogel (1896–1988; emigrated 1934), Étienne Balazs²⁴ (1905–63; emigrated 1935), Ferdinand Lessing²⁵ (emigrated 1935), Anneliese Bulling (born 1900; emigrated 1936[?]), Wolfram Eberhard (1909–89; emigrated 1937), Gustav Haloun (1898–1951; emigrated 1938), and Otto Maenchen-Helfen²⁶ (1894–1969; left Germany for Vienna in 1933 and emigrated from there in 1938), without any hint of their emigration and new affiliations.²⁷ In addition, Franke notes that the eminent

used the very same formula for his own account we have to read between the lines to understand what he really wished to say: it was not by his own will that “the works of non-Germans must have been unconsidered.”

²³ Franke had been offered the first chair in Sinology at the Kolonialinstitut der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg in 1909 and maintained it until 1923. By 1919, the Seminar of East Asian Studies had been integrated into the newly founded Hamburg University; see Franke and Benl, “Der Aufbau der ostasiatischen Studien in Hamburg,” *15–16*. From 1923 until his retirement in 1931, Otto Franke occupied the chair in Berlin; see Haenisch, “Die Sinologie an der Berliner Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in den Jahren 1889–1945,” 559–61. His autobiography was posthumously published under the title *Erinnerungen aus zwei Welten: Randglossen zur eigenen Lebensgeschichte* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1954); obituaries are listed by Herbert Franke, *Sinologie*, 22, n. 1.

²⁴ Franke, “Sinology in Germany,” 259, refers to him as Stefan Balázs, the appellation Balazs had used in Germany. Balazs, born in Budapest in 1905 as István Balázs, later successively adopted the German and then the French form of his first name, dropping Hungarian accents as well.

²⁵ When Franke's article was published it must have been clear that Lessing had actually emigrated to the United States. In 1935, he had been offered the Agassiz chair of Oriental Languages and Literature at Berkeley, and he had left Germany with an official permit, issued by the Reichskultusministerium (Ministry of Education), for a three-year leave (see *Ostasiatische Rundschau* 16 [1935]: 304). In 1938, Berlin University reappointed him as a lecturer in Tibetan, Mongolian, and in Chinese Buddhism (see *Ostasiatische Rundschau* 19 [1938]: 333)—a calling that he no longer followed.

²⁶ Franke, “Sinology in Germany,” 259. After his emigration to the United States in 1938, Mänchen-Helfen anglicized his name to Maenchen-Helfen (sometimes just Maenchen) and added a middle initial “J.” for “Johann,” for which since 1959 he used the English form “John”; see Charles King, “The Huns and Central Asia: A Bibliography of Otto J. Maenchen-Helfen,” *Central Asiatic Journal* 40 (1996): 178, note 1.

²⁷ Compare to this Franke's statement quoted in note 22 above.

journal *Asia Major* “unfortunately ceased publication in 1935,” but does not inform his readers that the Jewish founder, publisher, and editor of the journal, Bruno Schindler (1882–1964), had emigrated in 1933 to London (where he revived the journal in 1949). Even if we assume that Franke may not yet have received word on Maenchen-Helfen’s emigration when writing his account, and that he may not have regarded Eberhard, Lessing, Bulling, and Haloun as political emigrants, the cases of Wittfogel, Balazs, and Schindler must have been clear to him.

Otto Franke referred to 1930—the initial year of his survey—as the year in which Erich Haenisch published his report “Sinologie.”²⁸ It was certainly not accidental that Franke said not a word about a 1937 report by the National Socialist party member Jäger (see below), of which the English version had appeared in the very same journal *Research and Progress* where now, only two years later, Franke’s own survey was published. Although Franke was by no means a political liberal,²⁹ he was also not a National Socialist; his privilege of having direct access to, and a certain influence within the Foreign Ministry during the late 1930s and early 1940s³⁰ derived from his unquestionable reputation as the outstanding Western authority on Chinese history. After Jäger had simply erased the names of all the emigrants from his “Present State of Sinological Studies in Germany,” Franke’s account reads like an immediate rectification: although he could not refer to the scholars as “emigrants,” he still wanted to see them included in “German Sinology.” Behind this seemingly puzzling rhetorical strategy, we may recognize the stature of a character torn by inner conflicts of loyalty. As the “national-conservative” Franke would never have acted against the political leadership of his country, the scholar Franke could not betray or ignore the outstanding scholars of his field—many of whom were his own students.

²⁸ In Gustav Abb, ed., *Aus 50 Jahren deutscher Wissenschaft: Die Entwicklung ihrer Fachgebiete in Einzeldarstellungen* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1930), 262–74.

²⁹ The editors of his autobiography *Erinnerungen aus zwei Welten*, Franke’s children Olga and Wolfgang, note that they have omitted “political glosses which today could give rise to misunderstandings. The occasionally perhaps somehow abrupt transitions in the final chapters are due to these cuts.” The final chapters are those dealing mainly with the years of National Socialism; on Otto Franke’s “national-conservative” political orientation, see Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas*, 11–12, as well as Otto Franke’s own testimony in his autobiography.

³⁰ See Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas*, 66, 80–81, 96, 111.

Otto Franke’s son Wolfgang, focusing in 1940 on “The Younger Generation of German Sinologists,” also mentions Eberhard, Balazs, Walter Simon (1893–1981; emigrated 1936), Wilhelm (then in Peking), Diether von den Steinen (1903–54; in China since 1927), Gustav Ecke (1896–1971; in China since 1923), as well as Haloun and Lessing of the older generation.³¹ Avoiding the designation “emigrant,” Wolfgang Franke states that “German Sinologists covered by this summary do not necessarily all live in Germany and the language in which their writings are published is not always German; this summary also covers foreign Sinologists who have received their scientific training predominantly in Germany and have published their writings largely in German scientific journals.”³² In addition, he notes for every scholar his or her present place of employment. In this first of his several reports (he wrote others after 1945, see below), Wolfgang Franke, who like his father was not a member of the National Socialist party and was just at the beginning of his academic career, appears to have chosen this subtle way of a faithful presentation—again like his father—for pragmatic reasons.³³

The surveys given by National Socialist party members Jäger and Stange differ from those of the Frankes.³⁴

³¹ Wolfgang Franke was at that time in Peking, working at the Deutschland-Institut (see note 45 below); see his autobiography *Im Banne Chinas* 93–110.

³² Wolfgang Franke, “The Younger Generation of German Sinologists,” 437, note 2. I am not sure whom he intended to include under the category “foreign scholars.”

³³ Although Franke stayed in China from 1937 to 1950, he cannot be regarded—and does not regard himself—as an emigrant. On the one hand, he worked mainly at a German institution; moreover, after the initial period of German military success, he applied for membership in the National Socialist party, pragmatically considering his future prospects in German academia; see *Im Banne Chinas*, 123. (Fortunately enough, his party membership never materialized.)

³⁴ Jäger, writing in 1937, had since 1935 occupied the Sinological chair at Hamburg University. Stange, writing in 1941, had in 1939 succeeded Haloun in Göttingen after Haloun emigrated to England the year before; see Hartmut Walravens, *Friedrich Ernst August Krause: Major und Ostasienwissenschaftler* (Hamburg: C. Bell Verlag, 1983), 14–15. After 1945, both Jäger and Stange were temporarily dismissed for political reasons; see Wilhelm, “German Sinology Today,” 320, n. 11. According to the “Bericht des Reichsministeriums,” 6 and 9, Jäger had been a member of the National Socialist Party since 1933, while Stange had joined the party on January 1, 1932 (with the early membership number 855 624), being also a member of the party’s Sturmabteilung (“Storm Troopers”).

The English version of Jäger's 1937 report is deafening in its silence on the emigrants. In an involuntarily ironic manner Jäger takes notice only of "B. Schindler's" *Asia Major* "which testifies to the great progress made by Sinology in Germany since the close of the War [World War I]" and for which he hopes "that funds will be forthcoming to ensure the continued publication of this indispensable journal."³⁵ (There is no mention of the facts that Schindler had emigrated and the publication of *Asia Major* had been stopped.) The earlier German version of the report, published in 1936, includes the names of Lessing (at that time "on leave" at Berkeley), Schindler (mentioned in connection with *Asia Major*), and Haloun (at that time not yet emigrated).³⁶ Stange, writing in 1941, hints only at Haloun, Eberhard, and Hellmut Wilhelm—none of whom was "non-Aryan," we should note.³⁷ Both authors say nothing of any scholarly discontinuity in the days of their own writing; without referring to the eminent scholars that had left the country, both offer the names of scholars then active in Germany, some of whom hardly merit even a footnote in a history of European Sinological studies.

The four examples of 1937, 1939, 1940, and 1941 betray a need to define one's own position—there had been no such report between 1930 and 1937—and it may not be too speculative to understand this need at least partly as the immediate result of the emigration of most of the promising younger scholars.³⁸ This view is corroborated by an official report from the summer of 1942 which evaluates the situation of Chinese and Japanese studies at German and Austrian universities, prepared by the Reichssicherheitshauptamt (State Security Main Office), Berlin, on request of the National Socialist party headquarters in Munich. The report, based on information from unnamed scholars in academia, recognizes a shortage of young talent and, moreover, a "definite crisis" in Chinese and Japanese studies in Germany that may jeopardize the understanding of recent, as well as anticipated, major political changes in the Far East.³⁹ The im-

pact of the emigration is almost completely concealed: according to this report, many young scholars had accepted positions at museums because East Asian studies did not provide them with opportunities to earn their living. "In isolated cases," the report continues, some had "even" gone abroad and were therefore "lost for German research and educational work."⁴⁰ There is no mention of political reasons for this nor comment that a number of scholars had in fact been dismissed from their positions. In the report's comprehensive account of all scholars of Chinese and Japanese studies affiliated with German and Austrian universities,⁴¹ none of the emigrants' names appears. Stressing the urgent need for a German journal of East Asian studies with decidedly National Socialist orientation, the report also withholds any mention of the former existence of *Asia Major*.

It is in this context that one notices Jäger's and Stange's eloquent silence on most of the emigrants—a silence that sought to create the image of an unbroken and living "German" Sinology now mainly comprising those who had stayed in the country. The Frankes, on the other hand, obviously tried to counteract this narrow and impoverished vision of German scholarship; yet in 1939 and 1940 even they insisted on the endurance of a scholarly tradition which was then about to dissolve.

After 1945, and hence beyond the political pressure of the National Socialist regime, German Sinologists, although historians by profession, were in a very unfortunate way sometimes undecided or even reluctant to face the most recent history of their own field. When Herbert Franke, whose attitude towards the emigrants is above suspicion, wrote a long obituary on his teacher Gustav Haloun, he offered but one sentence on the circumstances of Haloun's emigration:

Im November 1938 verließ er Deutschland, um einem Ruf auf die durch die Emeritierung von A. C. Moule freigewordene Professur in Cambridge zu folgen.⁴²

³⁵ Jäger, "The Present State of Sinological Studies in Germany," 98–99. Felber, "Zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand," 83, n. 22, mentions that Erich Haenisch in July 1937 wrote a letter to Berlin University asking for financial support for the publication of volume 10 of *Asia Major*.

³⁶ Jäger, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Sinologie in Deutschland," 563.

³⁷ Stange, "Die deutsche Chinakunde," 54–55.

³⁸ Another impulse to write these reports may have been the competition for money and positions within German academia, with Chinese studies still lacking a broad basis.

³⁹ "Bericht des Reichsministeriums," 1.

⁴⁰ "Bericht des Reichsministeriums," 2. A similar statement may be found in Stange's report of 1941, "Die deutsche Chinakunde," 52.

⁴¹ "Bericht des Reichsministeriums," 5–17. Enumerating all established teachers and also scholars of the younger generation, in a number of cases the report gives individual political evaluations (sometimes critical) and mentions the fact of party membership, often including the year of entrance into the party as well as one's membership number.

⁴² Franke, "Gustav Haloun (1898–1951) in memoriam," *ZDMG* 102 (1952): 2.

Unintentionally,⁴³ I suppose, this sentence withholds more than it expresses and has the potential to blur the historical truth: Haloun's change from Göttingen to Cambridge was much more than just a career step.⁴⁴ We must be aware of the political—and human—significance of Haloun's decision in order to grasp the import of what we are told here. This rhetoric reminds us of an earlier, similar incident. A report of the Deutschland-Institut⁴⁵ in Peking 1935 announced that Hellmut Wilhelm had re-

⁴³ To preclude any misinterpretation, it should be noted that Herbert Franke dedicated his *Sinologie* (published 1953) to the memory of his teacher Haloun.

⁴⁴ Cf. Wolfgang Franke's obituary on Étienne Balazs: "Die sich Anfang der dreißiger Jahre zunehmend verschlechternde politische Situation veranlaßte ihn nicht selten zu pessimistischen Betrachtungen, und so ergab es sich nahezu zwangsläufig, daß er Deutschland, das seine zweite Heimat geworden war, verließ, als sich dort das unmenschliche totalitäre System breit machte. 1935 siedelte er nach Paris über" ("Étienne Balazs in memoriam," *Oriens Extremus* 12 [1965]: 1). Sixteen years after the obituary of 1952, in his *Sinology at German Universities* quoted above, Herbert Franke noted Haloun as one of the political emigrants.

⁴⁵ On the Deutschland-Institut, see Françoise Kreissler, *L'Action culturelle allemande en Chine: De la fin du XIX^e siècle à la Seconde Guerre mondiale* (Paris: Maison des sciences de l'homme, 1989), 184–95, passim; Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas*, 60–68, 142, 167, passim. The institute was founded by Cheng Shou-lin 鄭壽麟 (born 1900) in October 1931 as a center to promote German culture and science and was from May 1933 headed by one Chinese and one German director, working under the supervision of a German-Chinese board of trustees. The Chinese Minister of Education and German ambassador served as its honorary chairmen. Its original Chinese name, Te-kuo yen-chiu-hiu 德國研究會 (German: Deutsche Studiengesellschaft), was changed to Chung-Te wen-hua hsieh-hui 中德文化協會 (Deutschland-Institut) in 1933 and finally to Chung-Te hsüeh-hui 中德學會 in 1935. The institute was intended to serve both scholarly and practical needs: to assist Chinese organizations and individuals who wanted to learn about Germany, visit the country, or apply for scholarships, etc., and to produce a Chinese translation series of German scientific and literary works. In addition, it had its own library, mainly of works from German literature, philosophy, history, etc., as well as of Chinese books on Germany. From 1935 the institute was located in the northern part of Peking, close to the universities and the National Library. In August 1945 the German personnel withdrew from the institute, which nevertheless continued to exist for some years under the guidance of the National Library. While Wolfgang Franke maintains that the institute, although

signed from his position as director of the Institute in December 1934; the truth behind this laconic note was that Wilhelm's wife Maria was of Jewish descent, a fact that could have become a potential obstacle to the Institut's financial support from Berlin.⁴⁶

Also in 1952, in his inaugural lecture at Hamburg, "Die Entwicklung der Chinakunde in den letzten 50 Jahren," Wolfgang Franke chose to dwell on the methodological problems of Chinese studies in a historical perspective, leaving the fresh and still open wound of German Sinology untouched.⁴⁷ And again in his article of 1960, "Probleme und heutiger Stand der Chinaforschung in Deutschland," he begins with a vehement statement that "the present state of Chinese studies" is comprehensible only with regard to "the historical background." Unfortunately, by "historical background" the historian Franke understands the overall development and methodological problems of European Chinese studies since their very origins; on twenty closely printed pages there is but one sentence devoted to the emigration, and even this does not actually address the question itself.⁴⁸ How are we to reconcile Franke's reports of 1952 and 1960 with his honorable article of 1940?

It remains difficult to explain why in Germany, after Eduard Erkes' early remarks of 1948, it required so much time to reacquire the clear language of Herbert Franke's *Sinology at German Universities* (1968) or to produce the first systematic attempt at a history of the emigration of German Sinologists with Hartmut Walravens' list (1990). Partly because of so much time passed—and lost—we face increased difficulties in surveying this emigration and reaching an understanding of the variety of impulses suggested in the individual biographies.

mainly funded with money from the German Foreign Ministry, was kept relatively free from immediate political interference, Kreissler remarks: "À en juger par les expositions et les films [e.g., by Leni Riefenstahl] que le Deutschland-Institut propose au public chinois, il ne fait aucun doute qu'il joue, entre autres, le rôle de propagandiste du Troisième Reich" (Kreissler, *L'Action culturelle allemande en Chine*, 188).

⁴⁶ See Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas*, 64–65.

⁴⁷ In *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde* 72 (1952): 8–18.

⁴⁸ His isolated statement in *Moderne Welt* 1 (1960): 422 (rpt. ed., p. 559), that the number of Sinologists who emigrated to the United States between 1933 and 1952 is "barely smaller" than that of those who had stayed in Germany is made in the context of considerations on post-war international scholarly cooperation. Nowhere in his article does Franke mention the genuine impact of the emigration on the "problems and present state of Chinese studies in Germany."

From today's perspective, the category of the political emigrant—even for the years 1933–45—is not always easy to define.

Any attempt to write the history of emigration of German Sinologists between 1933 and 1945 must begin with a number of definitions constituting a conceptual pattern that may be compared with actual biographies in order to decide who should be included in such a history. Yet, precisely because the biographies are those of unique individuals, a fixed definition will not apply to every case of emigration. Even if we try to keep our conceptual framework somewhat flexible, any list of emigrants will be too exclusive or too inclusive, being either incomplete or containing the names of persons whose status as political emigrants may be questionable. The persons included in the following list are those who were (in a broad sense) scholars in Chinese studies (also historians of Chinese art) by profession. To include scholars like Diether von den Steinen and Gustav Ecke, we cannot restrict the date when a person left Germany to the years 1933–45 but must allow an earlier (though not a later)⁴⁹

⁴⁹ Scholars who left Germany immediately or soon after the war include the art historian Max Loehr (1903–88), who received his Ph.D. in 1936 from the University of Munich, became director of the Deutschland-Institut in Peking in 1941, and held this position until the institute was closed in 1945. He stayed in Peking until 1949, before returning to the Museum für Völkerkunde in Munich. In 1951 he went to the United States where he became professor of Far Eastern art and archeology at the University of Michigan; in 1960 he accepted the Abby Alrich Rockefeller chair of Oriental Art at Harvard where he taught until his retirement in 1974; see *Directory of American Scholars*, 7th ed. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1978), 1: 417; *Who's Who in American Art*, 17th ed. (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1986), 623; as well as James Cahill, "Max Loehr at Seventy" (*Ars Orientalis* 10 [1975]: 1–10, with bibliography); and the obituaries by Robert Bagley in *Archives of Asian Art* 42 (1989): 86–89 (including bibliography), Susan Bush in *Oriental Art* 35 (1989): 69–70, and Helmut Brinker in *Münchener Beiträge zur Völkerkunde* 2 (1989): 283–90. On Loehr's years in Peking, see Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas*, 112–23, 146–47, 167. Aschwin Lippe (Ernst Aschwin Prinz zur Lippe-Biesterfeld, 1914–88), also a well-known art historian (Ph.D. Berlin 1942), came to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City, in 1949 as a senior research fellow, and from 1949 until his retirement in 1973 worked there as a curator; see the obituary (including bibliography) by Sherman Lee in *Archives of Asian Art* 42 (1989): 84–86. The sinologist Werner Eichhorn (1899–1991) (Ph.D. Göttingen 1926; Habilitation, Bonn 1937), who had worked at German and Austrian universities from 1937, found employment as an assistant librarian at the Bodleian Library,

date. To include Hellmut Wilhelm, but not Wolfgang Franke, Walter Fuchs (1902–79), the Austrian Erwin Ritter von Zach (1872–1942), and others, we must look carefully into their individual circumstances before 1945. (The fact that a scholar may have returned to Germany after 1945 does not, of course, play a role in whether to identify him as an emigrant for the years before 1945.) To include Étienne Balazs, we must consider foreigners who worked and published in Germany until their emigration and who appear to have previously decided to continue their career in Germany.⁵⁰ (Balazs not only wrote his major works in German but also changed his given name István to Stefan.) With regard to Hans Hermann Frankel (Fränkel) and Conrad Schirokauer, we must include individuals who chose their profession after the date of their emigration, and who received their Sinological training in their new country. All these different circumstances may be subject to discussion; in the case of Frankel, for example, we do not know whether circumstances in Germany—as in the United States—would have led him to choose Chinese literature as his primary field of interest.

As a guiding principle, I identify three groups of scholars in the following survey, in hope of establishing the full extent and significance of the emigration in our field: a) those who emigrated as fully trained specialists in their field and who continued their work abroad; b) those who left Germany as scholars in Chinese studies or East Asian art history but did not continue their career in their specialized field; c) those who emigrated

Oxford, in 1949; here he stayed until 1961 when he became professor of Sinology at the University of Tübingen, a position he held until 1970; see *Contemporary Authors* (Detroit: Gale Research), vols. 29–32 (first revision, 1978), 182. Scholars had different reasons to go abroad shortly after the war (including political problems because of their immediate past); although sometimes related to the difficult scholarly and material situation of German academics as a result of the National Socialist regime and the war, we must keep these cases strictly apart from those of the former political emigrants or refugees.

⁵⁰ In this survey of German scholars I will also include the Austrians Otto John Maenchen-Helfen, Erwin Reifler, and Ernst Schwarz. Maenchen-Helfen had studied in Leipzig and was about to take up his academic career in Berlin when the National Socialists came to power. Schwarz returned after the war from China to the German Democratic Republic, where he later received his Ph.D. and taught at Humboldt University, Berlin. Only Reifler seems to have had no affiliation with German academia, but because of the common language and intellectual culture—Reifler had also worked in Berlin 1927–28 (see below)—I think it appropriate to include him here.

early during their academic training and began their careers in Chinese studies abroad. Amateurs in the field, although they occasionally made valuable contributions, are not listed here because they cannot be counted as sharing the academic responsibilities of institutionalized Sinology at a given location.⁵¹ I will also not mention

⁵¹ Most of the scholars presented here have been noted and described in some detail by Walravens. However, I add several persons, offer corrections and provide additional information, especially with regard to career details, obituaries, and published bibliographies. On the other hand, because of my concentration on professional scholars in Chinese studies or East Asian art history, some persons listed by Walravens will not appear in the survey proper but may be mentioned here, viz., Leonhard Adam (1891-1960), Willy Baruch (1900-1954), Walter Fuchs (1888-1966 [the diplomat, not to be confused with the Cologne Sinologist of the same name]), Curt Glaser (1879-1943), Eduard Freiherr von der Heydt (1882-1964), Stephan George Kuttner (born 1907), Alfred Oppenheim (1873-1953), Lucian Scherman (1864-1946), Gerd Wallenstein, and Karl With (both 1891). Three unusual cases are those of Vincenz Hundhausen (1878-1955), John Hefter (1890-1953), and Leonardo Olschki (1885-1961). Hundhausen only later in his life learned a modicum of Chinese and never occupied a position in Chinese studies. He went to Peking in 1923 and stayed until he was ordered to leave the country in 1954. A brilliant writer, he created (with help from Chinese informants) valuable translations, especially of Chinese poetry and drama; he also had his own small publishing house in Peking; see the long and informative obituary by Herbert Mueller in *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 79-80 (1956): 142-47. John ("Jonny") Hefter also never studied Chinese at a university but learned the traditional written language privately in Berlin and published some Sinological articles and translations. He left Germany shortly before World War II and worked as a secretary, teacher, and translator in Chungking, Kunming, and Shanghai. He was repatriated after the war and died in Berlin; see Martin Gimm, ed., *Zwei chinesische Singspiele der Qing-Dynastie* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1993), 9-12, 505-8 (with bibliographical notes). Olschki, a Jewish professor of Romance languages at Heidelberg University, was dismissed from his position in 1933. He went to Italy, where he worked at the University of Rome until a second dismissal in 1938. After his emigration in the following year to the United States, he first served in different temporary positions until he became a research associate (1944) and then lecturer (1948) in the Department of Oriental Languages at Berkeley. He studied Chinese from 1950 and published *L'Asia di Marco Polo* (1951; American ed. *Marco Polo's Asia* [1960]). Also in 1950 he was dismissed from Berkeley for not signing the "loyalty oath." After the "oath" was declared unconstitutional in 1952, Olschki, who now lived

the missionaries who worked in China, the most prominent of which were the Catholic Fathers of the Societas Verbi Divini ("Steyley Mission") who taught at the Catholic Fujen University and published the journal *Monumenta Serica*. They were not political or religious emigrants but individuals fulfilling their vocational duties in Peking. A final conceptual problem lies in the definition of "Chinese studies" which, strictly speaking, excludes scholars who as Altaicists or Japanologists sometimes crossed the borders into the Chinese field. Although academic divisions are to a certain degree arbitrary, for an approach that aims at an institutional history of our field it seems appropriate to accept these divisions here.

III

Ludwig Bachhofer (1894-1976) was a historian of Asian art, working mainly on Indian and Chinese subjects. After receiving his Ph.D. in 1921, he taught at Munich University until 1935 and also worked at the Munich Museum für Völkerkunde 1922-26. (His most eminent student of the years in Munich was Max Loehr.) Because his wife was Jewish, he was denied in 1933 an appointment as Außerordentlicher Professor (associate professor) at Munich University.⁵² In 1935 he emigrated to the United States to become professor of art history at the University of Chicago.⁵³

in Italy, was reinstated but did not return to his position and retired soon afterwards. See Arthur R. Evans, Jr., "Leonardo Olschki, 1885-1961," *Romance Philology* 31 (1977): 17-54, esp. pp. 41-44; *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Emigrés 1933-1945* (German title: *Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933*), ed. Werner Röder and Herbert A. Strauss, 3 vols. in 4 parts (München and New York: K. G. Saur, 1980-83), 2: 874.

⁵² Wolfgang J. Smolka, *Völkerkunde in München: Voraussetzungen, Möglichkeiten und Entwicklungslinien ihrer Institutionalisierung (ca. 1850-1933)* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1994), 290.

⁵³ See the obituary by Harrie Vanderstappen, with an appended bibliography compiled by Diane M. Nelson, in *Archives of Asian Art* 31 (1977-78): 110-12. For extensive bibliographical (and some biographical) information, see Hartmut Walravens, *Bibliographien zur ostasiatischen Kunstgeschichte in Deutschland*, 1: *Adolf Fischer, Frieda Fischer, Karl With, Ludwig Bachhofer* (Hamburg: C. Bell Verlag, 1983), with a supplement in Walravens, *Bibliographien zur ostasiatischen Kunstgeschichte in Deutschland*, 2: *Alfred Salmony* (Hamburg: C. Bell Verlag, 1984), ii-ix.

Étienne Balázs (1905–63), born in Budapest as István Balázs, began his studies in 1923 in Berlin, went in 1925 or 1926 to Paris, and returned to Berlin where he took his Ph.D. in Sinology in 1930. His dissertation on "Beiträge zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte der T'ang-Zeit"⁵⁴—which his teacher Otto Franke acknowledged as the best study ever written under his direction—introduced new perspectives on society and economy to the study of Chinese history. In 1935 he emigrated to France (naturalized 1955). Between 1940 and 1945 he and his wife survived as farmers in the southern part of France. In 1950 he became Maître de recherches at the Centre national de la recherche scientifique; later he helped to develop Chinese studies at the École pratique des hautes études. In France, his major publications were his extensive translations and studies of the monographs on economy (for which he received the Prix Stanislas Julien) and penal law of the *Sui-shu*, both published in 1954. In addition to his articles on various subjects,⁵⁵ Balázs later initiated and headed the highly successful Sung Project, which was the first project of international cooperation in European Chinese studies and also included Japanese scholars. As a visiting professor he taught at Hamburg University in 1960 and 1963.⁵⁶

Anneliese Bulling (1900–) studied Chinese art history and archeology at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University, Berlin. She received her Ph.D. in 1936 with a dissertation on "Die chinesische Architektur von der Han-Zeit bis zum Ende der T'ang-Zeit"; in the same year (?) she went to England. In 1946 she worked as a research scholar at the University of London; from 1947 through 1950 she did research at Cambridge University, where she received the degree Master of Literature. In 1953–54 she lectured at the University of London. In 1956, she arrived in the United States (naturalized 1977). From 1961 she worked at Columbia University—from 1969 until her retirement in 1983 as research associate in the Dept. of Art History.⁵⁷

William Cohn (1880–1961), born in Berlin and of Jewish heritage, was a historian of Asian art, who pub-

lished widely (almost 250 titles) not only on Japanese, Chinese, and Indian subjects, but also on Korean and South-East Asian art.⁵⁸ Cohn received his Ph.D. in 1904 at Erlangen University and was from 1929 until his dismissal in 1933 curator at the Staatliche Museen, Berlin. From 1934 to 1938 he served as the secretary of the Gesellschaft für ostasiatische Kunst in Berlin; in 1938 he emigrated to the United Kingdom. Beginning in 1946, he taught East Asian and Indian art at Oxford University; in addition, he founded and from 1949 to 1956 headed the Museum of Eastern Art at Oxford, the first British museum of its scope.⁵⁹

Ernst Cohn-Wiener (1882–1941), born in Tilsit into a Jewish family, was an art historian. Having received his Ph.D. in 1907 at Heidelberg University, he worked as a lecturer at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University, Berlin; until he was dismissed in 1933. The following year he emigrated to India where he was appointed Director of Art in Baroda State. For health reasons, he moved to the United States in 1939. His major publications date between 1921 and 1930, including books on East Asian, Jewish, and Central Asian Islamic art.⁶⁰

Wolfram Eberhard (1909–89) opened new fields of sociology and ethnology in Chinese studies; while still in Germany, he contributed significantly to the study of Han astronomy (together with his uncle, the astronomer Rolf Müller). When he received his Ph.D. from Berlin University in 1933, he had already been working for four years (and until 1934) as an assistant in the Far Eastern section of the Museum für Völkerkunde, Berlin. During his first visit to China (1934–36) he taught at Peking University, Peiping Municipal University, and the Medical School in Paoting. Returned to Germany, in 1936–37 he headed the Asiatic section of the Grassi Museum in Leipzig. In 1937, with the help of Adam von Trott zu Solz (1909–44; executed as a member of the resistance),⁶¹ he received a Moses Mendelssohn scholarship

⁵⁴ *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen* 34 (1931): 1–92; 35 (1932): 1–73; 36 (1933): 1–62.

⁵⁵ A number of his articles in German and French have been translated into English and published as *Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy*, tr. H. M. Wright (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1964).

⁵⁶ For two long and very informative obituaries see Paul Demiéville, *T'oung Pao* 51 (1964): 247–61 (including bibliography) and Wolfgang Franke, *Oriens Extremus* 12 (1965): 1–5.

⁵⁷ *Who's Who in the East*, 19th ed. (Chicago: Marquis, 1983–84), 123; *Directory of American Scholars* (hereafter cited as DAS), 7th. ed. (1978), 1: 87.

⁵⁸ See the *Bibliography Dr. William Cohn: In Honour of his Seventy-fifth Birthday 22 June 1955*, compiled by George Hill (Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1955).

⁵⁹ *International Biographical Dictionary* (hereafter cited as *IBD*), 2: 192; an obituary has been published by Peter C. Swann in *Oriental Art*, n.s., 7 (1961): 90.

⁶⁰ *IBD*, 2: 193.

⁶¹ See especially Wolfgang Bauer's obituary on Eberhard in *Jahrbuch der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1992 (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1993), 218–19. On Adam von Trott zu Solz, see Hsi-huey Liang, *The Sino-German Connection: Alexander von Falkenhäusen between China and Germany 1900–1941* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977), 147–57.

which allowed him to buy a round-the-world ticket. After visiting the United States, Japan, and China, he went to Hong Kong because of the Japanese invasion. Here, he received an invitation to join Ankara University in Turkey, where he taught from 1937 to 1948 as a professor of Chinese.⁶² He not only founded Chinese studies in Turkey but also worked on Turkish (as he did on Chinese) folktales. After his Ankara appointment was not renewed in 1948, he moved, with a one-year Rockefeller grant, to Berkeley, where he became lecturer in the same year, associate professor in 1949, and professor of sociology in 1952, the year of his American naturalization. He retired from Berkeley in 1976. Over the course of his career, extensive field research led him not only to mainland China, Taiwan, Korea, and Japan but also back to Turkey (1951-52), to Pakistan and India (1956-58 and 1977), Burma (1958), and Afghanistan (1960). He taught as visiting professor in Frankfurt am Main (1956), Lahore (1957-58), Heidelberg (1964), Taiwan (1967), Munich (1979), and Berlin (1980).⁶³ His bibliography for the years 1931 to 1978 contains 630 entries, among them 60 books (including

several editions and translations of his major works, such as *History of China*, which originally was published in Turkish).⁶⁴ His influence as a teacher matched his distinction as a scholar: many of his students are now distinguished scholars.

Gustav Ecke (1896-1971) studied in Bonn, Berlin, and Erlangen and received his Ph.D. in 1922 with a dissertation on Charles Meryon and the Romantic movement. He was appointed as a professor at Amoy University (1923-28), Tsinghua University (1928-33), and the Catholic Fujen University (1935-48); while in Peking, Ecke was in close contact and political accordance with Adam von Trott zu Solz.⁶⁵ During his Chinese years, he also served as lecturer at the National Academy of Fine Arts in Peking, and in addition spent some time in Tokyo, Nara, and Paris to conduct art historical studies. In 1949 he was appointed curator of Chinese arts at the Honolulu Academy of Arts; in the following year he became professor of arts at the University of Hawaii. After his retirement in 1966, he worked as a visiting professor at Bonn University for two years. In 1935, Ecke was a co-founder of *Monumenta Serica* at Fujen University.⁶⁶

⁶² On the significance of the Turkish universities at Ankara and Istanbul as a haven for German emigrants, see Horst Widmann, *Exil und Bildungshilfe: Die deutschsprachige akademische Emigration in die Türkei nach 1933* (Bern; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1973), and Fritz Neumark, *Zuflucht am Bosphorus: Deutsche Gelehrte, Politiker und Künstler in der Emigration 1933-1953* (Frankfurt am Main: Josef Knecht, 1980); see also Bentwich, *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars*, 53-56. The emigration of 144 German and Austrian scholars (see Widmann, *Exil und Bildungshilfe*, 131-32, 167) to Turkey after 1933 was organized by the Frankfurt am Main medical professor Philipp Schwartz and his "Notgemeinschaft" (emergency association) in Switzerland. The large-scale emigration of scholars to Turkey resulted from the coincidence of two originally unrelated historical events: the rise of Nazism in Germany and the Turkish modernization of the university system for which a great number of foreign professors were needed. Accordingly, the status and responsibilities of the academic emigrants in Ankara and Istanbul differed decidedly from the situation in other countries.

⁶³ This list is given in the *IBD*, 2: 232, and partly also in Hartmut Walravens, "In memoriam Wolfram Eberhard," *Oriens Extremus* 33 (1990): 7. According to *Contemporary Authors*, New Revision Series, vol. 2 (1981), 195, Eberhard taught in Germany in 1952, 1957, 1969, 1978, and 1980; see also "Wolfram Eberhard: A Brief Biography," in *Legend, Lore, and Religion in China: Essays in Honor of Wolfram Eberhard on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Sarah Allan and Alvin P. Cohen (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1979), xxiv.

⁶⁴ On this information, see Alvin P. Cohen, "In memoriam: Wolfram Eberhard, 1909-1989," *Asian Folklore Studies* 49 (1990): 128; also (the same obituary) *Central Asiatic Journal* 34 (1990): 180. Cohen refers to the bibliography given in *Legend, Lore, and Religion in China*, 225-66. German and Austrian professors at the Universities of Ankara and Istanbul were expected to lecture and publish in Turkish: at the beginning of their appointment with the help of interpreters and translators, later on their own; see Helge Peukert's "Introduction" to Philipp Schwartz, *Notgemeinschaft: Zur Emigration deutscher Wissenschaftler nach 1933 in die Türkei* (Marburg: Metropolis, 1995), 22-23.

⁶⁵ See Liang, *The Sino-German Connection*, 149-51.

⁶⁶ It should be noted that the Nazis were very aware of the Catholic missionary, research, and publication activities in China. According to the "Bericht des Reichsministeriums," 2-5, these very lively activities were regarded as hostile to the National Socialist ideology. The "Bericht" labels the Catholic universities in Peking and Tokyo as powerful "combat institutions" ("Kampfeinrichtungen") and describes *Monumenta Serica*—together with its counterpart *Monumenta Nipponica* in Japan—as an ideological instrument to monopolize published scholarship. *Monumenta Serica* appeared just in time to fill the gap created by the suspension of *Asia Major* in 1935 (see below). It is another fortunate irony of history that *Asia Major* was revived in England in 1949 just after *Monumenta Serica*, now under Chinese pressure, had ceased publication in 1948 (later to be revived outside China).

His publications include six books and about sixty articles on Chinese art history and architecture.⁶⁷

Hans Hermann Frankel (or Fränkel; 1916–) emigrated with his family first to the United Kingdom and then to the United States in 1935 (naturalized 1942). He received his education at Stanford University (1935–37) and Berkeley (1937–46); in 1942 he obtained his Ph.D. in Romance literature. After his wartime service in 1942–45, he studied Chinese at Berkeley (1946–47) before going to Peking University as an associate professor of Latin, German, and Western literature (1947–48). From 1949 to 1959 he taught Chinese history at Berkeley and then became assistant professor of Chinese at Stanford (1959–61). In 1961 he moved to Yale as associate professor of Chinese literature, promoted in 1967 to professor. As a visiting professor he taught at Hamburg (1964), Bonn (1974), and Munich (1980). Frankel has published mainly on Chinese literature, especially poetry.⁶⁸

Gustav Haloun (1898–1951) received his Ph.D. from Leipzig University in 1923 and presented his habilitation thesis, "Seit wann kannten die Chinesen die Tochter oder Indogermanen überhaupt," to the University of Prague in 1926, where he began his teaching career in the same year. In 1927–30 he taught at Halle University, and in 1930 at Göttingen and Bonn. After 1931 he worked as an unsalaried lecturer ("Privatdozent") at Göttingen, where he built the Sinological library into one of the finest European institutions of its kind (although the library survived the war, most of it was evacuated and later destroyed in a mining disaster). After he left Göttingen in 1938 to become professor of Chinese at Cambridge University, he built up the Sinological and Japanological library at his new place of work; the outstanding result of his efforts is obvious today. In his published scholarship on early Chinese history Haloun was the first Western scholar to apply the rigorous methods of textual criticism, as it had been developed in European classical studies, to Chinese texts.⁶⁹

Ruth Krader (1911–96) studied Chinese at Hamburg University (1931), in Berlin at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University and the Seminar für orientalische Sprachen (diploma 1933), in Paris at the École nationale des langues orientales vivantes (1933–34) and again in Hamburg (1934–35). From 1935 to 1938 she studied political science in Geneva (degree 1938); thereafter, she had to realize that for "racial" reasons she was no longer welcome in Germany, and that the professor at Hamburg University, Jäger, had chosen to ignore her.⁷⁰ She emigrated to the United States in 1939 (naturalized 1946); she studied first at Columbia (1939–42) and later at Yale where she in 1946 obtained her Ph.D. in Chinese studies. At the University of Washington, where she became head of the Far Eastern Library (1947–68), she took the Master of Library Science degree in 1955. From 1968 until her retirement in 1978 she was director of the Philosophy Library at the University of Washington.⁷¹

Ferdinand Lessing (1882–1961), from 1935 to his retirement in 1950 Agassiz Professor of Oriental Languages at Berkeley (naturalized 1946), was the first professor in the United States to teach courses in Tibetan and Mongolian. A leading member of the Sino-Swedish Expedition in 1930–33 to northwest China with Sven Hedin, he became an authority on Lamaism, in particular with his studies on the Yung-ho-kung temple in Peking. He also supervised the *Mongolian-English Dictionary*, published in 1961. His career had begun at the Seminar für orientalische Sprachen in Berlin where he received his first diploma in Russian and in Chinese in 1905 and began work as an assistant at the Berlin Museum für Völkerkunde. He spent eighteen years in Tientsin (1907–9), Tsingtao (1909–19), Peking (1919–21), and Mukden (1921–25), working as an instructor and translator; at Peking University, he was professor of German and Sanskrit. In 1925 he returned to Berlin to become professor of Chinese at the Seminar für orientalische Sprachen, from 1927 concurrently serving as a curator—later head—of the Eastern Department at the Museum für Völkerkunde.⁷²

⁶⁷ See the obituary by Pierre Jaquillard, *Artibus Asiae* 34 (1972): 115–18, including curriculum vitae and bibliography. On Ecke's role in Peking, see also Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas*, 68, passim.

⁶⁸ *IBD*, 2: 319–20; *Contemporary Authors*, vols. 61–64 (1976), 198; see also David R. Knechtges, "Hans H. Frankel, Teacher and Scholar"; Stephen Owen, "Hans Frankel, the Gentle Revolutionary"; and Knechtges, "Partial List of the Writings of Hans H. Frankel," *T'ang Studies* 13 (1995): 1–11.

⁶⁹ *IBD*, 2: 454; see also the obituary by Herbert Franke, *ZDMG* 102 (1952): 1–9, the bibliography compiled by E. B. Ceadel, "Published Works of the Late Professor Gustav Haloun

(12 Jan. 1898–24 Dec. 1951)," *Asia Major*, n.s., 3 (1953): 107–8; and Walravens, *Friedrich Ernst August Krause*, 11–15.

⁷⁰ This is the information given in the obituary (with bibliography) by Hartmut Walravens, *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 159–60 (1996): 13.

⁷¹ Obituary by Walravens (see previous note), 13–14; *Who's Who of American Women*, 5th ed. (Chicago: Marquis, 1968–69), 674; *Who's Who in the West*, 15th ed. (Chicago: Marquis, 1976–77), 404; further information from the Office of Personnel Services, University of Washington.

⁷² See the obituaries by Richard C. Rudolph, *Oriens Extremus* 9 (1962): 1–5 (including bibliography), and Alexander

Walter Liebenthal (1886–1982), a specialist on Buddhism, began his scholarly career only after World War I and two years as a prisoner of war in France. After his return to Berlin in 1920 he, in 1928, began a systematic study of Pali, Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese at Berlin University and other German universities offering Indological studies, culminating in his receipt of the Ph.D. from Breslau (Wrocław) University in 1933. In the same year he emigrated to China and began his work as an assistant at the Sino-Indian Institute of Yen-ching University in Peking (1934–35). In 1935 he was appointed lecturer in Sanskrit and German at Peking University. After the Japanese invasion in 1937, he followed the university in its removal to Changsha and Kunming. From 1946 to 1952 he again worked in Peking; 1952–60 he taught at Viśvabharatī University at Śantiniketan. He went to Jerusalem as a visiting professor (1960) and also to Paris (1960–61); finally, he became Honorary Professor at Tübingen, where he taught 1964–67.⁷³

Rudolf Loewenthal (or Löwenthal; 1904–96), who received his Ph.D. in journalism at Berlin University in 1933, emigrated to Peking where he joined the faculty of Yen-ching University (1934–47) as a lecturer in journalism. He also had contacts with the German Sinologists in Peking and provided them with translations of Russian scholarship.⁷⁴ In 1947 he moved to the United States (naturalized 1957) where he worked as a teaching assistant and research associate at Cornell University (1947–53). Later he became an instructor at Georgetown University (1953–59) and ultimately left academia to work for industrial companies. He wrote a number of works on the development of the press in China, especially the religious (Catholic, Mohammedan, Buddhist, Jewish) periodical press, and published substantial works on the Chinese Jews. In addition, he published Russo-Islamic and Sino-Islamic studies, compiled bibliographies and prepared translations of Russian scholarship, and wrote on various Central Asiatic subjects.⁷⁵

Otto John Maenchen-Helfen (or Otto Mänchen-Helfen; 1894–1969),⁷⁶ an Austrian born in Vienna, received his Ph.D., with a work on the *Shan-hai ching*, from Leipzig University in 1923. He lived as a private scholar in Vienna until 1927, when he moved to Moscow, where he headed the sociological-anthropological division of the Marx-Engels-Institute. In 1929, he undertook archeological expeditions into remote Central Asian regions of the Soviet Union, northwestern Mongolia, Nepal, Kashmir, and Afghanistan. From 1930 to 1933 he lived in Berlin and became habilitated; in 1933 he rejected a teaching position when asked to join the "NS-Dozentenbund" ("National Socialist Lecturer Association"). Instead he returned to Vienna where in 1938, after a second habilitation, he began teaching at the university as an unsalaried lecturer. The *Anschluss* in the same year forced him to leave again, now to the United States. Here he taught as a visiting lecturer (beginning in 1939) and professor (1942–47) of Oriental studies at Mills College in Oakland, California. From 1947 to his retirement in 1962 he was lecturer (1947–48) and then professor of art history at Berkeley. From 1962 he served as co-editor of the *Central Asiatic Journal*. Maenchen is best known for his complex works on the Huns and other Eurasian peoples; his unfinished magnum opus, *The World of the Huns*, was published posthumously in 1973. His command of languages (reading and speaking fluently Latin, Greek, the Romance languages, German, English, Russian, and to a certain degree, Chinese, Japanese, Mongolian, and Hungarian) allowed him to draw upon the broadest variety of sources; this he combined with an extensive knowledge of art history and the archeological record.⁷⁷

Franz Michael (1907–92) studied Law at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University and Chinese at the Seminar für orientalische Sprachen in Berlin, 1928–30. After obtaining his diploma in 1930 he went to Freiburg University to study political science and law; here, he

Wayman, *Artibus Asiae* 25 (1962): 193–94, as well as Hartmut Walravens's "Ergänzungen zum Schriftenverzeichnis von Prof. Ferdinand Lessing," *Oriens Extremus* 22 (1975): 49–58 (including bibliography and an early curriculum vitae, written by Lessing after 1933); *IBD*, 2: 712. See also note 25 above.

⁷³ See *Sino-Indian Studies*, vol. V, parts 3 & 4 (1957): *Liebenthal Festschrift*, ed. Kshitit Roy, vii–ix (including bibliography to 1957); *Kürschners Deutscher Gelehrten-Kalender*, 14th ed. (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1983), 2497; *IBD*, 2: 727.

⁷⁴ See Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas*, 121, 136, 145.

⁷⁵ *DAS*, 6th ed. (1974), 1: 383. For an obituary by Michael Pollak, together with a bibliography of Loewenthal's writings, compiled by Hartmut Walravens, see *Monumenta Serica* 45

(1997): 415–37; see also *The Sino-Judaic Bibliographies of Rudolf Loewenthal*, ed. Michael Pollak (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, in association with the Sino-Judaic Institute, Palo Alto, 1988), "Introduction," vii–xiii.

⁷⁶ See note 26 above.

⁷⁷ *IBD*, 2: 761; *Contemporary Authors*, vol. 109 (1983), 294; *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (New York: James T. White & Co.), vol. 54 (1973), 550; Herbert Franke in *Neue deutsche Biographie* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, vol. 15 [1987]), 636. For obituaries see Money Hickman, *Oriental Art*, n.s., 17 (1971): 183, and Robert Göbl, *Central Asiatic Journal* 13 (1969): 75–77; for a bibliography, see Charles King, "The Huns and Central Asia: A Bibliography of Otto J. Maenchen-Helfen," *Central Asiatic Journal* 40 (1996): 178–87.

received his Dr. jur. in 1933. Concurrently, he worked as a Deputy District Attorney and Judge in the civil service of Baden (1931–33). Although appointed as an attaché to the German foreign service in 1933, he was dismissed because of his Jewish origins and emigrated in the same year to China. From 1934 to 1938 he taught at National Chekiang University in Hangchow (going with the university on the inland march after the Japanese invasion); in 1938 he went to the United States (naturalized 1944) where he became a research associate at Johns Hopkins University. In 1942 he was appointed to set up the U.S. Army Asian language program at the University of Washington, where he also became assistant professor of Far Eastern history and government, being promoted to associate professor in 1943 and professor in 1946. From 1947 to 1962 he was assistant and then acting director of the Far Eastern and Russian Institute; he also served as chairman of the Modern Chinese History Project. In 1964 he moved to George Washington University, Washington, D.C. A professor of Chinese history and government, he became associate director of the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies (1964–69), later director of the institute and of the National Defense Education Center (1969–72). From 1972 until his retirement in 1977 he was professor of history and international affairs and served as chairman of the research colloquium on modern China and Asia. His earlier works deal with late imperial Chinese political history (*Der Streit um die Mandschurei; The Origin of Manju Rule in China*); later he co-authored the three-volume work, *The Taiping Rebellion: History and Documents*, before concentrating his research on contemporary Chinese politics.⁷⁸

John Mish (1909–83), born as Johannes Misch in Bismarckhütte (present-day Hajducki Wielkie, near Chorzów, Poland), studied classical philology and law at the University of Breslau (Wrocław) and, from 1931, Sinology and Manchu at the Seminar für orientalische Sprachen and at Friedrich-Wilhelms University, Berlin. In 1934 he received his Ph.D. in Sinology with a linguistics disser-

tation, with Manchu studies as his minor. He taught at the Warsaw Oriental Institute from 1934 to 1939. Later, he taught German and English at Markaziyah College in Baghdad (1940–41) and worked as an intelligence officer on China for the Indian government (1941–46) in Bombay. In 1946 he became director of the Oriental Division of the New York Public Library where he built an outstanding collection on East Asian studies. From 1955 he served concurrently as director of the Slavonic Division; he retired in 1978. An expert in Manchu studies, he also received scholarly appointments at the Asia Institute (1946–51), Dropsie College (1961–63), Seton Hall University (1963–76), Fordham University (1967–69), and Barnard College (1970–73).⁷⁹

Hugo Munsterberg (or Münsterberg; 1916–95), son of a German father⁸⁰ and an American mother, came to the United States in 1935 where he received his B.A. at Harvard College (1938) and his Ph.D. at Harvard University (1942). His dissertation resulted in *Chinese Buddhist Bronzes*, one of more than twenty-five books he authored. He worked as a lecturer in art history (1941–42) at Wellesley College, before he joined the U.S. Army for four years (1942–46). He became assistant professor and later associate professor of art history at the University of Michigan (1946–52) and professor of art history at International Christian University, Tokyo (1952–56). He then taught as a lecturer in art history at Hunter College, New York (1956–57), before he became professor of art history at the State University of New York at New Paltz (1958–78). After his retirement in 1979, he taught as visiting professor at Bard College and Parsons School of Design until 1991.⁸¹

Erwin Reifler (1903–65), an Austrian from Vienna, studied Chinese at the University of Vienna and was editor of the Chinese News Agency for Europe (in Berlin)

⁷⁸ *IBD*, 2: 815–16; obituary by Marie-Luise Näth, *The China Quarterly* 138 (1994): 513–16; *Who's Who in the South and Southwest*, 15th ed. (Wilmette, Ill.: Marquis, 1976–77), 525; personal notes and papers by Franz Michael (to 1965, five boxes) in the archives of the University of Washington. For his bibliography to 1963, see Gerald Stourzh, "Bibliographie der deutschsprachigen Emigration in den Vereinigten Staaten, 1933–1963: Geschichte und Politische Wissenschaft," Teil II und Nachtrag, *Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien* 11 (1966): 282–83. According to *IBD*, a full bibliography of Michael's works to 1979 may be found in the archives of the Research Foundation for Jewish Immigration, New York.

⁷⁹ *DAS*, 8th ed. (1982), 3: 385; *A Biographical Directory of Librarians in the United States and Canada*, 5th ed. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1970), 762; Martin Gimm, "Zum (Heisei tokubuh) Jakon gosai kooli hacin, eine nachgelassene Schrift von John L. Mish," *Aetas Manjurica* 3 (1992): 150–51 (including bibliographical information on Mish's Manchu studies). For obituaries, see *JAS* 53 (1984): 615 (by David H. Stam); the *New York Times* of Aug. 28, 1983; and the *New York Times Biographical Service*, vol. 14 (1983), 972.

⁸⁰ His father, Oscar Münsterberg (died 1919), published the books *Japanische Kunstgeschichte* (1904) and *Chinesische Kunstgeschichte* (1910).

⁸¹ *IBD*, 2: 840; *Contemporary Authors*, New Revision Series, vol. 2 (1981), 499; *Who's Who in American Art*, 20th ed. (1993–94), 837; see also the obituary by Elizabeth Brotherton, *Archives of Asian Art* 48 (1995): 100–101.

1927–28. Having received a degree in political science from the University of Vienna in 1931 with a dissertation on "State and Administration in Ancient China," he went to Shanghai, initially as a businessman, in 1932. Here he became assistant to the Austrian League of Nations advisor (1932) and professor of German at Chiao-fung University (1932–37). After the Japanese invasion he went to Hong Kong where he taught Chinese and German (1938–40); later he returned to Shanghai and became professor of German and Latin at the National Medical College (1940–41) and at the Sino-French University (1941–42). Because his father-in-law, Mendel Brown, was the rabbi of the Sephardic Synagogue, Reifler was closely connected to the Shanghai Jewish community. From 1943 to 1947 he was professor of Sinology at the (French Catholic) Université l'Aurore. In 1947 he traveled to the United States and, with the help of Karl August Wittfogel, found a position as visiting professor (1947) and then associate professor (1948) of Chinese language in the Far Eastern and Russian Department at the University of Washington; in 1955 he became professor of Chinese language. Reifler worked on linguistic, mainly semantic, problems, engaged in a machine translation project, and extensively studied the ancient measuring systems of various civilizations.⁸²

Alfred Salmony (1890–1958) studied art history and archeology in Bonn (1912–14) and Vienna (1919–20) and received his Ph.D. with a dissertation on "Europa-Ostasien Skulpturenvergleich" from Bonn. From 1920 to 1924 he was curator at the Museum für ostasiatische Kunst, Cologne, and from 1925 to 1933 assistant director of the museum. At the same time, he lectured at Cologne University and served as co-editor of *Artibus Asiae* (1924–33; since 1946, editor-in-chief). In 1926 he organized the Cologne Exhibition of Asiatic Art. Research and lecture trips led him to the United States (1926–27, 1932–33), to the Soviet Union (1928–34), and to China and Japan (1929–30). He emigrated to France in 1933 where he joined the Museums Citroën and Cernuschi, Paris (1933–34). In March 1934 he left France for the

United States where he taught as lecturer on fine arts at Mills College, California (1934–37). After a short stay as lecturer at the University of Washington (1937), he moved to the Institute of Fine Arts at New York University. Here he worked as a lecturer (1938–47; 1938–41 concurrently lecturer at Vassar College; 1944 at Wellesley College), associate professor (1947–53) and professor (from 1953). Salmony's eleven books and numerous articles cover a wide range of Asian, especially Chinese art: he wrote on painting, jade, sculpture, bronzes, archeological finds from tombs, ceramics, etc. His extensive library, including a most important collection of Russian scholarship on art and archeology, is now housed as the "Alfred Salmony Memorial Library of Asian Studies" at the Institute of Fine Arts.⁸³

Bruno Schindler (1882–1964) was a Jewish publisher from Leipzig who initiated, edited, and published *Asia Major* (from 1923) as a journal for Asian studies; it soon became the most important journal for Central, East, and Southeast Asian studies in Germany, and from its beginning—with the *Hirth Anniversary Volume*—the journal was international and mostly in English. Schindler had studied history as well as political and constitutional law at the universities of Berlin and Breslau. From 1907 to 1910 he worked in various English libraries and became the secretary of the orientalist M. Gaster. From 1910 to 1912 he studied Oriental languages in Leipzig. He went to China in 1912 where he observed the problems of the Chinese Jews in K'ai-feng; in Shanghai, he helped to organize the Jewish community. Before World War I he returned to Germany; in 1919, he submitted his dissertation "Das Priestertum im alten China" to the University of Leipzig. In addition to *Asia Major*, he served as a co-founder of several other journals, among them *Islamica*, *Caucasica*, *Armeniaca*. His emigration in 1933 to England brought *Asia Major* abruptly to an end. In England he and his wife co-founded and headed the Regents Park School for Jewish children. In 1936 he joined Taylor's Foreign Press, and in 1939 the Lund Humphries publishing house. Having started *Asia Major* in 1923 with a dedication to Friedrich Hirth, Schindler in 1949 revived his journal in England with

⁸² DAS, 4th ed. (1964), 3: 204; *Who's Who in American Education*, 21st ed. (Nashville: Who's Who in American Education Inc., 1963–64), 1141–42; personal papers (9 boxes) in the archives of the University of Washington; transcript of an interview with Henrietta Reifler by Isabel Stusser (April 16, 1987), kept in the archives of the University of Washington. Walravens, "Deutsche Ostasienwissenschaften und Exil," 239, notes a number of his linguistic publications; his work on measures was published posthumously in microfiche form under H. J. Griffin and Erwin Reifler, *A Comparative History of Metrology* (London/New York: Mansell, 1984).

⁸³ *IBD*, 2: 1011; obituaries in *College Art Journal* 18 (1958): 77; by John F. Haskins in *Artibus Asiae* 21 (1958): 285–86; A. B. Griswold in *Revue archéologique* 1 (1960): 104–6 (with bibliographical notes); and Gustav Ecke in *Ars Orientalis* 4 (1961): 453. The *New York Times* published an obituary on May 3, 1958. The most comprehensive material on Salmony may be found in Hartmut Walravens, *Bibliographien zur ostasiatischen Kunstgeschichte in Deutschland*, 2: *Alfred Salmony* (Hamburg: C. Bell Verlag, 1984).

the first number dedicated to Henri Maspero.⁸⁴ In addition to the journal, he was responsible for the publication of many books in Oriental and Slavonic studies at Lund Humphries.⁸⁵

Conrad Max Schirokauer (1929–) came with his family—his father Arnold Curt Schirokauer (1899–1954) was a professor of German philology—via Italy (1935) to the United States in 1939. Here he received his university education at Yale (B.A. 1952) and Stanford (M.A. 1952, Ph.D. 1960). 1960–62 he taught history at Swarthmore College; he later became assistant professor (1962), associate professor (1970) and professor of history (1977) at City College, New York. His research centers on Sung Neo-Confucianism.⁸⁶

Ernst Schwarz (1916–), fled as a Jewish student from Vienna to Shanghai in 1938, where he began to learn Chinese and worked mainly as a sports instructor. After the Japanese capitulation, he moved to Nanking in the autumn of 1945, where he worked at the National Library, lived in a Buddhist monastery, served as a secretary in the Ministry of Education, and taught in the Foreign Languages Department at Chinling University, after the university had returned from Chengtu in autumn of 1946.⁸⁷ From 1947 to 1950 he was a secretary in the Austrian diplomatic service in Nanking; later, he translated for the Chinese Foreign Language Press. He taught English language and literature at Hangchow University from 1958 to 1960 when he left for the German Democratic Republic. From 1961 to 1969 he was research assistant (“Wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter”) and from 1969 to 1970 lecturer at Humboldt University, Berlin, where he also received his Ph.D. in 1965. In 1973–74, 1975–76, 1981, and 1988 he gave lecture series on China at the Diplomatic Academy, Vienna. His books in-

clude translations of traditional Chinese philosophy and poetry.⁸⁸

(Ernst Julius) Walter Simon (1893–1981), born into a Jewish family, studied Romance and classical philology at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University (Berlin), 1911–14. After his military service in the German army (1915–18), he received his Ph.D. in 1919 and a diploma in library science in 1920. In 1921–22, he served at the library of Kiel University before returning to Berlin University where he served as librarian until his dismissal in 1935. Soon after receiving his Ph.D., he began to study Sinology and a number of Asian languages under Otto Franke. From 1926, along with his work in the library, he taught Far Eastern linguistics at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University as unsalaried lecturer (from 1926) and as *Außerordentlicher Professor* of Sinology (from 1930); he also was co-editor of the *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*. In 1932–33 he went as an exchange librarian to the Peking National Library. In 1934 his right to hold lectures (“*venia legendi*”) was withdrawn, and in the following year he was dismissed from his position in the library; in 1936 he emigrated to the United Kingdom where he became a faculty member at the University of London (1936–60). From 1936 he taught as a lecturer, and from 1947 as professor in Chinese, Japanese, Tibetan, and Manchu at the School of Oriental and African Studies. After his retirement, he taught as visiting professor at the Universities of Toronto (1961–62), Canberra (1962, 1970), Tokyo, and Melbourne (1970). From

⁸⁴ For a bibliography and an index of the *Asia Major*, see Hartmut Walravens, *Asia Major (1921–1975): Eine deutsch-britische Ostasienzeitschrift; Bibliographie und Register* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1997).

⁸⁵ *IBD*, 2: 1032; obituaries by Walter Simon, *Asia Major*, n.s., 11 (1965): 93–95; Erich Haensch, “Bruno Schindler und die alte *Asia Major*,” *Oriens Extremus* 12 (1965): 7–9; and Paul Demiéville, *T'oung Pao* 51 (1964): 262.

⁸⁶ *IBD*, 2: 1033; *DAS*, 8th ed. (1984), 1: 673; *Contemporary Authors*, vol. 107 (1983), 461.

⁸⁷ As other institutions, the American Christian Chinling 金陵 University (founded 1888, dissolved 1952) had been moved westward after the Japanese invasion in 1937. The university was located in Chengtu from early 1938 to summer 1946. See *Nan-ching ta-hsüeh ta-shih-chi* 南京大學大事記 1902–1988 (Nanking: Nan-ching ta-hsüeh ch'u-pan-she, 1989), 189–226.

⁸⁸ Biographical data for Schwarz, who lives in Austria today, are published by Thomas Vašek, “Unser Mann in Ostberlin,” in the Austrian magazine *Profil*, no. 44 (October 31, 1994), 46–50, dealing with Schwarz’s long-term service for the German Democratic Republic Ministry of State Security; a confirming article, “Sittenbild der Republik,” by Robert Buchacher and Thomas Vašek appeared in issue no. 3 (January 15, 1996), 34–37, of the same magazine. Additional information which I have received from Schwarz includes a personal “statement” (“*Erklärung*”) and the text of an autobiographical radio essay that was broadcast by the *Süddeutscher Rundfunk* (Stuttgart) on October 24, 1994. According to his “statement,” in 1960 he became labeled a “bourgeois” and could leave only for the German Democratic Republic: “an exit permit to Austria, a capitalist state, I would never have been granted.” His unpublished dissertation “*Zur Problematik der Qu Yuan Forschung*” is noted by Thomas Kampen, “DDR-Dissertationen und Habilitationen über China (1949–1990),” *Asien* 60 (1996): 170. The data on his teaching at the Diplomatic Academy, Vienna, have been provided to me by Bernhard Führer, London, who has received written information from this institution.

1964 he was chairman of the editorial board and from 1965 to 1975 editor of *Asia Major*. In his books and articles he specialized in Chinese and Tibetan linguistics.⁸⁹

Rolf Alfred Stein (1911–), studied in Berlin with Otto Franke before emigrating to France in 1933. In Paris he continued his studies in Chinese, Japanese, and Tibetan at the *École nationale des langues orientales vivantes*, the *École pratique des hautes études*, and the *Collège de France*. He became a French citizen in 1939 and soon after was mobilized and sent to Indochina. In the military, he also served as a Chinese and Japanese interpreter. A member of the *École française d'Extrême-Orient*, he was denied his salary by the Vichy government; he was fully reinstated in his position in 1946. In the same year, he went to China where he stayed for three years in Peking, continuing his studies in Tibetan, Mongol, and the aboriginal cultures of the Sino-Tibetan borderland. In 1949 he became professor of Chinese at the *École nationale des langues orientales vivantes*, and in 1951 received an appointment in the Fifth Section of the *École pratique des hautes études*, where he worked until 1974; concurrently, in 1966 he became professor at the *Collège de France*. His work at the leading French academic institutions as well as his extensive bibliography display a unique expertise in Tibetan language and culture ("high" and popular), Bon religion, Tantrism, Taoism, and Chinese cosmology.⁹⁰

Diether von den Steinen (1903–54)⁹¹ had left Germany for China as early as 1927, a year after completing his dissertation in Berlin. He taught at Sun Yat Sen

University (1927–29), Tsing Hua University (1929–36), and the Changsha branch of the *Deutsche Akademie* (1937). In 1938 he went to Berkeley where he was appointed lecturer in Oriental languages and in 1940 became curator of the Chinese-Japanese library collection. He is best known for an important article on Ts'ao Ts'ao's poetry.⁹²

Ilza Veith (1915–) studied at the medical schools in Geneva and Vienna (1934–36) before she emigrated to the United States in 1937 (naturalized 1945). At Johns Hopkins University she received her M.A. in 1944 and her Ph.D. (with a dissertation on the *Huang-ti nei-wen su-ching*) in 1947. From the School of Medicine at Juntendo University, Tokyo, she received the degree *Igaku hakase* (doctor of medicine) in 1975. From 1947 to 1957 she was a consultant in Oriental medicine at the Armed Forces Medical Library, Washington; she became lecturer (1949), assistant professor (1953) and professor (1957–63) in the history of medicine at the University of Chicago. She was visiting professor at the Menninger School of Psychiatry in 1963 and worked from 1964 until her retirement in 1979 as professor of the history of medicine and as vice-chairman of the department at the San Francisco Medical Center of the University of California; there, she also served as professor of the history of psychiatry (1967–79). She specialized in the history of Chinese medicine and its classical works.⁹³

Hellmut Wilhelm (1905–90) was born in Tsingtao, son of the missionary and Sinologist Richard Wilhelm. After World War I, he assisted his father at the newly founded China Institute in Frankfurt am Main. In 1928 he passed the State Examination in law but then decided to continue his father's work. In 1932 he received his Ph.D. in Sinology from the Friedrich-Wilhelms University in Berlin, where he studied with Otto Franke and wrote a dissertation on Ku Yen-wu ("Gu Ting Lin, der Ethiker"). He left Germany in 1933 to become lecturer (1933–37), and, after some years of private research, professor of German language and literature at National Peking University (1946–48). During his first year in Peking, he initially served also as director of the Deutschland-Institut.⁹⁴ Lectures that he presented to the German community formed the basis of some of his later books,

⁸⁹ *IBD*, 2: 1085; *Who's Who* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973–74), 2966; C. R. Bawden, "Ernst Julius Walter Simon 1893–1981," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 67 (1981): 459–77; for his bibliography to 1963, see Bruno Schindler, "List of Publications by Professor W. Simon," *Asia Major*, n.s., 10 (1963): 1–8. Felber, "Zwischen Anpassung und Widerstand," 82, gives the following diverging dates: 1929 lecturer, 1932 professor.

⁹⁰ Michel Strickmann, "Introduction," in Strickmann, ed., *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R. A. Stein*, vol. 1 (Brussels: Institut belge des hautes études chinoises, 1981 [Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 20]), vii–xv; for his bibliography to 1981, see xvii–xx. See also Kristofer Schipper, "The History of Taoist Studies in Europe," in *Europe Studies China: Papers from an International Conference on the History of European Sinology*, ed. Ming Wilson and John Cayley (London: Han-shan Tang Books, 1995), 481–82.

⁹¹ Walravens, "Deutsche Ostasienwissenschaften und Exil," 240, mistakenly gives 1956 as the date of von den Steinen's death; according to *The Far Eastern Quarterly* 14 (1955): 314, he died Sept. 10, 1954.

⁹² *DAS* (1942 ed.), 855; von den Steinen's position in Changsha is mentioned by Wolfgang Franke, *Im Banne Chinas*, 61. His "Poems of Ts'ao Ts'ao" appeared in *Monumenta Serica* 4 (1939): 125–81.

⁹³ *DAS*, 8th ed. (1982), 1: 792; *Who's Who in America*, 51st ed. (New Providence, N.J.: Marquis, 1997), 2: 4388.

⁹⁴ On the circumstances of his retirement from this function, see above.

among them *Die Wandlung: Acht Vorträge zum I-Ching*, the most widely read Western introduction to the *I ching*. While in Peking, he was offered a position at the University of Washington, where he was to become lecturer (1948), associate professor (1950), and professor (1953) of Chinese history. He taught until his retirement in 1971. A series of lectures that he presented between 1951 and 1967 at the Eranos Society in Ascona, Switzerland, were published as *Heaven, Earth, and Man in the Book of Changes*. Although Wilhelm taught and published on an astounding variety of topics in Chinese history and literature (in addition to his books—several of which were translated—he published about one hundred articles and more than eighty reviews), his works on the *I ching* define the core of his scholarship. With these works, he also continued the best of his father's scholarship. The names of the many distinguished scholars who received substantial parts of their Sinological education from Wilhelm testify to his importance as a teacher.⁹⁵

Karl August Wittfogel (1896–1988) studied Sinology (beginning in Leipzig, 1921), history, philosophy, sociology, economy, and geography at the universities of Leipzig, Berlin, Brünn (Brno), Wien, and Frankfurt am Main. He received his Ph.D. from Frankfurt in 1928 under the direction of the economic historian, Carl Grünberg, with a dissertation on “Die ökonomische Bedeutung der agrarischen und industriellen Produktivkräfte” which became the first chapter in his 1931 book, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft Chinas*. In 1920 he joined the German Communist Party, remaining a member until 1939, when, after the Hitler-Stalin pact, he broke with Communism. In

1925 he became affiliated with the Institut für Sozialforschung in Frankfurt am Main. Wittfogel's interest in the social and economic history of China can be traced back to 1919 when he presented six public lectures in Berlin; his first book on China was published in 1926 (*Das erwachende China*). In Germany his many articles on contemporary Chinese politics and economy (especially from 1926 to 1928) were but the smaller part of his work as a Marxist writer who publicly attacked Hitler and his party in numerous writings. In March 1933 Wittfogel was arrested while attempting to leave Germany; he served time at a number of prisons as well as in the early concentration camps of Papenburg and Lichtburg/Torgau. Released late in 1933 because of international protests and petitions, he went to England and thence to the United States. From 1934 to 1939 he worked with the International Institute of Social Research (the relocated former Frankfurt Institut für Sozialforschung), New York, and concurrently joined the Institute of Pacific Relations at Columbia University; from 1939 to 1947, following a research trip to China (1935–37), he served as director of the Chinese History Project, located at Columbia University under the joint sponsorship of both institutes. In 1947 he was appointed professor of Chinese history at the University of Washington, but was assigned only a minimum of teaching obligations so as to allow him to continue his research at Columbia. His magnum opus of 1957, *Oriental Despotism*, an analysis of the so-called Oriental “hydraulic society” and its parallels in Soviet Union political structures, became extremely influential.⁹⁶ He retired from the University of Washington in 1966.

Ernst Wolff (1910–) was born into the family of a German Jewish merchant in Tientsin. In 1928 Wolff began to study law at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University and Chinese at the Seminar für orientalische Sprachen (diploma 1930). After his first state examination in 1933 he worked at court in Berlin but because of his Jewish background was soon dismissed from public service. He went back to Tientsin and in 1936 joined the Kailang

⁹⁵ *Contemporary Authors*, vols. 5–8 (first revision, 1969), 1249; information from the Office of Personnel Services, University of Washington; “Hellmut Wilhelm, Memories and Bibliography,” *Oriens Extremus* 35 (1992): 5–34 (with contributions by David R. Knechtges, George E. Taylor, Donald W. Treadgold, Frederick W. Mote, and Herbert Franke); F. W. Mote, “Hellmut Wilhelm: A Biographical Note,” *Monumenta Serica* 29 (1970–71): iii–vi; Michael Gasster, “Hellmut Wilhelm, Sinologue,” *Chin-tai Chung-kuo shih yen-chiu t'ung-hsün* 近代中國史研究通訊 (*Newsletter for Modern Chinese History*) 8 (1989): 27–51. Earlier bibliographical accounts include “A List of Publications of Hellmut Wilhelm up to 1968,” *Monumenta Serica* 29 (1970–71): vii–xii; Hartmut Walravens, “Addenda to a List of Publications of Hellmut Wilhelm up to 1968,” *Monumenta Serica* 30 (1972–73): 634; Hartmut Walravens, “Further Addenda to a List of Publications of Hellmut Wilhelm up to 1968,” *Monumenta Serica* 32 (1976): 400–403; Ursula Richter, “In Memoriam Hellmut Wilhelm, 1905–1990,” *Chin-tai Chung-kuo shih yen-chiu t'ung-hsün* 11 (1991): 131–39.

⁹⁶ *IBD*, 2: 1253; *DAS*, 8th ed. (1982), 838; *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York: The Free Press, 1979), 18: 812–14; *Biographical Dictionary of Neo-Marxism* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1985), 431–32; G. L. Ulmen, *The Science of Society: Toward an Understanding of the Life and Work of Karl August Wittfogel* (The Hague: Mouton, 1978), including bibliography 1917–77 (pp. 509–23); obituary by Karl H. Menges, *Central Asiatic Journal* 33 (1989): 1–7. Obituaries also appeared in the *New York Times* (May 26, 1988) and in the *London Times* (June 18, 1988); see also *New York Times Biographical Service* 19 (1988): 626.

Mining company in Tangshan and Tientsin until 1951, first under British, later under Chinese leadership. In 1951 he went via Hong Kong to Tokyo where he stayed until 1959, when Franz Michael helped him to join the University of Washington. Here, he began as a research instructor in the Department of Far Eastern and Slavic Languages (1960) and worked as an assistant to Ruth Krader in the East Asian library. In 1962 he received his Master of Library Sciences degree, in 1966 his Ph.D. in Chinese literature, with a dissertation on Chou Tso-jen. From 1965, acting as the head librarian, he built up the Asian library at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Since his retirement in 1978 he lives in Seattle.⁹⁷

IV

By 1968, the definite break between those Sinologists who had left the country and those who still worked in Germany appears to have been acknowledged at last as an irreversible fact. Herbert Franke, who in the limited space of his *Sinology at German Universities* had to restrict himself to only the most important publications in the field, chose to remain silent about almost all the work of the emigrants. Although he included works written in other languages than German as long as they had been produced by scholars working at German universities, the scholarship of the emigrants was considered by another standard:

For scholars who previously worked in Germany but are now active abroad we shall cite only such works which have appeared in German.⁹⁸

This was an all too pragmatic compromise, and it was not even dictated by the title of Franke's survey. (Otherwise, why include works written in German, but not at German universities?) The delicate question of the demarcation line, now resolved by an arbitrary makeshift, was crucial for a new self-consciousness of "German" Sinology two decades after the war.

A key element in the progress from initial uncertainty to an eventual clear-cut distinction between "German" Sinology and the scholarship of the emigrants is the phenomenon that sets this field decidedly apart from

most others within the humanities: the question of re-migration after World War II. At present the most comprehensive source on German emigration between 1933 and 1945 is the *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Emigrés 1933-1945*, which is the result of a joint research project of the Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich, and the Research Foundation for Jewish Immigration, New York. With regard to the sciences and humanities, the *Dictionary* is basically restricted to those who attained the rank of professor or to outstanding researchers, that is, to the scientific and scholarly elite. As such, it includes the names of some twenty-four to twenty-five hundred individuals, most of them "full" professors. A comparison with the total number of professors at German universities in the winter semester 1930-31—4482 persons, of whom 2741 were "full" professors—shows immediately what the emigration as a whole meant to German academia. There is no doubt that in the emigration from Germany, the scholarly elite is represented disproportionately.⁹⁹

In 1984, Horst Möller, a leading scholar in the *Dictionary* project, brought attention to the previously underestimated phenomenon of re-migration. Referring to the whole of the cultural and scientific emigration, but considering only those emigrants who were born before 1908 (in Germany) and 1913 (in Austria or Czechoslovakia)—that is, those who received their professional socialization before their emigration—and who were still alive in 1948, Möller notes that almost a third of them later returned to Germany. Of these, the dominant group of nearly twenty-seven percent were scholars in the humanities.¹⁰⁰ Viewed against these numbers, Chinese studies and East Asian art history differ sharply from the overall situation in the humanities. Eduard Erkes' expectation in 1948 that some of the emigrants would return,¹⁰¹ was not fulfilled. Of all scholars who emigrated before 1945, the only one who returned during his active career (in this case: to begin his academic career) was Ernst Schwarz, who left China for the German Democratic Republic in 1960. Walter Liebenthal and Gustav Ecke went back to Tübingen and Bonn, respectively,

⁹⁷ Personal communication, October 24, 1997, at the University of Washington. Wolff's publications include *Chou Tso-jen* (New York: Twayne, 1971) and *Chinese Studies: A Bibliographic Manual* (San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1981).

⁹⁸ Franke, *Sinology at German Universities*, 31.

⁹⁹ See Horst Möller, "Wissenschaft in der Emigration: Quantitative und geographische Aspekte," *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte* 7 (1984): 1-2; see also Möller's *Exodus der Kultur: Schriftsteller, Wissenschaftler und Künstler in der Emigration nach 1933* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1984), 38-46.

¹⁰⁰ Möller, "Wissenschaft in der Emigration," 6, and *Exodus der Kultur*, 102-18.

¹⁰¹ Erkes, "Die kulturpolitische Bedeutung der deutschen Sinologie," 40.

only after their formal retirement. Again, of all Sinologists and art historians noted above, only Étienne Balazs, Wolfram Eberhard, and Hans Hermann Frankel returned for the occasional semester as visiting professors.

Three elements may have played a role here. The first is that many of the emigrants in our field were among the most innovative scholars of their time, a situation typical in a number of fields, like the social sciences, political sciences, and psychology,¹⁰² but also art history or musicology. Hence much of the creative potential within the field of Chinese studies was transferred from Germany to the United States. The names of Wittfogel and Eberhard may serve here as outstanding examples. As they and others had set themselves apart from their teachers and colleagues, they found abroad, mainly in the United States, more favorable conditions to develop their new interests and methods of scholarship.

The second element is that most of the emigrants, with the exception of Lessing and Simon, received their first appointment as professor after or through emigration. This situation differs from that of other disciplines in the humanities where the emigrants included many distinguished professors. The young field of Chinese studies, on the other hand, had just experienced its first major generation change: Richard Wilhelm had passed away in 1930, and in the following years the leading scholars Otto Franke, Alfred Forke (1867–1944), and Arthur von Rosthorn (1862–1945) retired. While many of the professors of other fields may still have felt strong ties to their former institutions and to some of their former colleagues—and also may have received more convincing invitations to return—one may consider that younger scholars, for whom political emigration had been the most decisive step in their careers, were less likely to remigrate after the war.

The third element that helps to explain the lack of remigration is the fact that a German-language environment was probably less important for scholars in East Asian studies than in other fields.

All three elements deserve further consideration, since they are crucial to an understanding of the history and even the present state of Chinese studies, and not only in Germany. We may ask, for example, what chances there were after World War II to develop broad-scale international cooperation much earlier than during the last two decades. The situation after the war could have been seen as promising indeed: in a very short time a substantial number of German scholars had found new positions at major research institutions in London, Paris, and at various places in the United States, introducing their

training and expertise to these institutions and in turn discovering and exploiting new opportunities to develop their work. Of course, deep gulfs opened up. In some cases, former National Socialist activists in Germany had directly taken over the actual or prospective seats of their emigrated—superior—colleagues, and one can only speculate how many of those who had been forced into exile, waited with growing embitterment to be offered a chair. For an analytical reconstruction of early post-war German Sinology, we would need precise data on how many serious efforts were actually made to call scholars back to leading positions at German universities, and why these efforts—if they can be documented—always failed.¹⁰³ For the time being, we are not able to look into this introverted side of our history, which is certainly very personal, but must eventually be related to the institutional history of German academia: (In this context, of course, we should not forget that even Stange, once a member of the *Sturmabteilung*, was graced, after some years of a forced break, with a professorship at the University of Göttingen in 1953,¹⁰⁴ to say nothing of “ordinary” party members at other places.)

As a principle, emigration and non-emigration were not in themselves standards to stigmatize or ennoble a scholar, and we know of enduring relationships, even friendships across this borderline, which could have served as the basis for much more intensive cooperation than actually took place. It is perhaps not surprising that the first major project of international cooperation in European Sinology, the *Sung Project*, was initiated by the emigrant Étienne Balazs. I would suggest that even today a state-of-the-field report on German Sinology should include consideration of missed opportunities and the resultant consequences for post-war development of Chinese studies in Germany.

The question of the language environment, which may have played a role in the decision of emigrants not

¹⁰³ Bawden, “Ernst Julius Walter Simon,” 468, mentions that in 1946 and 1947 Simon “was offered the Chair of Sinology at the University of Berlin, which was situated in the Soviet sector of the city, but he declined. Refusal of this offer may not have taken much consideration: there is no mention of the circumstances in his correspondence with the School which I have seen, and knowledge of the offer comes from a private communication.”

¹⁰⁴ According to *Kürschners Deutscher Gelehrten-Kalender*, 12th ed. (1976), 3100, Stange had held no academic position between 1946 and 1953 (see also the 1954 ed., column 2282). His status since 1953 was that of a “supernumerary professor” (“außerplanmäßiger Universitätsprofessor”); he was never granted “full” professorship.

¹⁰² Möller, “Wissenschaft in der Emigration,” 7.

to return to their former places, is a delicate one, since it is immediately related to our present situation. There can be little doubt that in our field English has become the single Western *lingua franca*. During the last decade, the importance of English has been enhanced through various strong impacts, including the growing number of young scholars in the United States, among them many Chinese, who have no academic ties to French or German Sinology; the growing stature of English in Europe, and the importance of “English-speaking” Hong Kong as a middle ground between China and the West.

And still, despite this combination of powerful impulses toward English as our common language, we should not forget how dramatically the emigration of German scholars sixty years ago reduced the former importance of the German language in East Asian studies. When we examine the chronological bibliographies of the emigrants listed above, we can see that these distinguished scholars left not only a geographical place. They also left their former language behind, in teaching and in writing. Since at that historical moment German Sinology was still in the initial stage of its institutional development, it lacked the “critical mass” of teachers and talent to balance these grave losses. As a result, there is no comparison between the amount and overall significance of scholarship that the emigrants published in English (and to a lesser degree in French) on the one hand, and contemporary German language contributions on the other. This observation, of course, does not mean to disparage those outstanding works written in German—e.g., Otto Franke’s monumental *Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches*—contemporary with the English publications of the emigrants. But it indicates that at the time of their publication, these works—viewed from an international perspective—were relatively diminished in terms of their own language context and support and instead were exposed to the growing pressure of a strong and unprecedented body of writings in English: the works of the emigrants. Thereafter, the full impact of this historical shift developed continuously through the multiplication of scholarship in the work of the emigrants’ students.

With respect to the lasting consequences that the years 1933–45 eventually inflicted upon German Sinology, it should be remembered that whatever may be regarded as a loss from a German perspective was, on the other hand, an enormous gain for Chinese studies at all those institutions where the emigrants were welcomed—in particular in the United States, but also in England and France. Considering the impact of the emigration on the exile countries, the boost given to Chinese studies is comparable with that in other fields of the humanities, and in the natural as well as the social and political sciences. The great development of American Sinology after World War II is inseparable from the engagement of the emigrants—now immigrants—who in turn received new opportunities to unfold their creativity under favorable conditions. And as the emigrants changed their new surroundings, their scholarship was also challenged and inspired by the new impulses they were now free to absorb. In the 1920s and very early 1930s, foreign students like István Balázs or George A. Kennedy (1901–60)¹⁰⁵ went to Berlin and other German universities to receive their Sinological education. After 1933, it was the teachers themselves who moved, to find their students abroad. Today, German students in Chinese studies are to be found in Leiden and in Paris, in London and in Cambridge, as well as at North American universities, sometimes close to their own lost tradition.

¹⁰⁵ Kennedy came in 1932 from Shanghai to Berlin where he studied for four semesters at the University before he took the diploma examinations in Chinese and Japanese at the Seminar für orientalische Sprachen; see the curriculum vitae (“Lebenslauf”) included in his dissertation *Die Rolle des Geständnisses im chinesischen Gesetz* (Berlin: privately published[?], 1939). According to his obituary in the *New York Times* (August 17, 1960), 31, he received his Ph.D. in Berlin in 1934; in *Who was Who in America*, vol. 4 (Chicago: Marquis, 1961–68), 520, the date is given as 1937, i.e., after he had joined Yale University in 1936; this latter date is also noted in the “Chronology of George A. Kennedy” in the *Selected Works of George A. Kennedy*, ed. Tien-yi Li (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1964), 511.

