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In 1792, the German essayist Karl Philipp Moritz, one of the leading writers of the proto-Romantic *Sturm und Drang* movement, published his travelogue of several journeys to different parts of Italy and Germany. Moritz described the moment of astonishment that came over him when he finally reached the Saint Gotthard Pass. He had hoped to arrive in Italy by the next day upon descending from Saint Gotthard, but although he stood there at a height of over two thousand meters, he could not spot anything similar to what he had expected to see. Instead of a “paradisiac land,” he saw only “bare rocks, a simple inn, far and wide no sight or trace of vegetation, and I was freezing in my German overcoat in the middle of the summer . . .”1 Deeply disappointed, Moritz asked a Capuchin friar, whom he met on the mountain, where the “entrance to Italy” was. The monk replied laconically with a Latin phrase: “Hic est Italia, hic est Italia.” Moritz was bewildered by the apparent tautology of this answer, but suddenly a distinction came into his mind, namely the difference between “the Italy of the geographers” and “the Italy of the poets.”2 In other words, Moritz distinguished between the political construct of Italy, with its artificial borders, and the literary or philosophical image of Italy. As one of the forefathers of German Romanticism, Moritz caught a glimpse of the modern concept of “the nation.” At the exact time when France constituted itself as a modern nation-state, Germans and Italians were still uncertain about what the terms “Germany” and “Italy” actually meant and which regions and populations of central and southern Europe should be part of those “countries.”

Scholars of modern European history time and again have described both Italy and Germany as “late-coming nation-states.”3 Not least with regard to the mutual influence and interconnectedness of the German and Italian nationalist movements in the nineteenth century, traditional historiography has emphasized the apparent parallels in the processes of nation-building, as well as the historical roles of “great men” such as Ernst Moritz Arndt and Giuseppe Mazzini, Otto von Bismarck and Camillo Benso di Cavour. This tradition was interrupted by World War I, only...
to be revived and politicized as the infamous Rome-Berlin Axis in the wake of the World War II and until the German occupation of Italy in 1943. During the 1950s, after a period of profound disruption and deep resentments on both sides, the concept of a parallel history came back to life in both Germany and Italy as an expression of shared European experiences. Bearing in mind that the first postwar European institutions, above all the European Economic Community founded in 1957, emerged in the same period, we can see that the detection of similarities and shared heritages was based mainly on political rather than on scholarly deliberations. Hence, it is not surprising that the founding document of the Treaty of Rome of 1957 starts with the assurance “to establish the foundations of an ever closer union among the European peoples” and to foster “the economic and social progress of their countries by common action in eliminating the barriers which divide Europe.”4 As a result, the strong emphasis on the historical and political commonalities, not only between Italy and Germany but among all of the European nations, concealed the social, cultural, and economic differences between them. However, in the 1950s and 1960s, most historians, as well as the European public, had not forgotten what had heinously divided Europe only twenty years earlier. In contrast to a unifying project, which Mazzini already had envisioned as the “United States of Europe,” historiography and popular opinion tended to perceive European history as a juxtaposition of distinct national histories.5 In West Germany, Fritz Fischer and Hans-Ulrich Wehler became well known for their thesis of a “special path” (Sonderweg) of German history, according to which Nazism was the product of the “partial modernization” of Prussian militarism. In Italy, the Roman historian Renzo De Felice and his disciples began to historicize Fascism in a similar way, trying to insert it into an alleged normality of Italian history and underlining its continuities with liberal Italy in order to deconstruct the master narrative of the Italian resistance.

**Comparative and Integrated History**

Particularly after the turn of the millennium, historians such as Sabine Behrenbeck, Gabriele Clemens, Christof Dipper, Patrizia Dogliani, Oliver Janz, Marco Meriggi, Alexander Nützenadel, Ilaria Porciani, Wolfgang Schieder, Pierangelo Schiera, and Edoardo Tortarolo initiated comparative studies on nineteenth- and twentieth-century Italy and Germany, highlighting the social, economic, cultural, or political fabric of these two national communities from a comparative perspective.6 These pioneering works corrected the traditional image created by both the “parallel history” and the “special path” thesis, offering a new, more nuanced view

of the fundamental differences in the processes of Italian and German nation-building. However, German and Italian comparative history still lacks a perspective that questions the story of two separate but allegedly homogenous entities.

Therefore, the volume at hand adopts the approach of an “integrated history” in order to deconstruct the essentialism of national history. The concept of an “integrated history” has been developed first and foremost in two separate historiographical fields: East Asian History on the one hand and the history of the Holocaust on the other. While historians of East Asia have to cope with a great variety of cultural, social, and religious reference systems, scholars of the Holocaust, most prominently Saul Friedländer, have tried to “integrate” the Jewish perspective into a narrative that has been dominated for decades by the perspective of the perpetrators. Building upon the results of these two relatively new historiographical traditions, this volume not only incorporates religious and cultural diversity but takes the multilayered texture of Italian and German society as the basis of research. Two aspects are at the center: while the gender perspective rectifies a still male-dominated historiography of nationalism, the Jewish perspective focuses on the multireligious structure of both societies and highlights the mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion of minorities.

Hardly any attempt has been made up until now to employ methods of gendered or Jewish history for a comparative study of Italian and German history. In fact, both German and Italian scholars discovered the analytical category of gender very late. It was not before the 1980s that German historians became interested in the complex relationship between gender and nation, between women’s emancipation movements, nationalism, and war, thus gaining access to a large group of historical protagonists that had been ignored in relevant literature so far. In Italian historiography, this process took even longer. Only toward the end of the 1990s could a new tendency be seen to emerge, stimulated above all by the studies by Ilaria Porciani, who rejected the categorical division between public and private spheres and who, by way of contrast, emphasized the central role of women, families, and parental networks for the construction and representation of imagined national communities. Paul Ginsborg has stressed the discursive connection between gender, family, and nation, quoting Giuseppe Mazzini, according to whom families represented “the temple of the modern nation” while a woman stood at the center of the family, an angel-like figure who facilitated everyday duty and pain with a mysterious influence of grace and love.

What is true for the lack of a gendered perspective on Italian and German history applies to a Jewish perspective as well. Although the exchange and interaction between Jewish intellectuals, rabbis, communities,
and institutions in “Italy” and “Germany” dates back to the Middle Ages, transnational research so far has focused on the intersections between French-Jewish and German-Jewish history. Other recent studies have emphasized the role of German rabbis in the modernization processes of Eastern European Jewish life or have examined the migration movement of German Jews to North America after 1848. However, despite the widely spread myth of an Italian-Jewish Sonderweg, this history was always connected to that of the central European Jews. Jews originating in the German lands have been part of Italian-Jewish communities for ages. As Anna Esposito has shown, even the venerable Jewish community of Rome included German Jews since the sixteenth century. In the early modern period, as Lois Dubin has demonstrated, the port city of Trieste—belonging to the Habsburg Empire but encircled by the mainland of the Venetian Republic and Venetian Istria—also became a focal point of an emerging proto-Haskalah among urban, educated Jewish merchants. In the nineteenth century, Jewish intellectuals like Samuel David Luzzatto, who was born in Trieste and later worked as a lecturer at the famous Collegio Rabbinico Italiano in Padua, and Naphtali Herz Homberg, born in a Bohemian town near Prague and active as a schoolteacher, reformer, and writer in Trieste in the 1780s, were mediators between the two cultures. Luzzatto maintained friendly correspondence with the chief rabbi of Prague, Salomo Judah Rapoport, and with Leopold Zunz, one of the founders of the Wissenschaft des Judentums (Science of Judaism). Homberg’s books were translated into Italian and had a great impact on the reform of the Jewish school system in both Germany and Italy.

Starting from our approach of an integrated and comparative history, we purposefully take these processes of interaction and exchange between contemporary Italian and German, Italian-Jewish, and German-Jewish spheres, protagonists, and concepts under consideration. The main chronological and thematic focus of the present volume is on the period between 1800 and the crucial years of World War I, which allows for a critical and long-term reassessment of notions, discourses, and narratives concerning nation-building, nationalism, and war. The binational comparison has deliberately been inserted into and widened toward a transnational context. This includes above all the Habsburg Empire and France, whose histories are inextricably entangled with the German and Italian spheres, but it also reaches as far as North Africa when it comes to the characteristic transnational parental and commercial networks of Italian-Jewish families.

The contributions by Amerigo Caruso and Ilaria Porciani reflect from two related angles on central concepts and perspectives of this historiographical approach. Caruso makes a plea for new methodological approaches toward writing national histories, which is supported also by Porciani in the conclusion of her chapter. Caruso’s chapter discusses the impact of
comparative and transnational history on traditional interpretations. He focuses on the classical paradigm of Italian and German national “parallel history,” considering in particular more recently emerging tendencies toward gendered and Jewish perspectives. Based on significant case studies in the German and Italian contexts, Caruso presents key strategies for countering teleological approaches to the nation-state, based on a persistent methodological nationalism. His contention is that national history, particularly regarding nineteenth-century Italy and Germany, has frequently overlooked the plurality of collective identities, of multiple political and cultural affiliations in the processes of nation-building, instead of reflecting on the construction of national identities, the problem of multiple social, political, and cultural loyalties, as well as the tensions and conflicts between national emancipation and the emancipation of minorities, all of which represent central aspects discussed by the authors in this volume. He highlights the major role of transnational and nonstate elements in the process of nation-building, stressing the complexity of patriotic discourse developed by transnational elites who referred to transnationally circulating emotions, experiences, and narratives of nationalism. In order to create new approaches toward national historiography, Caruso calls for the consideration of marginal traditions, informal groups, and the plurality of social and cultural micro- and intermediate spheres that are often removed from the master narrative of nationalism and the nation-state. His chapter makes the case for combining comparative and transnational perspectives and suggests searching for new concepts of periodization in order to overcome methodological nationalism and to reassess ingrained interpretative paradigms of national histories.

Porciani emphasizes the idea that during the “long” nineteenth century, family and nation were strictly entwined in the same patriotic discourse, cutting through divisions between male and female, public and private. Nations are imagined as a family; the family is considered the seat of national honor, while the nation is seen as the benchmark of family honor. Her chapter offers an extensive historical panorama on the respective interrelations in contemporary public debates and representations. Based on a wide range of sources from juridical texts to visual evidence, the contribution adopts a transnational perspective with particular attention toward Germany, Italy, France, and the United States, stressing the importance of a broader comparison when looking at the complex interplay between family, national discourse, and national identities.

The nation is not only militarized and masculinized but also “familialized.” Porciani highlights the role of the family as a key institution of national identity, of the health of the nation, and of national morality in public discourse, as well as in the process of nation-building. The family figures as a center of gravity in patriotic painting as well as in national
pedagogics. Porciani observes the politicization of home and family affecting the emerging bourgeoisie as well as traditional dynasties forced to come to terms with the postrevolutionary political order. Further, she stresses the role of the family as a symbol of national reassurance in times of crisis like war. Within her comparative assessment, there appear many common features in a certain transnational dynamic of the “familiarization” of the nation, constructed as a “patriarchically and hierarchically organized folk family” (Ruth Roach Pierson), while at the same time she points to important differences regarding, among others, the relevance of religion or denomination to the complex relationship between nation and family, with far-reaching consequences for the family as a symbolic and social order, as in the case of the laicism of Republican France and the anti-Catholic Italian Risorgimento nationalism compared to the concept of nation within the German Kaiserreich, deeply imbued by Protestantism. For the Jewish minority, the ties between family and nation were particularly important, where national unification and Jewish emancipation were considered to develop in unison, as in the case of Italy.

**Rethinking the Age of Emancipation**

The guiding question, which is implicitly present in all the contributions to this volume, concerns social and cultural as well as political participation and exclusion in the processes of nation-building, nationalism, and war. It is this ongoing tension between those who are supposed to belong to the imagined communities and those who do not belong that strikingly characterizes the “Age of Emancipation,” whose legal reforms and egalitarian concepts eventually did not succeed in bringing equality to everyone. We understand the notion of emancipation in its characteristic complexity and consider its manifold implications reaching from legal and political equality in the strict sense toward acculturation and bourgeoisification. The latter, rather long-term and irregular historical processes represent the common focus of our rethinking the “Age of Emancipation” between 1800 and 1918.

Speaking of Jewish emancipation in the legal sense, both Italian and German Jews were emancipated in the second half of the nineteenth century (with the exception of the short period under Napoleonic occupation)—their emancipation in terms of social and cultural integration, however, remained incomplete even after the end of World War I. Civic equality had been granted to Italian Jews as early as 1848 in the Kingdom of Sardinia-Piedmont and was extended between 1859 and 1870 to the subsequently conquered territories of the Kingdom of Italy, which was proclaimed in 1861. Nevertheless, in spite of the long-lasting narrative of
an unproblematic, almost idyllic integration of Jews into Italian society.\textsuperscript{19} Recent studies have shown that liberal Italy was by no means free from antisemitism and that the alleged “success story” of Italian Jewry proves to be erroneous, especially when applying a gender perspective that considers the incomplete emancipation of Italian-Jewish women.\textsuperscript{20}

Similarly to the Italian context, German Jews too were emancipated gradually. After they had been granted civic equality in several smaller South German states at the beginning of the 1860s, the legal emancipation process was concluded with the creation of the Dual Monarchy and the foundation of the North German Confederation in 1867 in Austria and Prussia as well. Two years later, Judaism was declared equal to all other confessions in the law regarding the \textit{Gleichberechtigung der Konfessionen in bürgerlicher und staatsbürgerlicher Beziehung}. With the foundation of the Empire in 1871, it became valid in the whole of Germany.\textsuperscript{21} In Italy, it was not before 1889 that the penal code included the equality of all confessions, among them also the Jewish faith, as officially recognized and legally protected religious communities.\textsuperscript{22} Thus, the legal emancipation process for Jews was concluded both in the German and in the Italian context toward the end of the nineteenth century, while the social and cultural integration processes continued on uneven paths until far into the twentieth century. The case of Jewish women stands out, since they did not achieve equal citizenship as did their male counterparts. Their integration processes as Jews \textit{and} as women followed patterns and strategies that differed considerably from the emancipation paths of Jewish men.

In both cases, the struggle and negotiations for emancipation occurred within the framework of nation-building and were closely connected to the creation of national consciousness. What is more, they formed an essential element of the history of families, influencing attitudes of national and cultural belonging, of gender as well as religious identities. Marcella Simoni presents an intriguing example of the relationships between emancipation, family, and nation in her contribution on the Livornese Jewish family Moreno, who migrated to Tunis in 1830. Based on the papers of the Moreno family recently donated to the Livorno State Archives, Simoni looks at the interplay between nationality and religion—i.e. Italian and Jewish identities—within the evolving colonial context of fin de siècle Tunis. The story of the Moreno family represents the transnational experience of Italian Jews in the nineteenth century, which has inevitably been linked to migration.

While Simoni sets the Moreno family into a broader context of Italian-Jewish and colonial history and focuses mostly on men as agents of emancipation processes, the contribution by Giulia Frontoni analyzes the political role of upper-class women during the revolution of 1848–49 in the Italian and German states. She distills two competing concepts, the
“mother of the nation” and the “political lady,” both of which assumed a decisive role in the self-empowerment of women as political players. By integrating the religious and social background of political activists and writers who participated in national movements, Frontoni provides evidence of the widespread belief in the middle of the nineteenth century that women should help to forge the nation in a manner befitting their social status.

Angelika Schaser adds an important element to the discursive and conceptual interrelationships between emancipation, family, and nation by looking into contemporary feminist ideas of motherhood, which were supposed to reconcile family status and intellectual work. They stood in opposition to the conventional perception of motherhood as a national task and to the necessary subordination of intellectual work under family duties. Her chapter is based on an analysis of a contemporary key document in German, the book *Motherhood and Intellectual Work: A Psychological and Sociological Study*, written by two educated German-Jewish women, Adele Gerhard and Helene Simon, and published in 1901. Their survey included well-known female protagonists from all over Europe and the United States as study participants. Schaser demonstrates that in spite of the emancipatory claims of the authors, their findings eventually emphasized traditional views of gender and family orders. In fact, it was seen as risky to combine motherhood and a demanding occupation. Motherhood and raising children were interpreted as the most important national duty for women across all social classes. Hence, the welfare of the respective nation was ranked higher than the needs of (Jewish) minorities, particular families, and individuals.

Picking up especially on Frontoni’s and Schaser’s portrayal of gender roles in very diverse social and religious contexts, several chapters in this volume are concerned with issues of *religion and education*, particularly the question of how different religious backgrounds of women evoked specific gender models within the broader framework of the nation-building processes in Italy and Germany. Liviana Gazzetta underlines the fact that the Risorgimento and the later national movement in Italy had to cope and compete with the idea of a “Catholic nation.” This development allowed Protestant and Jewish women to become active and equal members of the movement. Resting upon an analysis of sources like instructional materials for young women, Gazzetta shows that in the Protestant and Jewish communities, female involvement in the Risorgimento process at the same time promoted proximity to and often involvement in the feminist movement, unlike what tended to happen in the Catholic world. In general, she concludes, Jewish and Protestant female gender roles provided women with more agency in the public sphere than the traditional or liberal Catholic models.
Sylvia Schraut, by contrast, points to the strong Protestant imprint of the German Kaiserreich. The dominant gender model there was strongly influenced by Protestant values and norms, which is why Schraut argues that the so-called “German” gender model was in fact a Protestant one. Based on a thorough examination of instruction books and reading materials from the late nineteenth century, Schraut suggests that two aspects in particular were incompatible with leading Catholic concepts: first of all, the Protestant gender model only accepted married women as full women, whereas Catholic culture knew three female gender models: the wife, the nun, and the widow. Second, the Protestant gender model drafted a female life as a life that took place first and foremost within the family, while the Catholic model ranked living in a convent much higher than mere family life. In addition, as members of a convent, women were able to practice a profession, for example as a nurse or a teacher. Gazzetta’s and Schraut’s chapters complement one another, although their results contrast somewhat: in Catholic Italy, Protestant and Jewish women were more inclined to live a self-determined life, whereas in Protestant Germany, especially Prussia, Catholicism offered alternative models of womanhood that transcended the narrow role of a mother.

The transformation of the traditional ideal of womanhood in Judaism into a modern, bourgeois one is the focus of the contributions by Philipp Lenhard and Silvia Guetta. Starting in the early modern period, Lenhard shows that traditional Judaism did not separate primarily between the private and the public sphere but between different functions in religious and professional life. Initially, Jewish women were active in business together with their husbands or fathers and took care of religious observance within the household, while studying the Torah was restricted to men. It was only in the course of the emancipation process that Jewish gender ideals “assimilated” to dominant bourgeois norms and values. On the basis of a large corpus of modern Jewish “catechisms,” Lenhard suggests that Jewish emancipation in Germany thus implied the relegation of women to the household.

Silvia Guetta takes a deeper look at the new genre of the “Jewish catechism” as well, but from an Italian-Jewish angle. The focus of her chapter is the transformation of Jewish education in Italy in the nineteenth century. As in Germany, Jewish emancipation resulted in a new self-definition as a mere “community of faith,” which was clearly distinct from an ethnic or national identity. Funneling this modern concept of a “Jewish religion” to the next generation was a central aspect of Jewish education. Guetta performs an in-depth analysis of several Jewish journals, among which L’Educatore Israelita and its successor Il Vessillo Israelitico are the most important. These and other publications shared the same agenda, namely...
teaching Jewish history and literature on a popular level in order to foster and reshape Italian-Jewish identity.

Further crucial aspects investigated by Guetta are the reform of the Jewish school system and the advocacy of a new family ideal. If the traditional Jewish community dissolved in the era of emancipation, education became indispensable. Jewish children had to learn about their religion and their origins not only in school but also at home. As a result, the Jewish mother came to be expected to pass on the torch of Judaism to her children. Modern Jewish education in both Italy and Germany thus included a reformulation of gender roles. The process of emancipation did not necessarily occasion more freedom for women.

As a matter of fact, the demands for women’s rights remained unfulfilled even after emancipation had been granted to Jews. For women, whether Jewish or not, emancipation implied civic equality and political participation. At the same time, however, the concept of women’s emancipation was associated with detachment from a traditionally given social integration, which depended on their husbands and/or families. In Italy as well as in Germany, contemporary law defined women’s status in society. The Italian Civil Code, enacted in 1865, included the autorizzazione maritale (marital authorization) set by the Piedmontese Code of 1837, which itself drew heavily on the Napoleonic Code dating back to 1804. It legally emphasized the inferiority of women to men within the family and the young nation-state, and was not abolished until the passing of the legge Sacchi in July 1919.23 In the German context, the Geschlechtsvormundschaft, i.e. the legal dependence of women on their fathers, husbands, or male relatives, existed until the end of the nineteenth century, while the eheliche Vormundschaft, whose implications were comparable to the Italian autorizzazione maritale, prevailed until far into the twentieth century.24 Against this background, emancipation meant liberation from patriarchal social orders, family constraints, and hierarchies. Men and women had defined places in the cultural construct of the bourgeois societies of the “long” nineteenth century, divided according to their status as man or woman and positioned within a strict hierarchical ranking. Thus, the demand for “women’s emancipation,” a term that had been in use throughout Europe and the United States since the beginning of the nineteenth century, was above all directed against the division of male and female spheres. As Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker have argued, the contemporary notion of women’s emancipation meant the fight for self-determination and improvements in the legal, social, cultural, and political positions of women. It comprised both feminist and potentially feminist discourse, which is why the authors in this volume deliberately call the protagonists of the early movements “feminists.” What is more, the first women’s emancipation movements also included men who committed themselves

to the cause of women’s emancipation. In fact, the desired realization of the emancipation of women depended on a profound inner change within society and its capacity for development. Integration here meant the achievement of personal responsibility and independence as well as access to hitherto exclusively “male” spaces: suspension of legal dependence, access to secondary schools, universities, and qualified professions, as well as the right to political participation.

It was these topics that stood at the center of contemporary politics of women’s emancipation. The first women’s emancipation movements in Europe, whose protagonists conceived, developed, and discussed the respective issues within the framework of associations, journals, writings, and conferences, considerably shaped and characterized the period between 1848 and World War I. The number of middle-class Jewish women who participated in these movements was above average. Their usually high level of education as well as their unfulfilled demand for civic equality, which was gradually being granted to Jewish men, made numerous Jewish women participate, frequently as central actors, in first-wave feminism in the German-speaking areas, Italy, France, and many other European countries.

While the forerunners of the early women’s emancipation movements date back to the period of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, the European revolutions of 1848 marked the beginning of the first women’s emancipation movements in the Italian and the German contexts too. As in many other European countries, however, a continuous organization of German and Italian feminists developed only from the end of the nineteenth century. The foundation of the Allgemeiner Deutscher Frauenverein (ADF) in 1865 by Louise Otto-Peters and Auguste Schmidt in Leipzig preceded the creation of the first Italian women’s organization, the Lega promotrice degli interessi femminili, in 1881 by Paolina Schiff and Anna Maria Mozzoni in Milan. The ADF concentrated on women’s education and the improvement of working conditions for women, while the Lega promotrice, sixteen years younger and politically left wing, also explicitly aimed at the political emancipation of women. The fight for women’s suffrage represented one of its main purposes.

A key to understanding the ambiguous developments and often-conflicting concepts associated with women’s demands for the rights to self-determination and equal citizenship in the period leading up to World War I can be found within different uses of the term “emancipation” among contemporary protagonists of the respective movements. Focusing on the politics of women’s emancipation, Anne-Laure Briatte’s chapter in this volume analyzes the denominating strategies of German middle-class feminists in contemporary discourse. Briatte shows how the term “emancipation” fell into disrepute in nineteenth-century Germany, bringing women
close to the alleged “outsiders” of the national community—Jews, workers, and unionists, all of whom were seen as a danger by the supporters of law and order. Consequently, the term was banned from the vocabulary of middle-class protagonists. However, after Bismarck’s dismissal and the relative liberalization of the political context around 1890, German feminists began to combine different strategies to suggest emancipation without expressing it openly. They made use of historical parallels, iconographic references, and alternative ways of life, implying emancipatory claims for civil rights, economic and social independence, and the liberation of the body. By doing so, Briatte concludes, middle-class German feminists developed sophisticated public relations and emancipated themselves from social and cultural rules and norms that excluded them from the public sphere. Hence, they created participatory spaces for themselves outside the political arena, which remained inaccessible to them at least until 1918.

Magdalena Gehring complements Briatte’s view in her comparative study on the contemporary politics of women’s emancipation among German and Italian feminists during the late nineteenth century. Her chapter deals with central debates during the international congress on Women’s Achievements and Women’s Endeavors in Berlin in 1896. Gehring demonstrates that although German and Italian feminists had a similar understanding of women’s emancipation, Italian and German protagonists expressed the development of their movements very differently. Their discussions reflected the disparities in each country’s position and the different structure of their movements: the distinct regional diversity in unified Italy allowed there to be more radical feminists in the women’s movement than in its German counterpart, along with closer cooperation between social classes. At the same time, like the Italian protagonists, German feminists placed themselves deliberately on the international stage in order to raise consciousness and develop the approach of the advocates of women’s emancipation. Gehring’s analysis also emphasizes the transnational orientation of the politics of women’s emancipation in Europe at the turn of the century, for which international congresses represented an important forum. In the prewar period, however, nationalist ambitions also increased within women’s organizations throughout Europe. World War I put a temporary stop to the transnational alignment of the German and Italian women’s emancipation movements, whose protagonists eventually found themselves on enemy sides and within conflicting alliances.

**Gender and Jewish Perspectives on World War I**

Notions of gender, nation, and emancipation are central to an in-depth understanding of World War I. Nevertheless, mainstream historiography
still all too often neglects both gender issues and Jewish experiences and memories of the conflict. One recent contribution that successfully employs the analytical category of gender is the volume of essays *Gender and the First World War*, edited by Christa Hämmerle, Oswald Überegger, and Birgitta Bader Zaar. Regarding Jewish war experience and memory, especially in the German, the Austrian, and the Eastern European contexts, scholars such as Marsha L. Rozenblit, Petra Ernst-Kühr, Eleonore Lappin-Eppel, Gerald Lamprecht, Ulrich Wyrwa, Gideon Reuveni, and Edward Madigan have initiated significant research and publications that emphasize the place of World War I as a turning point of the Jewish experience in the twentieth century. In Italy, historians have just begun to reassess the Italian-Jewish perspective of World War I, touching upon questions such as the approaches of Jewish protagonists toward interventionism, Jewish soldiers’ testimonies, and relief work of Jewish communities. Only recently, there has also been an increasing interest in the political attitudes and discourses of Italian-Jewish women during the war. The chapters in this volume dealing with conflicts of national loyalty and belonging, gender relationships, narratives of violence, family dynamics, and the role of religion in discourses of remembrance with regard to World War I form a crucial part of our reassessment of the Age of Emancipation in terms of gender and Jewish history. The twofold perspective allows us to focus on neglected, silenced, or forgotten actors, narratives, and sources, thereby creating a counterhistory to simplified master narratives of the global conflict.

In Italy and Germany, as in the Habsburg Empire, France, and most European countries, the war was extensively supported by middle- and upper-class women. They were convinced that their war effort and relief work could eventually prove their right and fitness for citizenship. This tendency frequently resulted in an increasingly aggressive nationalism among women’s organizations and their protagonists. Numerous feminists distanced themselves from pacifist positions and the conspicuously transnationalist orientation that had characterized the politics of women’s emancipation movements since the nineteenth century. From the beginning of the twentieth century onward, a major part of German, Austrian, and Italian women’s organizations began to legitimate their activities by way of the national principle instead of via the traditions of human rights, thus maintaining the characteristic exclusive and aggressive elements inherent in nationalism. The realization of a constructive and long-term internationalism within the early women’s emancipation movements, which had represented one of the main goals of first-wave feminists, was doomed to failure in the face of the predominance of contemporary nationalisms. As soon as their “own” nation seemed to be threatened in its existence, the great majority of feminist actors gave priority to national aspirations in...
preference to pacifist and feminist principles, which had aimed at an international understanding. Middle-class German-Jewish and Italian-Jewish women usually participated in these developments in the same way as non-Jewish protagonists. Jewish feminists in particular hoped that the conflict would not only continue and further the process of Jewish integration but also eventually lead to the emancipation of women as well.

For Jewish men and women in general, World War I represented an outstanding opportunity to prove their national solidarity toward their home countries. As Sigmund Freud maintained in 1915, however, it brought an end to the ideal of “Kulturweltbürgertum,” the idea of a transnational cosmopolitan community of the educated elite, shared particularly by members of the Jewish bourgeoisie. As a diasporic people, Jews had often been viewed as quintessentially cosmopolitan, moving in transnational networks of family, economic relations, and worlds of learning. With the rise of the nation-states during the century before 1914, which ran parallel to the political emancipation of Jews as well as to a new wave of antisemitism, the tensions between loyalties to one’s native country and a transnational, cosmopolitan outlook had increased, since anticosmopolitanism represented an important element of antisemitic discourse and propaganda. The war brought a severe crisis for the mobile lives and hybrid identities of Jews, as can be illustrated by the case of the German-Jewish historian Robert Davidsohn (1853–1937). The chapter by Martin Baumeister questions the interpretation of the protagonist—who had lived in Florence since 1889, considering Italy his “fatherland by adoption,” and was forced to return to Germany at the outbreak of the war—as a forerunner of a transnational, particularly European utopia in the era of nationalism. Based on Davidsohn’s largely unpublished ego documents, Baumeister’s chapter looks into the scholar’s activities and experiences between 1914 and 1918. The war in particular is revealed as a challenge both to his ideals of national belonging—his patriotic loyalties and the love for his chosen second fatherland—and to his ideas of a bourgeois male identity. Baumeister’s close reading of the sources shows that Davidsohn’s Italian affinity, binational career, left-liberal convictions, and cosmopolitan sociability did not prevent him from taking an uncritical stance toward the official German interpretation of World War I as a defensive struggle against an overwhelmingly hostile alliance that included Italy. In fact, the scholar’s attachment to his German fatherland took precedence over a cosmopolitan outlook during the global conflict and resulted in a profound war patriotism. This attitude was closely connected to the historian’s effort to reaffirm a masculine bourgeois identity, since due to his age he was unable to enter active military service and thereby prove his solidarity toward Germany as a citizen-soldier on the battlefield. Baumeister concludes that Davidsohn’s increasingly nationalist viewpoint during
World War I in fact reveals the fragility and contradictions of his transnational biography and professional project.

The wartime attitudes of acculturated French-Jewish female intellectuals such as the educationalist Alice Hertz and the artist Laure Isaac show parallels to Davidsohn’s strong patriotic attachment to his native country, which eventually prevailed over a cosmopolitan outlook. Despite being part of transnational parental and professional networks, including German-Jewish connections, these women expressed a deeply rooted patriotism and unconditional support for the French Republic during the war, as Marie-Christin Lux explains. In contrast to the German-Jewish Grenzgänger Davidsohn, however, the patriotic sentiments of her protagonists, coined by republicanism, did not develop into nationalist viewpoints. Lux’s in-depth analysis of unpublished wartime letters by Alice Hertz and Laure Isaac to their husbands, the sociologist Robert Hertz and the historian Jules Isaac, both of whom fought on the Western Front, emphasizes the benefits of using marital correspondences as sources for reassessing middle-class Jewish women’s perspectives on World War I. By following personal narratives within these private letters, the study reveals how the protagonists tried to (re)define themselves and their roles within the war effort between being wives and mothers, French citizens, and Jewish women. Whereas the scholar Robert Hertz supported the concept of Jewish self-sacrifice as a citizen-soldier, oriented toward a masculine bourgeois identity similarly to Robert Davidsohn, the feminists Alice Hertz and Laure Isaac worked and volunteered in order to actively support their countries’ war efforts and to prove their patriotism. As wives and mothers, however, they did not identify with the idea of self-sacrifice as did their male counterparts. The two case studies give a significant insight into the close and often ambiguous interrelationship between patriotism and gender, offering a frequently neglected view of the war that deconstructs the binary concept of front and home front.

The gender perspective also allows us to focus on forgotten or repressed narratives of war violence against women and children. In World War I, civilians experienced various forms of violence, including rape, famishment, internment, air raids, etc., to an extent hitherto unknown. Christa Hämmerle and Nadia Maria Filippini demonstrate how war violence was communicated or silenced in wartime correspondence, autobiographical texts, and official documents by female and male protagonists. Whereas Hämmerle’s chapter deals with texts from the Austrian-Hungarian sphere, Filippini’s chapter starts from Italian documents and testimonies. By offering important insights into war violence against civilians within areas of conflicting alliances, the two complementary chapters emphasize the reverse perspectives of perpetrators and victims in the respective national contexts. Hämmerle’s contribution concentrates on areas of mobile war-
fare, as in the case of the Isonzo battles, and investigates diverse manifestations of war-related violence against civilians on the basis of mostly unpublished and largely neglected ego documents from family archives and institutionalized collections. Her detailed analysis of letters and diaristic war accounts by men and women, among them soldiers and war nurses, also asks about signs of patriotism and nationalism in these sources, i.e., whether they reflected the official national discourse about the alleged “clean” and defensive war of the Habsburg Monarchy. Hämmerle concludes that the examination of various forms of ego documents proves the difficulties in finding a coherent language for the experiences of war violence during World War I. In the Austrian context, discursive struggles in war diaries and diaristic texts remained private in the postwar era too and had no impact on public memory. The hegemonic culture of war remembrance became increasingly revisionist by glorifying the defeated Habsburg army. At the same time, civilian victims were largely forgotten after 1918, as they predominantly belonged to non-German ethnicities or were refugees, often Jews, from “mixed” areas of the Habsburg Monarchy that no longer belonged to the new Austrian state.

Nadia Maria Filippini extends this view and the interpretation of hitherto-neglected contemporary sources on war violence by focusing on the perspective of victims in the Italian context. Her study does not concentrate on ego documents but on testimonies and protocols from the Italian commission of inquiry regarding crimes committed by the enemy against civilians and prisoners of war, established in 1918. The thematic and geographical emphasis lies on the area of Veneto and Friuli, which became a war zone even before Italy’s entry into the war and from May 1915 onward experienced profound and long-lasting social disruption. Filippini’s analysis detects war atrocities against the local civilian population in the context of invasion and occupation by Austro-German forces, pointing to forgotten and repressed accounts by women and children whose lives were shattered by the experience of war. Like Hämmerle, Filippini also considers related social issues within the immediate postwar period, which regarded the reintegration process of civilian refugees and returning soldiers to Italy. Gendered readings of war experience, she affirms, reflect not only trauma, violence, and victimhood but also the self-determination, courage, and resistance of female protagonists who protected their children and families in the extreme circumstances of war.

What applies to a gendered history of World War I, which uncovers subtle narratives and highly diversified realities, is true for a Jewish perspective as well. There was no such thing as one common Jewish experience and memory of World War I. For Jewish minorities in the belligerent countries, the war became a sort of a testing ground for their sense of belonging, their loyalties to nation and state, and their will to maintain a
particular religious and cultural identity. In their respective societies, Jews shared the experiences of mobilization, warfare, violence, and bereavement, as well as the collective efforts to come to terms with the traumas of war and to commemorate mass death according to their social position and their political and ideological convictions. Primary sources, hitherto often unknown or neglected in relevant research, reveal the rich facets of their self-images as well as political and cultural viewpoints that emerged in the course of the global conflict. Up to now, the place and function of Jewish commemoration of war within public memory discourse and practices, as well as the creation of national collective identity in war and postwar societies, have not yet been sufficiently studied.

In her contribution, Tullia Catalan shows how Jewish women could engage in aggressive nationalism and how their nationalist stance could further radicalize in the context of the war. She presents a case study of two female Italian-Jewish writers in the borderlands of Austria-Hungary close to Italy, addressing an audience of women and children, whose irredentist nationalism went hand in hand with a strong commitment to the cause of women’s emancipation. Under the impact of ethnic and religious conflict in the Habsburg border region and the rise of political antisemitism on the eve of the war and particularly during the war, their nationalist credo became increasingly aggressive, assuming racist overtones and preparing the path to fascism.

Ruth Nattermann focuses on the same milieu as Catalan, bourgeois national Jews; however, she focuses on those living in their homeland, not in what Italian nationalists considered their “unredeemed lands.” In her chapter, she stresses the crucial role of personal choice and the closely knit unit of the family for individual political and ideological developments. She too considers World War I as a turning point for Italian nationalism and—referring to three Jewish family stories, in particular three prominent women, Margherita Sarfatti, Gina Lombroso, and Amelia Rosselli, as mothers and wives—illustrates how the experience of war violence and the loss of a beloved person, one’s own son, on the battlefield could lead into fascism, glorifying and politicizing the soldiers’ death as a sacrifice for a fatherland to be reborn, or, on the contrary, into antimilitarism, antifascist resistance, and exile.

Whereas Catalan and Nattermann deal with secular Jews who passionately embraced the cause of (Italian) nationalism while preserving at the same time a particular collective identity based on ethical values, ideas of a common origin, and shared family memories, Gerald Lamprecht discusses the constraints and barriers the Austro-German Jewish community had to confront when claiming public recognition and representation of their fallen soldiers and victims of war during wartime, i.e. during the last years of the Habsburg Monarchy and the crisis-ridden Austrian Republic.
from 1918 until 1938. Lamprecht’s chapter highlights the Jewish community’s insoluble dilemma between the willingness in principle to participate in public commemorations and the endeavor to preserve a Jewish particularism. Both in the late Empire and in the new national state it was difficult, if not impossible, for Jews to reconcile their sense of belonging as Jews with their declared patriotism and loyalty to the monarchy or, later, to the republican state, where remembrance was dominated by Christian traditions and practices. During the war as well as the interwar period, Jewish discourses about military service and war memory were always linked to the defense against the menace of antisemitism, the pursuit of social acceptance, and the state’s formal guarantee and protection of civil rights. Austria, in this way, preceded Fascist Italy, where, from 1938 onward, the Racial Laws gave the ultimate evidence for the impossibility of integrating Jews into the national heroic narrative, created and propagated by male and female, Jewish and gentile advocates of Risorgimento nationalism, and deceptively sealed by the unconditional participation in the national war effort.
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**Notes**

2. Ibid., 63.


19. This version was supported especially by Renzo De Felice, Storia degli ebrei sotto il fascismo (Turin: Einaudi, 1961). The important studies by Enzo Collotti and Michele Sarfatti have corrected this distorted view and demonstrated that the Racial Laws in 1938 did not represent a sudden change within Italian society.


26. On this argument, see Barbara Vogel, “Inklusion und Exklusion von Frauen: Überlegungen zum liberalen Emanzipationsprojekt im Kaiserreich,” in *Liberalis-
mus und Emanzipation: In- und Exklusionsprozesse im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik, ed. Angelika Schaser and Stefanie Schüler-Springorum (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010), especially 200, 204.

27. The respective dates and processes of these achievements differed considerably in the German and the Italian contexts. Whereas in Italy women were allowed to enter secondary schools and universities from 1884 onward, it was not before 1900 that German universities, and at first only the ones in Freiburg and Heidelberg, accepted female students. With the introduction of the legge Sacchi in 1919, Italian women were allowed to practice all professions (with certain exceptions), while such access was still restricted for women in Germany. However, Italian legal reforms in the aftermath of World War I excluded the vote for women, while in Germany women’s suffrage was introduced in November 1918; see especially James C. Albisetti, Schooling German Girls and Women: Secondary and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988); Geschichte der Mädchen- und Frauenbildung, vol. 2: Vom Vormärz bis zur Gegenwart, ed. Elke Kleinau and Claudia Opitz (New York: Campus Verlag, 1996); Simonetta Polenghi and Carla Ghizzoni, eds., L’altra metà della scuola: Educazione e lavoro delle donne tra Otto e Novecento (Turin: Einaudi, 2008); Simonetta Soldani, ed., L’educazione delle donne: Scuole e modelli di vita femminile nell’Italia dell’Ottocento (Milan: Franco Angeli, 1989).

28. In spite of their political, social, and cultural relevance, many of the protagonists and organizations of the early movements have been rather forgotten by European historiography and collective memory. Only from the beginning of the twenty-first century, especially German-speaking historiography has begun to examine thoroughly the biographies and writings of several central protagonists of the first women’s emancipation movements; see especially Angelika Schaser, Helene Lange und Gertrud Bämer: Eine politische Lebensgemeinschaft (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000); Susanne Kinnebrock, Anita Augspurg (1857–1943): Feministin und Journalistin zwischen Journalismus und Politik; Eine kommunikationshistorische Biographie (Herbolzheim: Centaurus Verlag, 2005); Britta Konz, Bertha Pappenheim (1859–1936): Ein Leben für jüdische Tradition und weibliche Emanzipation (New York: Campus Verlag, 2005). Recently, there has been a new trend toward the rediscovery of European first-wave feminism and its protagonists; see e.g. Johanna Gehmacher, Elisa Heinrich, and Corinna Oesch, eds., Käthe Schirmacher: Agitation und autobiographische Praxis zwischen radikaler Frauenbewegung und völkischer Politik (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2018); Angelika Schaser and Sylvia Schraut, eds., Frauenbewegungen in Europa (19.-20. Jahrhundert): Narrative, Traditionstätigkeit und Vergessen (New York: Campus Verlag, 2019).

29. The Italian and German cases represent important examples. The most important Italian women’s association, the Unione Femminile Nazionale (UFN), founded in 1899 in Milan, had about 10 percent Jewish membership until the passing of the Fascist Racial Laws in November 1938; see Liana Novelli-Glaab, “‘Zwischen Tradition und Moderne’: Jüdinnen in Italien um 1900,” in “Denn in Italien haben sich die Dinge anders abgespielt”: Judentum und Antisemitismus im modernen Italien, ed. Liana Novelli-Glaab and Gudrun Jäger (Berlin: Trafo Verlag, 2007), 110. Approximately one-third of the participants in the early German women’s movement were Jewish. In contrast to the numerous left-wing Italian-Jewish feminists, they mainly belonged to the moderate middle-class groups. Out of ninety-four women’s associations that existed in Berlin in 1893, thirty were led by Jewish


the Collective Memory of Central Europe: The Remembrance of World War I from a Jewish Perspective (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2018); Edward Madigan and Gideon Reuveni, eds., The Jewish Experience of the First World War (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).
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