

On D.F. Strauß and the 1839 Revolution in Zurich¹

Douglas R. McGaughey
Professor of Philosophical Theology
Willamette University

Perhaps no other individual theologian served as a lightening rod for the explosive energy of the theological world of the 19th century than did David Friedrich Strauß. As author of the controversial *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, he came to be seen as the representative of the liberal attack on the sacred scriptures because of his conclusion that the gospel narratives are myth. The theological right applauded the dismissal of Strauß from the university in Tübingen in 1835, and they were mortified with the announcement of his appointment in 1839 to the university in Zurich. Nowhere was the destructive power of religious conviction unleashed with such political consequences in the 19th century than in Zurich with this appointment. As consequential and deadly as the events surrounding Strauß' appointment and the subsequent political revolution in the canton of Zurich were, their details have not been told in English.² What follows seeks to fill that lacuna.

1. This article is the result of a Fulbright research grant under the sponsorship of Prof. Ulrich Köpf, Director of the Institut für Spätmittelalter und Reformation. In particular, it is indebted to the invaluable assistance of Prof. Hans Geißer and his graduate assistant, Mr. Ernst Friedauer, at the University in Zurich.

2. No comprehensive history of the events surrounding September 6, 1839, was published before that by Friedrich Schultheß in 1906 (see Schultheß Aufzeichnungen über die straußische Bewegung und den 6. September 1839 in the Züricher Taschenbuch (Zurich: 1906 <1864>), pp. 79-80) though Schultheß wrote his account in 1864 (see ibid., pp. 80 and 127). Its importance is enhanced because it is written by a participant (he was commander of the citizen's defense force, see ibid., pp. 79-80) and because he submitted the report for approval of its accuracy to representatives of all parties involved (see ibid., p. 81).

The present account depends primarily upon Schultheß, but it draws on newspaper reports from 1839 and at the time of the 50th anniversary of the revolution among other documents.

The Appointment of Strauß and Its Context

On January 26, 1839, in a second attempt,³ the Education Committee for the canton of Zurich voted to hire David Friedrich Strauß for the chair for New Testament Theology, Church History, and Dogmatics vacant as a result of the departure of Prof. Eduard Elwerts.⁴ The tie vote was decided in favor of Strauß by the chair and mayor, Hirzel.⁵ On January 31st the governing council of the canton voted 98 to 49 in favor of the Education Committee's recommendation which was followed by the approval on February 2nd of the privy council in a stormy session by a vote of 15 to 3.⁶

The university in Zurich had only been founded in 1833 as part of an educational reform movement initiated by the liberal government elected in 1831.⁷ The driving force behind this educational reform movement was Thomas Scherr, also from Württemberg as was Strauß,⁸ who had been named director of the reform in the canton and city of Zurich by the liberal government. The strategy of Scherr and the reformers was the introduction of an entirely new curriculum replacing the drill and memory method of instruction. Included in the reform was a thorough revision of religious instruction. School instructors were carefully trained in the new pedagogy. However, they were perceived, at least out in the countryside, as blind automatons of Scherr, who personally became the symbol of all that was wrong with the new curriculum in the

3. Strauß was rejected in 1837 when the entire theological faculty voted against the appointment (see "Die Züricher September-Revolution vom Jahre 1839" in the Züricher Post, September 7, 1889, p. 2). In the second round, only Professor Hitzig from the theological faculty supported the appointment (ibid., p. 2).

4. See Largiadèr, Geschichte von Stadt und Landschaft Zürich (Erlenbach-Zurich: Eugen Rentsch Verlag, 1945), p. 145.

5. See the Züricher Post, September 7, 1889, p. 2.

⁶6. See Friedrich Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, p. 84.

7. The liberals had come to power for the first time in the canton and city of Zurich on March 20, 1831 (see Largiadèr, Geschichte, p. 116). The University of Zurich opened on April 29, 1833. See Largiadèr, ibid., p. 128.

8. See the Züricher Post, September 6, 1889, p. 2.

eyes of its opposition.⁹ Strauß' appointment was meant to be the crowning accomplishment of the reform movement.

Within months of the publication of the first volume of his work in 1835, Strauß had been fired from his position at the Protestant seminary in Tübingen and sent to his home town of Ludwigsburg to be a professor of classical languages at the Lyzeum.¹⁰ Needless to say, Strauß was not satisfied with a position that encouraged such a limited range of his intellectual talent, and, upon obtaining a clear answer from the king of Württemberg that no church position would be made available to him,¹¹ he moved to Stuttgart and commenced a career as a writer - primarily of biographies.¹² His supporters in Zurich attempted to provide him with the academic career appropriate to his talents.

The intention behind the appointment of Strauß in Zurich was to establish a reputation for the new university as a center of free inquiry and to attract young people to a liberal institution on the cutting edge of its day. In addition, Strauß "should protect the people and the church 'from the Pietist and Orthodox head cold threatening out of northern Germany.'¹³" The liberals erroneously diagnosed the extent to which the canton was infected with its own virus.

9. See the Züricher Post, September 5, 1889, p. 2.

For Scherr's account of the reform, which equally provides one with the flavor of his contempt for those who misunderstood what the reform was all about, see Scherr's Ein freies und belehrendes Sendschreiben des züricherischen Seminardirektors an die Herrn XXIIger des sogenannten Glaubenskomite's. Allen guten Christen zur Betrachtung empfohlen von einem Freunde der Wahrheit, aus dem pädagogischen Beobachter besonders mitgetheilt (Zurich, 1839).

10. From Jörg F. Sandberger, "David Friedrich Strauß (1808-1874)" in Theologen des Protestantismus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, ed. by Martin Greschat (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978), p. 92.

11. See Sandberger, ibid., p. 92.

12. Among the many tragedies of Strauß' life, in addition to the catastrophe in Zurich and a destructive marriage, was the stormy relationship that he had with his theologically arch-conservative father, whose beliefs were a source of amusement for both mother and son. See Sandberger, ibid., pp. 84-5

The darker side of this relationship with the father, Sandberger reports, is that Strauß' father, lying on his deathbed in 1841, said that he (the father), "was cursed by God because of his son's Life of Jesus." See Sandberger, ibid., p. 94.

13. The Züricher Post, September 7, 1889, p. 2.

The Spark in the Tinderbox

By the time of Strauß' appointment in Zurich in 1839, it was clear to the conservatives that either the school reform movement in the canton of Zurich must be slowed down, if not stopped, or the church must itself undergo a major reform.¹⁴ Strauß' appointment became the occasion for the conservative church leadership to take the initiative against the educational reform movement in general, symbolized by Scherr, and against Strauß' appointment in particular. Schultheß observes that, even among liberals, there were those opposed to Strauß' appointment for fear that faith would no longer be accommodating to the conceptual capabilities of the common man which would only encourage disbelief and immorality. Schultheß quotes a letter from Major Uebel, one of the officers on the government's side during the uprising, written shortly after the fateful events, that contained the commonly held opinion among even those favorably inclined to support Strauß that his work is perhaps laudable in terms of its scientific critique, but he had not yet developed a definite system that portrayed his positive faith.¹⁵ Strauß was aware of this deficiency. He wrote a public letter Sendschreiben an die hochgeachteten Herren: Bürgermeister Hirzel, Professor Orelli and Professor Hitzig in Zurich, on March 1, 1839, to the mayor and supporters in which one can observe not only a conciliatory tone but the formulation of a constructive theology.¹⁶ The conciliatory third edition of The Life of Jesus (1838) should be evaluated in light of its coincidence with the possible professorship in Zurich in 1837. The thematic changes of the third edition are all reflected in the Sendschreiben an die hochgeachteten Herren.

Nevertheless, the shibboleth of the conservative movement became: "No salvation without the historical Jesus."¹⁷ At no point, however, did Strauß or those influenced by him, deny the reality of the historical Jesus! The quarrel between the conservatives and the Straußians was not over a historical fact or whether there was anything historical about the Christian faith, but, rather, what is the relationship between historical facts and spiritual truth?

14. See the Züricher Post, September 7, 1889, p. 2.

15. See Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, pp. 83 and 83, n. 1.

16. See Strauß' Sendschreiben an die hochgeachteten Herren: Bürgermeister Hirzel, Professor Orelli und Professor Hitzig in Zurich, herausgegeben von dem Vereine zur Beförderung der Volksbildung (Zurich: Züricher und Furrer, 1839).

17. The Züricher Post, September 8, 1889, p. 2.

The Two Phases of the 1839 Revolution

The resistance to Strauß' appointment in 1839 and the education reform movement under the direction of Scherr came in two phases. The first phase resulted in the pensioning of Strauß before he ever came to Zurich. The second phase resulted in a bloody revolution, the fall of the liberal government, and the firing of Scherr.

Phase One: The Pensioning of Strauß

The privy council's decision in favor of hiring Strauß occurred on February 2, 1839. By February 13th representatives from 29 congregations throughout the canton had met and decided upon creating an association in every congregation with two representatives to be elected from each association to form a Central Committee to coordinate the activities against Scherr's Education Committee and the call of Strauß. On February 28th an elected Central Committee from these church associations met for the first time in Zurich to develop a common strategy.¹⁸ A petition was generated covering the following ultimatums and grievances: 1) demanding the firing of Strauß; 2) insisting that the church councils play a role in the calling of the faculty to the university in Zurich (particularly, the petition called for the appointment of a professor decidedly of evangelical faith¹⁹); 3) calling for the establishment of a synod independent of the government constituted out of pastors and lay persons elected by the congregations; 4) requiring at least a third of the Education Committee to be elected by this same synod, 5) fostering and insuring of the religious dimension throughout the school curriculum from grade school through the university by a return to teaching Biblical literalism and memorization of Biblical passages, and 6) demanding revision of the education law including the dismissal of Scherr.²⁰

The congregation associations met on March 10, and 39,225 signatures were collected in favor of the petition with only 1,048 opposed.²¹ During the Shrove-Tuesday festival, effigies of Strauß, Hirzel, and Scherr were burned.²²

18. See Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, p. 84. The government was clearly already nervous about the impact of this movement. Schultheß was named commander of a 60 man elite corps that was to protect the town hall. Another 200 men were in reserve and troops were sent to protect the education seminar responsible for the education reforms. See Schultheß, ibid., pp. 84-5.

19. See Schultheß, ibid., p. 85.

20. See the Züricher Post, September 8, 1889, p. 2.

21. See the Züricher Post, September 8, 1889, p. 2, and Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, p. 85.

22. The Züricher Post, September 8, 1889, p. 2.

On March 16th the governing council met to discuss the situation in what was a very turbulent session. Mayor Hirzel argued that the “masses” had no business interfering in the decision process concerning academic affairs, and reminded the session of its responsibility to preserve the peace if necessary even with the assistance of the “Seven Concordat.” In this political alliance from March 17, 1832, seven cantons (Zurich, Bern, Luzern, Solothurn, St. Gallen, Aargau and Thurgau) all agreed to mutual support in the event that one of them was threatened with a violent uprising. A key provision was that the others could intervene without being invited.²³ Despite the mayor’s defense of Strauß, the governing council’s final vote (149 to 38)²⁴ was to pension Strauß at the amount of 1000 Franken per year before he ever entered the classroom.²⁵ Sandberger reports that Strauß donated the pension to the poor.²⁶

Phase Two: The Fall of the Government and Firing of Scherr

The Central Committee of the church associations took the decision of the governing council to dismiss Strauß as having defused the situation, and, in the belief that interim elections would bring their side stronger representation in the governing council to enable implementation of the remaining ultimatums, it disbanded on March 21st.²⁷ The government, however, saw the dismissal of Strauß as having satisfied the radical faction, and it proceeded with business as usual ignoring the additional demands.

The failure of the government to address the other demands made by the church associations resulted in the Central Committee being called back into existence on April 22nd. The Committee issued a letter of August 8th to all the congregations calling for a public gathering in Kloten for the 2nd of September.²⁸

The privy council met on August 23rd and issued a statement forbidding the gathering on September 2nd. It announced that it would press legal charges against those who persisted in attempting to call such a public protest into existence. The Central Committee’s response was to insist that it was answerable only to its constituency. At the end of its letter to the congregations,

23. See Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, p. 91, n. 1

24. Schultheß, ibid., p. 85.

25. See the Züricher Post, September 8, 1889, p. 2.

26. Sandberger, “David Friedrich Strauß,” p. 94.

27. Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, p. 86.

28. Schultheß, ibid., p. 86.

the Central Committee included the rallying cry, “be manly and strong.” This was taken by the government to be a call to revolt. The letter was confiscated and legal charges were brought against the Committee’s leadership.²⁹ On August 31st the government tried to calm things down by issuing a letter explaining the intent behind its actions, but it also underscored that it had the obligation to preserve order. It announced that it had arranged for troop support and in part had called some troops to Zurich.³⁰

Nevertheless, 15,000 people gathered in pouring rain on September 2nd to underscore their support for the educational reforms demanded in the spring.³¹ Four demands were formulated at this demonstration: 1) that the government rescind its charge that the Central Committee was acting in any way in violation of the constitution; 2) that the government rescind its legal charges against the Committee’s leadership; 3) that the government ensure that press freedom not only be used to the advantage of the government but that the opposition have the same rights; and 4) that the right to petition be underscored, the government’s hindrance of the Central Committee cease, and that the leaders of the privy council be called to accountability for its actions. Furthermore, the intention was announced to generate another petition along the lines of the March 10th version.³² Finally, the Central Committee called for a peaceful, public demonstration in Zurich on September 9th, during the next session of the privy council, to increase the moral pressure in favor of the demanded reforms, and to insist that the government either cease its current policies or resign.³³

On the other side, a group of “extremist” members of the government wanted to call a public demonstration for September 6th in support of the government. They were also in favor of crushing the opposition at all costs and, therefore, advocated calling in the help of the Seven Concordat. It was decided to leave any such decision up to the privy council which was to meet on September 9th.³⁴

29. See Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 87.

30. Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 88.

31. Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 88-9.

32. See Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 89.

33. Schultheß, *ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

34. See Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 91.

The Seven Concordat members, however, demanded an account of the situation from Zurich. The privy council, therefore, decided on the evening of September 5th to formulate its response to them on September 6th. The membership was divided (with several members absent) seven in favor and six opposed to seeking military assistance from the Seven Concordat. Nevertheless, those who favored involving the Seven Concordat were convinced that they would have a majority the next day.³⁵ But even the possibility of such outside intervention enraged the opposition who, upon hearing of the vote, now saw the honor of the canton to be at stake in addition to feeling threatened by despotism from their own government.

Already on the morning of September 5th, however, a member of the privy council had reported to the opposition that within 24 hours 30,000 troops from the Seven Concordat were to be on their way to Zurich to protect the government from any public threat.³⁶ The situation was ripe for an explosion. The vice-president of the Central Committee, Dr. Rahn, issued a statement to all the district presidents that the fatherland stood under threat from foreign troops, and they should have their followers ready to march on Zurich at the signal of the ringing of the church bells. Although this order was subsequently rescinded by Dr. Rahn,³⁷ the president of the district of Pfäffikon, Pastor Hirzel (not to be confused with the mayor and sponsor of Strauß or the commander of troops in Zurich), a liberal who was soured by having been denied a position at the university in Zurich,³⁸ “on his own initiative and own responsibility gave the signal for the public to march on Zurich.”³⁹

35. Two battalions from Thurgau were already situated on the canton border ostensibly engaged in military exercises but available at any moment to respond to a call for assistance from the government in Zurich. See Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 92.

36. Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 92.

37. Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 93.

38. The *Züricher Post*, September 10, 1889, p. 2. See, as well, the *Neue Züricher-Zeitung*, September 6, 1889, p. 1, and Largiadèr, *Geschichte*, pp. 148-9. Hirzel was a friend from university days of Alexander Schweizer, the Schleiermachian mediating theologian on the faculty in Zurich. Schweizer himself opposed the appointment of Strauß arguing: “The Education Committee does not have the right to reform the church. A reform may perhaps be necessary, but this must occur under the auspices of the church itself. The reconciliaiton between faith and knowledge cannot be achieved by sweeping faith aside and leaving knowledge occupying the field alone ...” (Largiadèr, *Geschichte*, p. 146)

39. Largiadèr, *Geschichte*, p. 148.

Pastor Hirzel had received the order from Dr. Rahn along with reports that some 800 to 1,000 “radicals” from Hinweil and Winterthur in support of the liberal government were secretly planning to take up strategic positions around the arsenals in Zurich. Pastor Hirzel feared that the news of such numbers would convince the Seven Concordat that the canton was not unified⁴⁰ and that the outside cantons would intervene on the side of the government.

The call to march on Zurich swept through the countryside like wild fire, and, by early morning of September 6th it was reported in Zurich that Hirzel was leading some 5,000 men towards the city.⁴¹ Pastor Hirzel’s group reached the city at 4:00 a.m. He acknowledged that a few hundred of his men were armed with firearms, but he insisted that such weapons were only for their own protection.⁴² He maintained that their intent in coming at all was only to bring moral pressure on the government in support of the demands from Kloten.

About 6:00 a.m. two government representatives, Hegetschweiler and Sulzer, visited the protesters to learn about their intentions. They carried back to the government the demands of the demonstrators, which essentially were that the government not employ foreign forces to enforce its undemocratic policies.⁴³

The mayor decided to place troops only in defense of the arsenals and on Münster Square rather than block the bridges, even in light of the threatening assembly on the left side of the Limmat river, because September 6th was a weekly market day and there was lots of traffic on the bridges in preparation for the market.⁴⁴ The mayor’s forces, greatly out numbered, amounted to only 356 soldiers and cavalry,⁴⁵ who were given the command to use their weapons only in an emergency and the soldiers were to withdraw into the neighboring houses should they be pressured by the crowd.⁴⁶

40. Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, p. 94.

41. Schultheß, ibid., p. 100.

42. Schultheß, ibid., pp. 100-101.

43. Schultheß, ibid., p. 101.

44. Schultheß, ibid., pp. 101-2.

45. Schultheß, ibid., p. 104.

46. Schultheß, ibid., p. 102.

Given its recall of the order to march on Zurich, the Central Committee was now faced with having to choose to support Pastor Hirzel or permitting their movement to crumble. They decided to send a signal to the Seven Concordat, that Zurich was under their firm control. At 9:00 a.m. the general alarm was sounded to bring down the government.⁴⁷ At this point, two columns four men abreast moved out from the left side of the Limmat river toward the center of the city. One column of some 600 men was led by Pastor Hirzel in the direction of the lower bridge (the Untere Brücke). At the head of the second column of some 1,100 men was Dr. Rahn, who crossed the Münster bridge. For the most part, both columns were armed only with scythes, pitchforks, and morning-stars. They marched singing in unison: “This is the day, that God has made; May He be honored, by all the world; May He be praised, for that which is through Jesus Christ; in Heaven and on Earth!”⁴⁸

After having crossed the lower bridge, Pastor Hirzel led his column down Stork Alley (Storchen Gasse) towards Münster Square where they were met by the cavalry whose commander ordered, “Go back, the square must remain open!”⁴⁹ Hirzel responded, “Peace! We’ve only come to peacefully pursue our demands with the government. For God’s sake don’t initiate a civil war!”⁵⁰ After loud cries and shoving by both sides, a shot rang out from the back rows of the demonstrators.⁵¹ The cavalry rushed forward, and a shot startled one of their horses which turned and fell throwing its rider. Shots continued to be fired as the cavalry turned to ride back onto the square firing at the demonstrators as they retreated. The infantry withdrew into houses from which they, too, fired on Hirzel’s group. Hirzel and his followers pressed forward in rage and were joined by Dr. Rahn’s column. They entered the Post Alley (Post Gasse) in an attempt to reach the yellow arsenal rather than stop at the post office building where the government was in tumultuous session.⁵² At this point the troops fired another round at the

47. Schultheß, *ibid.*, pp. 104-5.

48. “Dies ist der Tag, den Gott gemacht; Sein werd’ in aller Welt gedacht; Ihn preise, was durch Jesum Christ; Im Himmel und auf Erden ist!” *Neue Züricher-Zeitung*, September 15, 1889, p. 1.

49. Schultheß, *Aufzeichnungen*, p. 106.

50. Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 106.

51. Schultheß was convinced that it was not intentional. See Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 106.

52. Schultheß, *ibid.*, p. 107.

crowd before it could reach New Market Square. This time the demonstrators scattered in panic. Within five minutes no demonstrators remained on the right side of the Limmat river.⁵³

Meanwhile, the privy council had been in a rowdy session since 7:30 a.m. in their meeting hall in the post office building.⁵⁴ As the demonstrators were crossing the bridges shortly after 9:00 a.m., the only form of action they could agree upon was the rescinding of the legal charges against the Central Committee.⁵⁵ As shots rang out in the streets, they were shouting at one another about who among them was responsible for the spilling of blood. After the second round of shooting, the mayor commanded a cease fire. Representative Hegetschweiler delivered the order to the troops, and, as he turned to return to the government session, a corporal from the cavalry shot him in the face.⁵⁶ In addition to Hegetschweiler, the uprising brought fourteen deaths and another fourteen demonstrators were in part seriously wounded.⁵⁷

The government was no longer able to function in any reasonable fashion. One member even attempted to flee under the disguise of a woman.⁵⁸ Under the circumstances, the government resigned and was replaced by a provisional government in place by 10:45 a.m.⁵⁹ Both this provisional government and the Central Committee called for peace.

53. Schultheß, ibid., p. 109.

54. Schultheß, ibid., p. 111.

55. Schultheß, ibid., p. pp. 111-2. Earlier they had responded to this demand by claiming that they were powerless to intervene in an action initiated by the attorney general. See ibid., p. 90.

56. Schultheß, ibid., p. 112.

57. Initial reports were of eight dead and twenty-eight wounded. See the Schweizer-ischer Republikaner, 73 (10 September 1839), p. 1. However, the more accurate statistics of fifteen dead and fourteen wounded can be drawn from the relief organization formed to assist those families who lost loved ones in the uprising. See the Bericht über die Wirksamkeit des Hülfsvereins zum Besten der am 6. September 1839 Verunglückten (Zurich: J.J. Ulrich, 1840), pp. 6-12, which provides biographical sketches of the victims. See, as well, the Schluss-Bericht über die Wirksamkeit des Hülfsvereins zum Besten der am 6. September 1839 Verunglückten (Zurich: J.J. Ulrich, 1843).

58. See “Beschreibung des 6. Herbstmonats 1839 in Zürich” in the Neuer Züricher-Kalender auf das Schaltjahr 1840 (Zurich: Verlag S. Mann, 1840), p. 6.

59. Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, p. 118-9.

In the interim, well armed reinforcements for the demonstrators (circa 100 men) from parishes on the right side of the Lake of Zurich, along with some 100 men from the Pfäffikon group, entered Münster Square. They were eventually calmed by provisional government representatives only to be followed by another group of 300 men. The city witnessed such a succession of armed and angry crowds well into the night.⁶⁰ The next day brought further waves of groups through the city who filled New Market Square by 10:00 a.m. spilling over into Münster Square. The Central Committee greeted them there and congratulated them on their victory. In the meantime, the provisional government had taken steps to assure the Seven Concordat cantons that their intervention was not necessary⁶¹

The privy council met on September 9th, and it confirmed the new provisional government and called for new elections in fourteen days. A further action taken was the firing of Scherr.⁶² They were greeted with cheers of support at the end of their session.⁶³

One final irony in the tragic events of September 6, 1839: the city theater, founded in 1832 not without protest from the religious right,⁶⁴ was to have performed “Romeo and Juliet” on the evening of the revolution, but for obvious reasons the performance was canceled. The diva, who was to have performed on that evening, was Agnes Schebest, later to become David Friedrich Strauß’ wife in a stormy marriage that ended in a bitter divorce. It was even rumored in Zurich upon hearing of their marriage that Strauß had applied to be the new director of the theater.⁶⁵

In place of the pensioned Strauß, the new government hired the orthodox theologian, Johann Peter Lange⁶⁶ as of the summer semester of 1841.⁶⁷ Four years after the revolution the

60. Schultheß, ibid., p. 118-120.

61. Schultheß, ibid., p. 123.

62. The Züricher Post, September 12, 1889, p. 1. .

63. Schultheß, Aufzeichnungen, p. 125.

64. See the Züricher Post mit Handelszeitung und Stadtchronik, March 25, 1906, p. 1.

65. The Züricher Post, September 11, 1889, p. 2.

66. See Largiadèr, Geschichte, p. 229.

liberals returned to power in Zurich, but it was not until 1850 that they were able to hire a theologian of their liking for the university. Their choice was the “freisinnige” Alois Emanuel Biedermann. Biedermann, a Swiss, was educated in Switzerland although he spent several years studying under the Hegelian Wilhelm Vatke in Berlin. Beginning in 1869, Biedermann had yearly visits with Strauß on the Lake of Constance, and he even managed to convince Strauß to visit Zurich on one occasion.⁶⁸

67. See Paul Schweizer, Alexander Schweizers und Alois Emanuel Biedermanns Theologie im Rahmen der Züricher Richtungsbewegung des 19. Jahrhunderts (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1972), p. 293.

68. See Alois Emanuel Biedermann, Ausgewählte Vorträge und Aufsätze, ed. by J. Kradolfer (Berlin: Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1885), p. 50.