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‘The charter material from St Gall is unique for the Carolingian period’: thus Rosamond McKitterick near the start of a path-breaking discussion of early medieval charters.¹ No other medieval monastic community managed to keep so many of its original charters in a way that lasted or, in the High Middle Ages, resisted the temptation to make copies instead of keeping the originals. Though a great many charters were lost during and after the Reformation period, and some were shamelessly filched, the oldest of them were printed in 1645. An edition of all surviving charters (including those filched) was published in two volumes in the 1860s by Hermann Wartmann (1835–1929).² These volumes, representing the finest scholarship of their day, have clearly stood the test of time: not only have they remained scholarly stand-bys until the publication of the work under review, but they were regarded as still sufficiently useful in 1983 for a modern re-edition to be postponed, and it was decided that the new edition of all the St Gallen charters would begin with volume three, from 900. Nevertheless, ‘Wartmann’ was showing its age. In 1985 the archivist of St Gallen wrote that a new edition was ‘an urgent necessity’.

Meanwhile, the profound researches of Michael Borgolte had made some flaws apparent, notably in the datings of charters, and offered at the same time a wealth of new findings about the people and places who made up Carolingian St Gall’s charter-world.³ Rosamond McKitterick’s work admirably set out the charters’ social and

² Hermann Wartmann, *Urkundenbuch der Abtei St Gallen*, i: (700–840) and ii: (840–920) (Zurich/St Gallen, 1863; St Gallen, 1866). Wartmann was a former student of Georg Waitz (1813–86), godfather of the project.
³ The relevant works by Michael Borgolte are the following: ‘Chronologische Studien an den alemannischen Urkunden des Stiftsarchivs St. Gallen’, *Archiv*
cultural context; and in the early twenty-first century the appearance
of successive parts of the second series of *Chartae Latinae Antiquiores*
has provided excellent facsimiles. All this ground work is presented
in pp. ix–xii of Peter Erhart’s introduction, where the guiding prin-
ciples of the new edition are clearly stated at pp. xiii–xv. It must be said
at once that this is a contribution to Carolingian scholarship of the
very highest quality.

Particularly helpful, given the fundamental importance of dating
in charter scholarship, is the ‘Kommentar zu den Datierungen (700–
840)’ contributed by Karl Heidecker and Bernhard Zeller, pp. xvii–
xxvi. Like the mythic dwarfs on giants’ shoulders, they give due
acknowledgment to the work of both Wartmann and Borgolte. It is
on their revisions to the giants’ datings that, as Erhart notes (p. xii)
‘attention falls above all’. Rules of thumb inferable from editorial
practice are made clear (pp. xvii–xx): first and foremost, consult orig-
inals wherever possible; second, emend as little as possible; third,
when the various dating-forms in a given charter do not agree, con-
sider emending regnal dates in light of days and months; further,
accept Borgolte’s corrections to Wartmann’s dates; then, assume that
differentiating between monastic and non-monastic scribes can help
determine whether to accept the date offered by an original or by a
copy; then, do not make many assumptions based on the dates when
particular scribes held monastic offices, for these are seldom precise;
finally, when dating elements are missing or inadequate, give clear
indications of *terminus ante quem* or *post quem*, and assign a ‘c.’ dating
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5 Two mistakes in the Introduction are only very minor irritants: there is a
marker for footnote 18 but no footnote, and footnote 20 appears but without
a marker for it in the text.
only on the basis of information on persons named in the charter in question or in other related charters. These are working principles recognizably right for the tiro charter-scholar and expert alike.

In the rest of their ‘Kommentar’, Heidecker and Zeller consider difficulties encountered in the variety of regnal years used by the scribes of St Gall. These are difficulties that can be seen in a broader historical view to arise from the succession practices of the Carolingians. In 768, for instance, the division of the regnum Francorum between Pippin’s sons Charlemagne and Carloman put St Gall in Carloman’s kingdom. These editors convincingly reject the suggestion that some St Gall charters were dated by Charlemagne’s regnal years even before Carloman’s death on 4 December 771, basing their rejection not only on technical grounds but on an appraisal of Carolingian political thought and practice. Regnal-year datings were part and parcel of what Ildar Garipzanov has termed ‘the symbolic language of authority’, partly inherited, also much developed, by Carolingian rulers, and communicated to their people by, inter alios et inter alia, charter-scribes and charters.6 It is because regnal dates were anything but ‘merely’ formulaic that, to echo Peter Erhart, they demand our attention as signs of legitimacy. Signs were not always read at St Gall in precisely the same way, however. Heidecker and Zeller, noting (p. xxiii) that from 775 onwards nearly all the monastery’s scribes used reign-years for Charlemagne that dated from 9 October 768, interpret this as a consequence of the take-over of the Lombard kingdom in 774 and ‘the expression of a new and, so to speak, more generalized understanding of Charlemagne’s rulership’.

Charlemagne’s Divisio regnorum of 806 was a project for the future, but at St Gall in Alamannia it was perceived as something more concrete and immediate. Heidecker and Zeller point out (p. xxii with n. 25) that several St Gall charters dating from 807–9 give the regnal years of not only Charlemagne but also Pippin of Italy, to whom the divisio assigned Alamannia.7 ‘Political datings’ recur in

6 Ildar H. Garipzanov, The Symbolic Language of Authority in the Carolingian World (c.751–877) (Leiden, 2008).

7 Zeller, ‘“Politischer Datierungen” in St. Galler Urkunden 814–841?’, in M. Gravel and S. Kaschke (eds.), Politische Theologie und Geschichte unter Ludwig dem Frommen (forthcoming); and for the wider context see S. Kaschke, ‘Tradition und Adaption: Die “Divisio regnorum” und die fränkische Herr-
subsequent Carolingian divisions. After the forced retirement of Louis the Pious in 833, and the de facto succession of three of his sons, the St Gall scribe Theothart seemed unsure of when Louis the German’s reign began, dating a charter of 26 July 834 ‘anno secundo incipiente iunioris Hludouuici regis in Alamannia’ (p. xxvi). After Louis the Pious’s restoration in 834, and especially from 837 onwards, when Heidecker and Zeller detect a ‘consolidation and strengthening of the emperor’s position’ (p. xxv), St Gall scribes always give the regnal years of either the emperor alone or of both him and ‘junior’ Louis. Only charters written by scribes who did not belong to the St Gall community were dated by the years of ‘junior’ Louis alone. After the definitive breach between the emperor and his namesake in 839, all charters were dated by the emperor’s reign years alone: the clearest possible sign of legitimacy vindicated.

The last charter of volume one is dated 12 June 840, ‘anno XXVII Hludouuici imperatoris’. Louis died just a fortnight later, on 26 June. And there ends the project-story so far. With this beautifully edited volume readers must be satisfied for the moment. The Table of Concordances between it and ‘Wartmann’ and the Chartae Latinae Antiquiores volumes shows the very large number of reorderings of charters the new edition offers—further evidence of the crucial importance of datings. Volume two (promised by the publisher for 2016) will contain the indices of people, places, and things for all the St Gall charters down to 1000, thus making the contents of both volumes eminently usable. This reader for one can hardly wait to use them! But, having noted Wartmann’s regret in 1863 at having had to abandon planned maps for reasons of cost, she hopes that it is not too late to make a plea for maps in 2016.
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8 For the moment, though, we have Wartmann’s registers of people and places: still useful even if superseded by more recent work.
JINTY NELSON is Professor Emeritus in the Department of History, King's College London. Among her many publications are *Charles the Bald* (1992), and four volumes of her selected papers, *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (1986); *The Frankish World, 750–900* (1996); *Rulers and Rulership in Early Medieval Europe* (1999); and *Courts, Elites and Gendered Power in the Early Middle Ages* (2007).

In this volume of essays Tom Scott, Reformation historian from the University of St Andrews, brings together seven of his essays published between 2001 and 2011, some in rather obscure places. These are supplemented by three previously unpublished essays (‘Why was there no Reformation in Freiburg im Breisgau?’; ‘The Problem of Heresy in the German Reformation’; ‘Johannes Agricola’s *Ein nutzlicher Dialogus* as a Source for the Peasants’ War in Central Germany’) and an afterword, which he presents as ‘a personal memoir of my own visits to the GDR’ (p. 257). As an eyewitness to the transformations of GDR historiography and science policy from the early 1980s, Scott reminds us of a chapter of Reformation historiography that is in danger of being forgotten today, although it is of inestimable significance for the writing of early Reformation history in particular.

Scott here continues the trajectory of his life’s work which, starting with his 1986 study of Freiburg in the age of Reformation and Peasants’ War, has brought not only the Reformation history of the Holy Roman Empire in the 1520s, but also the wider debates in German-language historiography to the attention of historians in Britain and the USA. This task has lost none of its relevance — on the contrary — as he rightly points out in his brief introduction to the present volume.

From the beginning of his academic career in the mid 1980s to the present volume, Scott has consistently studied topics and pursued approaches which, even in a field that has been as intensively studied as the early Reformation history of the Empire over the last twenty-five years, can still yield new insights. Arguing that the Reformation should be seen against the background of late medieval Imperial history, as in the first essay in this volume (‘The Early Reformation in Germany between Deconstruction and Reconstruction’), Scott emphasizes the fruitfulness of an approach that seems
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recently to have experienced a renaissance, while demonstrating how it can be profitably employed, and not only in this essay. Scott’s interest in the social and economic contexts of Reformation activity focusing on the Peasants’ War of 1524–6, something that has not been widely studied recently, can make his works seem ‘outdated’. But they call to mind that while the cultural turn has stimulated Reformation history in important ways (and vice versa), the epistemological potential of the ‘old’ questions and approaches has certainly not been exhausted.

The volume is divided into two almost equal parts, ‘Social and Political Aspects of the Early Reformation’ and ‘Radicals in the Reformation’, but the main thread running through it is an interest in the events of the Peasants’ War. The only essay that does not fit into this framework is Scott’s study of accusations of heresy which, as he shows, form a complex strand of early Reformation discourse that was used by old and new believers to discredit each other. Scott’s substantive approaches to ‘the largest popular uprising in European history before the French Revolution’ (p. 2), by contrast, are diverse. He examines the central protagonists of the Peasants’ War under many different aspects: he looks at Gaismaier’s economic thinking (‘The Reformation and Modern Political Economy: Luther and Gaismaier Compared’) and the intellectual worlds of Balthasar Hubmaier, Christoph Schappeler, and Hans Hergot (‘Hubmaier, Schappeler, and Hergot on Social Revolution’). Two essays are devoted to the events of 1524–5 in Allstedt, focusing on Thomas Müntzer (‘Johannes Agricola’s Ein nutzlicher Dialogus . . . ’; ‘Müntzer and the Mustard-Seed: A Parable as Paradox?’). Three further essays take a systematic approach to the subject. ‘The German Peasants’ War and the “Crisis of Feudalism”: Reflections on a Neglected Theme’ reassesses historiographical debates that have fallen into oblivion; ‘The German Peasants’ War of 1525 and the English Peasants’ Revolt of 1381: A Comparison of Peasant and Urban Participation’ takes a comparative look at one of the basic themes of Scott’s oeuvre, the relationship between town and country; and ‘The Collective Response of Women to Early Reforming Preaching: Four Small Communities and

their Preachers Compared’ takes an innovative approach to gender history.

Completed by an exemplary index of names and places, and one of subjects, Scott’s collection of essays demonstrates the correctness of his conviction that, far from being a worked-out seam, early Reformation history ‘still contains new adits and shafts of exploration into unresolved questions’ (p. 1).

GABRIELE HAUG-MORITZ is Professor of Early Modern History at the University of Graz. She has published extensively on the Reformation in Germany, the constitutional and judicial history of the Holy Roman Empire, and media history. She is the author of, among others, Der Schmalkaldische Bund (1530–1541/42): Eine Studie zu den genossenschaftlichen Strukturelementen der politischen Ordnung des Heiligen Römischen Reiches Deutscher Nation (2002) and Die württembergische Ehrbarkeit (1648–1805): Annäherungen an eine bürgerliche Machtelte der Frühen Neuzeit (2009). Currently she is writing a comparative study of religious conflict and the media in France and the German lands in the middle of the sixteenth century.


Britain’s political and cultural insularity during the early modern period has long been accepted, more or less uncritically. Recently, however, thanks to the work of J. C. D. Clark, Timothy Blanning, Andrew Thompson, Tony Claydon, and others, this view has begun to give way to a broader European perspective. Comparative investigations as well as studies of transfer and cultural processes of translation and reception have shown—and not just in the context of the anniversary of the Hanoverian succession in 2014—how closely Britain was involved with what was happening in continental Europe, especially central Europe, and how much the Continent contributed to shaping (early) modern Britain. They have made clear that political, religious, and cultural processes on both sides of the Channel were not irreconcilable *Sonderwege*, but parts of a common European *ancien régime*.

This is the context for these two new studies by David Scott Gehring and David Worthington, which deal with special areas of contact and mechanisms of exchange between Britain and the Continent. Gehring examines a hitherto neglected dimension of Elizabethan foreign policy, studies of which have traditionally concentrated more on relations with France and Spain. Building on the work of Erkki Kouri in particular, Gehring looks at England’s relations with the Protestant imperial Estates from the start of Queen Elizabeth I’s reign to the 1590s. The book fits into the research on the Protestant cause or Protestant interest as an integrative force in English foreign policy, stretching from Simon Adams’s unpublished Ph.D. thesis of 1972 to Andrew Thompson (2006). Gehring analyses diplomatic contacts between English envoys and the courts of what he calls, terminologically not entirely convincingly, ‘greater Germania’

Trans. Angela Davies (GHIL).
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(p. 9, *passim*). Specifically, in addition to England, he focuses largely on the imperial Estates of Electoral Palatinate, the Electorate of Saxony, and Denmark. The Danish monarchy was closely connected with the Holy Roman Empire not only by its territorial holdings, but also through dynastic and denominational ties with, among others, Electoral Saxony.

The starting point for Gehring’s study is the observation that Lutheranism influenced Elizabethan ecclesiastical policy. This strand, like other continental denominational transfers to Britain, is not pursued further in the study. Instead, Gehring concentrates on various attempts by English politicians to conclude alliances with the more important Protestant imperial Estates. In the tradition of classical diplomatic history, he describes individual missions and their often rather hopeless attempts to persuade the princes, who were mostly theologically and politically totally at odds, to sign treaties of alliance, to support troops, or contribute money in the service of a wider, common Protestant interest. Despite external threats to the interests of Protestant polities, such as the French Wars of Religion, the revolt of the Netherlands, and the expansion of Spanish Habsburg power, the theological and denominational divisions within the Holy Roman Empire proved to be an insurmountable obstacle to forging political alliances, and the atmosphere surrounding the Formula of Concord and the 1580 Book of Concord further exacerbated this situation. Attempts at cooperation naturally had the greatest chance of success where, as in Electoral Palatinate or the Electorate of Saxony under the short reign of Christian I, they aimed to bring together Lutheran opponents of the Formula of Concord into a Protestant alliance.

Developments in the Empire and central Europe were, of course, closely monitored by Britain. It is not surprising, therefore, that when crises such as the French Wars of Religion or the Cologne War of 1584 threatened European Protestantism, feelers were quickly extended and attempts made to persuade potentially friendly princes to enter a wider alliance. The Danish king Frederick II’s support for English plans played a special part here. The English–Danish axis seemed to weaken after the execution of Elizabeth’s rival, Mary Queen of Scots, and Frederick II’s death, which followed soon thereafter. This was because Scotland now intervened more actively in Europe’s concert of Protestant powers, until the potential for conflict between Den-
mark and Scotland (for example, about the Orkney Islands) was contained when James VI married Anne of Denmark. A more significant break in England’s policy towards the Empire did not occur until the 1590s. It was caused by deaths and generational changes on both sides, the failure of the anti-French alliance army under the leadership of Anhalt followed by Henry IV’s conversion to Catholicism, and the consolidation of the situation in the Protestant Netherlands. This put an end to the ‘era of Anglo-German involvement in the wars of religion’ (p. 147) and, according to Gehring, the closest phase of Anglo-German cooperation until the eighteenth century.

This strictly chronological study convincingly presents the significance and, above all, the coherence of Elizabethan foreign policy towards the Protestant imperial Estates, based on rich manuscript material from British and German archives: ‘the Queen’s German policy exhibited a fundamentally consistent pan-Protestant ideology’ (p. 111). Although many diplomatic missions had no concrete results, the book’s achievement is to have demonstrated the integrative power of a Protestant cause between Britain and continental Europe, despite the fact that the most convincing military cooperation of 1591 after the union of Torgau took place in the context of English policy for France. This meant that Protestant policy towards the Empire was often simultaneously a policy towards France (pp. 140–3). Whether the numerous appeals to an international Protestantism should always be seen as instructions for specific political action or whether they were sometimes intended to promote a rhetorical integration (also internally), however, remains a moot point. Further studies, for example, on the theological background of Protestant appeals to the community, on the role of print, or on the imperial Estates’ political and cultural interests in cooperating with England could provide more insights. The way in which this study is structured and its rather one-dimensional perspective, looking from England to Europe, mean that potential interlocutors and cooperation partners in the Empire and their political chances and ambitions appear relatively pale and passive.

Gehring’s argument is detailed and factual, but does not adopt the newer methodological insights of a cultural history of early modern diplomacy. A number of exciting questions would repay further consideration. What impact did internal denominational policy between the two poles of reformed Puritanism and state church
Erastianism have on Elizabethan foreign policy and diplomacy? To what extent were both really ‘partners in the Protestant cause’ (p. 150)? Was Lutheranism a ‘third force’ during the late English Reformation period, or were there significant fractures, despite the postulated continuity?

David Worthington’s study of the experience of British travellers and migrants in continental Europe is located beyond the politics of political alliances and set against an even larger geographical horizon. It has grown out of the context of a number of studies and research projects conducted at the University of Aberdeen, dealing with the early modern Scottish diaspora on the Continent of Europe. Worthington himself is the author of a study, published in 2003, of Scots in Habsburg military service in the seventeenth century. These interests explain the geographical scope of his investigation, which includes the eastern part of central Europe, in particular, the Prussian–Polish Baltic region, and the Habsburg sphere of influence going beyond the borders of the Old Reich.

The timeframe Worthington suggests, 1560 to 1688, that is, from the establishment of a Scottish national church to the Glorious Revolution, is to be understood loosely. The Introduction refers back to the Middle Ages, while the Conclusion looks forward well into the eighteenth century. Between them lie five large chapters which look at links between British travellers to Europe and the formation of expatriate networks (chapter one); diplomats and spies, especially around the Habsburg court (chapter two); soldiers in the service of continental armies (chapter three); Protestant scholars and traders (chapter four); and Catholic colleges, orders, and clergy from Britain on the Continent (chapter five). The Conclusion offers more than a mere summary, including references to connections with the later Jacobite diaspora and the place of Anglo-Irish migrants in the collective memory of individual central European regions. Particular attention is paid throughout to the Leslie family of Scottish descent, one of whose members, Walter, gained a certain notoriety as an imperial field marshal and assassin of Wallenstein.

The study offers a great deal of detailed information about the careers and contacts of the mostly Scottish expatriates it discusses. Fully in the spirit of the book’s ‘transnational perspective’ (p. 2), some of them ended up in North Africa or the Netherlands in the service of Spain. Some we find in Poland, or fighting for the Habs-
burgs against the Ottomans in Hungary. Networks of mercenaries and diplomats were formed on an ad hoc basis, or based on family relations (pp. 93–4). The comparison between Protestant and Catholic migrants is appealing. For Catholics, their educational infrastructure helped in group-formation, as is demonstrated by taking the example of the Jesuit academy in Braunsberg/Branievo in the Duchy of Prussia (pp. 158–9).

It is a problem, however, that the book does not have an overarching argument, but consists primarily of a collection of rather scattered individual stories. Often these are not clearly contextualized in terms of the origin of the source, or their specific political and cultural setting. In particular, the way in which travel reports are used is methodologically unsatisfying. Ignoring the findings of recent research, travel reports are here treated (and extensively quoted) as sources of seemingly objective factual information, without a closer look being taken at their authors or intended readership (pp. 26–8).

Based on sources from numerous European archives (Britain, Belgium, Spain, Poland, Czech Republic, Austria), contemporary prints, and (sometimes obscure) research literature from a number of national historiographies, this book is valuable as a treasure trove of personal history and a pioneering cross-genre work. It paints a picture of a ‘largely male, disproportionately Scottish if transnational, mixed Protestant and Roman Catholic grouping with a “multiplicity of involvements” in both home and host societies’ (p. 189). Further archival research on both sides of the Channel may possibly reveal an even greater diversity among the British expatriates in early modern continental Europe.

The two studies under review here both show, in different ways, how fruitful the investigation of Anglo-continental relations and networks in the early modern period can be. They also point to the many research questions that have not yet been adequately answered, and document a fundamental change in some areas of British research on the early modern period over the last twenty years. A corresponding change in central European research is now required in order to temper the traditional dominance of Franco-German transfers by looking at the significance of early modern exchange relations between Britain and Germany. But both studies underline the difficulty of adequately reflecting the multipolarity of entanglements in a transnational perspective and presenting them in a narrative that does justice to the
transcultural realities, complex communication structures, and mobility of the early modern population. There is always the danger of preferring to look in one direction rather than the other. In conjunction with the selection of sources and approaches, this can result in rather traditional histories of transfer and reception whose unilinearity does not do full justice to the actual complexity of the exchange across the Channel. Yet if, as in the books discussed here, this opens new horizons, then this represents a major asset for research.

ALEXANDER SCHUNKA is Junior Professor at the University of Erfurt/Gotha. His publications include Soziales Wissen und dörfliche Welt: Herrschaft, Jagd und Naturwahrnehmung in Zeugenaussagen des Reichskammergerichts aus Nordschwaben (16.–17. Jahrhundert) (2000); Gäste, die bleiben: Zuwanderer in Kursachsen und der Oberlausitz im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert (2006); and Migrationserfahrungen – Migrationsstrukturen, edited with Eckart Olshausen (2010). At present he is writing a study of intellectual relationships between German and British theologians and churchmen in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century.
This edited volume on caricature and visual satire is based on a symposium to celebrate the tercentenary of the accession of the House of Hanover to the British throne in 1714. Comprising nine chapters, it aims to demonstrate, as the editors write in their introduction, that the eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century dynastic link between the United Kingdom and the German electorate represented ‘a determining factor’ for the emergence and development of caricature in England. In what follows the reader encounters something very different, namely, a number of excellent essays on various aspects of caricature: visual print’s artistic origin, its production and markets, and exchange with other media. The Personal Union is left unexplored and is hardly referred to in any of the contributions. This observation is not meant as pedantic criticism. Rather, it aims to point out that students and scholars of art history, history, and cultural studies will discover more in the book than the title implies, or, at least, something different from what it suggests.

The nine essays are divided into four sections. The first deals with the king as a central figure for the artistic genre. It explores the importance of monarchy both as an attractive topic for caricaturists and a major reason for the rising popularity of loyalist and opposition caricature. Werner Busch points to the Catholic origin of caricatures. The first representations of caricatured heads appeared at the papal court in Rome. While late sixteenth-century Italian caricature showed individual portraits, however, it was in England that such ‘heads’ were placed in satirical images and narratives. The emergence of English caricature around the middle of the eighteenth century coincided with the end of George II’s reign and the accession of George III. The late Hanoverian monarchs lived during an age of caricature. Sheila O’Connell, Christina Oberstebrink, and James Baker demonstrate in their contributions that the monarchy was central to the success of the genre. While O’Connell’s essay provides a concise history of caricature of members of the royal family, Oberstebrink places the British caricaturist James Gillray into the contemporary discourse on art. Gillray’s Shakespeare references can be understood as a response
to art theory. Similarly, the caricaturists’ approach of making fun of authority, not least the monarchy, has an equivalent in Shakespeare’s use of the comic in drama. While caricatures can be understood as something new to a mid eighteenth-century audience, there were strong links with other artistic genres.

James Baker points to the strong nexus between caricature and commerce. Artists, engravers, and printers experimented with royal images, not least in the hope of better sales. However, as the strategies of the stationer, printer, and entrepreneur Samuel Fores show, appealing to the loyalism of potential buyers while also exploiting the broader appeal of caricaturing the royal family proved to be a delicate business. It was because of the controversies surrounding the royal princes such as George Augustus Frederick that monarchy took centre stage in caricatures. In other words, politics needs to be included in an interpretation of caricature as art.

The second section discusses the evolution of topics and the subversive content of images. Karl Janke argues that the English Republic encountered difficulties in visual self-representation. While caricaturists benefited from the aggravated ideological confrontations of the late seventeenth century it was the conservative ‘counter-offensive’ that won the ‘civil war of images’ and the ‘battle for state symbols’. Republican political ideas were successful in poetry and prose while it proved much more difficult to develop a Republican iconography.

Temitope Odumosu’s contribution can be placed somewhere between sections one and two. Her analysis of royal caricature deals with the discourse on anti-slavery. While caricatures played with the frugal image of George III and his family, they also referred to Wilberforce’s anti-slavery movement that had advocated abstaining from colonial products such as sugar since 1791. At the other end of the political spectrum we find references to black African women in caricature that highlight the distance between royalty and reality. While Prince William publicly defended slavery on economic grounds, he was known to have an African mistress, something caricaturists hastened to exploit. However, ‘representing the prince with a “black” woman was certainly a daring intervention’ (p. 133).

The more practical aspects of caricature production and sale are at the heart of the third section. Timothy Clayton points to the differences between France and Britain. While French representations of
monarchy were often state funded, the emergence of a consumer society provided an important prerequisite for British caricature. However, commercial success also led to piracy of ideas and to the question of copyright. As early as 1735, unauthorized copies became illegal. Efforts by caricaturists to sell themselves as artistic personalities was both an attempt to defend their genre against other artistic traditions and a device to tackle the thriving market in cheaper versions of art.

The final section deals with caricature’s interaction with other media. Brian Maidment explains the visual image’s path from individual large-scale artefact to illustration in printed periodicals and other forms of serial publication. He describes the fold-out, engraved frontispiece as a mechanism for providing small-sized volumes with a large and glamorous form of illustration. Publishers embarked on this strategy around 1820. This can be placed somewhere between the wish of publishers to preserve the tradition of political caricature and the changed market for comic visual culture. As Maidment shows, the Glasgow Looking Glass can be interpreted as a prime example of this sort of development. More importantly, he also demonstrates that visual artists in their ‘frantic energy, endless inventiveness and low success rate’ (p. 180) experienced comic art as a form of intense experimentation that was symptomatic of the transformation of the 1820s and 1830s.

Finally, Sune Erik Schlitte points to the many layers of caricaturist biography and art. John Wolcot’s success (under the pseudonym Peter Pindar) as a critic of society must be placed against his ambition to exploit career opportunities, address popular topics, and benefit from political argument. In conclusion, caricaturists must be understood in their artistic, social, economic, and political context. As Wolcot’s caricature Lousiad of 1787 (referring to a louse George III found in a dish) shows, it was because of the British upper class’s interest in opposition caricature and the Prince Regent’s support of Pindar that the caricature became so successful.

As in Schlitte’s essay, the reader finds strong thematic overlap in most contributions to the volume. (Hence the editors refer to the four sections only very briefly in the introduction. The categories find no place in the table of contents.) Caricature, cartoons, and other forms of visual satire need to be placed between art and commodity. Thus while some of the elaborate, large-scale, and coloured examples can
be seen as high (and expensive) art, cheaper copies with a large print run appealed to a much wider audience. While caricaturists placed themselves in an artistic tradition, the potential price of their art, or the income it could generate, proved just as important an inspiration.

While this volume’s description of the multi-layered world of caricature is strong, a small critical reservation needs to be made. The historiography on the Personal Union is entirely neglected. John Harald Plump’s *The First Four Georges* (1975) is described as the best account of the Hanoverians. While we find references to Ernst Brandes and his links with Britain, and to the Hanoverian artist Heinrich Ramberg’s contribution to caricature, none of the more recent books on cultural transfer between Britain and Hanover is mentioned. The original and innovative aspects of the book are to be found elsewhere. Despite this reservation, the volume is recommended as a highly readable, concise, and inspiring state-of-the-art account of English political caricature during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

TORSTEN RIOTTE is a Lecturer at the Goethe University Frankfurt. His publications include a monograph on composite statehood during the reign of George III, *Hannover in der britischen Politik* (2005) and several articles on the Dynastic Union between the two states. He is co-editor of *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714–1837* (2010) and of volumes 3 and 4 of the edition *British Envoys to Germany* (2006 and 2010). His most recent study of European monarchs in exile will be published at the end of 2015.

Focusing on cultural exchange between Britain and Germany from 1770 to 1840, this volume represents the published outcome of a conference of early-career researchers at the Institute for European History in Mainz in 2009. An introduction by the editors sets the analytical pace. It refers to the historical backdrop, differing starting points in Britain and Germany, and general patterns of Anglo-German intercourse. It also exercises analytical concepts of intercultural exchange and doffs a cap at important historiographical predecessors, in particular, the volume edited by Rudolf Muhs, Johannes Paulmann, and Willibald Steinmetz (1998). The editors argue the case for extending the focus of this study backwards in time to this earlier period and outwards in subject to areas not traditionally identified as cultural. They also emphasize the plurality of the subject and the need to distinguish between reception and impact.

Jennifer Willenberg takes up the analytical baton with an article explaining how foreignness was constructed and perceived in Anglo-German discourse. Cultural goods are identified as belonging to one’s own culture or as foreign by means of stereotypes, models, and fashions. In such ways, information is selected for adoption or rejection, and the self is defined simultaneously with the foreign. Willenberg then sets out to illustrate her argument by pointing to the formative influence of French ideas about Britain on eighteenth-century Germany, in particular, the work of Voltaire and Montesquieu. In so doing, she introduces a recurring theme of the volume: the European dimension of the subject. She also proceeds to explore how patterns of thought about Britain developed through and beyond the revolutionary period and in reaction to changing power-political relations.

The significance of Göttingen as a sort of cultural camera obscura transposing British themes onto a German screen is taken up by Sünne Juterczenka. The lens is widened from Europe to empire, as Juterczenka analyses how Göttingen academics received and presented information about British exploration of the Pacific. Published discussions of Captain James Cook’s exploits, it is argued, testify to the increasing focus on Britain as opposed to France or Portugal, but also to an emerging sense of self-worth on the part of Göttingen’s academics. Their absorption of notions of British empiricism at first encouraged a sense of themselves as *Stubengelehrte*. This, in turn, formed a foundation for arguments regarding German analytical strengths and the necessity of subjecting empirical if not superficial British findings to German science. Both Willenberg and Juterczenka demonstrate the European context and the more problematic phase post-1789.

Evelyn Gottschlich turns to the reception of the Earl of Chesterfield’s letters in Germany and, in particular, to the way in which his arguments about politeness were received. In a consideration which rests upon comparison of moral philosophical traditions in Britain and Germany, Gottschlich reveals how politeness constituted a particularly British phenomenon rooted in the specific social context of public life. This made it difficult for German philosophers to understand or recognize Chesterfield, who they rejected as having no moral principles and simply advocating good deeds for self-serving ends. Chesterfield’s treatment is contrasted with that of Shaftesbury, whose ‘moral sense’ movement was understood and became popular in Germany. Politeness, therefore, was not treated as a major theme by German writers. As the eighteenth century ended, German moral philosophy was presented as strengthening its interest in moral sense theories, while British counterparts became more evangelical, leaving Chesterfield’s politeness a thing of the past.

Michael Bies likewise considers the limitations of German Anglophilia. On the one hand, his introduction of Charles Gore both recalls contemporary British fascination with Weimar and focuses attention on a man whose presence in the town brought about personal encounters with leading figures in German cultural life, including Goethe. On the other hand, Bies deftly explores how Goethe drew upon Gore as the basis for his English Lord in *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*, but also how Goethe’s depiction, while grounded in reality,
can be seen as a rejection of English traits. For example, the camera obscura makes a reappearance, this time as the English Lord’s—and Gore’s—preferred method of producing artwork. Goethe, however, presents this utilization of intentionally empirical methods as leading to imitative and pedantic results. Art, by implication, is about something unseen, more spiritual. In this case study, Bies masterfully illustrates the strengthening aspirations of German culture, its increasing emphasis on artistic idealism, and the simultaneous rejection of British cultural approaches. His account is a useful extension of Juter- czenka’s account of growing academic confidence.

Uwe Ziegler, recalling initial points made regarding the definition of culture, considers discussion of the British constitution in Prussia from 1790 to 1823. His account traces pre-revolutionary interest and how this was transformed after 1789. Prior to the revolution, anti-absolutist interest predominated, despite conservative concerns in the wake of American independence. After the revolution, a Burkean interest in constitutional liberalization in order to avoid revolution developed in Prussia. Ziegler also explains how enlightened interest in the British constitution was spread across a network of reformers from the 1760s on, not just in Göttingen but also in Königsberg, Berlin, and elsewhere. Thus by the turn of the century a visit to Britain had become an established part of the education of the aspiring and reflective civil servant. Despite the small number of those concerned, Ziegler argues that the impact of British influence was enhanced, given the positions of the individuals and the political situation. Once direct contact with Britain became difficult after 1803, the information and arguments regarding Britain would continue to have influence. However, this provides a useful distillation of the phenomenon that discourse regarding foreign themes and subjects can exist in a vacuum and for domestic purposes. Drawing on previous essays, Ziegler again underlines how Montesquieu’s arguments regarding the Germanic characteristics of the British constitutional system were utilized by reformers for their own ends.

Later, however, the reformist discourse foundered on resistance constituted by an alliance between Hardenberg’s administrative precedence, the provincialism of the Estates, and the conservatism of the aristocracy. Ziegler’s constitutional exploration demonstrates clearly the tensions, evolution, and limitations of Prussian discussion of Britain. Out of this discussion a home-grown constitutional posi-
tion emerged, emphasizing representation rather than democracy, and culminating in, for example, Hegel’s critique of the Reform Bill. The theme of continuity between Hegel’s position and that of the late-Enlightenment political publicists is explored in greater depth by Iwan-Michelangelo D’Aprile. D’Aprile’s focus on Friedrich Buchholz expands the critical position of conservatives to social and economic questions.

Oliver Werner explores the way in which preconceptions about foreign states led to a particular focus and the selection of information, and the ramifications of this in political decision-making. In this case, however, the object of study is Henry Addington. Addington’s experience during the Napoleonic Wars as British envoy to Prussia, it is argued, shaped his approach to German politics when appointed as Britain’s representative to the Confederation in Frankfurt in 1828–9. Werner shows how this led to a particular position on intra-German politics. He also adds a fresh area of investigation by considering the measures taken by European states during this period to ensure the appointment of diplomats with an understanding of the culture of their host states. Governments, it is implied, were themselves becoming aware of the importance of freeing themselves from their own preconceptions for the sake of better information-gathering.

In the volume’s final contribution, Niall Busse studies the remarkable network of chemists built up by Justus von Liebig, now seen as a classic example. Busse focuses his attention on the carriers, rationale, locations, media, and objects of transfer at work. The essay becomes a contemplation of the concept of culture. There are differing academic cultures. Liebig was intent on spreading his own approach via his pupils in Britain. Scientific literature is considered as a cultural medium. Liebig’s enthusiasm for empiricism fuelled his support for the translation of John Stuart Mill’s System of Logic. Busse also highlights how chemistry provided a dense network of contacts facilitating cultural transfer in more mundane senses. The deficiencies of chemistry in Britain required the transfer there of German glass implements and raw materials. Liebig wrote on English-style note-paper, constructed an English garden, and introduced tea at 5 o’clock in Giessen.

This volume is not without weaknesses. More explicit cross-referencing reinforcing the contributions and an analytical conclusion...
drawing the whole together would have been helpful. The relevance of some of the contributions to the whole is not made obvious enough. The perennial problem of England versus Britain is left unaddressed and at times becomes excruciating. There are similar concerns when discussing Prussia versus Germany. The question of representativeness is never far from the reader’s mind: how far can a small group of academics at Göttingen or reformers in Berlin constitute a German reception at all? Indeed, are terms such as Britain and Germany suitable when considering intercultural transfer in this period? There is an imbalance, with most of the contributions focusing on German reception and leading one to question the title’s reference to Austausch. Despite fleeting mention, there is little consideration of economic themes. Nevertheless, together and separately, the contributions in this volume constitute important and welcome additions to research on cultural transfer and Anglo-German relations, both chronologically and thematically.
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LEIGHTON S. JAMES, Witnessing the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars in German Central Europe, War, Culture and Society, 1750–1850 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), xiii + 281 pp. ISBN 978 0 230 24917 2. £55.00

Leighton S. James draws on the full range of German-language ego documents that survive from the turbulent decades around 1800: letters, diaries, and memoirs. On this broad source basis, he reconstructs contemporary perceptions of the wars of the time. This applies to the entire period from the outbreak of the revolutionary wars to the end of the wars of liberation; to all locations with German-speaking actors, from Spain to Russia; and to testimonies of soldiers on campaign as well as to records left by civilians who experienced the war at home. James manages to compress this huge programme into just 200 pages of text.

And there is still space for a chapter outlining the constitutional and political framework for the disintegration of the Holy Roman Empire, thus making the book accessible to those who are not familiar with these complicated, very German structures. And there is also room for a concise chapter discussing the specific features of the various text genres and the older and more recent literary traditions that might have influenced the individual authors.

The book’s specific nature is defined by the wealth and breadth of its coverage on the one hand, and compression on the other. It is designed as a handbook that systematically covers the whole of its subject area in order to reflect the state of research. But it is intended to be much more than that. By arguing so closely from the sources, it claims to make an independent and continuing contribution to research in its own right. Its systematic coverage, however, militates against transparency and unity of epistemological approach.

To start with, the author explains his main epistemological interests, but here, too, he poses several very different questions. He asks to what extent experiences of the war were shaped by social status, gender, denomination, and literary interpretations; to what extent eye-witness testimonies reflect a changed culture of war; and to what extent the war encouraged the development of German nationalism. All three are justified and complex questions which, under the cir-
cumstances, can only be addressed sporadically, unsystematically, and in an unbalanced way. And it remains unclear whether the overwhelmingly broad range of sources presented is based on a methodological selection and evaluation of the texts. The treatment of the sources also varies. Sometimes they are themselves the subject of an analytical reception history, when the author is investigating the reflection of ethnic stereotypes, for instance; at others, they are a medium which is used to illustrate events, for example, to tell the story of how resistance to the French occupation fell apart.

We do the book more justice, therefore, if we read it as a handbook with a pragmatically designed methodology that allows the reader to follow the voices of contemporaries through the period, while also reporting on current research and discussing it in the light of the author’s own reading of the sources. His knowledge of these allows him to bridge gaps in the debate. Given the constraints outlined above, it does this in a highly concentrated form, and in what, from a German perspective, seems like a typically English fashion, with quotations from the sources used as examples to prop up wide-ranging theses and arguments that quickly follow on from each other.

Two chapters take a military perspective, and another two a predominantly civilian one. The military chapters deal with the conditions of military service, with emphasis on the problems of patriotism. They also look at perceptions of the Other during extensive campaigns. The following chapters, conceived more from the civilian perspective, examine reactions to the French occupation and perceptions of liberation, with a stress on the participation of women. Thus they allow a rough chronological juxtaposition.

Read as a handbook, the volume spreads out before the reader a wealth of stimulating observations and references to current research which, in the end, merge together to create a remarkable panorama of the period. To this extent, therefore, the author has produced an unprecedented synthesis. At the end, he pares the fruits of his own reading down to two essential theses which will serve to stimulate further discussion. First, James wants to free his sources from appropriation by nationalist interpretations of the nineteenth century. These are, in any case, no longer taken seriously as reference texts. In this context, James points out that his ego documents reveal little patriotic inspiration, and expose highly differentiated and inconsistent perceptions of France in particular.
This also affects the author’s second main concern. Going against the grain of recent research, which emphasizes the particularity of this era, James claims to find hardly any specific features in the ego documents he examined. Rather, he mentions similarities with eighteenth-century testimonies, and even with those of the First World War. Thus the texts suggest that from the point of view of the individual, the burdens of war changed little—‘unsurprisingly’ is a word that recurs often in this context. The values and perspectives of social orders prove to be long-lived, while the undeniable political and military upheavals of the time are barely reflected in these contemporary accounts. This finding must, of course, itself be related to the status, genre, and perspective of the documents. But it is also a reason to consider the basic implications both for the range of these sources and, conversely, for the implementation of changes. Eventually, however, even these 200 pages are exhausted.
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Sven Oliver Müller’s monograph, which has grown out of the Habilitationsschrift he submitted to the University of Bielefeld, focuses on the role of the audience in opera houses and concert venues during the nineteenth century. In Berlin, London, and Vienna he is looking at three distinct and well-chosen cities. This is an ambitious and fascinating project and, to anticipate, Müller pulls it off beautifully.

In his introduction Müller usefully points to the power of audiences and their influence on performances. His study focuses on patterns of behaviour that were often seen as annoying and disruptive by composers and musicians, such as talking through performances, applauding in the middle of a scene, walking in and out of auditoria in the middle of a performance, and so on. Disappointingly, Müller’s focus is entirely on middle- and upper-class audiences at concert and opera performances. Although this is perhaps understandable given the enormity of the project and the comparative approach, the focus on elite audiences and the canonical high-art repertoire they patronized is also limiting. It sidelines the vast audiences attracted by a more popular musical programmes, for example, in the music halls and variety theatres of Britain, and the body of work on popular entertainment.

Müller usefully sets out the ideas for his book in a number of theses. He argues that musical performances made and extended social and political groups; that audience behaviour was not static but changed throughout the nineteenth century; that the pleasure of attending concerts cannot be separated from their social function; that the years from 1820 to 1850 were a distinct turning point in the reception of music and the process of creating mass audiences for concerts and operas; that we can detect changing mechanisms of exclusion in practices of musical communication; that audiences were multifaceted and interconnected; and, finally, that audiences were co-creators of musical performances. In working through these theses, Müller looks for common ground in Europe’s musical life by taking a comparative approach. One area of common ground, he argues, was the middle-class appreciation of music that decisively influenced its reception. Patterns of behaviour, Müller argues, were,
in fact, very similar across Europe, with similarities decidedly outweighing the differences (p. 28).

In terms of balance, Vienna, perhaps surprisingly, gets the shortest treatment. Müller’s expertise lies elsewhere, as illustrated by his previous publications, and he clearly feels much more at home discussing the situation in London. At times he could have explored the fundamental differences between Germany and Austria on the one hand and Britain on the other in more detail, in particular, relating to state funding. On page 44, when discussing musical venues in Europe, he could have mentioned that there was no equivalent to a Hoftheater (court theatre) in Britain (although he briefly notes this on p. 59). He could also have stressed that the performance ‘pot-pourri’ on offer at London theatres did not actually cease to exist with the emergence of the symphony as an art form (p. 49), but continued well into the twentieth century at many venues. Otherwise this second chapter’s focus on audiences, social structures, inequalities and status, and distinctions is highly convincing. Müller shows how concert and opera venues in growing cities acted as spaces for meeting and negotiating social distinctions. Elite bourgeois and aristocratic audiences consciously linked aesthetic beauty with economic power (p. 67).

In chapter 3 Müller turns to programmes and repertoires. He addresses the issue of ‘cultural transfers’ and the development of common repertoires, aesthetics, and tastes. The nineteenth century saw the development of a standard opera repertoire consisting of Mozart, Bellini, Donizetti, Meyerbeer, Verdi, and Wagner. The same applied to orchestral music, with symphonies by Beethoven, Brahms, and Dvorak topping the bill across Europe. These similarities, Müller argues, were down not only to the qualities of the musical compositions themselves, but also to the discourses surrounding them (p. 106). Europe, on the whole, was fascinated by the idea of the ‘musical genius’, for example, especially Beethoven and Wagner, who almost created his own myth. Strauss and Mahler, on the other hand, divided opinion (p. 134). The cult of the virtuoso, too, was a European phenomenon with Liszt, Jenny Lind, and Paganini the most obvious examples. Another pan-European development was a longing for oriental dreams and illusion on stage, with increasingly elaborate productions being staged from the 1830s on (one minor point of criticism here is that Gilbert and Sullivan’s enormously successful Savoy operas warrant a broader discussion here, or at least a
bit more space than just a footnote on p. 191). From the 1850s on, however, a more conservative taste in musical programming took hold all over Europe, with calls for ‘true art’ and ‘absolute music’ (p. 175).

Chapter 4 deals with the changing musical experience during the nineteenth century and the ‘invention of silence’ (p. 217). Between 1820 and 1860 a fundamental shift occurred across Europe, as audiences at concert and opera performances grew increasingly quiet. Müller convincingly discusses this phenomenon as a change in patterns of behaviour through self-control. Quiet audiences first appeared in northern Germany around 1820 in a development which reached Britain around 1850, although as late as 1877 there were still complaints about London audiences applauding during a performance instead of at the end of it. Müller’s particular interest in elite forms of performance, however, perhaps narrows the focus too much here as this kind of expression of the audience’s appreciation could still be found in the 1940s and 1950s, especially at regional repertory theatres. Applause would break out as soon as the local favourite actor appeared on stage, regardless of whether this was appropriate to that particular moment in the play or not. In the context of high art, on the other hand, European concert and opera audiences had grown quiet by the last third of the nineteenth century, thanks to pan-European cultural transfers, as Müller argues (pp. 257–8). They had developed into quiet and avid listeners, and their behaviour consciously exemplified their elevated social and cultural status. Music was now considered art to be marvelled at, and not something to be enjoyed as background entertainment.

Müller rightly points out that this development is all the more remarkable when contrasted with the early nineteenth century, when riots had regularly broken out and audiences had taken a much more active role, almost playing out their own performances. Müller discusses a fascinating example from the Berliner Hofoper in 1818, when the audience decided to put on its own show in response to a vain soloist, Josef Fischer, who had criticized them previously for not showing sufficient appreciation of his performance (p. 264). At London’s Her Majesty’s Theatre in 1840 aristocratic audiences almost caused a riot in order to stake their claim to how operatic performances were run (pp. 265–6), and to reaffirm their place in society at large. Müller usefully puts this unrest into a larger political context,
including London’s Promenade concerts and other, similar, popular concert series elsewhere.

In chapter 5 Müller discusses the political dimension of operatic performances as events where power, control, and influence were negotiated, celebrated, and reaffirmed. Performances themselves were very similar across the Continent, irrespective of whether they were put on in celebration of a monarchy or a republic (p. 296). During official gala performances and through the active participation of audiences, an imagined nation came together. Interestingly, and again linking to Müller’s claim that practices were similar across Europe, the nationalistic rituals played out in Vienna, Berlin, and London were almost identical (pp. 327–8). Müller also makes clear, however, that musical performances were used not only to affirm existing political structures, but also to question them. In the 1830s and 1840s, in particular, performances became political demonstrations and concerts were turned into ‘battle grounds’ (p. 337) in the run up to revolutions on the Continent, or to mock the behaviour and outdated taste of aristocratic audiences in London. In contrast to Berlin and Vienna, however, middle-class audiences in London enjoyed significantly more freedom of expression (at least after 1850) than their continental peers.

Overall, Müller has written a detailed, well-researched, and well-argued book. He is always in command of his vast material, and the study’s comparative nature is exemplary. Müller is also able to place his research into current theoretical debates, although the tentative claim for a ‘musical turn’ may be a bit far fetched (pp. 19 ff.). As Müller’s book does not only speak to a German-language readership, I would highly recommend that it is translated into English.
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The German term in the title of this book opens up a wide field. While an English translation exists, it is not a direct equivalent. ‘Völkerpsychologie’ is a hybrid in German, both a technical term and a part of everyday language. Neither variant corresponds exactly to ‘folk psychology’ or ‘psychology of the people’, which come across in English as distorted neologisms. Nor do paraphrases such as ‘folklore’ or ‘ethnic anthropology’ convey the meaning of the German term. The author’s decision, therefore, to leave the German term in the title (although not consistently throughout the text) is a good one. It seems that both the term and what it refers to are specific to the German-language discourse of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and this in itself is an important statement about the subject. But what does the term mean in German? Is the difficulty in translating it merely a matter of terminology, or does it also point to substantive peculiarities? Does it refer to a scientific method or to an academic subject? Or perhaps to a specific style of thinking?

As Egbert Klautke’s concise book makes clear, all of this applies at the same time to Völkerpsychologie. His decision not to present his subject as a defined field, but as a contradictory and mutable concept that served different purposes at different times, is illuminating. The reader is thus confronted with a conglomerate of ideas, drawn from intellectual history and the history of ideology, of very different provenances: a bundle of themes from Wesensschau and Seelenschau, ethics and morality, and elements of social and cultural history. This mixture aspired to become a theory of civilization and a philosophy of history. At the same time, however, the changing Zeitgeist meant that the term was used to refer to quite different things. This is what makes up the peculiarity of the subject, and it would have been a pity if the author had limited his account to one aspect of the confusingly varied writings. Nonetheless, Klautke had to make a selection, and here a third decision on his part is to be praised. It reveals the common sense of an experienced historian. Almost typologically, Klautke describes how the concept was invented and consolidat-
ed by Moritz Lazarus and Heymann Steinthal from the middle of the nineteenth century (ch. 1); how Wilhelm Wundt, a medical doctor and philosopher from Leipzig, made the approach academically respectable and worthy of inclusion in encyclopaedias (ch. 2); and then how it was popularized in the journalism of the 1930s and 1940s, citing the psychologist Willy Hellpach from Karlsruhe (later Heidelberg), a student of Wundt, as a representative figure (ch. 3).

In the first chapter, Klautke introduces Moritz Lazarus (1824–1903) and Heymann Steinthal (1823–99), and presents an intellectual history of the liberal science of early Völkerpsychologie. This mental construct was liberal because it resulted from reflection on the relationship between religion and modernity, and defined emancipation, equality (of chances and before the law), and freedom (of the individual) as the central problem nexus of the time. Early Völkerpsychologie was connected with the journal Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft which the two founded in 1860, and thus itself generated publicity; it was liberal because it put up its terms for discussion, above all, ‘Verdichtung’ (condensation or thickening), the title of an essay by Lazarus, but also the interpretative figure of ‘Zirkulation’ (circulation), as well as ‘Mannigfaltigkeit’ (multiplicity) and ‘Verflechtung’ (entanglement). In this journal, the term ‘Völkerpsychologie’, which had been in use since 1851, became the key concept for a universal meta-science of modernity, which today we would probably call social psychology or sociology. What was special about this project, however, was that it chose language as the material and method for its own interpretative attempts. By 1890, twenty volumes of this journal, which also printed work by Windelband, Dilthey, Goldziher, Bastian, and Simmel, had been published. The main authors, however, were the editors, both of whom had been shaped by the experience of Jewish emancipation in nineteenth-century Germany. They came from a traditional religious milieu, left the provinces behind, and headed for the metropolis, Berlin. Once there, both gave up their original intention of studying theology and becoming rabbis, and turned instead to philosophy and linguistics. Both were more impressed by Johann Friedrich Herbart, the founder of an empirical cultural psychology, than by Herder’s theory of the Volksgeist. They were students of Friedrich Eduard Beneke, and enthused about the writings of Wilhelm von Humboldt.
Drawing on the work of Ivan Kalmar and Gerhard von Graevenitz, Klautke gives a precise account of the eminently modern concept of culture developed by the Jewish founders of this journal. Despite elements of romanticism in their language and thinking, their concept did not, as a whole, aim to define states or nations in terms of collective ontologies and set them off against each other. Rather, the journal presented a comprehensive sociology of the relationship between individual and society. The editors understood the nation as a community of consent (Zustimmungsgemeinschaft), as a collective to which one belonged not on the basis of birth and property alone, but also through communication and a ‘daily plebiscite’ in Ernest Renan’s sense. Their most famous student was Georg Simmel, who took Steinthal’s and Lazarus’s terms, approaches, and arguments and developed them further. Unlike Wundt, however, Simmel did not use the key concept itself. Wundt, who did, and considered the coinage ‘Völkerpsychologie’ a ‘masterpiece of the art of language’, spelled out one of the aspects of its early history in his own work. In some ways logically, however, he referred to his two predecessors much less frequently than Simmel did.

The second chapter consists of the best scholarly introduction we have so far to the voluminous work of the doctor, psychologist, and polymath Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920). To the present day, his name, rather than those of Lazarus and Steinthal, is associated with Völkerpsychologie. From the 1890s, Wundt, an established university professor, gave lectures that were well received not only in Germany (Martin Buber and the doctor and psychiatrist Emil Kraepelin, for instance, could be named) but also in the USA (for example, by George Herbert Mead and Franz Boas). Between 1900 and 1920, he published ten volumes on the subject, in which he presented his approach, preserving the liberal approaches of the nineteenth century in the subtitle, Entwicklungsgesetze von Sprache, Mythus und Sitte. Wundt wanted to put psychological methods onto an academic basis, and pursued experimental, almost scientific methods. His best-known

---

work was *Die Grundzüge der physiologischen Psychologie* (1837). As in the case of Lazarus and Steinthal, a number of attempts have been made to make Wundt relevant and see him as a ‘misunderstood scholar of the humanities’.  

But much of what he simply assumed in his writings has become completely foreign to us today. Even contemporaries of his, such as the historian Gerhard Masur, noted about the theory of stages in world history presented in Wundt’s *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie* that it conveyed the impression of ‘free historical life being violated by a regular course of development imposed on it and declared as the norm’.  

The hypostatization of the notions of ‘Volk’, ‘Volkstum’, and ‘Volksgeschichte’, which increased shortly thereafter, in the 1930s and 1940s, made this unease even greater, not least because *Völkerpsychologie* was now associated with the racism of the period. Even if this did not connect directly with Wundt, let alone his Jewish predecessors, but merely drew on them and borrowed their concepts, the tradition of *Völkerpsychologie*, which had still been rich and diverse in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was overlaid and finally destroyed by völkisch essentialism (for example, in Werner Sombart) and the racism of the Nazi years.

While the third chapter does not give an account of Nazi *Völkerpsychologie*, it provides the portrait of a scholar working on the intellectual and political margins of the age. Although he engaged with a number of Nazi ideological beliefs, he did this in a different spirit from most Nazi supporters. Willy Hellpach was a student of Wundt, and his *Einführung in die Völkerpsychologie* (1938) was the first attempt since Wundt’s death to popularize his ideas. In his writings, Hellpach did not subscribe to the racism of someone like Hans F. K. Günther (whom he criticized for his materialism), but he supported the ideological values of landscape psychology and ethnic physiognomy in the tradition of Friedrich Ratzel. Hellpach, therefore, did not simply assume the legacy of his academic supervisor. Rather, his works represented a synthesis of the ‘synergetic dynamic’ of the scientific milieu of Leipzig, which was home not only to Wundt but also to Karl Lamprecht and Hans Freyer.
In this chapter, Klautke demonstrates the range of topics covered by Hellpach, and makes it clear that his writings were always addressed to two audiences. Hellpach wrote about the social question, human emotions, colour perception, environmental psychology, big city nervousness, hysteria, group behaviour, and education for a broad public, continuing the journalism he wrote as a student under a pseudonym. Nonetheless, he was also proud of his research achievements; in his memoirs, he later pointed out that he was the first to introduce the psychology of business and work to the university. He described his world view as a ‘socialism of reason’, which allowed him to switch between left-wing and right-wing political positions. For a time he was close to the Pan-German League, but admired Britain for its international standing. For him, the war was an opportunity to balance out the distorted mutual perceptions of the opponents by means of a ‘living Volk psychology’. During the Weimar Republic Hellpach represented Liberal ideas and and was politically active for the German Democratic Party, among other things serving as Baden’s minister of education. In 1933 he remained in office, and his work could be published. His Völkerpsychologie enjoyed great success as essential reading for anything to do with the topics of Volk and Volksstum. In Klautke’s account, Hellpach appears less as the representative of an academic discipline than as the beneficiary of a particular style of thinking that he used—half opportunistically, half pragmatically—for his own purposes. In this way, he created a characteristic mixture of support for and opposition to National Socialism: on the one hand he criticized the Nazi Party’s anti-Semitism; on the other, he agreed with the Nazis’ social policies of exclusion based on völkisch criteria, which he still saw through the eyes of Friedrich Naumann and the early twentieth century.

On the whole, Klautke’s study benefits from the fact that instead of attempting to recapitulate all attempts to play fast and loose with Völkerpsychologie, he concentrates on the origins of the concept, which are underestimated or even forgotten today. Yet in the conclusion he explains why, although Völkerpsychologie from time to time achieved a high intellectual level, it had no future. The differences, some subtle and some more fundamental, between Völkerpsychologie and the

many variants of past and present collective characterology can hardly be intellectually or terminologically maintained. Even supporters always felt that they had to start from the beginning and clear up misunderstandings. Hellpach, who had not only worked in the field himself for decades but, as Wundt’s student, knew his writings well, attempted to make a comeback by publishing a book entitled Der deutsche Charakter in 1954. The reason he gave was that the topic was ‘a branch of research that had not got beyond its early stages’. He was wrong; this thinking had been discredited and was therefore finished.

Although the representatives of Völkerpsychologie selected by Klautke fit into a series, his book makes it clear that their writings were not connected. On the contrary, they fell apart into entirely different islands of knowledge, each of which was wholly committed to the logic of its time and the hopes of its representatives. In doing so, Klautke charts the historical and systematic differences between the concepts of Völkerpsychologie over a century in a book of fewer than 200 pages. Readers will consult with profit this short, but important history of ideas, science, and culture, which deals with the arguments and topics relating to Völkerpsychologie.

The year 2014 brought us a bumper harvest, some would even say a glut, of publications on the cataclysmic conflict that engulfed Europe a century ago. While the sheer volume of scholarship came close to what Germans call a Materialschlacht, relatively few newly unearthed contemporary voices have rung out. Amid the din of the historians’ disagreements, the BBC’s decision to re-issue as podcasts a dozen restored in-depth interviews with eye witnesses first recorded in the early 1960s thus offered a refreshing change of tone. One of the faces and voices brought back to life from the material archived for the landmark ‘Great War’ series (1964) belongs to Stephan Kurt Westmann.

When the war broke out in 1914, this 21-year-old German medical student was about complete his first stint as an Einjährig-Freiwilliger conscript with the 5th Badenese Infantry Regiment (Nr 113). Instead of returning to his studies Westmann now served, first as a medical NCO and then as an officer, for the whole duration of the conflict, on both Western and Eastern fronts, at Verdun and on the Somme, bayonetting enemies in hand-to-hand combat and patching up the wounded in filthy dressing stations. He not only appears to have been good at soldiering, winning a brace of Iron Crosses and surviving years of slaughter with only minor injuries, but seems also to have developed a liking for the military which outlasted the war itself. Within days of being demobbed in 1918, he volunteered to join the 8th Hussars to help provide a ‘security police force’ that would prevent ‘civil disorder’ (p. 151). Westmann would remain involved with the newly formed Reichswehr until at least 1920 (as a member of no less notorious a unit than the Reichswehrbrigade 15, formerly known as the Freikorps Reinhard).

Watching the 1963 interview,1 viewers may not find it easy, though, to recognize in the dapper and slightly fragile gentleman carefully detailing the events of these frantic years the tough young warrior who lived through them. The man describing these harrowing experiences in fluent, but heavily accented English, is a septua-

genarian, a naturalized Englishman, and a Harley Street consultant with a house in leafy Chorleywood. And it was also this man who authored the wartime memoirs *Surgeon with the Kaiser’s Army*, penned at the same time, which have just been published in an updated version edited by his grandson. This lively, opinionated, and often wry narrative provides a wealth of graphic detail about the rough end of warfare and especially about the medical care (or lack thereof) received by the wounded. The book brims with memorable stories about bordellos and pet dogs, outings in biplanes and horse-drawn panje carts, hospital trains and boils on the behinds of senior officers—all of it sustained by endless servings of the bland noodle soup that was the German army’s standard fare. Westmann’s memoirs were first written in German, but the translation is smooth enough to make the text readable while retaining a flavour of the German original.

Westmann’s book is thus of obvious interest to those keen to learn more about the combat experience of front-line soldiers during the Great War, even though his retrospective account has, naturally, been filtered and re-shaped by the intervening decades. It could be argued, though, that the real originality and poignancy of these recollections lie in the testimony they give of a German–British–Jewish life in the twentieth century—that the voice truly worth listening to here is that of the elderly man speaking in the 1960s and not that of the youthful soldier whose war he recalls. Although one would hardly know it from his narrative, which mentions his ‘descent’ only once and then to describe it as irrelevant (p. 4), Westmann was a Jew. After the war he completed his medical training, married Marianna Goldschmidt, another Jewish physician, and embarked upon a successful career which involved not only a lucrative private practice and an appointment at the Charité, Berlin’s University Hospital, but also, as the editor informs us in a colourful ‘epilogue’, a large home on the Kurfürstendamm and an expensive car. As a prominent Jewish doctor and outspoken critic of the Nazi Party Westmann was about to receive a visit from the Gestapo in April 1933. Tipped off in the nick of time he hastily made it across the border to France, apparently behind the wheel of his flashy car. He would eventually settle in the UK, where he and his family were naturalized in 1940 and where Westmann eventually turned into the bow-tie-wearing gentleman interviewed in 1963.
Read against this background, *Surgeon with the Kaiser’s Army* offers a number of intriguing insights into the memory, world view, and identities of its author at the time of writing. It is fascinating to speculate to what extent some of the more salient features in the landscape of Westmann’s memory are specific to him or form part of a wider pattern amongst Jewish refugees from Germany. For one, Westmann’s attitude to the Kaiserreich, to its politics and culture, to its role during the run-up to the Great War, even to its last monarch, appears to have remained remarkably unchanged from what one would expect from a patriotic German soldier in 1914: the Wilhelmine Reich was ‘a hive of activity’, prosperity ‘pervaded all classes’, and the ‘workers seemed content, protected against exploitation by powerful trades unions, a raft of social reforms and legislation passed by the Reichstag’ (p. 3). Even humble dwellings were ‘spotlessly clean and well-furnished’, unemployment and illiteracy did not exist, arts and sciences flourished, and ‘anti-Semitism was not an issue’ (pp. 3–4). Known as the ‘Prince of Peace’, Kaiser Wilhelm II was ‘no fool and neither was he suffering from paranoia’ (pp. 5, 7). Rather, he led a country surrounded by strong and revengeful neighbours and, like a farmer with rich grazing lands, took sensible steps to secure his property. Similar paeans of praise for Imperial Germany, its army, culture, and institutions are liberally sprinkled across the text, and there is a clear determination to isolate and protect this idyllic recollection of German history from what was to follow: ‘What a difference to the demonic machinations of Hitler twenty-five years later!’ (p. 19).

Just as Westmann’s Kaiserreich appears to have lost none of its pre-1914 lustre, his verdict on the French has not changed much either. For a start, the author is at pains to confirm where the national allegiance of the Alsatian population lay. His men, Westmann recalls, who were almost all from Alsace, ‘were highly indignant at the slightest suggestion that they were anything other than fully German’ (p. 84). Given what the reader learns about the French throughout these memoirs, this is hardly surprising: they are consistently described as slovenly, cowardly, untrustworthy, and uncivilized. The peasants Westmann encountered on the Eastern Front, were ‘completely devoid of any sense of hygiene’ (p. 89). This immediately reminded him ‘of rural France, where the response to the question as to where one could answer a call of nature was, “Tout le
Jardin, monsieur, tout le jardin” (p. 89). Moreover, the French would treat German soldiers who had fallen into their hands appallingly: ‘they beat them up and French women spat in their faces or scratched them. When they tried to defend themselves they were punished severely and brutally’ (p. 115).

The deeply unflattering portrayal of the French contrasts, perhaps rather unsurprisingly, with Westmann’s recollection of the noble British, whose stretcher-bearers ventured out into no-man’s land to deliver wounded German soldiers to the German trenches (p. 46). Generally, when a Red Cross flag appeared to allow for wounded soldiers to be retrieved, the Germans would cease their fire and the ‘British would do the same for us’ (p. 73). But at Verdun this humanitarian practice could not be used since ‘there seemed to be a difference between British gentlemen and French Cavaliers’ (p. 73). The problem appears to have boiled down to an issue of national character, the man from Chorleywood explains: ‘The British kept their promises as gentlemen, but the French did not’ (p. 115).

Westmann’s memoirs contain few direct references to the concerns that are contemporary to the time of writing, but both the Cold War and race relations are interestingly interwoven with his recollections of the First World War. The author refers only very briefly to his post-1918 service with military units such as the Reichswehrbrigade 15, whose founder, Colonel Wilhelm Reinhard, eventually rose to the rank of SS-Obergruppenführer, but he still regards their actions as ultimately successful. After all, ‘without them, the red flag with its hammer and sickle would now be flying on the shores of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans’ (p. 151). It was only many years later, Westmann observes in a different place, that he understood why white British prisoners of war had been so desperate not to be kept together with ‘Indian or black troops’. Having lived in England for some time it dawned on him that this ‘might have had something to do with what we now call the colour bar’ (p. 63). There are similarly intriguing asides about the ‘vice’ of homosexuality amongst the soldiers (pp. 86–7) and the unrestrained sexual behaviour of the ‘Congolese French troops whom Poincaré sent into the Ruhr five years after the war to squeeze millions of marks for reparation from an already exsanguinated Germany’ (p. 122).

Surgeon with the Kaiser’s Army can thus be read with profit, and occasionally with raised eyebrows, on a number of different levels. It
is a multi-layered ego-document composed by a man whose eventful life must have left him with multiple, partially imbricated identities—German patriot, soldier, medic, bourgeois, Jew, refugee, immigrant, acculturated Englishman. That Stephen Westman, as he had then become, decided to write this text half a century after 1914 reminds us how, for some, the war continued in one form or another for a very long time indeed. ‘Nearly all my pals lay buried in foreign soil, together with nine million soldiers who had lost their lives in the Great War’, he ends his recollections—‘and for what?’ (p. 151).
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Germany was the first nation in Europe to lose its colonies. As such, Britta Schilling so cogently reminds us in her book Postcolonial Germany, it has an exceptionally ‘long-lived and relatively dynamic’ colonial memory (p. 2). Recovering and tracing that memorial culture over most of the twentieth century, Schilling’s study shows that, despite a widely held belief, Germany at no point suffered from colonial ‘amnesia’ (p. 10). On the contrary, her main argument is that German colonial memory, conceived as an ‘entangled memory’ (p. 9) of both private and public narratives, was especially adaptable and resilient despite gaps, disruptions, re-evaluation, and partial forgetting. Schilling takes a refreshingly new approach to the question of collective memory, focusing on its material culture, or as she puts it, on ‘how things make us think about the past’ (p. 9). Creatively organized chronologically and thematically at the same time, the book takes the reader through five chapters, each representing a different time period and a different category of artefact.

Chapter 1 addresses the immediate postcolonial era (1915 to 1925) when Germany was stripped of its colonies after the First World War. Through her reading of several ‘Africa-books’ — a cross between travel account, adventure story, and memoir — Schilling demonstrates how a small group of former settlers who had been forced to move back to the metropole left their mark on important national issues, such as the question of war guilt and the notion of Heimat, by weaving these themes into stories of ‘good colonialists’, loss, and victimhood. In the end, these books, which had a considerable market, functioned as ‘politically charged treatises’ (p. 40) with the aim of gaining a larger audience for the colonial cause.

Chapter 2, moving further into the Weimar Republic (1925 to 1935), analyses commercial and cultural products from the former colonies displayed at colonial balls. Here Schilling engages thought-provokingly with Sigmund Freud’s dream theory and his concept of wish fulfilment to argue that colonial balls served to create the illusion of a colonial paradise that had been lost and thus ‘fulfilled a certain set of desires held by the German colonial elite in the interwar years’ (p. 42). She shows how in these balls a number of different ele-
ments—colonial products, ‘black’ performers (both blacks and ‘blacked up’ whites), and jazz—came together in a condensed, overdetermined scene that helped to fashion fantasies of economic recovery, racial hierarchy, and exoticism.

These elite aspirations became an object of mass distribution only during the Nazi period, by way of schoolbooks, as chapter 3 (1935 to 1945) shows. In the Third Reich ‘the colonial story stayed much the same’ (p. 89). Colonialism was still remembered exclusively positively, albeit with some significant variations. National Socialist ideology reinterpreted the colonial project, and, in particular, colonial violence, within the logic of ‘race war’ and heroic sacrifice. Violence was no longer passed over but celebrated. Thus colonial memory served as a tool for the formation of a collective will (Willensbildung) and the Volksgemeinschaft so crucial to the Nazi regime.

After the Second World War, in the face of devastating mass destruction and murder, colonial memory temporarily disappeared from public discourse. But interestingly, Schilling observes that Germany’s colonial past resurfaced rather quickly. She argues that continuity not rupture dominated the public narratives, notably regarding both East and West German foreign aid policies for the Third World. Chapter 4, in my opinion the most compelling and intriguing, examines the practice of gift-giving by German states to their former colonies in the era of decolonization (1949 to 1968). Based on previously unexplored archival sources and Mauss’s anthropological theory of the gift, this chapter notes that German gift-giving was deeply symbolic and ritualized in nature, and that this process was ‘motivated by prestige even more than by economics’ (p. 129). In pursuing these practices, the two Germanys could not avoid references to the colonial past. In the context of the Cold War, colonial memory was reinterpreted yet again with the aim of producing images of themselves as benevolent former colonizers, outdoing the other state and inducing the need to reciprocate on the side of the gift-receiving party. And African agency finally becomes evident in this chapter (an aspect that is unfortunately almost entirely absent in the other parts of the book). Schilling demonstrates how African state leaders consciously deployed certain tropes of colonial memory in order to secure their interests.

Chapter 5, entitled ‘The Empty Plinth’, addresses the most recent past (1968 to 1990) in which Germany’s colonial past ‘receded from
the nation’s (or, rather, both nations’) collective memory’ (p. 134). This chapter deviates the most from Schilling’s initial intention to trace colonial memory through different kinds of objects. It tries to make do with a period of colonial memory characterized by a void. According to the author, there was ‘no tome, no statue, no product of consumption’ (p. 153) that could meaningfully build collective colonial memory. Empty plinths (and more obviously those few colonial monuments that remained erect but were rededicated), however, could have been interpreted as physical objects, even if they were not visible or palpable. Instead, the chapter mostly discusses non-material phenomena: debates among historians about the nature of German colonialism and discussions around the anti-apartheid struggle and how it related to the ‘Namibian question’. It would have been more convincing to remain within the realm of the material, however peripheral it may have been to colonial memory—ethnographic collections on display in German museums, or fair trade products sold in the flourishing Drittwellläden, for example.

Partly to fill the gap in public memory mentioned above, the book closes with a final, sixth chapter which revisits the entire period under investigation, but revolves around family memories. Based on a large pool of interviews conducted by Schilling herself, the chapter traces the fate and function of family heirlooms that were passed down through generations to construct private colonial memories. This chapter also harks back to the public memories discussed in earlier chapters and shows how the public and the private were intertwined. She argues that if private memories are taken into account, ‘the realities of colonial memory formation are far more intricate’ (p. 195) than a look at the official memory discourse would suggest.

Overall, Postcolonial Germany is an important and timely study. The long time span Schilling covers and the contextual knowledge she provides are impressive and delivered in straightforward prose. Great effort has obviously been put into collecting such a wide range of different sources, which have been carefully analysed. Schilling’s use of approaches from neighbouring disciplines such as anthropology, archaeology, and cultural studies is also laudable. Yet the question of material culture in particular could have been examined more closely, especially with all the interpretative tools these disciplines offer. Thus Schilling’s theoretical aim to understand ‘the link between memory and material culture’ (p. 7) appears to remain unful-
filled. At least, there is no explicit explanation of exactly what it is that things do to memory, or how memory gets inscribed into things in return. This might be because the artefacts Schilling chooses are highly diverse and therefore hardly comparable. It might also be related to her rather cursory analysis of the quotidian uses of the chosen artefacts. A more extensive, thicker description of the materiality of memory objects, of their sensual and physical impact on those who consumed, owned, used, and appropriated them would have been helpful in order to make the connection between material culture and memory formation more transparent. More careful editing might also have helped to bring the different strands of interpretation from the individual chapters together in an overall thesis regarding the role of material culture in collective memory. But this should not deter anyone from reading Postcolonial Germany. It has the great merit of reminding many readers, or perhaps even informing them for the first time, that Germany had a colonial past and that its legacy lives on in many different forms and material shapes, even if contemporary decision-makers would often like to ignore this fact.