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I. Introduction: The Public Flogging of the Indian Kings

Immediately after the solemn act of anointment, ancient Indian kings had to undergo an act of severe public humiliation in their annual consecration ceremony. While speaking the words: ‘We beat the sins away from you, we lead you past death’, the priest and his helpers slowly beat the king’s back with wooden sticks taken from holy trees.¹ This scene, the ritual humiliation of a king, stages an unsettling alliance between power and weakness right at the heart of an archaic inauguration rite. The ritual is described as a part of the ancient Indian royal consecration rājasūya in the White Yajurveda, one of the four main Vedic texts transmitting liturgies for ancient Hindu rituals, probably dating back as far as the second millennium BC. How can we explain this ritual of humiliation and weakening of a future king?

In late nineteenth-century Germany, in the year 1893, when Albrecht F. Weber presented his edition of this Indian liturgical text to the members of the Royal Academy in Berlin, the assumption of an ongoing struggle between king and priest, rex and sacerdos, between state and church, lay close at hand. Kulturkampf explained everything. The nineteenth-century arguments still sound familiar in the early twenty-first century: religion, in those ancient days, was trying to subdue the independent exercise of secular power. The ritual was

thus identified as an indication of the predominance of the priestly class, even in ancient India. Sacred influence in secular affairs (der priesterliche Hauch der Zeit) must have been as fully developed, Weber concluded, as it was in the German Middle Ages. The ancient Indian king appears as the ‘sadly priest-ridden heir’ to what Weber considered was once the ideal Aryan king. The priestly class, moreover, had successfully manipulated truly original Aryan rituals of power in its own favour.

As early as 1957, Johannes Cornelis Heesterman drew attention to the limits of Weber’s Wilhelmine views in the foreword to the modern edition of the rājasūya texts. In many ways, however, the nineteenth-century view still shapes ways of seeing in the early twenty-first century. The idea of a pre-modern society dominated by the power of religion is commonplace. This is true not only of first year students of medieval history, but also of what we might call the modern ‘collective memory’. Western Europeans are quite sure that it was a commitment to secular principles that enabled their forefathers to overcome the pre-modern ‘dark ages’ of religious domination. With Machiavelli, so the story goes, ‘modern’ concepts of power developed. The idea of a secular state took shape and eventually prevailed in the notorious struggle between the secular and the religious. Emperors and kings no longer submitted to popes and archbishops. Ecclesiastical influence was banned; religious concepts of rulership vanished. Machiavelli, Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke laid the foundations for modern political theory, a secular understanding of power, rationality, enlightenment, the separation of church and state, and, finally, for democracy and all the other great ‘blessings’ of Western civilization.


3 See Frank Rexroth (ed.), *Meistererzählungen vom Mittelalter: Epochenimaginatio nen und Verlaufsmuster in der Praxis mediävistischer Disziplinen* (Munich, 2007), esp. the article by M. Bojcov, who suggests that these grand narratives owe their longevity at least in part to their fairy-tale structure: the good (in our case, the secular and the rational), once severely oppressed, after a series of trials wins over the bad (religion).

4 We will not trace the various reasons for the longevity of this tale, which might have served a purpose in the 19th and 20th centuries, but can certain-
The ideas presented in this article trace a different path in the history of power. It is argued that the unsettling alliance between rituals of weakness (as exposed in the figure of the beaten king) and the exercise of power cannot be adequately explained as a constant feature of political struggles for power, especially between the sacred and the secular.

II. Classical Explanations

Before examining the view that there is more to ritual weakness than its function as a political instrument in the struggle between religious and secular power, we will first briefly sum up the most common academic interpretations. To medieval historians, it is self evident that a medieval king performed rituals of humiliation before God and the saints, thus demonstrating the Christian virtue (Herrscher-tugend) of humilitas. Acts of public humiliation were used in medieval politics as an instrument of power. And as medieval kings and emperors were crowned by religious authorities, every coronation was more than the official installation of a future ruler; it was an opportunity to readjust the balance between secular and ecclesiastical powers. All the symbolic gestures of humiliation to be performed, for example, by the future emperor before his coronation in Rome (he had to dismount from his horse and walk towards the pope; then, seated on a chair, he had to kiss the pope’s feet; and, inside St Peter’s, repeatedly prostrate himself before the altar) can therefore be interpreted as acts of submission to the spiritual authority of the church. In the same way, every medieval inauguration provided a stage for a ritual contest between spiritual and worldly power. Finally, scholars seem to agree that the medieval Roman church, its liturgy and its rituals also supplied the basic ritual elements for secular ritual.

The Power of Weakness

ly no longer cast light on the condition of the postmodern, global, and postcolonial world, especially because it explains nothing at all to members of cultures which have never expressed their inner conflicts in terms of oppositions such as secular vs. ecclesiastical, church vs. state, or religion vs. rationality. For a solid treatment of this problem in Carolingian history see Mayke de Jong, The Penitential State: Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious, 814–840 (Cambridge, 2009), 9–10.
An equally familiar explanation is offered by ethnologists. They consider acts of humiliation to be 'liminal elements' at the very centre of *rites de passage*; that is, in those rituals that accompany social passage or status elevation, such as adoption or birth, puberty, ordination, coronation, engagement, marriage, and death. First systematically described by Arnold van Gennep in 1909, they were further elaborated in the formal analysis of the ritual process by Victor A. Turner in 1969. Van Gennep distinguishes three ritual phases: separation, margin, and re-aggregation, or pre-liminal, liminal, and post-liminal phases. The actual transformation of the ritual candidate takes place in the core period of the ritual process. It requires spatial and temporal withdrawal from the regular modes of social action for a period in which the central values of the culture in which it occurs can be scrutinized. It is, moreover, generally accompanied by a series of ritual humiliations and sufferings. While ritual beatings, slaps, public laughter, mockery, or ritual undressing may be quite harmless, physical torture, mutilation, tattooing, the loss of a finger, circumcision, or infibulation leave life-long scars.

Finally, we might recall the point of view of a political pragmatist such as Machiavelli. Suffering, weakness, and even scenes of public defeat can be employed as instruments of power according to ancient and modern Machiavellians. The appearance of meekness (*pietà*), humanity (*umanità*), or piety (*religione*) might sometimes be important for the successful pursuit of political aims. Weakness as an instrument of power was well known in medieval politics. One of the examples most often cited in this context is an incident reported by Thietmar of Merseburg. At the synod of Frankfurt in 1007, Emperor Henry II practically forced his bishops to give in to his will by weeping and repeatedly throwing himself on the ground in front of the whole congregation. His point, namely, the foundation of a new bishopric of Bamberg, was thus eventually won. This example fits neat-

---


ly into the use of weakness as an instrument of power according to modern theories of the strategies of power. Modern handbooks on power generally dedicate a few sentences to the intelligent use of weakness, with advice such as: act in a stupid manner in order to overcome your stupid partner, pretend to be weak, avoid appearing cleverer than your boss, the appearance of defeat can sometimes be very helpful and transform weakness into power!7

III. Case Studies: Ritual Weakness in Medieval Inauguration Rituals

The following case studies from the Middle Ages illustrate rituals of weakness which the future ruler had to undergo in the course of inauguration ceremonies in different parts of medieval Europe. The examples to be discussed are (1) ritual defeat in a mock fight, (2) sexual intercourse and ritual bath, (3) ritual beatings, (4) ritual illness, and (5) ritual manslaughter.

1. Ritual Defeat in a Mock Fight: The Irish Kings of Tara and Connacht

Here we see a ritual element that forces the future king into suffering defeat. An example from Irish sources highlights this situation, namely, the inauguration of the kings of Tara in Ireland as described in the *vita* of the early Irish saint, Colmán. This hagiographical text, composed at some time in the twelfth century, contains an enumeration of the rights and privileges of St Colmán, and in this context a passage describes a detail of the local inauguration ritual of a new king:

And thus it should be done, the king to be at the foot of the pilar-stone of the hostages above, and the man of the Huí Forannan upon the flag-stone below, an open horsewhip in his hand so as to save himself as best as he can from the cast, provided that he do not step forth from the flagstone . . . The king

7 e.g. Robert Greene, *The 48 Laws of Power* (New York, 1998), law 21, 22, 46, 47.
who shall slay a descendant of thine shall decay or die an early death, unless his steed and his dress be given to him for it.\textsuperscript{8}

The text is cryptic, but the situation it describes is clearly a mock fight. Apparently the future king stands at the foot of the inauguration stone, which is occupied by one of his future subjects (a man of the Hui Forannan). The future ruler has to perform a difficult task: he must throw a javelin at his future subject, but is not allowed to hit him. Thus there seems to be no alternative but to demonstrate ‘incompetence’ in handling a spear. Of course, we could go further and interpret an otherwise lost trace of ritual manslaughter into this twelfth-century account of an inauguration scene. For present purposes, however, the humiliating aspects are more important. The element of humiliation is ritually embedded in a symbolic fight in which the future king claims access to the inauguration stone occupied by a man of his people. In order to win—that is, in order to gain access to the stone—the candidate must refrain from victory in the duel. Or in other words, there is no way to victory but by allowing defeat.

A marginal trace of the same motif might be recognized in the inauguration of the O’Conor kings of Connacht held at the royal mount of Carnfree (Carn Fraoich). This mount, in use over the centuries until the later Middle Ages, was also furnished with an inauguration stone. The rites that constituted the inauguration ceremony in Carnfree were no doubt influenced and changed by political realities. The only textual description is preserved in a late medieval prose tract and bardic poem, the prototype of which has been dated by Katharine Simms to the twelfth or thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{8} From the \textit{Vita} of St Colmán, son of Lúachan (12th cent.). Kuno Meyer (ed.), \textit{Betha Colmáin Mac Lúacháin: The Life of Colmán son of Lúachan}, Todd Lecture Series, 17 (Dublin, 1911), 72–3, § 70 (with a brief description of the inauguration of the kings of Tara. Trans. from the Old Irish by Kuno Meyer). Thanks to Dr Katharine Simms, who kindly drew my attention to this passage and suggested plausible readings. Cf. Elizabeth FitzPatrick, \textit{Royal Inauguration in Gaelic Ireland c.1100–1600: A Cultural Landscape Study} (Woodbridge, 2004), 99–129, at 49, 103.

to this ceremonial ode, the future king performs an act of humiliation before gaining access to the mount (and thus the stone). He has to give his horse to one of his subjects, a keeper of the mount, before bending down so that his subject can mount the horse from the future king’s back. We might speak here of a mock deal, rather than a fight. However, the motif is the same: the ritual obliges the future ruler to act in a subordinate role.

2. **Sexual Intercourse and Ritual Bath: The Kings of Donegal**

The next example might be called one of the most unsettling cases of a medieval European inauguration ritual: the royal bath preceded by sexual intercourse between the future ruler and a horse. (See Illustration 1.) A ritual of this sort is described in the late twelfth century by the well-known author Gerald of Wales in his report on the inauguration of the kings of Donegal:

> A new and outlandish way of confirming kingship and dominion. . . . There is in the northern and farther part of Ulster, namely in Kenelcunill, a certain people which is accustomed to appoint its king with a rite altogether outlandish and abominable. When the whole people of that land has been gathered together in one place, a white mare is brought forward into the


middle of the assembly. He who is to be inaugurated, not as a chief, but as a beast, not as a king, but as an outlaw, has bestial intercourse with her before all, professing himself to be a beast also. The mare is then killed immediately, cut up in pieces, and boiled in water. A bath is prepared for the man afterwards in the same water. He sits in the bath surrounded by all his people, and all, he and they, eat of the meat of the mare which is brought to them. He quaffs and drinks of the broth in which he is bathed, not in any cup, or using his hand, but just dipping his mouth into it round about him. When this unrighteous rite has been carried out, his kingship and dominion have been conferred.

The procedure is indeed disturbing. We are told that the king of Donegal, on the day of his inauguration in front of his future subjects, embraced a white mare (‘jumentum candidum . . . Ad quod ille . . . bestialiter accedens’), which was then killed, boiled in water, and eaten by the whole assembly. The king-to-be in the meantime took a bath in the broth. This is what Gerald of Wales reports about the kings of Donegal.

Historians disagree on the historical value of Gerald’s account. It was and is read as a piece of written evidence testifying to the very roots of civilization, to the archaic ideas surviving on the Celtic fringes of Europe. In accordance with practices known from the common ancestry of Indo-European peoples, the ruler-to-be accomplishes a symbolic mating with the mare, which represents the sovereignty of the land.\textsuperscript{12} On the other hand, the reliability of the source has often been questioned, and the passage in the \textit{Topographia} has been dismissed as a piece of Anglo-Norman propaganda. Like other conquest historians in the twelfth century, Gerald, it was claimed, was collecting arguments to justify the conquest, for example, by documenting the barbarism of the subjected people. As he never visited the north of Ireland, his report of the Donegal inauguration is based on hearsay.\textsuperscript{13} In spite of the many parallels to the account that can be found in the rituals of other Indo-European peoples which, in fact, makes this sort of practice not implausible,\textsuperscript{14} Gerald’s description is quite obviously biased. It is generally agreed that, as a representative member of the Anglo-Norman aristocracy, Gerald collected material on his visits to Ireland as proof of the cruel and barbaric character of the Irish in order to justify the miserable outcomes of the Anglo-Norman invasion.\textsuperscript{15} We should keep in mind, therefore, that we owe our knowledge of the archaic Donegal inauguration to its force as a political argument in favour of a conquering people.

The Donegal inauguration inspired modern scholars to undertake comparative Indo-European anthropological studies from the nine-


\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Katharine Simms, \textit{From Kings to Warlords: The Changing Political Structure of Gaelic Ireland in the Later Middle Ages} (Woodbridge, 1987), at 22.


11
teenth century on; it provoked not only objections but also a search
for comparable material. The intention of refuting the ‘calumnious
charges against the Irish people, princes and kings’ brought by
Gerald of Wales inspired John Lynch’s interest in Carinthian ritual.16
Lynch dismissed the view that the story about the kings of Donegal
had a historical core. His argument was that none of the holy bishops
of Donegal would have allowed such a pagan rite to be practised in
his diocese. He was also convinced that no country in the world
would have such a disgusting way of installing its kings, although he
mentioned that there were some customs in other parts of Europe
which were no less ridiculous, for instance, the case of Carinthia.

So much for the historical context of the textual transmission of
our knowledge about the inauguration of the kings of Donegal in a
type of royal bath. The involvement of a horse is obviously one of the
most prominent features in inauguration ceremonies amongst Indo-
European peoples. Its prototype is usually traced back to the Indian
Asvamedha, the ritual sacrifice of a male horse in the course of a new
king ascending to the throne.17 We would thus have an Irish coun-
terpart in the inauguration of the kings of Donegal. The fact that a
mare and not a stallion is involved in the Irish case has given rise to
a discussion about whether or not the custom was of Indo-European
origin. The ritual intercourse of the king-to-be with the mare would
then refer to the ritual view of territorial sovereignty as a female god-
ess or queen. In order to conquer the land, the future king had to
conquer and lie with her. This tradition mingles with that of the cer-
emonial sacrifice: ritual slaughter of the horse, which is subsequent-

16 John Lynch, ‘Cambrensis Eversus, seu potius Historica fides’, in Matthew
Kelly, Rebux Hibernicis Giraldo Cambrensi Abrogata, 3 vols. (Dublin, 1848), i. 111.
17 Schröder, ‘Ein altirischer Krönungsritus’, 310–12; Pokorny, ‘Das nicht-indo-
 germanische Substrat’, 123–5; Wilhelm Koppers, ‘Pferdeopfer und Pferdekult
 der Indogermanen’, in id. (ed.), Die Indogermanen- und Germanenfrage: Neue
 Wege zu ihrer Lösung (Salzburg, 1936), 279–411; Jaan Puhvel, ‘Aspects of
Equine Functionality’, in id. (ed.), Myth and Law amongst the Indo-Europeans:
Studies in Indo-European Comparative Mythology (Berkeley, 1970), 157–72; id.,
Comparative Mythology (Baltimore, 1989), 267–76; Heesterman, The Ancient
Indian Royal Consecration; Kim McCone, Pagan Past and Christian Present in
Early Irish Literature (Maynooth, 1991), 117–20; Yolande de Pontfarcy, ‘Two
Late Inaugurations of Irish Kings’, Études celtiques, 24 (1987), 203–8; Pleterski,
‘Die Kärntner Fürstensteine’, 84.
ly boiled and consumed by all the people. Thus all share in the sovereignty of the land, which can then be transferred to the candidate.\%^{18}

The temporary placing of the future king into the kettle with the broth is indeed unsettling. Pontfarcy interprets the bath in the soup as the completion of the ritual mating between the future king and the mare, the return into the cosmic uterus, and eternal rebirth.\%^{19} The cauldron used to boil the sacrificial meat to be eaten at the victors’ feast figures as a symbol of sovereignty and plays a prominent part in Pindar’s account of the horse competition at the Olympic Games of 476 BC.\%^{20} Another trace leads to the concept of the ritual bath, knowledge of which is also transmitted from early modern Madagascar.\%^{21} Whether it is a symbolic return to the cosmic uterus or a ritual boiling of the sacrifice, I suggest that the public bath in the horse’s broth should be added to our list of ritual sufferings and humiliations in medieval inauguration rites.

\%^{18} Note here that Emil Goldmann also suggested that the Carinthian rite had an original sacrificial function, arguing that the role of the animals involved, especially the horse, was that of a sacrificial victim. Add to this the fire-maker mentioned by John of Viktring and we have basically everything needed for a ceremonial sacrifice. Emil Goldmann, Die Einführung der deutschen Herzogsgeschlechter Kärntens in den slowenischen Stammesverband: Ein Beitrag zur Rechts- und Kulturgeschichte (Breslau, 1903); for a critical review of Emil Goldmann, see August von Jaksch writing in Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, 25 (1904), 69–103. The 14th-century contemporary John, however, gave an entirely different interpretation of the horse and the ox, claiming that they stand for the Carinthian people, who use cattle to till the Carinthian fields. Moreover, later sources all speak of a ‘mageres ungestaltes Feldpferd’ (literally: an old mare) which would be fit neither for a sacrifice nor the task of representing the Carinthian people.

\%^{19} Pontfarcy, ‘Two Late Inaugurations’, 204.


A Continental example of the public humiliation of a future ruler is the inauguration of the dukes of Carinthia at the 
Fürstenstein.\textsuperscript{22} Here we have a ritual beating—the future duke’s face is slapped, right in the 
middle of his inauguration ceremony. We will begin by introducing the inauguration site. The 
Fürstenstein consists of a Roman pillar turned upside down and placed on the earth, so that its original 
base provides a traversable platform. It was located in an open field near Karnburg and is now preserved in the atrium of the 
Landesmuseum Klagenfurt.\textsuperscript{23} A second piece of inauguration furniture was the Duke’s Chair (Herzogstuhl), 
which was situated some miles away and apparently came into use once the elevation of the 
candidate to the dukedom was complete. As compared with the Irish examples cited so far, the Carinthian 
inauguration has the great advantage of being extremely well documented in the sources. In 
fact, so much brilliant research has recently been done on it that it will suffice here briefly to 
recapitulate the procedure and sketch the main problems of interpreting the rite.\textsuperscript{24}

The oldest comprehensive narratives about the Carinthian inauguration ceremony date from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth

\textsuperscript{22} For the most recent and comprehensive study of the Carinthian inauguration see Pleterski, ‘Die Kärntner Fürstensteine’; Peter Štih, ‘Die Nationalerwerbung der Slowenen und damit verknüpfte Geschichtsvorstellungen und Geschichtsmythen’, Carintha, 197 (2007), 365–81; Annette Kehnel, ‘torex spil 
und Geltungsmacht: Die Geschichte der Symbole der Kärntner Herzogseinsetzung’, in Gert Melville (ed.), 
Institutionalität und Symbolisierung: Verstetigungen kultureller Ordnungsmuster in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Im Auftrag des Sonderforschungsbereiches (Cologne, 2001), 477–91. For an older treatment 
of the Carinthian inauguration ritual that is still academically valid see Paul 
Puntschart, Herzogsetzung und Huldigung in Kärnten: Ein verfassungs- und kulturgeschichtlicher Beitrag (Leipzig, 1899), 11–29; see also Claudia Fräss-
Ehrfeld, Geschichte Kärntens, i. Das Mittelalter (Klagenfurt, 1984), 343–50.

\textsuperscript{23} The ritual use of the inauguration stone is closely associated with the 
Carinthian inauguration chair, sometimes named sedes tribunalis, situated 
some miles away near Maria Saal. It is first explicitly mentioned in the written 
 sources as sedes Karinthani ducatus in a letter from the imperial notary, 
Burchard of Cologne, dating from the year 1161. August von Jaksch (ed.), Die 
Kärntner Geschichtsquellen 811–1202 (Klagenfurt, 1904), 387, no. 1031.

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. Pleterski, ‘Die Kärntner Fürstensteine’.
centuries, when the Habsburgs first created the dukedoms and installed the dukes of Carinthia. The following description of the ritual procedure at the Fürstenstein is by the Irish historian John Lynch, who wrote in the year 1662. I cite him at length here, first because this text is not well known, and secondly because as far as I know he is the first historian to work on the Carinthian inauguration from a comparative perspective:

When a new prince is about to assume the reins of government in Carinthia, a singular ceremony is observed, unknown in any other state. A marble stone is erected in a wide meadow. When the inauguration is to take place, a peasant, to whom the office belongs by hereditary right, stands up on the stone, having on his right hand a young black cow and on his left a lank and half starved mare. The people are all around, and there is an immense concourse of peasants. The candidate, surrounded by a band clothed in purple, advances towards the stone; the insignia of his office are borne before him, and the whole train of the procession except himself is gorgeously dressed. He comes in peasant’s dress, with a cap on his head, shoes on his feet, and a shepherd’s crook in his hand, and looks more like a shepherd than a prince. As soon as he appears in sight, the man on the stone cries out in the Illyrian tongue, ‘Who is he that cometh on so proudly?’ ‘The lord of the land is coming,’ answer the surrounding multitudes. ‘Is he a just judge?’ he

asks; ‘Seeks he the good of his country? Is he a free man? And worthy of the dignity? Does he practise and promote Christian piety?’ ‘He does and he will’ answers the crowd. The man then resumes, ‘Pray tell me by what right can he deprive me of this seat?’ The master of the ducal palace answers: ‘The place is purchased from you for sixty denari: these cattle,’ he says, pointing to the cow and mare, ‘shall be yours; you shall have the clothes which the duke takes off, and you and your whole family shall be free from tribute.’ After this dialogue, the peasant lightly slaps the candidate’s cheek, orders him to be a just judge, and after receiving the money, retires from his position. The duke then ascends the marble column: brandishes his sword as he turns round and round; addresses the people, and promises that he will be a just judge. They say, too, that he drinks water which is presented to him in a peasant’s cap, as a pledge of his future sobriety, etc. . . . It is the princes of Austria that are thus installed: they are styled the archdukes.26

John Lynch’s text summarizes the installation based on Eneas Silvio Piccolomini’s late medieval version in his work De Europe, compiled in 1458. Complemented by the earliest comprehensive descriptions from the fourteenth century, the procedure can be summed up as follows. The future duke appears at the stone and is dressed in a peasant’s clothes by a hereditary ‘dresser’. The stone, however, is already occupied by a peasant, a member of the family who holds the right to inaugurate the dukes (‘rusticus libertus . . . per

26 John Lynch, Cambrensis Eversus, seu potius historicæ fides in rebus hibernicis Giraldo Cambrensi abrogata, ed. Matthew Kelly, 3 vols. (Dublin, 1848), iii. 344–7. The source used by John Lynch is a certain Joannes Auban, otherwise known as Johannes Boemus, John of Bohemia, who lived in the early 16th century and was a collector of antiquities and curiosities. In his work Omnium gentium mores leges et ritus he writes about the origin of mankind as readily as about the character of the people of Asia. Boemus Johannes (Aubanus), Omnium gentium mores, leges et ritus, ed. August Vindele (Augsburg, 1520), for the passages cited see: Liber tertius, vol. xiii. His source, in turn, was Eneas Silvio Piccolomini, private secretary and diplomatic adviser to the Habsburg Emperor Friedrich III, the later Pope Pius II (1458–64). Piccolomini reports on the installation of the dukes of Carinthia in De Europe, written in Austria in 1458, drawing on the work of John, abbot of Viktring (see p. 17 of this Article).
successionem stirpis ad hoc officium heredatus’, John of Viktring). According to John of Viktring, the peasant holds a speckled ox with one hand, with the other a mare. According to Ottokar, the future duke brings these animals along. Then follows a litany of speech and replies. The peasant inaugurator asks the assembled people about the future duke, his character and Christian faith, and whether he is worthy of the ducal dignity. A symbolic deal between the future duke and the peasant follows. The latter receives the cattle, the clothes, sixty denari, and freedom from tax on his house in exchange for the dukedom. Eventually, a mock fight takes place between the duke and his inaugurator in which the duke is slapped in the face by the peasant, who then gives way to the duke. After taking possession of the inauguration stone, the duke turns around on the stone, swinging the sword to the four cardinal points; he then has to take a draught of water, brought to him in a peasant’s hat, several fires are lit by the holder of the office of fire-maker (‘incendiarius, quem dicunt ad hoc iure statutum’), a mass is celebrated in the nearby church of Maria Saal, and a meal follows. After the mass, the duke performs his duty as a judge for the first time, sitting on the Duke’s Chair (Herzogstuhl), where he bestows fiefs upon his vassals.

There are many interpretations of the Carinthian inauguration. From the seventeenth century on political theorists interpreted the Carinthian people’s right to install their future dukes as a significant contribution to the development of the contractual theory.27 The nineteenth century was fascinated by the question of the national origins of the rite. Georg Graber read the inauguration as a ceremony based on Germanic laws and institutions, introduced and imposed on the subdued Slavic people by the German conquering tribes at some time in the seventh or eighth century.28 Emil Goldmann, by


contrast, saw the original meaning of the ritual as the integration of a foreigner and outsider, namely, a Germanic ruler, into the Slavic tribal state. The fact that the peasant asks his questions in a Slavic language (‘windische rede’ in Ottokar’s Reimchronik; ‘Slavice’ in John of Viktring) seems to support the idea that the Slavic peasantry was welcoming a foreign Germanic chief. Goldmann in fact speaks of an initiation rather than an inauguration rite. He is thus the first (after John Lynch) to suggest a strictly comparative interpretation of the Carinthian ritual, tracing its origins to royal consecrations in ancient India (rājasūya) and pre-Christian ceremonial sacrifice. The inauguration stone might originally have been an altar plate, and the mare involved would have been intended as a sacrificial victim. This theory has recently resurfaced, and the Indo-European pedigree of the Carinthian rite and its kinship with ritual marriage and fertility rites (hiros gamos) have been much elaborated. The oft lamented problem of the uniqueness of the Carinthian ritual can therefore be dismissed.

This ceremony imposes a whole series of humiliations on the future duke. First, he is dressed in peasant clothes. Even if we accept the theory that it was a precious wedding costume that the duke had to wear, we must not forget that it was a peasant’s wedding costume and not a duke’s. The change of clothing performed in this account therefore fits neatly into the pattern of ritual undressing, which is often found at the opening of a rite de passage and symbolizes the renunciation of status and individuality. Ritual undressing and change of clothes in fact survived as an element of most European inauguration orders, even in imperial inaugurations. These aspects, however, tend to be marginalized and treated under the heading of ‘subsidiary actions’ (Nebenhandlung).  

30 Ibid. 115–91; for further literature see above, n. 17.  
31 The uniqueness is often still stressed, see e.g. Claudia Fräss-Ehrfeld, Geschichte Kärntens, 348: ‘Das Problem der Herzogseinsetzung ist ein Schlüsselfproblem der Kärntner Geschichte, die Quellenlage macht es zu einem ungelösten. Die Einzigartigkeit dieser Zeremonie bedingt den Mangel an echten Vergleichen.’  
A second humiliation performed at the stone was the ritual interrogation concerning the qualities and characteristics of the candidate, during which the future duke is obliged to be absolutely silent. In a ceremonial litany, the peasant negotiates the candidate’s suitability with the assembled people. In its fourteenth-century version, this litany, beginning with the peasant’s question ‘qui est iste, qui procedit?’, is no doubt a Christianized version of the ritual trial, modelled on the messianic Old Testament prophecies in Psalm 24. Again, parallels might be drawn with other European coronation ceremonies.

A third and final element of ritual humiliation can be identified in the symbolic deal between the duke and his inaugurator, accompanied by a mock fight. The inaugurator frees the way to the stone, signifying access to power and the dukedom, in return for the cattle, clothes, money, and freedom from taxation. This idea of a symbolic deal between the king and his inaugurator is also common in Irish sources. In the story of the finding of Cashel, a swineherd gives the land to the future king Conall Corc in return for certain rights and gifts. The above-mentioned ceremonial ode of the inauguration of the O’Conor kings of Connacht carefully lists all the rights and valuables which the king-to-be has to grant in return for the kingship. The idea of rulership as an item of trade turns power into an issue negotiated between the one who dominates and those dominated. The Carnthian example has often been cited as a showpiece of a people acting as sovereign by handing over power to the selected future holder, thus entering into a contract. The symbolic mock fight would ritually confirm the actual contract and, by inflicting physical pain, ensure proper commemoration of the treaty entered into. As in the above-mentioned Irish example concerning the kings of Tara, the mock fight exposes the future holder of power to the power of others and forces him into a ritually prescribed position of suffering.

4. Ritual Illness: The Invalid Ruler in Roman, French, and German Coronations

Another very potent image of the weak, ill, or invalid ruler is to be found in the context of the inauguration of French kings in Reims.  

medieval emperors in Rome, and German kings in Aachen. The first medieval imperial coronation ceremony was performed at Christmas 800 when Pope Leo III crowned Charlemagne in St Peter’s Basilica in Rome. According to his biographer, Einhard, Charlemagne was taken completely by surprise. The oldest coronation order, however, dates from the year 960. In between, from Charlemagne to Berengar I (915), eleven emperors were crowned in Rome, but we know nothing about the actual procedure. The narrative sources are surprisingly uninterested in the issue. Reports of coronations only become fashionable from the fourteenth century onwards.34

From the year 960, however, the procedure of the ceremonial crowning of the medieval emperor can be reconstructed from the ordines. These are texts which contain the actual order of the ceremony, list the words and prayers to be spoken by those involved, and provide instructions on how to proceed and what to do. Most of these texts were written in the wider context of the papal curia; that is, we have to take into account a clear clerical bias. The reconstruction and textual transmission of the ordines, which were widely distributed all over Europe and usually used for royal coronations in Aachen and elsewhere, was one of the major issues addressed by German historical research in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Begun by Georg Waitz in 1873, this project was largely completed by Reinhard Elze in 1960; others, such as Helmut Beumann, Eduard Eichmann, and Percy Ernst Schramm also contributed a great deal.35 It should

34 One exception is the coronation of Louis the Pious by Pope Stephen II in 816, described by Ermoldus Nigellus in his epic, Ad honorem Hludowici Christianissimi Caesaris Augusti, Book II. Widukind of Corvey describes only the royal crowning of Otto I in Aachen (936), and probably wrote down what he saw when Otto II was installed in 962. The most reliable report of a medieval coronation is of the crowning of the very last emperor, Karl V, in Bologna in the year 1530. It was compiled by the papal master of ceremonies, who himself led the procedure. See Eduard Eichmann, Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendland: Ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des kirchlichen Rechts, der Liturgie und der Kirchenpolitik, 2 vols. (Würzburg, 1942), i. pp. xii–xiii.

briefly be mentioned that no medieval imperial or royal coronation was exactly the same as its forerunner. Like all the rituals discussed so far, the political needs of the time always influenced the actual arrangements.36

The Mainz Ordo, however, served as a *Leittext*, a guiding model. It survived in more than fifty copies from all over Europe, dating from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries, and recorded the basic elements of every medieval coronation. One of the most famous copies is an illuminated manuscript of the Ordo for the sacralizing and crowning of the French kings, produced in the mid thirteenth century. According to Jacques Le Goff, this Ordo was never 'performed' and was only an ideal representation of a royal consecration as imagined by Louis the Pius. Le Goff also suggests, however, that the structure of this rite can be interpreted as a *rite de passage*.37

The ‘invalid king’ is introduced in the first, pre-liminal phase of separation which, in the context of the coronation ritual, is symbolized by the act of escorting the candidate from the palace to the church. Both the Mainz and French Ordo specify an interesting aspect. Two bishops are commissioned to fetch the king from the palace, or to be more precise, to get him out of bed (‘exeunte rege de thalamo’). They bear witness to his awakening and rising from bed. It is their duty to lead the candidate from his bed to the church, supporting him actively on the left and right side. This detail presupposes a state of weakness ritually imposed on the candidate.38


central liminal phase is introduced with significant gestures: the candidate must lay aside his weapon and coat (a ritual undressing) and is led to the altar, where he lies on the ground with arms spread out in the form of a cross. He lies thus prostrate until the end of the litany and again before confession. Then, of course, the liturgical interrogations might be interpreted as a ritualized trial: the future king is treated like a defendant. The act of anointing, finally, might be read alongside the ritual treatment of the ill and the dying who, apart from priests and bishops, were anointed in the Christian Church. The Mainz Ordo prescribes anointment not only of the head and wrists but also of the chest, which presupposes undressing. An eleventh-century medieval writer ascribes literal transformative powers to the act of anointing: ‘te hodie in virum alterum mutavit.’

Finally, the act of coronation forces the candidate into a posture of submission, into an ‘inclinatio semiplena’ as Jean Claude Schmitt puts it, drawing on Humbert de Romanis. The coronation in the sacramentary of Warmundus of Ivrea (early eleventh century) illustrates the necessity of submitting to the authority of power. The one to be crowned, probably Otto III, has no choice but to bow down before his coronator. This idea of the humiliated king can be traced back to the Old Testament Psalms, to the sufferings of the chosen king, and to the image of the suffering servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53. The medieval sites of royal and imperial coronations, such as the altar of St Peter’s in Rome, or that in the cathedral in Aachen, are

43 In this context, it would be worth investigating medieval acts of self-coronation. There is an example from Visigothic Spain, where self-coronation was interpreted as an act of delegitimation. See Reinhard Schneider, *Königswahl und Königserhebung im Frühmittelalter: Untersuchungen zur Herrschaftsnachfolge bei den Langobarden und Merowingern* (Stuttgart, 1972), 200, n. 65.
therefore places of humiliation and represent a period of temporary weakness on the part of the future emperor or king.

A final observation relates to one of the most important insignia of royal power in the Ottonian empire, the *Reichskrone*.45 (See Illustration 2.) This insignia of power consists of eight metal plates, four of them depicting the logic of the heavenly Jerusalem in a complicated arrangement of precious gems and jewels. The four other plates are pictorial enamels depicting the classical ideals of Christian rulership in the following personifications: Jesus Christ (*maiestas domini* or *pantocrator*), King David, King Solomon, and King Hezekiah. Each figure holds a banner bearing an inscription. The three kings are usually described as Old Testament models of Christian rule in the Middle Ages: Rex David with the reminder *honor regis iudicium diligit* (the honour of the kings loves justice); Rex Solomon with

45 Space does not permit a detailed discussion of the never-ending story of the problems of dating the *Reichskrone*. The most generally accepted opinion dates it to the late 10th century. However, it has been plausibly argued that it dates from the 11th century (Mechthild Schulze Dörlamm) or even from the mid 12th century (Hans Martin Schaller). For a comprehensive account see Joachim Ott, ‘Kronen und Krönungen in frühottonischer Zeit’, in Bernd Schneidmüller and Stefan Weinfurter (eds.), *Ottonische Neuanfänge: Symposium zur Ausstellung ’Otto der Große, Magdeburg und Europa’* (Mainz, 2001), 171–88;
the words *Domine et recede a male* (fear the lord and keep away from evil). The banner on the Hezekiah plate is carried by Isaiah, the prophet, and reads: *Ecce adiciam super dies tuos xv annos* (I will add to your days another fifteen years).

King David and King Solomon are depicted standing, while the *maiestas domini* plate and the Hezekiah plate depict their kings seated. Most significant for our purposes is the observation that the Hezekiah plate, smaller than the other pictorial plates, represents a rather dubious ideal of kingship. The Old Testament King Hezekiah was disobedient and struck by God with disease for his sins. The plate depicts this king in a vulnerable position: sitting on his throne, supporting his head with his hand on his right cheek, the other hand on his heart. A suffering king! On his right the prophet Isaiah stands upright and in the foreground. He is about to tell the sick king of God’s promise to restore the king’s health and to add another fifteen years to his rule.

A suffering king on the central insignia of royal power in the medieval German empire might, in fact, be a reason to explore further the function of weakness in rites of empowerment as something more than a mere instrument of power, preferably employed by religious or archaic powers to suppress secular and rational forces. The public display of weakness might also be explained as a structural unit in the collective management of power in pre-modern, modern, and postmodern societies.

5. Ritual Manslaughter: The Sword in the Crown of the German Emperor

wearing the crown on his head and holding the sceptre in his left hand. Behind him, three princes of the realm stand with the royal insignia. The one in the foreground holds a sword in his left hand and stabs the king’s head from behind, right in the centre of the crown. The scene is unsettling. What are we looking at? An assault? A ritual sacrifice? A public execution? Obviously we are seeing a person who, in the presence of others, is being threatened from behind with a sword. But none of those standing around seem to be unduly worried by this.

Nor are modern scholars, as Werner Paravicini has only recently pointed out. ‘Strangely, the striking gesture has attracted little attention in the research. It has hardly been a problem to anyone. None of the many present-day colleagues I asked had an explanation to
hand.\textsuperscript{46} It seems, in fact, that historical research has rendered this threatening gesture all but invisible. Its threatening nature has either been overlooked, described without comment, or interpreted away.\textsuperscript{47} Of course, the general warning to be very careful when interpreting medieval images must always be heeded. Richental’s depictions could be visual misunderstandings, as Jürgen Petersohn and, in conversation, Karl Friedrich Krieger, have pointed out.\textsuperscript{48} It is well known that Richental was a highly partial witness, and that he often lacked understanding of the symbolic content of the insignia and political communications of his time. Other contemporary witnesses do not report this gesture at all. It is therefore likely that what is shown in the image from Richental’s Chronicle has little to do with what actually happened at the Council of Constance.

The evidence is, however, explicit. With the same clarity, presented unmistakably in word and image, the ‘sword in the crown’ is mentioned on nine further occasions in April and May 1417. Eight were enfeoffments of high-ranking imperial princes, which Sigmund had called for in the new year, among them Friedrich von Hohenzollern, Burgrave of Nuremberg (18 April 1417); Duke Ludwig VII the Bearded of Bavaria-Ingolstadt (11 May 1417); Ernst and Wilhelm III of Bavaria-Munich (11 and 13 May 1417); Archbishop Johann of Nassau (23 February 1417); Duke Adolf of Kleve (21 or 28 April 1417); Johann of Bavaria, Count Palatine of Neumarkt-Amberg (13 or 31 May 1417); and Magnus of Saxony, Prince Bishop of Camin (26 May 1417). The gesture was carried out again (and perhaps for the last time) when Duke Friedrich IV of Austria was retrospectively enfeoffed on 8 May 1418. Finally, a highly detailed description of the


\textsuperscript{47} For a recent description of the scene see Karl-Heinz Spieß, ‘Kommunikationsformen im Hochadel und am Königshof im Spätmittelalter’, in Gerd Althoff (ed.), \textit{Formen und Funktionen öffentlicher Kommunikation im Mittelalter} (Sigmaringen, 2001), 261–90, esp. 272, ill. 3, with a commentary on the act of enfeoffment at 277–85.

sword in the crown is mentioned for Christmas 1414, when King Sigmund attended mass in Constance cathedral. Again, image and text clearly refer to the ‘sword in the crown’: ‘while the king sang, the duke of Saxony stood behind him, with the naked sword in his hand, and he held the tip of the sword right to the centre of the king’s head.’ There is no doubt: all manuscripts of the chronicle unanimously testify, in word and image, to these ten occasions on which the same gesture was used at the enfeoffment of the imperial princes.

Historians have offered a number of possible interpretations which make the gesture less threatening. Legal historians have interpreted the sword as the ‘axis of God’s rule’, in the words of L. Fischel, for example, while G. Wacker has described it as an axis of law linking the divine and the earthly judge-king. Bernd Schneidmüller, building on the work of Hermann Heimpel, has recently embedded the Christmas reading of Sigmund in the context of late medieval tendencies of desacralization. He has pointed out that the precedence of the Christian empire over the Church is anchored in the festive liturgy in a highly sophisticated way, for what is being read is the opening of the second chapter of the Gospel of St Luke: ‘In these days a decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled. Exiit edictum a Cesare Augusto, ut asecrieretur universus orbis.’ This sentence turns the history of salvation into a chapter in the history of the emperor, as it were: ‘For after all, in calling a census, Caesar Augustus created the preconditions for the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem. The Roman empire thus preceded the Christian church.’ All these interpretations have one thing in common: they deflect our attention away from an act that physically threatened the


51 Ibid, 288.

ruler and direct it towards the assumed symbolic content of this strange gesture, regardless of whether the spoken act of the imperial reading is regarded as a liturgically concealed statement of imperial superiority, or whether the sword is seen as a reminder that all power originates in divine authority.

A third line of argument must also be mentioned here. Intentionally or not, the Christian understanding of sacred rule as expressed in this ritual conveys strong connotations of Christian humilitas. This is a commonly and universally used building block in the medieval language of ritual, whether within the framework of the inauguration of a ruler, enfeoffment, the consecration of a ruler, conflict resolution, or another situation of political communication. The argument goes that the ritual transformed a ruler threatened by a sword into a ruler urged to practice the Christian virtue of humility.

The following attempt to interpret the sword in the crown is linked to this argument. It starts with the interpretation of the gesture as an ‘old ceremonial protective gesture’, first suggested by Hermann Heimpel and Hartmut Boockmann. This may initially sound paradoxical, for who is being protected from whom? One potentially revealing source who answers this question is connected to the coronation of Otto I as emperor in 962. According to Thietmar of Merseburg, on the occasion of his coronation Otto I had named the later bishop of Utrecht as sword-carrier, asking him to hold the sword over his head ‘when I am praying at the holy threshold of the apostles today’. Thietmar, who was writing in 1018 (and thus more than

---


54 Thietmar von Merseburg, *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg*, trans. and annotated David A. Warner (Manchester, 2001), bk. IX, ch. 32, p. 175; ‘When the aforementioned Caesar entered Rome, he made this trustworthy youth his sword-bearer, with the following words: “Today, while I am praying at the threshold of the Apostles, you must continually hold the sword above my head. For I am well aware that the Romans’ loyalty to our predecessors was often suspect. It is wise to foresee adversity while it is still distant and thus avoid being found unprepared for it.”’
fifty years after the event he describes), had found a practical explanation for this gesture by pointing to the emperor’s fear of the traitorous Romans. The function of the sword over the imperial head was to protect it.

The episode contains an important pointer, however. The sword-carrier is to spring into action on the threshold of the church. The sword is to be lifted above the future emperor at precisely the moment when he is waiting and praying on the threshold of St Peter’s. The candidate is led to the church in a solemn procession. As early as the Mainz Ordo, the threshold of the church has a symbolic function. Ad sacra limina apostolorum, in the Mainz Ordo, ad ostium ecclesiae, is where the future emperor must wait while the archbishop and the bishops pray to God to support the weak candidate. In this view, then, the task undertaken by the Ottonian sword-carrier is not designed to protect the candidate, but rather an exaggerated statement of the candidate’s vulnerability on the threshold of the church, at the very core of liminality. Seen in this way, the analogy which Boockmann and Heimpel assume between an Ottonian gesture of protection in the context of the emperor’s coronation and the sword in the crown at the enfeoffments in Constance is highly plausible. But we might add a further dimension. The ‘old ceremonial gesture of protection’ expresses the power of the protector as well as the weakness of the protected (king). The scene therefore supplies an intense image of the ‘powers of weakness’ by depicting the ruler’s need for protection. The materiality of the sword above the ruler’s head stores an awareness of the fragility of power. It argues with the power of weakness in the central passage of status elevation. The gesture in Constance can find a place in this tradition.

IV. Cross Cultural Case Studies

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the above-mentioned Carinthian example already caused a lively academic discussion in which Emil Goldmann, for example, drew a comparison with the annual consecration of the king in the ancient Indian rājasūya ritual mentioned at the beginning of this article. The Babylonian Akitu festival is often mentioned as a prototype for this form of ritual. This was a festival of ritual renewal, which lasted for several days and is
known to have existed in two forms, as a spring and autumn festival, from perhaps as early as 3,000 BC. Within the framework of this festival, performed every year, the king was divested of his insignia. He had to submit to a ritual trial in the temple and to endure the blows of the high priest before—ritually renewed—he could assume sovereignty for another year.55

On this trail of Ancient Near Eastern culture we must include the tradition of the ill-treated Gottesknecht, the image of the suffering king that forms a leitmotiv of Christian images of rule, but goes back as far as the origins of the people of Israel. It is assumed that the Canaanite–Israelite ritual renewal of life left traces of their liturgical staging in the Psalms of Lamentation of the Elect.56 Isaiah’s words, too, ‘He had no beauty or majesty . . . He was despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows, and familiar with suffering. Like one from whom men hide their faces he was despised, and we esteemed him not’ (Isaiah 53: 2–3) can be read as a liturgical accompaniment to the ritual humiliations undergone in the context of the Canaanite rituals of installation.

Early ethnological studies dating from the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries document practices that are, in many respects, unsettlingly analogous: the ruler beaten in Sierra Leone, South India, and Zaire,57 and the martyred and ritually murdered ruler of Burkina

56 Herbert Haag, Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja (Darmstadt, 1985); cf. Ahlström, Psalm 89, 40.
Faso, documented in Michael Cartry’s fascinating studies. Other examples might be added here. Suzanne Blier, to cite just one, highlights the paradoxical alliance between royal perfection and ritually induced physical disability in the African concepts of kingship found in Benin, Yoruba, Dahomey, and Cuba. Physical imperfection and weakness seem to have influenced various types of African royal ceremony and art. Since kings were forbidden by ritual to speak in pub-
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The Power of Weakness

1–25. Frazer cites John Matthews, *A Voyage to the River Sierra-Leone, on the Coast of Africa* (London, 1791), 75. Here the preconditions for royal office are mentioned, among them knowledge of local traditions, a command of rhetoric, ‘a good head’, sobriety, and the capacity to receive the complaints and ailments of the people. Except among the Mandingos and the Suzéés, kings are usually strangers: ‘few kings are natives of the country they govern.’ However, there is no hint of ritual maltreatment of the future king. J. Zweifel and M. Moustier, ‘Voyages aux sources du Niger’, *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, 20 (1880), 111. A report of their (highly entertaining) performance before the Société is on p. 579. No mention, however, is made there of the maltreatment of kings. Frazer also cites Olfert Dapper, *Description de l’Afrique contenant les noms, la situation & les confins de toutes ses parties, leurs rivieres, leurs ville & leurs habitations, leurs plantes & leurs animaux, les mœurs, les costumes, la langue, les richesses, la religion & le gouvernement de ses peuples* (Amsterdam, 1686; reprint 1970), 250 where we find the following description of the election of a king of Sierra Leone: ‘Lors qu’un Roi est mort, son fils lui succède; que s’il n’a point d’enfant mâles: c’est son frere ou son plus proche parent qui monte sur le trône. Avant qu’on le proclame Roi, on le va chercher dans sa maison, on le charge des chaînes & on l’amene ainsi dans le Palais, où il lui faut essuyer un certain nombre de coups qu’on lui donne. Ensuite on rompt ses liens, on lui met les vêtements Royal & on l’amene dans le Funco où les Principaux du Royaume sont assemblez, & le doyen des Soldatequis après un long discours, pour prouver les droits du Roi á la couronne, lui remet entre les mains les marques de la dignité Royale, qui sont une espece de hache avec laquelle on tranche la tête aux criminels. C’est ainsi qu’on installoit les Rois sur le trône de Sierra Lionna (!) avant que les Rois de Quoja ou Cabo-monte s’en emparassent, ces Princes y envoyant maintenant un Gouverneur avec le titre de Dondagh qui signifie Roi.’
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lic, they assumed aspects of a mute; too sacred (or dangerous) to touch the ground, they were transported on hammocks; they stood with their arms supported by courtiers, had to move extremely slowly, or held court while lying prone on special back rests, all characteristics signalling at once disability and physical inability to stand independently.  

V. The Power of Weakness Beyond the Middle Ages

Taken together, these images suggest a strong tradition of ritually induced states of weakness in a future ruler (defeat, illness, beatings, maltreatment, murder), across different time periods and cultures. Kings and princes in India, Ireland, Babylon, Carinthia, France, and Germany might have more in common than historians like to admit. The medieval historical tradition, in particular, has treated its kings and emperors all too gently, often seeming to fear cross-cultural comparison like the plague. Christian rulers have been treated as an entirely unique species, only to be understood within the comprehensive framework of the European Christian tradition. One might even speak of an occidental belief in a Western Christian Sonderweg that has blinded historical research until today. To the present day, there is a firm insistence that a structural difference exists between the Christian and other concepts of rulership.  

Franz-Reiner Erkens has only recently widened the ‘German historical horizon’ by suggesting cross-cultural comparisons beyond the boundaries of the Christian world. In the introduction to his most recent monograph on sacred kingship, he argues not only that the distinction between Christian and pagan concepts of rulership should be dropped altogether, but also that Christian concepts of rulership should no longer be treated as particular cases within the cultural development of human soci-

---


The ‘power of weakness’ no longer deserves treatment as something unique, whether as a memento to Christian humilitas or an expression of archaic or pagan traditions.

Rituall induced weakness is a constant part of rituals of power all over the world. There is something that we might call the art of weakness (Schwäche zeigen). Elements of humiliation right at the centre of universal rituals of power can be seen less as indicating religious domination and much more as an expression of collective knowledge about a fundamental rule of power. I suggest reflecting on the possibility that claims to authority and power can only be successful if power finds ways and symbols of expressing its weakness, its own contingency, its fragility. Future research might therefore look for rituals and symbols of weakness as an expression of the collective knowledge of the indispensable need for balance in the making of social coherence. They could be analysed as elementary units in what we might call the social reproduction of order.

All the examples mentioned here have one thing in common: in the ritual performance, the future ruler is physically weakened (sometimes going as far as ritual killing). He is forced to submit; the transience of human existence is demonstrated to him. Rituals of humiliation, the symbolism of infirmity, and gestures of protection are ubiquitous in the rituals marking the accession and maintenance of power. They have a fixed place in the repertoire of cultural strategies of legitimization.

In any case, the ritual beatings of the Indian kings which opened this article are more than just the renactment of a struggle for power between secular and spiritual authority. Anyone who wants to rule must be prepared to suffer. Awareness of this connection can be demonstrated across cultures and periods, and is certainly not something unique to the Christian Middle Ages. This knowledge perhaps separates the Middle Ages more from the age of absolutism than from the present day. Anyone who wants to rule today must be prepared to suffer: electioneering in soup kitchens, appointment diaries

that put the achievements of medieval asceticism in the shade, public grillings in talk shows, the revelation of private lives in gossip magazines, and so on. As a rule, beatings of the elect still play a central part in the machinery of power today. They are, however, administered differently: not on a single occasion, in a concentrated and violent form within the ritual framing the accession to power, but democratically institutionalized and permanently watched over by the media in the ‘bodies of power’.
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‘Above all, it was through the men and women of English descent who worked with [Boniface] in Germany that the English tradition of an organized church under the ultimate authority of the pope passed to the countries converted under his leadership. When all allowance has been made for the part played by Boniface in the ecclesiastical politics of the Frankish kingdom, he remains essentially the leader of an Anglo-Saxon mission to the heathen of Germany.’1 This quotation from Frank Stenton’s Anglo-Saxon England summarizes the older research on the Anglo-Saxon missions to the continent and their main strands: the well-organized missionaries constituted ecclesiastical structures, brought papal authority to the Frankish kingdom, and converted the German heathens. Despite the title of his book, James Palmer is not concerned with every aspect of the Anglo-Saxons’ contact with Francia, but concentrates on the Anglo-Saxon missions. Unlike many earlier writers on this topic, Palmer is interested less in the missions themselves than in their legacy and the literary manifestations of their activities, especially in hagiographical texts. In particular, he analyses how the vitae written in the eighth and ninth centuries reshaped or shaped the past and thus the conception of the Anglo-Saxon missions as a whole.

The study, which emerged from a doctoral dissertation, is clearly structured. After an outline of the modern scholarship on the subject and a summary of the sources in the introduction, the missionaries’ motives are scrutinized. Peregrinatio was clearly an issue, but has to be treated individually and at the same time seems to be ‘a literary construction of piety’ (p. 75). The second chapter, ‘Kings and Nobles’, reflects on contacts between the missionaries and the Frankish aristocracy. It is not by chance that the success of the Anglo-Saxon missions and the rise of the Pippinids-Carolingians coincide. Chapters 3

and 4 are mostly concerned with the hagiographers’ views of the missionaries, and especially their conception of the Frankish world. Paganism ‘gave a clear “something” against which the saints could fight’, so that the protagonists of the *vita* were heroes of a kind and ‘the focal points from which true Christian culture spread into different communities’ (p. 144). By this means, the saints’ lives also contributed to the formation of local Christian identities. As the next chapter shows, the hagiographers depicted the missionaries as bringing order into the wilderness. Apparent manifestations of change and transformation were the (re-)establishment of ecclesiastical institutions, above all, monasteries. Consequently, Palmer elaborates on monasticism in chapter 5, focusing on the development of the saints’ cults in several specific contexts (especially Fulda and Tauberbischofsheim). The last two chapters go beyond the Frankish kingdom, bringing into focus Rome, namely, the papal authority, and the Holy Land by analysing the account of Willibald’s pilgrimage.

In his concise conclusion, Palmer stresses that the missions ‘did play a role in defining the language and direction of Church reform, an invigorated monasticism and interest in papal authority’. But, he suggests, this was not exclusively the result of the missionaries’ influence, and these topics may as well be projections of hagiographers and other writers ‘onto the “golden age” of the Anglo-Saxon “missions” ’ (p. 283). Moreover, hagiography was written with certain audiences in mind, but this factor did not always affect the content, especially the concept of sanctity. Saints are not just there, they were created by individuals or groups, and this creation is already an interpretative act that finds expression in saints’ cults and especially in *vita*.

The entire study is clearly and fluently written, which adds to the comprehensibility of the presented insights. One major drawback, however, is Palmer’s use of German-language scholarship. He makes ample use of German (and Dutch) works, but it is questionable to what extent he really understands them. The assumption of Palmer’s poor command of the German language is based on his use of a number of odd quotations, as in the introduction, to pick one example. On p. 10, Palmer cites Albert Hauck as follows: ‘Wer vom Standpunkt der konfessionellen Polemik [. . .] kann annehmen, dass ohne Rom die Entwicklung der mittelalterlichen Kirche eine geradere, gesün-
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dere Richtung innegehalten [sic!] hätte, als sie es wirklich hat.’ 2 The original passage reads: ‘Wer vom Standpunkt der konfessionellen Polemik aus die Geschichte der Vergangenheit betrachtet, kann annehmen, daß ohne Rom die Entwicklung der mittelalterlichen Kirche eine geradere, gesündere Richtung innegehalten hätte, als sie es wirklich that [sic!]’. Palmer’s omission shows that he does not understand the grammatical structure of this sentence, especially as his translation contains a question mark in square brackets, as if Hauck would have asked a question and forgotten to set a question mark. There are various other passages in which Palmer quotes erroneously, 3 inserts wrong words in omissions, 4 cites titles of works incorrectly, 5 or just uses incorrect terms. 6 The examples given here are not complete, and they are not meant to ridicule the author, but are intended to demonstrate that the errors cannot simply be explained as careless mistakes. Rather, they suggest that the author has limited language skills in German.

Leaving these deficiencies aside, the book presents an articulate study of hagiographical interest in the Anglo-Saxon missions, revealing that these literary works do not only interpret past events and their protagonists, but shape the picture of this past and thus affect the impression of the Anglo-Saxon mission(s) as a whole. ‘This is why something like the Anglo-Saxon missions cannot be understood as a series of confined events: their significance was constantly revised, edited, and reshaped according to the needs, interests, and tastes of anyone whose attention was drawn by the saints of the Carolingian world’ (p. 290). It is to be hoped that future research on hagiography will display the same diligent and prudent analysis as James Palmer has carried out for the vitae of Anglo-Saxon missionaries.

2 The omission is Palmer’s; [sic!] was inserted by the reviewer. Palmer cites the 2nd edn. of Albert Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands (Leipzig, 1898), i. 577, although a 3rd and 4th edn. were also published (Leipzig, 1904), in which the cited passage appears on pp. 593–4.
3 On pp. 11–12, for example: ‘der den universalkirchen Zusammenhalt erneuerte’ instead of ‘der den universalkirchlichen Zusammenhalt erneuerte’.
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Jens Schneider’s poetically titled book, *Auf der Suche nach dem verlorenen Reich* (‘In Search of the Lost Kingdom’), marks an important contribution to the study of Lotharingia in the Carolingian and immediately post-Carolingian period. The book began its life as a Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Paderborn under the direction of Jörg Jarnut. Lotharingia has long attracted interest from historians in both France and Germany and, as one might expect of a dissertation jointly supervised by Régine Le Jan, Schneider has integrated his work thoroughly within the historiographical traditions of both nations.

Schneider’s main aim is to examine what constituted Lotharingia in the years between 855 and 959. He begins with a brief overview of historiography on the topic before moving on to contextualize his own study within work on space (*Raum*) and identity in the earlier Middle Ages. Schneider rightly contests that earlier scholarship often took a rather simplistic view of these phenomena, presuming both space and identity to be independent entities. Schneider’s approach, however, inspired by the ‘Vienna school’ of ethnogenesis theory and the ‘spatial turn’, is to treat both of these as malleable social constructs. In doing so, Schneider does not seek to deny that external factors, such as geography, might play a part, but he wishes to emphasize that identities and spatial awareness are not to be taken for granted: they are actively generated by the interaction of humans with their environment. The straw man through much of this argument is Thomas Bauer, whose 1997 book argued that a distinctive Lotharingian identity can be discerned as early as the ninth century and traced from there into the High Middle Ages.¹ As Schneider points out, Bauer never outlined what he understood as constituting a ‘historical region’ (*historischer Raum*) and, as such, his arguments are dangerously circular, identifying the historical region of Lotharingia on the basis of his findings, rather than a previous definition of the phenomenon. Schneider, in contrast, builds his analysis on

recent discussions of space, both practical and theoretical, calling particularly on Frank Göttmann’s criteria for a distinctive historical region: nature and environment; population; society; behaviour and mentality; economy; and politics and constitution.

For practical reasons Schneider begins his analysis with issues of politics and constitution, turning his attention first to the borders of the regnum Hlotharii, as defined first in 843 and then again in 855. Schneider argues that the middle kingdom did not encompass most of Frisia in either of these divisions, building here on work by Kaj van Vliet. In general, Schneider produces a clear and detailed picture of the kingdom’s borders, emphasizing that modern lineal precision is not to be expected. The modifications of the Lotharingian borders in the years following 855 are then discussed, with particular detail on the problematic regions of Burgundy and Alsace. Throughout, Schneider takes an admirably pragmatic approach, pointing out that modern precision is not to be anticipated for early medieval borders, which were likely to be fluid and fluctuating, though not necessarily un- or ill-defined. Although natural boundaries defined some of the kingdom’s borders, these were by no means decisive. Likewise, neither diocesan divisions nor linguistic frontiers seem to have had a substantial influence on the borders. Indeed, Schneider concludes that the most important factor throughout these divisions was the interests of the landed aristocracy.

Schneider then turns his attention to other traditional constitutional aspects of the regnum Hlotharii. He notes first of all that Lotharingia was a kingdom with its own ruler for only very brief spells during this period: between 855 and 869, under Lothar II, and then again between 895 and 900, under Zwentibold. Most of the time, however, the kingdom was either divided between or fully incorporated into its more powerful neighbours to the east and west. Although incorporation into a larger kingdom need not in and of itself mean that all local identity is lost (the regnum Italicum famously remained distinct despite centuries of German dominance in the High Middle Ages), Schneider points out that there is strikingly little evidence for a distinctive tradition of Lotharingian kingship. Indicative of this is the absence of evidence for local election and coronation—it would seem that Lotharingia was generally treated simply as a part of a larger kingdom, rather than as a distinctive entity to which one acceded separately. Building on the work of Hans-Werner...
Goetz, Schneider further contests that there was no regionally defined duchy (ducatus) of Lotharingia and that the title dux, used sporadically for leading local magnates, did not define a specific office so much as indicate particular royal favour (it was essentially an Ehrentitel). As such, the style says more about the good relations an individual enjoyed with the king than about institutional government on the ground.

Briefer sections are dedicated to Lotharingia’s environment, natural landscape, and population. In the first of these Schneider depends heavily on reference works and more specific geographical studies, but the results remain important for the overall picture he paints. He points out that Lotharingia as a region was characterized by variety, not unity, when it came to its natural environment and landscape, and that its borders took little account of climatic or environmental differences. As Schneider moves on to the issue of population, he faces the challenge that we do not have any accurate means of measuring population density in the earlier Middle Ages. He therefore opts for the innovative—but by no means unquestionable—approach of reading religious foundations as barometers of settlement. These suggest a rough north–south divide, with the south being more heavily populated and based more firmly around urban centres. What is essential, however, is that the picture is by no means uniform; again it would seem that variety was characteristic of the region.

As Schneider comes to discuss the region’s society, he emphasizes once more that space is ultimately a social phenomenon. Here, however, it is notable that the borders of pagi and dioceses do not closely follow those of the Lotharingian kingdom, which makes it unlikely that these were a source of societal unity. More might be said about the use of forests, Schneider comments, since the region seems to have been particularly known for offering good hunting. Nevertheless, whilst the hunt was an important part of elite society and Lotharingia may have been particularly well suited for it, Schneider convincingly argues that the social role of forests was probably little different from that in the neighbouring East and West Frankish kingdoms. A rough north–south divide emerges from the examination of
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charters and central places, though even within these respective regions there is little reason to assume true social unity. In this respect, the picture seems to be of a society somewhere between what we observe further to the east and west, which is hardly surprising given Lotharingia’s central geographical placement.

As Schneider turns to the issue of behaviour and mentality, he again runs up against the difficulty of quantifying these in an early medieval context. He therefore opts to approach the topic from two angles. First, he investigates the cult of saints as a potential indicator of mentalities, since previous work (in particular by Bauer) treated the patron saints attested within the region as an important sign of unity. Schneider argues, however, that Bauer too often relied on patron saints first attested in the High Middle Ages, presuming that the origins of their cults lay much earlier. Restricting himself only to those patron saints securely attested before 959, however, Schneider comes to very different conclusions: no distinctive Lotharingian tendencies can be seen, though again there are hints of a north–south divide. Secondly, Schneider takes into account later Jewish traditions about the region of ‘Lotir’. These are first attested in the High Middle Ages, but have been taken as evidence of a Lotharingian identity and the close affiliation of Jewish communities with the region as early as the ninth century. However, as Schneider points out, the name Lotir does not necessarily date from the earliest period of Lotharingia—as the modern name itself testifies, the memory of Lothar long outlived his brief reign in the region. Moreover, the term Lotir does not seem to have been used for the entire kingdom of 855. As such, it provides little evidence for a pan-Lotharingian identity in the ninth or early tenth centuries.

Finally, Schneider turns his attention to his final criterion: the economy. Here, too, diversity seems to be the order of the day, with a general north–south divide being visible. The southern regions were agriculturally richer and saw considerably more continuity with the Late Antique period, which meant that the old provincial civitates played a more active role in economic life. The only real indication of coherence within the region comes from the main routes of travel, which enabled easy communication both north–south and east–west. However, Lotharingia was also well connected to both the West and East Frankish kingdoms, so this alone is unlikely to have fostered a distinctive local identity.
To conclude this detailed first section, Schneider returns to the spatial turn, arguing that according to such an understanding of space there is little reason to treat Lotharingia as a distinct region in this period. Given this, it is hardly surprising that we have few indications of a gentile ‘Lotharingian’ conception of the region, with most references to the ‘Lotharingians’ as such coming from later periods.

The second section of Schneider’s study takes a rather different tack, attempting to approach the topic from the angle of contemporary vernacular literature. This material has been surprisingly little discussed in recent work on the development of national identities in the Early Middle Ages and Schneider’s discussion is therefore most welcome. Schneider chooses to focus on the two works in which one might most anticipate some sense of Lotharingian identity finding expression, were it present: Otfrid of Weissenburg’s Evangelienbuch and the Ludwigslied.

Beginning with the first of these, Schneider must admit that Weissenburg, where Otfrid wrote his Evangelienbuch, was probably part of Louis the German’s East Frankish kingdom from the start and therefore not technically part of Lotharingia. However, since Otfrid himself may have hailed from what was to become the middle kingdom, Schneider still sees every reason to investigate his work further. Although written in the vernacular, Otfrid’s Evangelienbuch gives remarkably little indication that it was designed to foster some kind of ‘national’ or ‘gentile’ identity. When such an identity is expressed at all, it tends to be a pan-Frankish, rather than peculiarly East (or Middle) Frankish. This fits well with the other evidence for vernacular text production around Louis the German’s court, which Schneider convincingly argues had educational rather than ‘national’ aims: the vernacular was used to reach a broader audience, not to foster a sense of unity.

The second text Schneider considers, the Ludwigslied, might superficially seem to offer more evidence for distinctive identities. Here, however, the great mystery is why a poem would have been written in the (Rhine-)Frankish vernacular in praise of a West Frankish ruler. Although scholars have taken this as an indication of the bilingualism of Louis III’s court, Schneider argues that this, in fact, points towards an audience primarily in Lotharingia or East Frankia. In particular, he suggests that the poem is best understood within the context of Charles the Fat’s succession plans in the early 880s. It has long
been known that Charles attempted to adopt Carloman II in these years; however, as Schneider points out, the earliest evidence for such plans (a letter—or possibly two letters—by Hincmar of Rheims), may suggest that the original idea was to adopt both Louis the Stammerer and Carloman. In this light, a praise poem in the Frankish dialect may well have been designed to make Louis’s potential accession more attractive in Lotharingia. This fits well with the content of the poem itself, which depicts Louis as a successful defender against the viking threat at a time when this was felt particularly acutely in Lotharingia. As Schneider admits, such a theory must remain speculative, but it provides interesting food for thought for future scholars.

On the whole, Schneider’s arguments are forcefully and convincingly made and his command of the secondary literature, particularly in French and German, is impressive (though an atypical oversight seems to be Simon Coupland’s important work on viking activity in the ninth century, which is unmentioned throughout the book). Although aspects of his arguments will come as little surprise to those acquainted with the modern work of Matthias Becher and others on the emergence of distinctive regional identities within the duchies and principalities of the ninth and tenth centuries, it is fair to say that Lotharingia has yet to be subjected to such detailed scrutiny, and the results remain most informative. However, this is not to say that there are no points on which Schneider’s arguments might be questioned. It is by no means clear that Schneider’s arguments against a distinctive Lotharingian ‘gentile’ identity in these years must preclude the existence of a more general ‘regnal’ identity of some description (to use Susan Reynolds’s terms). Indeed, Schneider himself admits in his conclusions that at least in the 850s and 860s the Lotharingian episcopate stood firmly behind Lothar II, hinting at such an identity (pp. 454–5). Moreover, when in 911 and again c.925 the region passed from the East to the West Frankish kingdom and then back again, it is notable that it did so as an entity and was not sub-divided. Some of Schneider’s finer points might also be queried. The present reviewer, who is an Anglo-Saxonist by training, was surprised to be informed that proprietary churches were a largely continental phenomenon and that the early medieval English nobility

made little use of them in their familial strategies (p. 54). Likewise, he was not entirely convinced by the idea that population density might be discerned on the basis of ecclesiastical foundations alone (pp. 156–66).

Still, it would be wrong to end this review on a negative note: this book is both challenging and engaging, and if, at times, it raises more questions than it answers, it should be all the more commended for this fact. Schneider’s book is well researched, well presented, and thoroughly argued; it is a must-read not only for those working on Lotharingia, but also for anyone interested in space and identities in the earlier Middle Ages.
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This collection of thirteen studies by Giles Constable is very welcome. Many, such as ‘The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries’ (first pub. 1952), for example, have been widely read since their first publication and have deeply influenced crusade studies. Most of the essays have been revised and the documentation enhanced without any suggestion that the articles were written at a later date, as Constable explains in the introduction. New sections, however, have been added, among them two appendices on the names and numbering of the crusades. Further sources have been brought into the discussion and translated for the volume. Two essays are published here for the first time. The volume therefore represents the sum of Constable’s studies on the twelfth-century crusades.

The essays are arranged in a partly systematic, partly chronological order. The collection opens with two general essays on historiography and symbols (‘Historiography of the Crusades’; ‘The Cross of the Crusaders’). These are followed by essays which focus on social history (‘The Financing of the Crusades’; ‘Medieval Charters as a Source for the History of the Crusades’; ‘The Place of the Crusader in Medieval Society’; ‘The Military Orders’). The remaining seven essays are devoted to specific events, individuals, or topics concerning the twelfth-century crusades, starting with three studies of the First Crusade and early crusading (‘Cluny and the First Crusade’; ‘Early Crusading in Eastern Germany: The Magdeburg Charter of 1107/08’; ‘The Three Lives of Odo Arpinus: Viscount of Bourges, Crusader, Monk of Cluny’), followed by three on the Second Crusade and crusading in the middle of the twelfth century (‘The Second Crusade as Seen by Contemporaries’; ‘Two Notes on the Anglo-Flemish Crusaders of 1147–8’; ‘The Crusading Project of 1150’). An essay on the Fourth Crusade concludes the volume. The two appendices on the names and the numbering of the crusades serve as summaries and present Constable’s current position on the phenomenon of the crusades in general. Constable does not, however, provide a general conclusion summing up his methodological experiences and their results. The essays presented here therefore stand for themselves and are to be read as separate contributions. Some common features and general results concerning the history of the crusades
and the history of the twelfth century will nonetheless be highlighted here.

Constable’s opening essays on historiography and symbols define his position in the complicated field of crusade studies, which is structured by schools and various conflicting crusade definitions (traditionalists, pluralists, popularists, generalists, among other denominations). The role of the popes, their ideology of war, their privileges, the populace, the motives of the different participants, the strategic aims, the position of Jerusalem in the ideology of the crusades, their geographical direction, and their duration have all long been disputed.

Carefully balancing the benefits and shortcomings of the various perspectives on the crusades, Constable makes use of the different approaches on offer. He is equally interested in papal and canonical concepts, the spiritual expectations of lay people, and economic and psychological occurrences. But Constable’s position in this debate is clear-cut. He emphasizes that there was no coherent crusade concept, just as there was no standard term or even a uniform symbol. Ideas, concepts, and institutions of crusading changed over time. Moreover, different modes of action, degrees of institutionalization, motives, and interpretations of symbols existed simultaneously and were not infrequently contested. Constable explicitly stresses this position in the two appendices. This is why he prefers to speak of ‘crusading’ and ‘crusade’ instead of ‘the Crusade’ with a capital letter, and also suggests that campaigns should be identified by dates and place rather than by numbers. In his essays he translates this position into historical analysis.

Two aspects in particular can be highlighted as general findings of the essays on social history. First, charters and methods of financing show that people from all levels of society and members of both sexes responded to the appeal of the crusades. The spiritual expectations of the people were high, as the donations made in support of the crusades show. Secondly, the flexibility and creativity of twelfth-century societies can be seen in the emergence of new forms of social and spiritual life in the growing cities and the countryside. One of these was ‘the crusader’ or, more specifically, the knight of a military order. Constable holds the opinion that they were neither pilgrims nor monks or warriors in the traditional sense, yet that they shared with them some or all of their ideals, privileges, and characteristics.
In the context of scholarly debates current at the time when the essay was first published (1989), Constable maintained that crusaders in general and knights of the military orders in particular transcended the social order and combined different elements to create essentially new social forms *sui generis*. Even in the light of more recent debates on the military orders as *fraternitates*, this position still holds firm.

The three essays on early crusading put into practice Constable’s multi-layered approach, encompassing social, economic, cultural, and mental history. Intimate knowledge of the monastery of Cluny informs his detailed analysis of its influence on the First Crusade. Constable probes communication links and family relations, spiritual and economic involvement in the Reconquista, and Cluny’s contribution to the idea of holy warfare and to the movement of the peace and truce of God. Even if Cluny’s direct participation in the First Crusade was limited, Constable argues, its role in the development of crusading should not be underestimated. His ‘Life of Odo Arpinus’ adds to this picture and at the same time sheds light on social orders and their flexibility in this period, when Odo changed from Viscount to crusader to monk of Cluny and prior of La Charité-sur-Loire. In his essay on the long contested Magdeburg Charters, Constable experiments with the flexible term ‘crusading’ as exemplified in the first chapter. Since the originators of the charter appealed for military assistance by declaring the territory held by the Slavs ‘our Jerusalem’, Constable argues, the charter itself should be seen as evidence for an early transfer of crusading ideas.

The three essays on crusading in the middle of the twelfth century are valuable for their meticulous analysis of the sources and the image of these controversial campaigns in the minds of contemporaries. Some enthusiasm prevailed in France despite the catastrophes of the Second Crusade and the criticism they provoked. The historical accounts make it possible to link a campaign to the Second Crusade, even if it was not directed to the East and resulted in the conquest of Lisbon. The analysis of the Fourth Crusade also goes back to crusading in general as seen by contemporaries and by the generations of historians—medieval, early modern, enlightened, and modern—who tried to make sense of the crusades after the event. The Fourth Crusade has long been criticized from different perspectives. Constable suggests an interpretation that shows the relations
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between Constantinople and Jerusalem as holy cities, and even Constantinople as Jerusalem, in the minds of the crusaders. He thus demonstrates again how crusade ideas were transferred to new geographical goals and how, at the same time, the idea of liberating Jerusalem persisted in the minds of the participants. He upholds the importance of these ideas even against the greed, ambition, and vengeance which are said to have driven this crusade.

Whether this reading of the sequence of studies was the intention of the author will not be discussed here. A different ordering of the essays would have been possible. Topics and details of recent debates which are not addressed could be named. The collection presents, however, a coherent and highly convincing approach to the analysis of the crusades. One of the topics which Constable constantly pursues in his works is the motives, concepts, and images of the participants. Some of those who are seeking orientation in this field of research today could perhaps wish for more explicit statements. Constable could have flagged up parts of his argument with buzzwords like ‘discourse analysis’, ‘network analysis’, or even ‘spatial turn’. But this has never been his style. As usual, Constable moves elegantly and seemingly effortlessly between different genres of sources and methods of interpretation and transcends methodological trends.
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The history of travel is a subject which has greatly grown in popularity in recent years, although its study is made difficult by the fact that source materials are relatively dispersed and less accessible than those relating to political or religious history. A further problem, as Folker Reichert notes in his introduction to this volume, is that while travel was long regarded as an integral part of the maritime and colonial histories of Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, and the Netherlands, it was neglected as a subject of study in the German-speaking countries until relatively recent times. This anthology of primary source texts relating to travellers from and to the medieval Holy Roman Empire therefore represents a welcome addition to the available materials for the study of the subject.

The anthology contains thirty-seven texts, drawn from standard editions. The vast majority are extracts from longer works, and range in length from about half a page to half a dozen pages. Twenty-five are written in Latin, nine in High German and three, all by the Rhineland nobleman Arnold von Harff, in Low Franconian. All of the Latin texts are accompanied by facing-page translations into modern German, but translations are given for only two of the vernacular texts. This is clearly necessary in the first case, a safe-conduct issued by Duke Louis I of Savoy to the Bernese patrician Konrad von Scharnachtal (no. 3), which survives only in a linguistically problematic High German version. However, it is less obvious why a translation is also given for Konrad Grünenberg’s description of Venice (no. 33), but not for the three extracts dealing with the pilgrimage of Arnold von Harff (nos. 4, 29, 18), whose Low German dialect is surely less comprehensible to most modern readers.

The texts are drawn from a variety of genres, but mostly from descriptive narratives, and the selection offered illustrates how far the surviving sources are unrepresentative of the actual scope and extent of medieval travel. Although trade must have accounted for a large proportion of long-distance journeys, there are only two texts
relating directly to mercantile activity: Balthasar Sprenger’s account of German merchants in India (no. 7) and an Italian–German phrase-book and glossary (no. 19). This is probably an indication that merchants were too unwilling to give away valuable knowledge, or simply too busy, to write about their business in any detail. The anthology is thus highly reliant on accounts of diplomatic journeys or descriptions of pilgrimages to Rome, Santiago, and, above all, Jerusalem, both of these source types together accounting for over half the extracts chosen. One might, however, question how far the selection of sources has been justified by the editors. In keeping with the scope of the Freiherr-vom-Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe, they have intended to provide a source collection on travel from a German perspective, that is, by assembling texts written by German authors or by foreign authors travelling to Germany. These criteria clearly warrant the inclusion of Aeneas Silvius Piccolimini’s description of the Rhine (no. 23), but hardly justify that of the same author’s account of Scotland (no. 24). Similarly, one can understand the reluctance of an anthologist to do without Willem van Rubruck’s famous account of his journey to the court of the Mongol khan at Karakorum (nos. 27, 36), yet given that Willem originated from French Flanders one is sceptical of the rather tenuous justification that he was supposed to provide pastoral care for German miners in Central Asia. Surely one could have found some less well-known texts for inclusion. It is surprising that there is not a single text dealing with the crusades to Prussia, which if not part of the Empire was nevertheless a German-speaking country and a goal for numerous nobles from Germany and elsewhere during the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.

The texts are organized into four sections, each of them with its own introduction. Section I (‘Anlässe und Motive des Reisens’) is perhaps the least illuminating, particularly since those authors who recorded their diplomatic journeys were preoccupied with the honour and reputation of themselves and their masters and show little real curiosity about the lands they travelled through. Section II (‘Alltag des Reisens’) is the most interesting and lively, giving a very varied selection of extracts dealing with the practical dimensions of travel: advice on purchases for the voyage, on medical provision and spiritual wellbeing; passports and safe-conducts; financial accounts; and a contract of carriage with a ship’s captain, rounded off with three narratives. Taken together, these extracts offer valuable insights
into the complexity and difficulty of long-distance travel when means of transport were essentially limited to ship or horseback. The real gem in this section is Felix Fabri’s extended description of life aboard a pilgrim galley sailing to the Holy Land (no. 22), which gives many details which will be familiar to those who have experienced the mass package holiday travel of the modern age: the annoying habits of other nationalities in one’s company; the disappointment of the food provided by the tour operators; the difficulties of sleeping in transit; and the interminable queues for the lavatories.

Sections III (‘Raumerfahrung und Orientierung’) and IV (‘Kulturbegegnung und Kulturkonflikt’) take us into the realm of geographical descriptions of foreign countries. The majority of these narratives are humanistic in conception and polished in style, and their emphasis is less on the experience of travel itself than on the encounter with foreign cultures. Responses range from the critical, such as Antonio de’ Costabili’s horrified description of German food and drink, manners, and fashions (no. 31) to the more reflective, such as Georg von Ungarn’s account of the Turks, who receive a more sympathetic treatment than the Germans do from most of the Italian authors (no. 34). The extent of intellectual curiosity evident in this section clearly shows how far modern approaches to travel writing were already present at the end of the Middle Ages.

The volume includes a general introduction, a classified bibliography, and indexes of people and places, although it is regrettable that there is not a single map illustrating the journeys of the authors included. While readers might quibble with the selection of texts, the editors are to be congratulated on assembling an anthology which will offer much useful material for study and food for thought. It could easily be used to provide the main source readings for a seminar course on the history of travel in the Middle Ages, while even those readers whose German has been learned as a second language will find that the translations and notes will enhance their understanding of many of the sources.
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Around 1900 a debate on the spiritual roots of a process that had started in the late eighteenth century and is generally described as the awakening of a modern Czech national consciousness was causing waves in Prague, and not only among scholars, but also in political circles. Two figures confronted each other: on the one side Tomáš G. Masaryk, sociologist, philosopher, and politician, born in 1850 and a Hussite Protestant; on the other the highly ambitious historian Josef Pekař, twenty years younger than Masaryk and a professing Catholic. To simplify, in this controversy Masaryk assumed that there had been a transfer of ideas from the period of the Bohemian Reformation to the nineteenth century, a process that had been interrupted but not stopped by the counter-Reformation during the Baroque period. In Masaryk’s view, the Catholic phase was merely an episode and had no real impact whatsoever. Pekař, by contrast, was interested in integrating and revaluing the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in which he discerned the spiritual and political origins of the later national awakening. The dispute about the ‘meaning of Czech history’ occupied large sections of the intellectual public for generations, and the same could be said of the quarrel about the periodization of their history, which gained a new dimension in 1918 with the establishment of a common state for Czechs and Slovaks. The master narratives relating to the whole state adopted a division into periods oriented by the year 1620 which followed Bohemian developments. Czech national historiography logically subdivides the modern history of Bohemia and Moravia into two major periods: the brilliant era before the Battle of the White Mountain (*doba předbělohorská*), when the Kingdom of Bohemia is seen as a model of status group and aristocratic representation which achieved religious freedom for Protestants; and the time of the *Temno*, the dark period after 1620 (*doba pobělohorská*) associated with absolutism, a change of elites, and counter-Reformation.
The period of the Bohemian Baroque, long neglected in the research, has held a special interest and fascination for historians since the reorganization of Czech historiography after 1989–90. This applies to research on religious and cultural history as much as to investigations of the aristocracy and the political system. Also new is the interest in neighbouring regions, as are attempts to approach them comparatively. Not what separates but what connects, it seems, is now the main object of interest and investigation. As always in historical research, arguments, concepts, and methodologies from an outside perspective are stimulating. This research does not have to concern itself with the ramifications of an intricate and complicated national history and, as a rule, is not suspected of having its own agenda of legitimating or conferring meaning on the present. In addition to the advantages of this sort of outside perspective, of course, there are also many dangers inherent in maintaining a spatial and personal distance to the subject of investigation. Where, for example, are the boundaries of a space to be drawn if one is not looking at classical entities defined by national, regional, or local history? What chronological framework and what turning points does one select for investigation? And how representative is the individual case, or the person or group of people selected, if one aims to generalize from it? The two books under review here offer good examples of the benefits and dangers of taking a view from outside in this way.

Howard Louthan, Associate Professor in the History Department of the University of Florida, has spent many years studying the comparative religious and cultural history of central and eastern central Europe in the late medieval and early modern periods. His special ability to relate different types of sources to each other, especially textual and visual ones, and productively to integrate the findings of research on art, literature, and cultural history also characterizes his most recent monograph on a period of Bohemian history that the term ‘re-Catholicization’ is much too sober and factual to describe. It looks at the century after the infamous 1620 Battle of the White Mountain in Prague when, within a few generations, a whole territory underwent an almost wholesale change of confession. In Louthan’s view, violence and force, the main factors mentioned in the existing historiography when accounting for this radical change, were less important than negotiating skill and the power of persuasion. In Louthan’s account the scene is populated not by politicians,
generals, and strategists, but by painters and preachers, missionaries and musicians, scholars and architects. Everyday Catholic life and faith of an astonishingly colourful, rich, and charming diversity awaits the reader in the century between the moving of the relics of Saint Norbert from Magdeburg to the Premonstratensian Abbey of Strahov in Prague in 1627 and the canonization of John of Nepomuk in 1729.

Louthan is extremely well versed in both the older and the newer research literature. One could have wished, however, for a more precise and better documented account of how the specific Catholicism found in Bohemia fitted into the wider European context. And an important work such as Peter Hersche’s two-volume study *Muße und Verschwendung* (2006) about European society and culture in the age of the Baroque should unquestionably have been evaluated, not just the earlier work of the now retired Berne historian on the intentional backwardness of Catholic communities. On the whole, however, Louthan provides a stimulating and balanced overview which is an exciting read and clearly expands our knowledge of how Bohemia grew into the system of the Habsburg monarchy.

While Louthan’s study investigates individual aspects of confessional identity, Rita Krueger, Assistant Professor of History at Temple University, raises the question of the national identity of Habsburg Bohemia in her dissertation, also published in 2009. The title is rather vague and does not clearly specify a timeframe but, despite numerous digressions into earlier eras, the main focus is on what is known as the period of national rebirth, that is, from the late eighteenth to the middle of the nineteenth century. Krueger’s book is much more politically oriented than Louthan’s, and must therefore confront problems arising out of the specific order of the (early) modern Habsburg Monarchy, a composite state with a variety of overlapping traditions, loyalties, and feelings of belonging which partly reinforced each other, but could also work against each other, and cannot be reduced to a simple formula. In retrospect, this was a highly durable polity, although until well into the modern period it was more a monarchical association than a fully formed state.

Krueger’s book centres on the cultural role of the nobility in Bohemia, its behaviour within and towards the Monarchy, and the development and objectives of its patriotic intentions, actions, and discourses. It looks at the problems, already widely debated by con-
temporaries, of backwardness and progress, loyalty and resistance, and national formation and cultural and social self-confidence. But who is ‘the nobility’ in Bohemia? That this social group is, in practice, restricted to the high aristocracy, while the lower aristocracy hardly rates a mention, is the least of the problems. The fact that the book largely concentrates on one family within the high aristocracy, the Sternbergs, and at most draws on other aristocrats with similarly progressive views, is much more problematic. However informative many of the detailed threads of the narrative and the individual analyses are, the whole context is not totally convincing. To take just one example, too much is known and too much has been published in recent years on the activities of the aristocracy in the area of culture, architecture, gardening, and many other fields for this account to be satisfying. Whether, and to what extent, this (Czech-language) research is not only cited, but has really been digested is questionable, at least in individual but highly prominent instances. The book’s greatest weakness, however, is its lack of conceptual precision. The main concepts are vague, and methodologically the reader can never be sure whether or not the terms used are backed by far-reaching theoretical considerations.

It is a great pleasure to note that both books carefully select, analyse, and discuss large numbers of archival sources, printed source editions, and secondary literature in Slavic languages. The time when it was possible to write the history of eastern central Europe without having command of the languages is definitely past. One difficulty and weakness of both accounts, however, is their concentration on Bohemia, here understood as the core of the Bohemian lands, while regional subsystems are largely ignored. Even the big Catholic reform which, in many respects, was generally uniform, displayed completely different features in Moravia and Bohemia, not to mention the other Crown lands. And similar specificities will certainly also be found in the development of the aristocracy and the aristocratic identity. This is not to defend legal and constitutional history, but it reminds us that all the individual processes of formation which are discussed in both books occurred within a specific framework which will have to be taken into account by other historical subdisciplines.
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In recent years, there has been a strong resurgence of interest in the Moravians, the pietist followers of Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf, arising from two disparate directions. First, the turn to transatlantic, transnational, and transregional history in the early modern world has highlighted the importance of groups like the Moravians, who through geographic mobility and missionary efforts achieved influence far beyond what their relatively small numbers might suggest. Second, renewed interest in the field of religious history, and especially in the allied movements of evangelicalism and pietism, has brought the Brüdergemeine, as the Moravians called themselves, into the centre of historical attention. Gisela Mettele’s new work, Weltbürgertum oder Gottesreich, offers an important contribution to each of these literatures by exploring in depth how this international community functioned and sustained its shared identity across such a wide terrain and in the midst of growing nationalism. In a further contribution that is especially significant for those interested in the Moravians, she follows the Moravians from their founding through their post-Zinzendorfian retrenchment to the mid nineteenth century (1727–1857).

Mettele’s broad chronological sweep enables her work’s theoretical purpose: assessing the Moravian community in the context of the late eighteenth century’s transition to modernity and the process of secularization that historians so often associate with it. By interrogating how the Moravians created and sustained their international network, she asks whether they were, as Christian Gotthilf Salzmann called them in 1787, citizens of the world. Mettele’s answer is clearly that they were not. On the contrary, the Moravians developed and, remarkably, sustained, a unique outlook and identity that allowed them to engage the world while also remaining essentially outside of it, primarily connected to one another rather than to the various places where they lived. Indeed, she argues, they believed they were striving to be leaders in the kingdom of God (Reich Gottes), a spiritual realm on earth in which political boundaries were obstacles to be negotiated rather than sources of personal identity. The Brüderge-
meine sought to avoid the perils of worldliness by sanctifying all aspects of life, from economic activity to education to the family, making all of daily experience an expression of one’s relationship to God. Zinzendorf, Mettele notes, thought of life as liturgy: ‘liturgical work, liturgical eating, liturgical sleeping; even sexuality was conceived of as liturgy’ (p. 51).

The bulk of Mettele’s work provides close, synchronic examinations of the organization, communication networks, and collective memory of the Brüdergemeine. In the first section, she argues that the Moravian concept of Pilgerschaft was ‘essential for the self-understanding’ of the community. ‘The Herrnhuter’, she writes, ‘understood themselves to be “Wanderers” not only in the metaphorical sense, but they also translated the metaphor into their lifestyle’ (p. 43). This concept of religious itinerancy allowed the Moravians to build a strong ‘imagined community’, à la Benedict Anderson, despite their incredible geographic mobility. As they travelled and set down new roots, the Moravians negotiated privileges for themselves in a variety of political spaces, often through connections with nobility or royalty. Within those spaces, they then carefully side-stepped political conflict, consciously choosing to remain loyal subjects of a political entity if such a path were possible. In the case of the ever more pressing issue of slavery, for example, ‘they avoided . . . taking a clear position, because doing so would have transgressed the principle of not mixing in political questions, which the Brüdergemeine saw as the most important fundamental condition for its worldwide missionary activities’ (p. 109). Factors often seen to divide international religious fellowships in other contexts, such as linguistic diversity, were merely tools for spreading the Gospel in the case of the Brüdergemeine.

One of Mettele’s most lasting contributions is her clear articulation of the strategies the Moravians used to maintain their distinctiveness and unity without becoming isolated, closed, or sectarian. The close-knit, if geographically dispersed, network of Moravians sustained its sense of shared identity through near-obsessive communication. Leaders in Europe (and the Moravians were intensely hierarchical), directed the whole system, and they required regular reports from all satellite units, be they well-established towns in North America, mission sites in the Caribbean or Russia, or itinerant evangelists. These reports were collected, abstracted, and re-circulat-
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ed in a massive undertaking called the Gemein Nachrichten. Everything about the Nachrichten was carefully considered to promote religious feeling and unity. They were, according to a 1770 committee report, ‘a fortunate invention and blessed method to hold the whole Brethren–Christendom on earth in one mind’ (p. 151). The collective reading of these reports, another part of the Moravian liturgy, served to bring members in touch with one another, created a shared sense of identity, and defined the community’s focus. Yet, as Mettele aptly notes, these readings were not moments when average Moravians could challenge a central narrative.

Mettele provides scholars with the most comprehensive analysis these remarkable sources have yet received, paying particular attention to both the form and content of the widely circulated documents. Comprised of sermons, community diaries, and spiritual autobiographies from around the Moravian world, the Gemein Nachrichten, she argues, discursively created ‘a completely separate cosmos with its own meanings and significances, in which the political events only played a subordinate role, and then only in light of the question of how the spread of the kingdom of God would be perceived’ (p. 184). If the content of the reports supported the idea that the Moravians were a fellowship apart, this was reinforced by their reproduction and dissemination. Though parts of the Gemein Nachrichten were eventually printed rather than handwritten, Mettele demonstrates that the Moravians drew careful distinctions between what should be printed and shared with a wide audience and what should be kept handwritten, and thus seen by a more intimate group. The Moravians were not resistant to print media in principle; they made extensive use of printed books, tracts, and serials when it suited their purposes. Yet the Gemein Nachrichten’s central purpose was not to reach out to the wider world, but to bind together those who were already in the fold and provide the group with a shared history, lexicon, and spiritual mode. By helping to maintain the Moravians’ sense of a separate identity, the Gemein Nachrichten provided another bulwark against the forces of secularization. Mettele fruitfully pairs her analysis of the Gemein Nachrichten with an analysis of the Lebensläufe the Moravians produced, which she uses in particular to provide a gendered analysis of the Moravian community and the sense of the individual nurtured there. Here, too, she argues that the Moravian community remained remarkably stable throughout the
period of her study, as the autobiographies remained ‘organized around the experience of the [spiritual] rebirth’ (p. 236).

Some of the dynamics of this dramatic period in history fit only awkwardly within Mettele’s otherwise strong study. Her synchronic approach and her important finding of essential continuity in both the mechanics and the content of group identity, for example, leaves her with somewhat limited means to explain the community’s decision, in 1857, to devolve into three separate geographic entities. A brief conclusion attributes these changes to the tendency, most pronounced in the United States, for Moravians to become more attached to their geographic location than to the Brüdergemeine itself, but one wonders what was changing while the leadership carefully continued to edit the Gemein Nachrichten and the Lebensläufe into consistent form. Similarly, while Mettele thoughtfully admits that the mutual exchange between European and non-European peoples is beyond the purview of the present study, that the Moravians so consciously chose to almost always exclude non-whites from their inner core suggests that race may have played a significant if elusive role in defining the levels of what was, by at least some definitions, a profoundly diverse society.

These quibbles, however, should be seen as pointing to the strength of Mettele’s accomplishment in articulating the stability of Moravian collective identity and the Brüdergemeine’s strategies for maintaining its religious sensibility within, and yet apart from, the wider world. She has done an admirable job of showing how this unique group both represents and challenges conceptions of religion, identity, and gender in the early modern Atlantic world. Her work represents an important contribution to the fields of Moravian, pietist, and early modern religious history.
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‘Never write a second volume!’ With this warning from an earlier academic teacher echoing in his ear, the present reviewer (along with many other colleagues) has been anticipating, with a mixture of expectation and impatience, the continuation of Derek Beales’s political biography of Joseph II.1 After the masterly first volume, the second turns to this contradictory personality’s period of sole rule from 1780 to 1790.

Derek Beales, Professor Emeritus of Modern History at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Sidney Sussex College and the British Academy, has made good use of the more than twenty years since the first volume was published, and not only in putting together, in the continuation volume now published, a complete panorama of the foreign and domestic policy of the greatest reforming Habsburg ruler. The fruits of his labours in the 1990s are a number of individual studies, some meticulously balanced, others richly steeped in the sources,2 and a major study of the culture of European monasteries in the eighteenth century,3 which places a well-known aspect of Joseph’s reforming policy into a comparative European context.

The volume under review here, dealing with the brief decade in which Joseph ruled the Habsburg monarchy alone between the death of his mother Maria Theresa on 29 November 1780 and his own death on 20 February 1790, is aptly subtitled *Against the World*. This casts light on both the good and the less good aspects of the character and political views of this lonely, ambitious ruler who made extreme demands on himself and others. These traits include ‘self-dramatisation’ (p. 40), seeing himself as a Sisyphean martyr, and, in the later years of his rule, growing self-pity and a certain control fetishism (‘no

2 Many of these are collected in Derek Beales, *Enlightenment and Reform in Eighteenth-century Europe* (London, 2005).
one better deserves to be called a control freak’, p. 337). In personal
dealings with high officials and his brothers and sisters, Joseph could
be deliberately hurtful, yet in Vienna and on his travels, he was, in
principle, available to every one of his subjects, accepting many peti-
tions. Fanatical in his readiness to sacrifice himself for the state and
sincerely convinced that he was the best judge of the general good
and that he had to do everything himself (letters he wrote to his
brother Peter Leopold in 1787–8 are full of passages illustrating this,
also, unfortunately, in respect of his role as a military commander),
he listened to advice, but insisted on his right to decide everything at
his own discretion.

Joseph’s view of the state as a machine whose regulating mecha-
nisms should be constructed as uniformly as possible for the whole
monarchy testifies both to his optimistic, Enlightened ambition and
to a fundamental misunderstanding of the realities of a composite
state like the Habsburg monarchy. The result was that people of such
different temperaments as Leopold II and Metternich strongly criti-
cized Joseph’s course of centralization. The stubborn self-confidence
with which the absolutist Joseph resisted any claims for participa-
tion, either by the old Estates or in a modern democratic sense, is well
documented in his dogmatic statement to the Estates of Brabant: ‘I do
not need your consent for doing good’ (p. 605). This was written
exactly eleven days before the Third Estate, in a revolutionary act, de-
clared itself the French National Assembly in Versailles on 17 June
1789.

Beales organizes his material in chapters alternating between
chronological narrative (especially for the first and last years of
Joseph’s reign) and more issue-related analysis. Church and religious
policy forms one focal point which, accounting for more than 160
pages, stands out on the contents page; foreign policy agendas and
Joseph’s six extended journeys through the monarchy and to Russia
and Italy (map on pp. 134–5) are also given special consideration.

Joseph’s love of music and great interest in the theatre emerge in
a separate chapter which is broadly and expertly worked out, and
also deals with the emperor’s daily routine in Vienna. Joseph had an
enormous personal stake in the first performance of Mozart’s
Marriage of Figaro in 1786. In the following year, he appointed the
composer Kammermusicus with an annual salary of 800 florins, and in
1789 probably commissioned Così fan tutte.
Beales’s account of Joseph’s harsh domestic policy in the last year of his reign, when he was already ill, climaxes in the tax and serfdom patent of 10 February 1789. This would have imposed a uniform payment on peasants for the discharge of taxes to the ruler and dues to the landowner, and the income of the aristocracy would have been drastically reduced. Finally, however, all that remained was the formal resignation. Just over three weeks before his death, on 28 January 1790, Joseph revoked all his reforms for Hungary with three significant exceptions: toleration, the establishment of new parishes, and the abolition of serfdom.

Beales’s book covers the whole of the monarchy; his work draws on a wide range of sources (many in archives) and literature in Italian (the Italian ottocento was a focus of earlier research), German, and Hungarian. Many footnotes, especially at the beginnings of chapters, contain useful bibliographical essays. A few passages are not quite up to date with the most recent (German-language) research, for example, on the Tyrol, and on Joseph’s role as Holy Roman Emperor, where Volker Press’s work is missed. In addition to maps and illustrations, the book contains a number of informative tables on administrative and financial history; Beales does not fail to acknowledge Peter Dickson’s fundamental research in this area. Among the older literature that Beales repeatedly draws upon is, justifiably, Paul von Mitrofanov’s comprehensive biography of the emperor, first published in Russian in 1907.

When summing up the situation of the monarchy in 1790, the year of Joseph’s death, Beales emphasizes the crucial role for foreign policy of the 1781 alliance with Russia. In domestic policy, Beales stresses Joseph’s attempts to establish a ‘new Catholicism’ (p. 649) and the significance of his policy of religious toleration (unique in Europe in the case of the Jews). Josephinian ecclesiastical policy, which tried to place pastoral care on a secure footing by building up a network of new parishes, but ultimately also allowed the large monasteries and their cultural achievements to survive, receives a surprisingly positive assessment, as do preparations for a systematic re-codification of civil law. The attempt to break up the aristocracy’s position as landowners with legal jurisdiction over the inhabitants of their estates, however, and Joseph’s ambitious plans to centralize the monarchy are judged to have had no chance of success. Nor, Beales suggests, must we overlook the fact that Joseph had a
decidedly militaristic bent, paying (far) too much for an (ill-led)
army.

The conclusion, at fifty pages almost book-length, takes a sober
and differentiated approach and will certainly remain the best piece
of research literature on the Habsburg ruler for a long time. In it,
Beales addresses a number of simple but fundamental questions and,
in the best pragmatic traditions of British historiography, provides
clear and plausible answers. Was Joseph despotic? Pretty much. Was
Joseph Enlightened? Undoubtedly. Was Joseph a revolutionary? He
had some features of a revolutionary about him. What were the long-
term consequences of Joseph’s rule? The significance of the Joseph-
inian tradition of officialdom for the nineteenth century has long
been well known. In Austria, a discussion is taking place at present
about whether the ‘fundamental bureaucratization’ of Josephism
(Waltraud Heindl) and a ‘state piety’ imposed from above (Ernst
Hanisch) are still formative influences on the country today. With
grateful respect we must acknowledge that the second volume of
Derek Beales’s opus permagnum has placed our knowledge of the his-
tory of central Europe in the pre-revolutionary decade 1780–90 on a
new, much more secure basis both in terms of these fundamental
questions and many illustrative details.
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The fascination of the Weimar Republic as a subject of historical research seems undiminished. Recent years have seen not a decline, but a steady increase in the stream of works covering a wide variety of topics from all areas, whether political, social, or cultural. One of the reasons for this continued interest is the short lived and contradictory nature of the Republic. Regarded even by contemporaries as the laboratory of modernity, Weimar’s reputation was based on pioneering developments in the arts and architecture and the breaking down of social conventions, with Berlin being seen as the epitome of the Roaring Twenties. At the same time, remnants of the past loomed large in the political and social fabric of the Republic. Strong monarchist and militaristic traditions spring to mind as well as a civil service and judiciary largely unchanged since Wilhelmine days. The Republic’s demise, of course, remains one of the key points of interest for historians, but there has been a noticeable shift away from the question ‘Why did it fail?’ to ‘Did it fail?’ to quote Peter Fritzsche. As a consequence, the historiography on Weimar has become more diverse with a stronger emphasis on social and cultural issues.

The study under review here falls into the latter category. Subtitled *The History of a Cultural Relationship*, Storer’s work, which is based on his Ph.D. thesis, is, in fact, quite narrowly focused on a small group of British intellectuals and their perceptions of the Weimar Republic. The cultural and social modernity of Weimar is one of the key themes, which is not surprising, given the subject of the analysis. Storer’s aim is to explore the reasons for the attraction that British intellectuals suddenly developed to a country that ‘had recently been the enemy in the most destructive conflict Europe had ever known’ (p. 2). By definition, this group of individuals had a natural interest in all things new and exciting, which were not in short supply in Weimar Germany, ‘a nation somehow uniquely in tune with the zeitgeist of the 1920s’ (p. 3).

Storer’s main aim is to counterbalance the dominant influence of the novels by Christopher Isherwood and his circle of friends on the image of the Weimar Republic in the English-speaking world. He has
certainly achieved this objective. Both the definition of the term ‘intellectual’ and the selection of individuals ensure that a wide and, above all, representative spectrum of views is covered. The sample includes a diverse range of people such as the novelist Edward Sackville-West, the artist Wyndham Lewis, the campaigner E. D. Morel, and the journalist Frederick Voigt. The concentration on these intellectuals, who had travelled to Germany at the time, demonstrates the varying impact that this direct exposure had on their views and allows changes in their perceptions to be tracked. The restriction of the primary sources to personal accounts—memoirs, diaries, correspondence, and fictional works—is sensible, but not without risk. Material of this nature can be inaccurate, unverifiable, and might not even represent the true views of the authors. Storer deals with this potential pitfall by keeping a critical distance, pointing out inaccuracies, and setting observations into context in an exemplary manner. The thematic approach makes the study highly accessible and also reduces redundancies. The seven chapters deal with such themes as the impact of war and peace on British attitudes towards Germany, the occupation of the Rhineland, the dominant influence of Berlin, the views of female intellectuals, the representation of Weimar Germany in fiction, and the German fascist movement.

One of the most interesting aspects of the study is covered in the first chapter. It examines British travel and tourism to Germany in the 1920s, a facet of the Anglo-German relationship in the inter-war period so far largely ignored. It is remarkable to see how many Britons visited Germany at this time. There were many different reasons for their trips. The first to go to Germany were soldiers of the occupation force, closely followed by diplomats, journalists, and the administrative staff of the various inter-allied bodies. Once normal relations had been re-established, a growing number of businessmen started to arrive. Over time Germany also became an increasingly popular destination for growing mass tourism. In part this was the rediscovery of a country that had been a well-established destination for British travellers in pre-war times; in part it was attributable to the favourable exchange rate during the inflation years, which meant that transport, accommodation, and food and drink were available at bargain prices. Some visitors were driven by sexual adventurism, something that the sex and entertainment industry in Berlin catered
for very well. This of course, was also why many intellectuals were drawn to Weimar Germany. The extent of these contacts contrasts starkly with those at official level. Despite the re-establishment of diplomatic relations in 1920, no ministerial or state visits took place until Chancellor Brüning travelled to London in 1931. And not until the mid 1920s was the boycott of German scientists and artists in Britain formally ended.

The chapters dealing with political themes offer fewer groundbreaking new insights, but confirm the well-documented findings of other research on the general perception of Germany in Britain during the inter-war period. This is definitely true of the section dealing with the impact of war and peace on British attitudes. That hatred of the enemy was stronger on the home front than in the trenches, that the long-term psychological effect on many soldiers was to turn them into advocates of peace and reconciliation, that the terms of the peace soon came to be regarded as unfair or even vindictive, that only a revision would pacify a troubled Continent, and that France’s attempts to enforce the peace treaty were counter-productive is widely accepted. The main protagonists Storer has chosen for this part are H. W. Dawson, Harold Nicolson, and John Meynard Keynes, who were members of the British delegation at Versailles and later became the leading advocates of revision. As their accounts of events have featured in numerous other works, it is only logical that Storer comes to similar conclusions.

In a way this also applies to the section on the ‘German Fascisti’. The attitudes of the intellectuals whom Storer has selected here towards the National Socialists reflect similar views held by other sections of the British public. They ranged from antagonism or ignorance to open sympathy if the Nazis were noticed at all, which depended largely on their political fortunes. He justifies focusing on Nazism as the only extremist political movement under scrutiny as a way of invalidating Isherwood’s notion of Weimar as a doomed state and society. Storer establishes the significant fact that most of Isherwood’s contemporaries held a very different view. Despite the Republic’s political and economic troubles, he suggests, ‘few British intellectuals regarded it as being in terminal decline and, more importantly, few if any saw the Nazis as its inevitable, or even likely, successors’ (p. 171).

The strongest parts of Storer’s study are those in which he reconstructs the impact that direct encounters with the reality of life in
Weimar Germany had on British visitors. For this purpose, taking a closer look at the British occupation of the Rhineland makes sense, for once the numbers of British service personnel and their dependents stationed there had reached a certain level, they in turn attracted many other visitors wanting to see for themselves how Britons and Germans lived together side-by-side. Storer finds that the occupation was instrumental in changing British official and public opinion towards the Weimar Republic, as the ‘experience of British servicemen and their civilian counterparts living cheek-by-jowl with the Germans in the Rhineland did much to popularise a more sympathetic attitude towards the former enemy’ (p. 58). By including women writers, Storer adds a very important and so far often neglected female perspective to his work. The focus on women’s living conditions and their place in contemporary German society opens up a human dimension that complements other accounts of direct encounters and is crucial to the change in perceptions mentioned above.

Finally, Storer deconstructs the myth that Berlin was the epitome of the Roaring Twenties. It was, in fact, not only an important European cultural centre but at the forefront of modern art, literature, music, film, and architecture. It was also a Mecca for sexual pleasure-seekers and a city plagued by political and social unrest that seemed to be in constant crisis. It was this mixture that made it a magnet for so many British intellectuals. Its contradictions and extremes caused reactions ranging from an enthusiastic embrace to disillusioned disdain. By disentangling these opposing views Storer is able to show that there were two common threads uniting almost all British visitors to the German capital: they thought Berlin was quintessentially modern and they regarded it as emblematic of the country.

The most significant shortcoming of this otherwise fine piece of research is that Storer has made no attempt to link the perceptions and attitudes of the selected intellectuals towards Weimar Germany with the wider debate in Britain. Given that, by Storer’s definition, intellectuals are leading cultural figures and shapers of opinion it would have been interesting to see what impact their writings actually had, not least because the sample includes quite a few journalists and popular authors whose works reached a mass audience. Other than that, Storer has presented a well-structured, well-written, and compact study that offers a fresh perspective on the image of Weimar.
Book Reviews

Germany among an influential segment of the British elite. It achieves its prime objective of correcting the image of a doomed democratic experiment that has been popularized in the English-speaking world by the works of Isherwood, Auden, and their friends. It is particularly strong in the sections that deal with the modern aspects of the Weimar Republic in culture, arts, and society. Above all, it helps to fill a gap in the still sparsely researched British perceptions of Germany in the inter-war period.

Discussions of ‘political religion’ as a phenomenon have recently reawakened interest in National Socialism as the idea creating the identity of the Third Reich. In the process, the old notion of a deep gulf between Nazi ideology and Christianity has been modified by the insight that the two amalgamated and mixed to some extent: transitions were fluid and the boundaries between them cannot, therefore, be historically determined with any precision. There are different views of the extent to which National Socialism assumed ‘religious’ features. Richard Steigmann-Gall has recently argued that the ‘Positive Christianity’ mentioned in point 24 of the Nazi Party manifesto was not, as has so far been assumed, a tactical veiling of Nazism’s true ideology, but rather a genuine expression of the fact that National Socialism was rooted in a national Protestantism. Protestant Christians, he suggests, could therefore in good faith also have been Nazis.

While this thesis remains highly controversial, it has so far been generally accepted that National Socialism did not have any comparable Catholic roots. The study by Derek Hastings initially confirms this view. Hitler’s decision in 1923 to forge a power political alliance with General Erich Ludendorff, figurehead of the German–völkisch camp, in order to launch a putsch against Weimar democracy following the example set by Mussolini, formed an insurmountable obstacle to any alliance between Catholicism and the Nazi Party (pp. 3, 138–42, 185). The strongly anti-Catholic nature of the völkisch movement, which strikingly revealed itself in open attacks on Munich’s Cardinal Faulhaber in 1924, prompted, for example, Munich’s Catholic laity to address a petition to the Bavarian minister president, Eugen von Knilling, protesting against the new Protestant–völkisch Kulturkampf (pp. 147–8).

Hastings’s main interest, however, is in the Nazi Party’s formative phase, especially in Munich, which was outwardly Catholic and politically highly volatile between 1918 and 1923. The fact that a radical splinter group, the (National Socialist) German Workers’ Party, gained a foothold in the swamp of the völkisch movement is attributed by the author to the Nazi Party’s dominant religious Catholic
identity at this time (pp. 4, 46–7, 107, 183). The National Socialists achieved their rise as a Catholic-oriented movement, Hastings suggests, whose religious identity consisted in what he calls a 'Catholic–Nazi synthesis' (p. 116). The implied conclusion is that the story did not necessarily have to end in the later, uncontested opposition between Catholicism and National Socialism. For Catholics, however, it was not possible to go along with the transformation of the party’s religious identity into a secular, political religion.

Hastings puts his case in five chapters. In chapter one he argues that the milieu-specific connection between confessional and party political commitment to political Catholicism was not applicable to the special conditions in Munich. The roots of the Catholics who joined the early Nazi Party lay in a reforming Catholicism that was anti-ultramontane and critical of Catholicism. It was organized in, among others, the Reformverein founded by Josef Müller, a diocesan priest in Bamberg. Astonishingly open to contemporary eugenic and racist ideas, they demanded social renewal by means of a religious Catholicism which aimed to reconcile the nation with modern society (pp. 16–45).

In chapter two Hastings argues that the religious identity of the emergent Nazi movement in the Bavarian capital, convulsed by post-war chaos, socialist revolution and its violent suppression, was shaped not by forces around the völkisch, Protestant-dominated Thule Gesellschaft, but by people influenced by the ideas of reforming Catholicism and disappointed by the Bayerische Volkspartei (BVP). These included Franz Schrönghamer, Dietrich Eckart, later editor (from late 1920) and influential friend of Hitler’s, and the priests Bernhard Stempfle and Josef Roth. They increasingly turned the Völkische Beobachter into a platform for criticizing political Catholicism, whose compromises with amoral Jews and atheistic socialists they saw as posing a danger to the Catholic faith and the German Volk (pp. 47–76).

Chapter three turns to the vague demand for a confessionally neutral ‘Positive Christianity’ made in February 1920 in the Nazi Party manifesto. This exactly matched the ideas of those völkisch Catholics who rejected both the monarchical particularism of the Catholic patriotic societies and Protestant-dominated racist organizations such as the Deutschvölkische Schutz- und Trutzbund. In the Völkische Beobachter they gained the upper hand in 1921 when a distinction was
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drawn between political and religious Catholicism, which also made the Nazi Party attractive to Catholics beyond the specific environment of Munich. Among Catholic students and their organizations in particular, Catholic ideas combined with völkisch ones in the defence of Christian morality against Judaism. Accusations by the BVP that the Nazi Party was pursuing a völkisch ideology hostile to faith led the Nazi Party to distance itself from movements that were deutschgläubig and anti-Rome, and emphasized its Catholic profile even more clearly (pp. 77–106).

Chapter four looks at a small number of committed Catholic priests, known as ‘Nazi storm troop preachers’—Philipp Haeuser, Bernhard Stempfle, Josef Roth, Alban Schachleiter, Lorenz Pieper, and Magnus Gött—who advocated the ‘Catholic–Nazi synthesis’ that had grown out of ‘Positive Christianity’ as a belligerent Christianity of action and the sword. Their anti-Semitism linked up with anti-Jewish prejudices which were firmly rooted in the nineteenth-century Church. This synthesis found its densest liturgical expression in the heroic ceremonies organized by Abbot Schachleiter to commemorate Albert Leo Schlageter who had been killed in the Ruhr struggle. The influx of new members to the Party from Munich and its environs was largely the result of this campaign which had been authorized by priests (pp. 107–42).

In chapter five, Hastings turns to the alienation and breach caused by Hitler’s decision to derail the democratic republic in alliance with Ludendorff’s anti-Catholic Kampfbund. This anti-Catholicism, which grew noticeably when Hitler concluded his alliance with Ludendorff and continued after the Party was re-founded in 1925, ended the Catholic phase of 1922–3. Schlageter’s place as the movement’s martyr and the hero of a secular political religion was taken by those who were killed in the November putsch (pp. 143–76).

This study by Hastings convincingly makes three points which have tended to be underexposed in contemporary research on Catholicism so far: first, the spiritual and political confusions of Munich’s liberal reforming Catholicism, distanced from an ultramontane Catholic milieu; secondly, the significance which the völkisch derivative of this critical Catholicism initially achieved in the early Nazi Party under the slogan ‘Positive Christianity’, only to lose it, for confessional reasons, to a Protestant anti-Catholicism; and thirdly, the extent of the social networking between Catholic–völkisch
activists in Munich’s bourgeois and student circles on the one hand, and in the Nazi movement on the other, as well as the potential for mobilization which the Catholic ‘Nazi storm troop preachers’ represented.

The question remains: how ‘Catholic’ was the early Nazi movement? Was it as ‘Catholic’ as, according to Steigmann-Gall, it later became ‘Protestant’? Hastings seems to suggest this when he draws an analogy between cultural Catholicism and cultural Protestantism (p. 9), or emphasizes that the völkisch–Catholic activists, like the reforming Catholics of the nineteenth century, had seen themselves as members of the Catholic Church (pp. 78, 179). Yet he also seems to hold back, suggesting that, by contrast with the Catholic milieu, the religious identity of the early Nazi movement cannot be measured. Hastings is obviously aware of the problem that while his widely defined concept of ‘Catholicism’ (p. 178) includes the amalgamations and mixtures produced by the Catholic–Nazi synthesis, it thereby forfeits the capacity to distinguish and separate more precisely. This study, which is otherwise agreeably condensed and well written, would have benefited if its research on the Catholic–völkisch network and its impact had been placed into a wider historical context. For example, the reader would like to know what impression first modernist reforming Catholicism and then the smaller group of the ‘storm troop preachers’, not all of whom were Bavarian, left behind on the more than 1,000 clergy (as of 1921), probably most of them neo-scholastically schooled, in the archdiocese of Munich. It would also have been worth investigating further whether reforming Catholicism had a substantive (theological) basis among early National Socialists, or whether it merely functioned as an ultramontane enemy image, or one directed against political Catholicism, which was rooted in cultural Protestantism. And, finally, the identity-generating significance of the Catholic religion for early National Socialism could have been explored even more deeply if the contributions by Schrönghammer, Eckart, and others had been evaluated in the context of the Völkische Beobachter as a whole.


2 Ibid. 392.
Another question is whether a Catholic-tinged early Nazi movement would have proved to be a realistic alternative in the long term. The Catholic card would obviously not have been a power political trump if Hitler had continued to bet on it after the attempted putsch. Outside Munich, the movement’s capital, the **Völkische**, despite their Catholic–völkisch profile, were unable to achieve more than 10 per cent of the vote; in Catholic regions outside Bavaria, approval was even lower, garnering less than 5 per cent of the vote. The ‘Catholic’ Nazi Party was a local and passing episode which Hitler did not want his old Catholic comrades to remind him of, as the example of Schrönghamer shows (p. 3).

From this point, additional light is cast on the ‘Positive Christianity’ mentioned in the Nazi Party manifesto, but also on what Hastings suspects, in this early phase, was a personal affinity for the Catholic religion on Hitler’s part (pp. 102–3, 180–1). ‘Positive Christianity’ was a tactical formula which could be used by both Catholics and Protestants, and which Hitler could employ to pass over those who saw it as offering a serious way in to National Socialism, whether they were of a deutschchristlich or völkisch-Catholic persuasion. Hitler always subordinated his religious convictions to his power political ambitions.

With the exception of Daniel Goldhagen’s *Hitler’s Willing Executioners,* no book on contemporary Germany history has received as much attention from the German public in the last twenty years as this study, published in late October 2010. *Das Amt* was not only widely reviewed in the German media, and sometimes strongly criticized, by Hans Mommsen, for example. It was also noticed abroad, in publications ranging from *Time* and the *Wall Street Journal,* to *Libération, El País,* and the *Economist.* Even the BBC *News at Ten* broadcast a brief report about the book’s publication on 27 October 2010. And despite its length, coming in at more than 700 pages of text, 70,000 copies were sold within three months. The book is a summary of the work of an independent commission of historians, set up in the summer of 2005 by Joschka Fischer, Germany’s then Foreign Minister, to look at the German Foreign Office’s involvement in the Nazi regime’s crimes, and at how the ministry, which was re-founded in 1951, has dealt with this past.

What prompted this initiative on Fischer’s part was the publication, in spring of 2003, of a white-washed obituary for Franz Nüsslein in the German Foreign Office’s house journal, *AA-Intern.* From 1962 to his retirement in 1974, Nüsslein had served as the Federal Republic of Germany’s consul-general in Barcelona. During the war, however, he had worked as a lawyer imposing death sentences on Czechs in the Nazi Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia. Neither these years in the Third Reich, nor the fact that he had been punished by the Czech authorities, was mentioned in Nüsslein’s obituary. Thereupon Fischer decreed that in future his ministry would not, after their deaths, honour diplomats tainted by association with the Third Reich.

---

2 *Frankfurter Rundschau,* 16 Nov. 2010.
This ruling provoked a storm of protest from a number of diplomats, both retired and still active. Pointing to Fischer’s own radical past as a left-wing extremist and street fighter in Frankfurt in the 1970s, they argued that everyone had the right to make mistakes. Members of the German Foreign Office, they claimed, should therefore be judged not only by their political pasts, but on the basis of their achievements in the ‘new’ German Foreign Office from 1951.

The work of this commission also triggered historiographical work in other German ministries. Since the summer of 2009, a panel of experts under the leadership of Hans-Peter Ullmann, an economic historian at Cologne university, has been working on the role of the Ministry of Finance in providing money for rearmament, the financial exploitation of the countries occupied during the war, and the financial victimization of the Jews from 1933. The experts have also been exposing personal continuities in its successor ministry in the Federal Republic of Germany after 1945. Inspired by the sensation caused byDas Amt, the panel published an interim report in the autumn of 2010 which claimed that the Finance Ministry had been much more deeply involved in depriving Jews of their rights and in their annihilation, and that it was therefore more guilty of the crimes of the Third Reich than the Foreign Office. Even the Federal Republic of Germany’s Ministry of Justice, which had been seen to deal with its own past in the period 1933 to 1945 comparatively well by staging a touring exhibition and publishing a catalogue already in the late 1980s, has now, in response to discussion ofDas Amt, decided to look further at how it dealt internally with the Nazi legacy in the early years of the Federal Republic.

As is so often the case, media reports both in Germany and abroad focused on the seemingly sensational aspects ofDas Amt. They concentrated on what is supposed to be new, namely, that the German Foreign Office was much more deeply involved in the Third Reich’s crimes than has so far been acknowledged, and that between 1945 and the publication of this book, it did not face up to this. Among professional historians, however, these alleged revelations evoke no more than a tired smile, as in the case of theWehrmachtexhibition
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5 Im Namen des Deutschen Volkes: Justiz und Nationalsozialismus, exhibition catalogue (Cologne, 1989).
mounted by Hamburg’s Institute of Social Research in the mid 1990s. This did no more than disseminate the findings, in a less nuanced and more popular form, of academic studies by Wilhelm Krausnick and Christian Streit which had been published fifteen years earlier. Essential aspects of what is presented in Das Amt have been known since Christopher Browning’s research of the 1970s and that done by Hans-Jürgen Döscher in the 1980s and 1990s. These findings, recently given added depth by the work of Sebastian Weitkamp, can be summed up as follows: the German Foreign Office had been permeated by members of the Nazi Party since 1933; it was involved in the Final Solution implemented during the Second World War; and finally, after 1945, there was continuity among staff who refused to face up to their own dark past, holding on instead to their self-image of an institution more or less resistant to Nazism.

What is new about the book, therefore, is not so much the central argument as the more comprehensive and much better documented account of the German Foreign Office’s past as compared with the pioneering studies in the field mentioned above. This is largely because its authors were granted unhindered access to the personnel files of the ‘old’ and ‘new’ Foreign Office before the closed period of thirty years after the death of the actors, which applies to ordinary users, had elapsed. Although many other archives were also consulted, these astonishingly productive files are the main primary source on which the book is based. The flip side of this person-centred approach, however, is that the study falls apart into dozens of accounts of the fates of individual diplomats, each documented in great detail—an approach, incidentally, which had reduced the value

of Döscher’s Ph.D. thesis in the 1980s. The depiction of the recruitment and individual working lives of diplomats between 1933 and 1945, their strategies of justification and suppression after the end of the Third Reich, and their succession to positions in the ‘new’ Foreign Office from 1951 and their careers in it, prevents the authors from taking a wider perspective and analysing the activities of the institution as a whole.

This is a shortcoming mainly in the first, shorter part of the book dealing with the years 1933 to 1945 and for which Moshe Zimmermann is responsible. He focuses largely on the German Foreign Office’s involvement in the exclusion and annihilation of the Jews. Almost no notice is taken of other aspects of the institution’s work, such as the classical fields of diplomacy, economic relations, and cultural policy abroad. Nor is much mention made of its role in the recruiting of forced labourers, the formulation of war aims, and the plundering of cultural assets, or, indeed, of the institution’s loss of significance as the main actor in foreign policy, which was visible from as early as the 1930s. Moreover, the first part of the volume is written in an accusing and hostile tone that, in case of doubt, always finds against the historical actor. Thus, for example, repeated mention is made of the fact that individual diplomats had spoken out against the persecution and murder of the Jews and the suppression of the Slavic population in the occupied areas of the USSR. Yet, it is suggested, their motives were not humanitarian, but purely pragmatic in nature, as the measures criticized either harmed Germany’s standing abroad, or made the conduct of war more difficult. Apart from the fact that it is difficult for historians to make such judgements even when they can consult a large number of ego-documents, more source criticism is called for here. Humanitarian arguments would have evoked a quizzical response from the diplomats’ superiors or other departments, such as the Reichssicherheitshauptamt (Reich Security Head Office), or may even have harmed the diplomats’ careers. In a racist state such as the Third Reich, only pragmatic arguments had any chance of improving the situation of those affected. But this cannot lead us automatically to conclude, as this volume does, that all diplomats lacked empathy for the victims of these policies.

The book attempts to destroy the justification strategy which ex-career diplomats developed while preparing for the Wilhelmstrasse Trial of 1948–9 in Nuremberg, and in particular for the defence of Ernst von Weizsäcker, former secretary of state who was being tried on behalf of the whole profession. According to their own accounts, the old career diplomats who were already serving during the Kaiserreich and the Weimar Republic were largely immune to National Socialism. They had remained in post only, they claimed, in order to prevent something worse, obeying Secretary of State Bernhard von Bülow’s dictum that one did not leave one’s country in the lurch just because it had a bad government. They suggested that the murder of the Jews, which most diplomats did not find out about until towards the end of the war, if at all, had been organized with the assistance of unqualified, opportunistic newcomers such as Undersecretary Martin Luther, who had been imposed upon the Foreign Office with Joachim von Ribbentrop’s accession to office in 1938. According to the authors of the book under review, this myth was upheld until the publication of their study.

Two things are problematic about this. First, most of the examples which the first part of the book gives of diplomats who, either at the centre or in the occupied countries, took part in organizing the deportations of the Jews or stealing works of art were, in fact, diplomatic newcomers of this sort. We could mention Otto Abetz as ambassador in Paris, Edmund Veesenmayer as special envoy in Hungary in 1944, Franz Rademacher as adviser on Jewish matters in the Abteilung Deutschland division of the German Foreign Office, and Eberhard von Künsberg as head of the eponymous unit for confiscating cultural assets. Thus, going against its own argument, this study provides empirical evidence that there was a core of truth in the accounts of themselves provided by the Wilhelmstrasse diplomats after 1945. The study attempts to refute this by pointing out that the ‘old’ diplomats had dominated the central political, economic, and legal departments until 1945. But these departments are precisely those which, especially since the outbreak of war, had suffered an extreme loss of significance compared with those dealing with propaganda and Jewish policy. In terms of staff numbers, they did not expand like other departments dealing with the new areas of activity created by the war.

Secondly, the study provides no evidence that the German Foreign Office has upheld this white-washed view of the past in relation
to the outside world in recent decades. Before Fischer’s initiative, the Foreign Office was certainly not looking for a critical re-working of its history, but to conclude from this that it was hanging on to an old version does not match up to reality either, at least since the 1970s. Attempts to discredit Döscher’s Ph.D. thesis in 1987, for example, did not emanate from the German Foreign Office, but from individual members of the wartime generation, such as Theodor Eschenburg and Marion Gräfin Dönhoff, who were offended by the account of Secretary of State Weizsäcker, with whose family they were on friendly terms.

Yet apart from the fact that it attempts, with a great deal of fuss and ultimately unnecessarily, to destroy a myth that has not recently been actively spread or even really believed any longer, the second part of the book on the German Foreign Office’s policy towards the past is much more balanced than the first and written in a less accusatory style. The second part makes clear that, despite personal continuity with the period before 1945, there was a re-orientation in the thinking especially of the higher-ranking diplomats who continued to dominate the Foreign Office in the 1950s and 1960s, not so much in numbers as in their political weight. Thus with a few exceptions, such as the Middle East departments with their traditional pro-Arab and anti-Israeli attitude, personal continuity did not mean that the diplomacy that had characterized the Foreign Office until 1945 was continued. The old Wilhelmstrasse diplomats quickly transformed themselves into advocates of multilateralism, cooperation with international organizations, and close ties with the West, rather than holding on to the idea of Germany as an autonomous Great Power whose function was to act as a bridge between East and West. Similarly, they remained loyal when power changed hands in 1969, and supported the new Ostpolitik pursued by the Social Democratic–Liberal coalition. It is precisely this adaptability, whether out of opportunism, a sense of reality, or perhaps a profound change of heart, that may be one reason why, in recent years, the German Foreign office and its past have not been of as much interest as the authors of this book think they should have been.
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The relationship between Britain and the GDR was unequal. Whereas the United Kingdom was a parliamentary democracy, the East German dictatorship had emerged from the collapse of the National Socialist dictatorship, the defeat of the Third Reich, and the ensuing occupation by the Soviet Union. Moreover, the rulers of the Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (SED, Socialist Unity Party) sought to gain recognition from the late 1950s to 1973 and even to reinforce their diplomatic status as late as the 1980s. By contrast, the British government was rather uninterested in the GDR, which was largely equated with the oppressive dictatorship of the SED and thus basically retained its image as a grey state until its final demise. Some leading British politicians, however, perceived the GDR as an antidote to the mighty Federal Republic. As a result of the Second World War, the division of Germany ultimately symbolized Britain’s last major military and political victory before the country’s decline fully emerged.

Because of the overriding importance of these issues, research on relations between Britain and the East German state has so far concentrated on the diplomatic and political realms. By contrast, this comprehensive overview by Stefan Berger and Norman LaPorte also deals with trade, political parties, trade unions, the Churches, peace movements, friendship societies, and town councils. Building on the published literature and extensive archival studies, they trace a vast array of contacts.

As Berger and LaPorte emphasize in the first two chapters, Britain’s governments unequivocally supported the Federal Republic with the onset of the Cold War. Tied to their West German and American alliance partners in NATO, they took sides in favour of West Germany’s policy of non-recognition vis-à-vis the GDR in accordance with the Hallstein doctrine of 1955. The rulers in East Berlin, however, were not entirely unsuccessful in exploiting resentments about West German rearmament among the British elites and their unease about the prominent role of some former Nazis in the Federal Republic. Yet relations between the leaders of the SED and the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) deteriorated after the
onset of de-Stalinization in March 1956 and the suppression of reform Communism in Czechoslovakia in August 1968. Moreover, the CPGB remained a small party that never had much influence on British politics. It was therefore Labour politicians such as Richard Crossman who advocated détente and demanded the recognition of the GDR in the late 1950s and early 1960s. This proposal, however, also promoted by the East-West Parliamentary Group and the Britain–GDR Parliamentary Group in the 1960s, met with resistance from the Foreign Office in particular. Its key officials prioritized support for the Federal Republic over relations with the GDR in order to gain access to the European Economic Community, secure Britain’s reputation as a reliable alliance partner, and thereby maintain the country’s role as a major power.

After the GDR had been recognized by the British government, relations between the two states continued to be situated in a wider multi-polar relationship that encompassed the Federal Republic, the United States, and the Soviet Union. European states such as France and Poland, too, had to be taken into account by East German and British politicians. In the third chapter of the book, Berger and LaPorte trace the proliferation of contacts between trade unions, friendship societies, and the Churches from 1973 to 1979. Although relations were ‘surprisingly diverse and manifold’ (p. 24), mutual suspicion of the advocates of rapprochement persisted. Supporters of the GDR in friendship organizations like the British German Information Exchange (BRIDGE) complained about excessive control by the East German authorities. As the leadership of the SED rejected free and spontaneous interaction, exchange between Britons and East Germans remained one-way traffic.

Berger and LaPorte argue in the fourth chapter that relations between Britain and the GDR did not fundamentally change during Margaret Thatcher’s period as Prime Minister from 1979 to 1990. Nevertheless, official East German organizations such as the Liga für Völkerfreundschaft constantly attempted to influence British civic movements like the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and European Nuclear Disarmament that lobbied for peace in the 1980s. East Berlin’s rulers also opposed the Euro-Communists in the CPGB and the Britain–GDR Society, which was finally disbanded in 1986. By contrast, town twinning flourished. Councils dominated by Labour left-wingers, whose influence in their party rose in the early 1980s,
proved to be especially susceptible to the appeal of SED politicians who held influential positions in many East German local councils. These contacts were by no means restricted to politics, but also encompassed cultural relations which became wider in the first half of the decade. As the SED rulers bluntly rejected Mikhail Gorbachev’s reform policies, however, the image of the GDR continued to be tainted by the unwillingness of its leaders to allow liberty, their oppressive dictatorship, and their inability to raise living standards. Apart from their committed supporters, few Britons shed tears when ‘real socialism’ collapsed in late 1989.

Although Margaret Thatcher’s reluctance to accept the unification of the two German states reflected deep-seated reservations about the ascendency of the Federal Republic from the 1950s on, the SED leadership was never able decisively to influence mainstream politics in Britain. Personal contacts, too, were closely monitored by the rulers in East Berlin and the pervasive state security force (Staats sicherheitsdienst). Nevertheless, these interactions furthered mutual understanding between East Germans and Britons. Despite its limitations, cultural exchange modified opinions and perceptions and, in sum, was ‘not entirely without effect’ (p. 16).

Berger’s and LaPorte’s book is the first comprehensive overview of relations between Britain and the GDR. Going beyond the realm of diplomacy, it provides readers with detailed insights into a vast range of social and cultural contacts. These, however, cannot be neatly separated from politics, especially in the case of the East German dictatorship. Nevertheless, Berger’s and LaPorte’s frequent terminological equation of the SED with the GDR has to be questioned. Their book largely confirms the findings of previous investigations of political relations before the British government’s official recognition of the GDR in 1973. Yet it provides a wealth of new insights into the many contacts in the second half of the 1970s and in the 1980s. Ultimately, Stefan Berger and Norman LaPorte convincingly demonstrate that relations between Britain and the GDR were not merely a footnote in twentieth-century European history. They reflected and influenced the overarching multilateral relationship between the United States and the USSR as well as major European powers. Not least, contacts shaped mutual perceptions that continue to influence cross-border interaction between Britons and Germans.
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At a time when cultural history and the study of transfers and socio-cultural interactions are dominant, Pietism’s processes of exchange with corresponding spaces are a frequently researched topic. Relations between England and Halle Pietism are considered to represent an uncontroversial and fixed body of knowledge. Yet little is known about the concrete shape taken by these relations in situative communicative acts, their success, or how they were perceived by contemporaries. This is the problem addressed by the conference ‘Networking across the Channel: England and Halle Pietism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries’. Its focus, the axis London–Halle, was one of the most significant paths of communication by which Pietism impacted on the world. The conference was sponsored by the German Historical Institute London and the Franckesche Stiftungen in Halle, into whose remit the topic outlined here falls.

Individual papers were held together by a history of communications approach which provided a model for analysis and interpretation. Against this background the conference’s organizer, Holger Zaunstöck (Halle), in his introductory paper presented a theoretical model for interpreting a communicative space. According to this model, Pietist protagonists and their opposite numbers interacted in a number of different mental and physical spaces. The process of opening up space by ‘communication between absent partners’ served, from Halle’s point of view, to create a ‘Pietist public’, whose point of reference, both physical and symbolic, was always the Franckesche Schulstadt in Halle. An essential element in this process, which was partly deliberate and partly unintentional, was the establishment of fragile but stable networks. This approach drawn from communications history strongly emphasizes the acts as process.

Drawing examples from Halle’s perspective, Zaunstöck outlined how this theoretical approach could be translated into empirical
practice. He suggested that charity schools, the stock of historic buildings, Pietist correspondence, the journal *Hallische Korrespondenz*, and the famous Kulissenbibliothek’s rich holdings relating to England could provide elements for spatial reconstruction. The point of these projects, he continued, was to make money, to position Halle Pietism in translocal discursive spaces, and to bind Pietist network actors and the widespread circles which they addressed to the Franckeschen Stiftungen. In addition, Halle Pietism’s network can be reconstructed at various levels on the basis of its concrete relations with England. From this prescribed perspective, it remained for the rest of the conference papers to break open and critically investigate established topoi and the metanarratives of Pietism in the eighteenth century.

Alexander Schunka (Erfurt/Gotha) demonstrated how, in retrospect, the independent polyglot Orientalist Heinrich Wilhelm Ludolf became a central agent of Halle Pietism in London and the essential ‘motor driving Halle’s expansion out into the world’. Even before he came into contact with August Hermann Francke, Ludolf, as a philologist who travelled tirelessly, worked in the service of a Christian universal church. His linguistic work, which is still in use today, is an eloquent testimony to his interest in the Ethiopian, Orthodox, Greek, and Armenian churches. As secretary to Prince George, consort of the later Queen Anne, Ludolf was able to secure reliable influence, donations, and contacts to support Halle’s efforts in London. His own confessional indifference, intercultural competence, and acceptance of his role as God’s instrument meant that he could successfully interact in a diffuse field between the Anglican church, the irenic movement, and internal Protestant reforming movements. He was not completely tied into any specific communications system, and rejected institutional commitment. Ludolf was therefore able to use different networks and instrumentalize them for his own specific interests, while his many contacts also guaranteed his usefulness to his various partners. Schunka convincingly showed how Ludolf became an effective connecting link between existing networks.

The special case of communications between Halle and London formed part of a wider historical and geographical context of mutual perception. For Jan van de Kamp (Amsterdam) its central factors were the European-wide *peregrinatio academiae*, the extensive migration movements of intellectual and religious refugees, increasingly
intense economic exchange processes, and mutual literary reception. The demand for English-language and translated devotional literature of British provenance revealed common interests. The thematization of subjects such as social conflict, intense catechesis, self-observation, and Sunday observance demonstrated the large overlap between Anglicanism, Pietism, and the Reformed churches, despite strict observation of confessional boundaries. The objectives of the various political and church actors, however, precluded either a church union among the Protestants, or the mutual adoption of heterodox principles. Van de Kamp concluded that ecclesiological differences prevented ‘mutual intellectual stimulation and financial support’ from assuming an institutional, permanent form.

At a time when scientific standards were just emerging and establishing themselves, the pre-modern republic of scholars exchanged and produced knowledge primarily through personal relations. Therefore, according to Kelly Withmer (Sewanee), trust and credibility were the central resources in encouraging and disseminating innovative thinking. Taking as an example the transfer of knowledge between the Royal Society and Halle, Withmer showed how knowledge was transported in both directions over the Channel. The strict requirements of the English empirical school, under the watchful eye of the Royal Society, exerted an enormous pressure to conform on European scholars who wanted to be successful in England. One of the main German mechanisms of transmission between the two scientific traditions was the eclectic method, among whose adepts were Johann Daniel Herrnschmidt and Johann Christoph Sturm. The selective, situative choice out of a large pool of available theories allowed them to become aware of newer experimental approaches. Yet as the example of research on luminescence shows, the findings of Continental Europeans were not accepted if they did not match up to English scientific standards. The trend towards scientization was supported by new didactic concepts such as the teaching of Realien, that is, subjects related to the real world such as biology, geography, and mathematics, in Halle. Thus the eclectic method and new educational approaches created an opening by which empiricism could enter, and they formed a bridge for transmitting knowledge between the two scientific cultures.

Presenting a micro historical case study, Juliane Jacobi (Potsdam) described how an attempt to organize a permanent exchange of stu-
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dents and teachers between schools in Halle and London failed. The teachers despatched to London lacked the sensitivity to grasp the specific features of the English school system and to integrate them into their own practice. The charity school movement which came out of the institutionalized church in England was closely followed in Halle through the relevant publications, and a Latin education on the Halle model was introduced on the English education market. But the pressure to offer economically profitable schooling quickly led to conformity in terms of language and syllabuses. The second objective of recruiting school and university students for Halle’s educational institutions also, in retrospect, had disappointing results. For the period between 1700 and 1720, there were only thirteen English students in the Franckeschen Stiftungen. The main barrier was probably confessional. Another factor not to be underestimated, Jacobi suggested, was the English tradition that, into the twentieth century, gave parents a significantly greater part in educating their children.

In the evening lecture, Andreas Gestrich (London) provided an overview of how the Pietist movement fitted into the whole context of British–German relations. The period of upheaval and change around 1700 made similar demands on both regions, which responded with analogously adapted strategies. In two central problem areas, religious renewal and moral reform, for example, the mission developed common working spaces and, through bidirectional translating and publishing activities, a common space for intellectual perception. While London drew on the human resources and linguistic ability of central Germany, its counterpart in Halle was dependent on English infrastructure. Even in their common fields of activity, the two sides could have different addressees, objectives, and institutional forms of problem-solving. Thus the English charity school movement and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) targeted the problem classes and lower social strata. The Franckeschen Stiftungen, by contrast, pursued a wider aim of educating and reforming the whole of society. Beyond this, Gestrich suggested, the strong millenarian charge and the development of various denominations within the English monarchy can only be understood against the background of political instability. For the Pietist movement, by contrast, Lutheran orthodoxy represented the real challenge, as millenarianism in Germany was limited to the lay sec-
tor of piety. On the whole, Gestrich said, an ‘incomparable communications network of Pietists’ emerged that, in the context of British–German relations, was outdone only by the arcane and inaccessible correspondence between diplomats.

Michael Schaich (London) traced the factors determining the development of Pietism in London, and identified the Pietist-dominated nodal points. The capital, he said, was characterized by a unique religious diversity, and the emissaries of Pietism thus entered a ‘multi-confessional, religiously fragmented city space’. The two most important spaces clearly shaped by Pietism, he went on, were the Lutheran German court chapel and the Lady chapel in the Savoy. The court chapel was highly significant for transnational, Pietist communication networks, but less so for contexts relating to the court and capital city. The Lady chapel in the Liberty of the Savoy, by contrast, was located in a unique religious biotope, housing five confessional communities in close and competitive proximity. Lobbyists from the whole Protestant spectrum came together here, which made for lively exchanges while also lowering the barriers to confessional border-crossing. To oversimplify, the ‘constraints of the space, which placed limits on action’ meant that it was precisely the many freedoms and opportunities offered by the English capital that limited the space to act because they exposed the Pietist actors to free competition.

From 1722 on, Friedrich Michael Ziegenhagen (1694–1776) developed the court chapel in London to become an independent Pietist centre. Christina Jetter (Tübingen) showed how, in the tension between Halle and London, Ziegenhagen presented himself as a strict Lutheran and celibate servant of God’s Kingdom. He developed his personal profile as a Pietist against the negative background of London, the stronghold of freedom and moral depravity, of prosperity and unbelief. Ziegenhagen’s acceptance by the SPCK ensured him access to MPs and members of the East India Company. In addition, he maintained a widespread communications network in Germany. Halle was not its only nodal point, but measured in terms of frequency of correspondence and capital acquisition, certainly the most important. Ziegenhagen’s success as a mediator was firmly reliant on his ability to incorporate mutual expectations and filter information for specific addressees.

Ziegenhagen’s correspondence and private papers proved to be controversial property on his death, both conveying the knowledge
required for power and identifying his legitimate successor. With the meticulous care of an archivist, Jürgen Gröschl (Halle) traced what had happened to Ziegenhagen’s papers. He described how some of the papers left by this London court preacher, items which had long been sought, were recently discovered among the holdings of the Franckeschen Stiftungen, and presented them as an important foundation for future research. The majority of the newly discovered documents (around 400 items) are sermons, catalogues of sermons, and plans for sermons. The different stages preserved here make it possible for the first time to reconstruct how the ‘famous exegete’ Ziegenhagen built up his sermons. However, we are still sadly missing the correspondence conducted from this contact point between England, Germany, the East Indies, and the West Indies, for example, about competing religious communities.

Daniel Jeyaraj (Liverpool) presented his initial findings on the reception of Christian Friedrich Schwartz (1726–98) in the English-language area. Schwarz is remembered as the founding father of the Lutheran Tamil church in south India. An assessment of the journalistic, devotional, and biographical literature around 1800 revealed that our view has been dominated by a strongly idealized image of the missionary. Hagiographic anecdotes and iconographic stylization rapidly produced the stable legend of a Christian missionary. This image has largely ignored the restrictions placed on Schwartz’s ability to work by wars and territorial and religious borders, and the conflicts that erupted between the Lutheran Schwartz and other religious communities and missionary groups, administrative officials, and rulers in the confused political conditions of south India.

A conceptually ambitious paper by Alexander Pyrges (Trier) took us back onto theoretical terrain for the end of the conference. From its heights, Pyrges looked anew at the ‘topography of the social’ and provided an empirical example to illustrate that ‘networking was the natural state of the social’. The colonization project in Ebenezer (Georgia) for emigrants from Salzburg shows, from an external perspective, what use was made of the established communications link between Halle and London. Among other things, those involved took recourse to the ability of the Halle orphanage’s network, which was accustomed to handling precarious communications, to tap into foreign communications systems. Multipolar transfers and concentrated interactions ranging from latent to manifest allowed those involved
to increase their options by crossing borders and multiplying their resources. Thus Pyrges concluded that in a relatively long-lasting context of interaction such as the Ebenezer project, belonging to a network and the network structure predetermined the actions of the actors if it did not drive them.

To sum up a successful conference, it remains to be said that by focusing thematically on a clearly defined question, the contributors provided a thick description of the state of communications between London and Halle in the early modern period. One advantage of this methodologically rewarding approach was that the individual contributions were closely related to each other. The fact that the papers were interlinked produced intense discussions in which different assessments and ways of looking at things often produced controversial but stimulating findings. Another outcome of the conference was an assessment of the significance of transfer. As almost all the actors, transfers, and topics presented at the conference originated in Halle, Halle seemed to play the more active part in the bilateral relations discussed. For the Pietist networkers, London represented a medium in the lexical meaning of the word. As a transmission space and intensifier, the city demanded concessions and posed challenges, but offered the chance to obtain attractive added value. A final point needs to be made about the conceptual nature of the conference’s topic, Halle Pietism. Various papers concentrated on the reform movement from different focal lengths. Often, details of individual actors or phenomena could not be unequivocally assigned to Pietism, as in the specific historical examples presented, many borders were blurred. This is an important observation with respect to the definition of the polymorphic term ‘Pietism’, especially in its Halle version.

ERIK NAGEL (Studienzentrum August-Hermann-Francke)
When it comes to assessing the 1970s and 1980s, titles of historical publications often end with a question mark. Were western societies ‘on the way to a new modernity’? Did the 1970s mark the ‘end of confidence’? Was it a ‘period of disillusionment or promise’? Elke Seefried (Munich/Augsburg) added to this much-debated area of research by organizing a workshop, hosted by the German Historical Institute London, which also asked a question: ‘From Planning to Crisis Management?’ Focusing on temporal perceptions and the political, the workshop highlighted two categories of fundamental importance to both contemporary debates and today’s historiography on this period. By concentrating on West Germany and Britain from the 1960s to the 1980s, the workshop aimed to evaluate dimensions of change and continuity, and to identify differences and similarities between the two countries.

The workshop was opened by Dirk van Laak (Gießen) who introduced the idea of planning in the twentieth century as one of the key terms of the conference. The first section focused on scientific and social actors closely interlinked with the political sphere. Elke Seefried presented those who claimed to be able to predict future developments on the basis of scientific research, namely, futurologists. Even though the confidence in prognoses which had characterized the 1960s was shaken in the early 1970s, the idea of planning remained extremely important while adapting to the emerging new paradigms of ecology and quality. Fernando Esposito (Tübingen) then drew attention to punks as a culture which challenged notions of progress but demanded the ‘decolonization’ of the future. Interestingly enough, their rejection of dull routines contributed to the emergence of new forms of capitalism characterized by ambivalences—more flexibility on the one hand, and a loss of security and

predictability on the other. While punks rejected utopian ideas, NGOs were to a large extent based on them. But as James McKay (Birmingham) showed, radicalism turned into reformism when NGOs exchanged their independence for political influence in the present. As they became sought-after experts in different policy areas, NGOs subjected their timeframes to those of politics. Referring to the peace movement of the early 1980s, Holger Nehring (Sheffield) pointed out how different estimations of present and future threats led to conflicts between those who opposed the stationing of nuclear weapons and those who demanded it. This went along with different ways of viewing the past, namely, when peace activists connected present developments with the Second World War.

Political parties and political conceptions of planning were the subject of the second and third sections. The perceptions of past, present, and future in both conservative and social democratic parties in Britain and West Germany were presented as shifting and ambiguous, yet in different ways. As Julia Angster (Kassel) and Lawrence Black (Durham) showed for the SPD and the Labour Party respectively, the future no longer seemed to be promising for both social democratic parties, a ‘better future’ as it were, but threatening. Especially for the SPD, ‘change’ had increasingly served only as a means of preservation since the 1970s. At the same time the conservative parties’ attitude towards the future changed as well, as Martina Steber (London) pointed out. While the conservative parties had focused on the present for decades, advanced concepts of planning and the promise of ‘a better tomorrow’ gained importance during the 1970s. The British conservatives were much more open to the future than the West German CDU. The Labour Party, however, was labelled an actor of the past and old-fashioned.

Glen O’Hara (Oxford) then elaborated on planning timeframes in British politics between 1961 and 1973. In his view, shrinking time horizons were a consequence not so much of presumed economic problems as of rising complexity, unintended consequences, and an increased sensitivity to volatility in economics. This, he said, added to the collapse of the ideas of linear progress and modernization. The terms ‘ungovernability’ and ‘overload’ played an important part in both British and West German debates as the consensus of the 1960s eroded. In contrast to O’Hara, Gabriele Metzler (Berlin) emphasized the 1970s as a period of political and economic crisis which led to a
crisis of legitimacy in Western democracies. Yet liberal democracies did not disappear. Instead they changed, thus making the 1970s a period of reform.

How these changes in attitudes and in framing time manifested themselves in different areas of politics was at the centre of the following sections, starting with economic policy. Contesting prevalent assumptions, Alexander Nützenadel (Berlin) argued that Keynesianism was not a phenomenon of the 1960s and early 1970s in West Germany, but had been implemented there during the late 1950s, when economists turned their attention to Anglo-American theories. By the early 1970s Keynesianism was already in decline since it had proved to be inefficient in solving new problems. For Britain, Jim Tomlinson (Dundee) questioned the frequently invoked ‘end of Keynesianism’. He referred to the survival of Keynesianism at national level, stressing that public spending was not cut back despite the boom in neo-liberal thought. Analysing ‘Keynesianism’ in detail, the section also revealed the variety of concepts that lay behind the overall term.

Reversing the conference’s main title, Rüdiger Graf (Bochum/Cambridge) explained the development of oil forecasts in energy policy as a development from crisis management to planning. The energy crisis of the 1970s revealed the weaknesses of such forecasts, yet led not to a decrease in planning but to improved planning. In her presentation of British policies towards Europe, Helen Parr (Keele) connected planning with British foreign policy under Harold Wilson and Edward Heath. Approaching Europe, she pointed out, was the only way for Britain to develop a new timeframe in order to remain an important political player on the international scene. Enrico Böhm (Marburg) also pointed to the relevance of the international level. In his presentation on the G7 summits, he stressed their importance as an instrument of economic crisis management. Not least, he suggested, these summits served as a way of exercising symbolic policies to demonstrate strength and unity.

The last section turned towards social and education policies. As Martin Geyer (Munich) demonstrated in his presentation, the 1970s and 1980s saw the emergence of new discourses on risk, risk management, and security, thus developing new time horizons. The risks of the future ranked more highly than the risks of the past. Demography in particular, and scenarios of future demographic develop-
ment emerged as a strong argument for criticizing the welfare state. For the British case, Pat Thane (London) pointed out that disappointment in the social policy outcomes of the supposedly optimistic 1960s did not lead to cuts in social policies but, despite the economic crisis, to the heyday of the welfare state during the 1970s. Finally, Wilfried Rudloff (Kassel) drew attention to education policies. Aimed at a country’s younger generations, education policy is inextricably linked with questions of the future. Using a four-level model, Rudloff showed how education forecasting and planning became important political tools and therefore shifted the time horizons of education policies since the 1960s. Until the mid 1970s, the ‘future’ remained the basic reference point of education policy before the focus shifted towards the present again.

The 1970s will probably remain a period which raises questions for quite some time, with research on it producing findings but also some more question marks. By concentrating on the British–German comparison, however, the workshop specified questions, and helped to identify characteristics of the time and the dimensions of further research. First, notions such as ‘progress’, ‘crisis’, and ‘risk’ became visible as constructions. Rather than asking ‘crisis—what crisis?’ Jim Tomlinson therefore suggested asking ‘crisis—whose crisis?’ Second, Holger Nehring raised the question to what extent concepts and approaches to timeliness really can be transferred when comparing different societies. Third, Elke Seefried asked how large-scale theories such as high modernism can help to make sense of the 1970s. Fourth, she stressed the changing role of the state and its legitimacy as an important factor which shaped political thinking and policies of the 1970s. Establishing timeframes, Steven Fielding (Nottingham) suggested, means making sense. Linking these different timeframes with each other and with the actors behind them will help us to understand the 1970s, as this workshop clearly showed.

REINHILD KREIS (University of Augsburg)
Global History: Connected Histories or a History of Connections?
Spring school held at the German Historical Institute London, 11–14 Apr. 2011.

In April 2011 the German Historical Institute in London hosted an academic event long anticipated in research circles on global history. Jointly organized by scholars from Heidelberg University and the University of Leipzig, a spring school with the thought-provoking title ‘Connected Histories or a History of Connections?’ was established as a communication platform for the first generation of historians trained in global history. The workshop brought together Ph.D. students at an advanced stage of their research to discuss their approaches based on comparisons and connections. It therefore served as an ideal introduction to the Third European Congress on World and Global History, and provided a crucial interface between research and teaching.

In an attempt to distinguish between connected histories, where the connection provides the background for findings in order to shed new light on established narratives, and a history of connections, where global connections become the primary object of research (Roland Wenzelhuemer, Heidelberg), students and scholars alike were invited to sharpen their ideas of cross-cultural interactions. Thought-provoking questions and controversial statements on differing practices and diverging opinions challenged our understanding of targets, duties, and methods, and of the future of global history. The large number of trans-disciplinary works, a wide range of topics, and the Ph.D. candidates’ different positions in the field further encouraged in-depth discussions.

A recurring debate, initiated by Antje Flüchter (Heidelberg), centred on traditional understandings of periodization and the search for an appropriate starting point for one global world. After lively discussions on revisiting the role of early modern connections that are traditionally under-represented in global history, both early modernists and advocates of a meta-narrative of global history emphasized the importance of pre-nineteenth-century developments for our understanding of globality.

The need for a ‘cosmopolitan meta-narrative’ of global history intermingled with local elements, as advocated by Patrick O’Brien, was another central topic of debate. It was interesting to note, how-
ever, that the younger generation did not seem particularly worried that a period of pronounced dualism between persistent scholarly critique of a lack of specialization and global history’s success as a widely recognized research perspective would give rise to alarming tendencies. It seemed that most of the students were more interested in defining methods and theories than re-visiting problematic terms and concepts. Against this background, the question of whether we still need to re-define global history arose. The commonly held view was that to tap the full potential of global history requires a multitude of approaches to be accepted; only then will it be possible to abandon the intrinsic notion of ethno-centric boundaries.

Although all participants advocated concepts of global history, their approaches differed significantly depending on their academic backgrounds. Thus it should not surprise us that questions about the ambivalent character of global history were not answered to universal satisfaction. What was most striking in this respect was that the discussions and debates hardly ever touched upon the self-inquiries and self-evaluations that had concerned global history researchers in the past. Yet this is not to say that the ‘new’ generation is unaware of the shortcomings of the developing discipline. In fact, they seemed eager to contribute to gradually building up a global historical meta-narrative by addressing their individual research questions. This seems to herald an empirical turn within the research field, one that promises more monographs based on specific case studies in years to come.

What most of these ambitious projects had in common was a highly empirical framework and often also a multilingual corpus of sources. In terms of specific research interests, social and political aspects of long-distance connections held centre stage while dry economic analyses were almost totally avoided, a development that could be taken as a clear sign of a social, cultural, and political turn in global history. Thus the term ‘social history of globalization’ was frequently used. Projects such as Lisa Hellman’s (Stockholm) work on the social relations of the employees of the multi-ethnic Swedish East India Company in Canton and Macao suggest promising results in this regard. Combined with the methodological search for a global history from below, other research, such as that on capacity building in education policies for the scheduled caste in India (Monika Milowska, Warsaw) and the emergence of a development caste in
Nepal (Sara Elmer, Zurich) demonstrates that a social history of the local level is indispensable for our understanding of the spread of global knowledge.

Other studies on shifts in the socio-economic field proved stimulating for the conceptualization of the creation of globality. The categories discussed in this context included new zones of interaction and the role of global actors. Anirban Ghosh (Munich) examined the new identities of the Indian circus and raised the question of how to write a global history of these new actors and agencies. With regard to early modern actors and agencies, neutral carriers in a maritime trade environment made two appearances. Strikingly, they played a crucial part in America’s trade with India and China, as Lisa Sturm (Frankfurt an der Oder) argued, and they also existed in Manila because of the absence of foreign intermediaries in the Manila trade. This was illustrated by Birgit Tremml (Vienna) in her work on the multi-layered early modern Manila market that challenges state-of-the-art concepts of port cities.

A further noticeable aspect was that contemporary topics held interesting implications for the future of writing global history. With impressive interdisciplinary strength, the research projects of Birte Herrmann (Heidelberg) and Nils Riecken (Berlin) examined the perception and historiography of globality in contemporary China and Morocco respectively. Gerrie Swart’s (Stellenbosch) presentation on the intercultural level of the African Union’s cooperative security discourse demonstrated an appealing approach.

Strictly speaking, a true global history approach dealing with connected histories or histories of connections was not evident in all research agendas. Often we were given a trans-national study with strong comparative foci instead. This was the case with research on the role of Swiss knowledge in the temperance movement in colonial Africa and Latin America (Soenke Bauck and Francesco Spoering, Zurich), and on the global context of the anti-alcohol movement in Bulgaria by Nikolay Kamenov (Berlin and Zurich). A study of the development of insolvency law (Lea Heimbeck, Frankfurt am Main) in Greece, Egypt, the Ottoman Empire, and Venezuela during the nineteenth century, and the mutual influence of Western European constitutional cultures (Christina Reimann, Berlin) both highlighted the phenomenon of a trans-national league active in problem-solving.
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To sum up, four innovative fields of research were addressed: (1) a social history of globalization, (2) globalized actors, (3) a global space (that is, port cities), and (4) re-visited time frames. In regard to methodological deepening, the question of how to write a global history from below was raised. So far we can say with some certainty only that economic globalization as the main focus of a final narrative in global history has lost ground. There can be no doubt that we will hear more about these changing research paradigms in the near future. Responding to the explicit rejection of economic history by a number of students, Silke Strickrodt (London) with good reason warned against playing down important implications for the study of global connections that arise out of economic aspects.

A further worthwhile outcome of the discussions, although theoretically still vague, centred on the assumption of a linear process of learning and/or dis-learning in global settings. Based on the question of whether certain political, economic, or social phenomena rooted in the early modern era were interrupted or forgotten, ‘disentanglement’ emerged as a tempting concept. Given the indisputable fact that global movements disappear, the question of how connections and processes disentangle again in privileged places of cultural exchange will have to be addressed in future. Here it may be worth exploring in a specific setting why cultural skills were lost to the next generation instead of being stored. One hypothetical answer is that they disentangled because they turned global, and were no longer just cross-cultural or trans-national.

Despite the euphoric atmosphere at the workshop, the Ph.D. candidates were reminded of pointless reinventions of approaches and advised to think twice before they labelled their findings as ‘different’ or ‘new’. In his final comments, Arndt Brendecke (Berne) sounded a note of caution on dead-end battles about the exclusiveness of a certain period, technique, or movement in history. Instead he suggested focusing on our most important ability as global historians, namely, explaining longue durée developments. Hence we could say, ironically, that the sometimes desperate search for better theories and methods has taken us back to where we started from: the history of connections.

In discussing the difficulties of writing an integrative global history on everything that happened, Matthias Middell (Leipzig) hinted at the pitfalls of current projects in which everything is lumped
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together. Arguing against conceptually and empirically weak syntheses in global history, he called for future Ph.D. research in the field to fill these gaps. As alternative approaches, he suggested addressing a manageable narrative, as proposed by Michael Geyer in a 1995 article in the *American Historical Review*, or, alternatively, looking at specific actors and their concrete intentions when connecting the world via social networks.

Taken as a whole, this pilot project has major potential for the future, offering Ph.D. students at an advanced stage of their research the chance to reflect on their projects and to solve difficult problems such as factual misunderstandings and theoretical uncertainties. These often remain unaddressed whilst students are doing research at their home institutions. My personal impression was that as the spring school, unlike almost every other academic gathering, offered ample time for discussion, it was rewarding for participants and the research field alike. Given this, the organizers deserve praise for the initiative and their constant endeavours to create a constructive atmosphere.

The event ended with a particularly illuminating representation of influential historical connections for the world as we know it today. An excursion to the Royal Observatory in Greenwich brought the participants into direct contact with an invention that resulted in a globalizing phenomenon beyond comparison: the Prime Meridian as the centre of world time.

BIRGIT TREMML (Institute of Economic and Social History, University of Vienna).
Scholarly interest in the history of global Christian missions has burgeoned in the past twenty years, producing rich opportunities for transnational, interdisciplinary research. At the same time, in Middle Eastern studies, historians have begun to pay new attention to Christians living in Islamic societies. The workshop on Middle East Missions occurred at the intersection of these two fields of inquiry. Organized by Deborah Gaitskell (School of Oriental and African Studies, SOAS, University of London), Silke Strickrodt (GHIL), and Rosemary Seton (SOAS), the workshop focused on case studies involving Egypt and Britain during the early to mid twentieth century, and drew an international audience of participants. Together, the presenters argued that the history of British missions—and missionaries—vis-à-vis modern Egypt has been inextricably connected to broader issues in intellectual and diplomatic history; to the history of churches and missions as social and political institutions; and to the study of Egyptian nationalism and British imperialism.

Heather J. Sharkey (University of Pennsylvania) served as the discussant for this workshop and also surveyed the state of the field. She attributed the growing interest in this subject to various factors. First, she noted, there has been both a rethinking of Muslim–Christian relations in the post-9/11 milieu and a rejection among academics of the Samuel Huntington-inspired discourse of the ‘clash of civilizations’. Second, many young scholars of Middle Eastern heritage (and especially those who come from Egyptian and Lebanese Christian diasporic communities) have been setting new research agendas in European and North American universities. Third, scholars have begun to find rich materials in the archives of Christian mission and church-associated organizations, many of which have generous access policies that facilitate research. Fourth, historians have drawn inspiration from recent works in British imperial and postcolonial history, which have recognized religion as an important (if complicated) factor in popular and political culture, in both Britain and its former empire. Four papers followed these introductory remarks.
First came the paper of Vivian Ibrahim (SOAS), entitled ‘The Coptic Question: Religion and Nationalism in Colonial Egypt’. She focused on the Copts, the indigenous Christians of Egypt, who accounted for perhaps 10 per cent of the Egyptian population in 1900. Drawing on British government archives, Egyptian Arabic newspapers, and a range of published works, Ibrahim told a complex story about modern Coptic activism and British–Coptic relations in the early twentieth century. She showed how British Anglicans expressed solidarity with the Coptic Orthodox Church and with Coptic Egyptians. Missionaries in particular lent credence to the story of Kyriakos Mikhail, a Coptic journalist based in London, who in 1911 published a series of articles that emphasized Muslim injustice towards the Christian minority of Egypt. These articles inspired a media flurry in Britain over ‘The Coptic Question’ and reverberated into Egypt by prompting Muslim and Christian Egyptians to debate the meaning of Egyptian nationalism and the role that Copts should (or could) play therein. In the end, debates over the ‘Coptic Question’ within Egypt inspired a more assertive brand of Coptic activism.

Above all, Vivian Ibrahim’s paper demonstrated the importance of the expatriate, diasporic Coptic community, and of its transnational connections, in shaping Coptic society in Egypt. It is significant that Kiriakos Mikhail wrote in London, not Cairo: the location and the distance arguably made it possible for him to advance claims that would have been too strident to air in Egypt. The London venue also enabled him to find an influential and sympathetic British audience. Recent scholarship on the Coptic diaspora—particularly in the United States, where there has been a powerful Coptic lobby working in Washington, DC—has recognized the significance of expatriate politics for Coptic Orthodoxy today. Ibrahim’s study of ‘The Coptic Question’ in early twentieth-century Britain may illustrate the beginning of this trend.

In a paper entitled ‘British Missionaries and Religious Liberty in Egypt, 1919–48’, John Stuart (Kingston University) spoke about the fascinating career of one missionary. This was Stanley Andrew Morrison, who worked in Egypt for the Church Missionary Society (CMS) from 1920 to 1951. John Stuart called Morrison ‘an inveterate and assiduous lobbyist’ who devoted an ‘equal commitment to serving the mission and to furthering the cause of religious liberty’. Morrison became a leading figure in the Egypt Inter-Mission Council.
(a body of American, British, and other Protestant missions founded in Cairo in 1922), and both contributed to and benefited from the International Missionary Council, which was founded in New York in 1921. Through these avenues he helped to shape the human rights discourses that were expressed in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and gained ecumenical support from the World Council of Churches (which was founded in Geneva in the same year).

Stuart’s ultimate achievement in the paper was to confirm, through his study of Morrison, the centrality of missionaries to the formation of international human rights discourses. At the same time, his paper integrated missionaries into a broader field of intellectual and diplomatic history while paying close attention to British and British imperial history.

Samir Boulos (University of Zurich) presented a paper entitled ‘British Missionary Schools in Egypt: Spaces of Cultural Entanglements, 1900–56’, which relied substantially on oral sources. He applied Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of the formation of *habitus*, that is, systematic manners of ‘being, seeing, acting and thinking’, to the study of mission schools and their graduates, and concentrated on two schools that flourished in the half century before the Suez Crisis. These were the English Mission College, founded in Cairo 1922 as an outgrowth of the Church Mission to the Jews, and Bethel Girls School, founded in Suez in 1906 as a primary school of the interdenominational Egypt General Mission.

A few of the people whom Boulos interviewed were Muslims who attended one of these Christian schools. Their positive comments about their classroom experiences challenge the claims about Christian missionary coercion and duplicity that Egyptian Muslim nationalists, beginning in the 1930s, invoked to justify restrictions on missionary activities. These Muslim graduates emphasized the ethical and moral, rather than explicitly Christian, dimensions of their mission-school educations, and thereby, Boulos argued, negotiated their way out of possible identity crises. Further research may help to elucidate whether the Muslim graduates’ emphasis on universal ethics in the classroom indicated an openness to inter-communal symbiosis. Boulos also touched on the possible consequences of social class as mediated through schools. He noted that the English Mission College, whose students came from the petite bourgeoisie, tried to
instil the value of individualism more than the Bethel Girls School, which catered to poor students. His paper represents a case study of the social and ideological differences that distinguished Christian missions from each other.

In a paper entitled ‘Christian Mission Provoked by Islamic Piety’, Catriona Laing (Cambridge University), examined the career of Constance Padwick (1886–1968), another dynamic CMS missionary to Egypt. Padwick worked during the inter-war and immediate post-war period, so that her career overlapped almost completely with that of Stanley Morrison (whom John Stuart discussed in his paper). Among female missionaries to the Middle East, Padwick stood out as an exceptional scholar of Arabic and Islamic studies.

Laing focused in her paper on Padwick’s most substantial publication, *Muslim Devotions: A Study of Prayer Manuals in Common Use* (1961). Throughout her career in the Middle East, Padwick had collected some 150 prayer manuals that Muslims used for devotion. Many of these, which reflected Sufi tendencies, suggested to Padwick ‘a warmer . . . Qur’an’, or what we could arguably call (adapting the evangelical Christian expression) an Islam of the heart. To Padwick, the manuals suggested points of Islamic and Christian convergence. Many of them evinced an intense devotion towards and adoration of Muhammad, elevating him to the status ‘of something more than mere man’ in a way that may have implied ‘a desire for a Christ-like form of mediation’. Padwick appears to have seen in these manuals a bridge for Muslims approaching Christianity, leading Laing to argue that Padwick’s engagement with Islamic piety and her interest in living religion was fuelled by a desire to witness to Christ, and that her book confirmed her legacy as a ‘mission strategist’.

The discussion following the paper revealed an interesting twist in this story. In response to a question about why a British publisher re-issued *Muslim Devotions* in 1996, Laing remarked that Padwick’s book appears to have gained respect today among British Muslim missionaries, who welcome it—precisely because of its presentation of a Christ-like Muhammad—as a bridge for Christians approaching Islam.

The papers presented at this workshop generated lively, fruitful discussion, and illuminated two kinds of linked histories. The first kind was Muslim–Christian inter-communal history in Egypt and on the world stage. The second kind was British–Egyptian transnation-
al history. The latter, transnational dimension calls to mind what the historian Daniel T. Rodgers observed in his book *Atlantic Crossings* (1998) about nineteenth-century connections between the United States, Britain, and Germany within the nexus of the ‘North Atlantic world’. ‘Every serious reader of the past instinctively knows’, he wrote, ‘. . . that nations lie enmeshed in each others’ history.’

HEATHER J. SHARKEY (University of Pennsylvania)
Scholarships Awarded by the GHIL

Each year the GHIL awards a number of research scholarships to German postgraduate and postdoctoral students to enable them to carry out research in Britain, and to British postgraduates for research visits to Germany. The scholarships are generally awarded for a period of up to six months, depending on the requirements of the research project. British applicants will normally be expected to have completed one year’s postgraduate research, and be studying German history or Anglo-German relations. Scholarships are advertised each year in September on H-Soz-u-Kult and the GHIL’s website. Applications may be sent in at any time, but allocations are made in April (deadline for applications 15 March) for the current year and October (deadline 30 September) for the following calendar year. Applications, which should include a CV, educational background, list of publications (where appropriate), and an outline of the project, together with a supervisor’s reference confirming the relevance of the proposed archival research, should be addressed to the Director, German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ.

During their stay in Britain, German scholars present their projects and the initial results of their research at the Institute’s Research Seminar, and British scholars do the same on their return from Germany. In the second allocation for 2011 the following scholarships were awarded for research on British history, German history, and Anglo-American relations:

Daniel Anders (Düsseldorf): Die englische Außenpolitik in der Juli-krise 1914
Falko Bell (Mainz): Britische Human Intelligence im Zweiten Weltkrieg
Felix Brahm (Bielefeld): Waffenhandel: Eine europäisch-ostafrikanische Verflechtungsgeschichte, 1850–1900
Regina Finsterhölzl (Berlin): Werbung und Marktforschung in Ghana, 1930–70
Elena Heßelmann (Duisburg): Making Sense of the UK and International Development: Ideas, Institutions and Foreign Policy Change
Leonhard Horowski (Freiburg): Die Entstehung des Ministeriums in Großbritannien und Brandenburg-Preußen, ca. 1660–1800
Anna Kubasiak (Frankfurt): Munizipalsozialismus? Das Entstehen der städtischen Leistungsverwaltung in Frankfurt am Main, Birmingham und Philadelphia
Matthias Schmelzer (Berlin): A Temple of Growth for Industrialized Countries: The Growth Paradigm and the OEEC/OECD, 1950s–80s
Martin Skoeries (Jena): Die Wirkungsgeschichte des protestantischen Netzwerks unter Maria Tudor, 1553–8
Stefan Tetzlaff (Göttingen): Von der Werkbank zum bedeutenden Industriezweig: Kapital, Politik und Technologie in der Transformation der frühen Automobilindustrie Indiens, ca. 1930–80

Forthcoming Workshops and Conferences

Sport in Early Modern Culture. Conference organized by the German Historical Institute London and the DGG-Network ‘Body Techniques’, to be held at the GHIL, 17–19 Nov. 2011. Conveners: Angela Schattner (GHIL) and Rebekka von Mallinckrodt (Free University Berlin).

While the history of sport in the modern period has attracted a great deal of interest in recent years and new approaches have found their way into research, sport and physical exercise in the early modern period is still a rather neglected topic. Our aim is not to continue the well-known discussion of whether or not sport existed in pre-modern times. There were many physical activities beyond the courtly
exercises of fencing, riding, and dancing, ranging from rowing, wrestling, *jeu de paume*, soccer, and gymnastics to swimming, diving, pall mall, shooting, running, and ice skating. The early modern period had professional players as well as sports grounds, training as well as contests, referees as well as public audiences. And sometimes important political and economic issues were at stake. This conference aims to bring together specialists from diverse disciplines and many nations to view the practice of sport and physical exercise in its cultural context, taking into special consideration social, political, and economic influences.

*Ninth Workshop on Early Modern German History.* Workshop organized by the German Historical Institute London, to be held at the GHIL, 9 Dec. 2011. Conveners: Angela Schattner (GHIL) and David Lederer (National University of Ireland Maynooth).

The Workshop on Early Modern German History, first held in 2002, has now established itself as the principal forum for cross-disciplinary discussion of new research on early modern German-speaking Central Europe. Previous themes have included artistic and literary representations, medicine and musicology, as well as political, social, economic, and religious history. Contributions are also welcome from those wishing to range outside the period generally considered as ‘early modern’ and those engaged in comparative research on other parts of early modern Europe.

*Diverging Paths: Conservatism in Britain and West Germany from the 1960s to the 1980s.* Workshop to be held at the German Historical Institute London, 26–8 Jan. 2012. Convener: Martina Steber (GHIL).

Historians agree that the decades from the 1960s to the 1980s were marked by fundamental change which profoundly challenged Conservative worldviews and self-understandings all over the ‘West’. At the same time Conservatives were active players in influencing the direction taken by economic, social, political, and cultural change. In
the 1980s, both in Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany, Conservative-led governments dominated the decade politically. Whereas ‘Thatcherism’ shaped the country in Britain, in West Germany the post-war model of the social market economy continued to provide the rationale of CDU/CSU policies. So far, research has accentuated these diverging paths, emphasizing the impact of neoliberal thought in Britain. However, there is a surprising lack of broader historical and comparative studies, and now a new interest in Conservatism in this period is beginning to flourish in both countries. This workshop will bring together this new research and open up comparative perspectives, both to sharpen national specifics and to test the prevailing interpretation by focusing on entanglements, interactions, and similar patterns of development.


This workshop complements the workshop ‘Transcending Boundaries: Biographical Research in Colonial and Postcolonial African History’, which was held at the GHIL on 7–8 May 2010 and examined biographical research in non-European, southern societies with a focus on Africa. The planned workshop takes a comparative perspective and extends the discussion to other non-European, southern societies. It concentrates on historical agents in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East who, in various contexts (colonialism, post-colonialism, imperial power relations, global crises, and local conflicts), transcended boundaries (geographical, religious, cultural, and/or linguistic) and were forced to re-examine and re-define their life plans and objectives. The contributions will deal with the complex interplay between human action and experience on the one hand, and the crossing of spatial boundaries (‘translocality’) and historical events and processes on the other.
LIBRARY NEWS

Recent Acquisitions

This list contains a selection of recent publications in German and English, primarily on German history, acquired by the GHIL library in the past year.


Amos, Heike, Die Vertriebenenpolitik der SED 1949 bis 1990, Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, Sondernummer (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)

Arad, Yitzhak, The Holocaust in the Soviet Union (Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press, 2009)


Asal, Sonja and Stephan Schlak (eds.), Was war Bielefeld? Eine ideengeschichtliche Nachfrage (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2009)
Recent Acquisitions


Baumgartner, Ingrid, Paul-Gerhard Klumbies, and Franziska Sick (eds.), *Raumkonzepte: Disziplinäre Zugänge* (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2009)


Böhler, Jochen, *Der Überfall: Deutschlands Krieg gegen Polen* (Frankfurt am Main: Eichborn, 2009)

Bösch, Frank and Constantin Goschler (eds.), *Public History: Öffentliche Darstellungen des Nationalsozialismus jenseits der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2009)


Dartmann, Christoph, Günther Wassilowsky, and Thomas Weller (eds.), *Technik und Symbolik vormoderner Wahlverfahren, Historische Zeitschrift, NS Beiheft 52* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010)


Drossbach, Gisela (ed.), *Von der Ordnung zur Norm: Statuten in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2010)


Recent Acquisitions


Eisenberg, Christiane, *Englands Weg in die Marktgesellschaft*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 187 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009)


Frei, Norbert, *Flick: Der Konzern, die Familie, die Macht* (Munich: Blessing, 2009)
Library News


Geipel, Ines and Andreas Petersen, Black Box DDR: Unerzählte Leben unterm SED-Regime (Wiesbaden: MarixVerlag, 2009)


Gestrich, Andreas, Lutz Raphael, and Herbert Uerlings (eds.), Strangers and Poor People: Changing Patterns of Inclusion and Exclusion in Europe and the Mediterranean World from Classical Antiquity to the Present Day, Inklusion/Exklusion, 13 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2009)


Goldstein, Cora Sol, Capturing the German Eye: American Visual Propaganda in Occupied Germany (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009)


Grammbitter, Ulrike and Iris Lauterbach, Das Parteizentrum der NSDAP in München (Berlin: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2009)

Gregory, Stephan, Wissen und Geheimnis: Das Experiment des Illuminatenordens, Nexus, 83 (Frankfurt am Main: Stroemfeld, 2009)
Recent Acquisitions


Hardtwig, Wolfgang (ed.), *Die Aufklärung und ihre Weltwirkung, Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, Sonderheft 23 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010)


Heinsohn, Kirsten, *Konservative Parteien in Deutschland 1912 bis 1933: Demokratisierung und Partizipation in geschlechterhistorischer Perspektive*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 155 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2010)

Herf, Jeffrey, *Nazi Propaganda for the Arab World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009)


Library News


Horn, Sabine and Michael Sauer (eds.), Geschichte und Öffentlichkeit: Orte, Medien, Institutionen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009)


Hundt, Martin (ed.), Der Redaktionsbriefwechsel der Hallischen, Deutschen und Deutsch-Französischen Jahrbücher (1837–1844), 3 vols. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2010)

Janz, Oliver, Das symbolische Kapital der Trauer: Nation, Religion und Familie im italienischen Gefallenenkult des Ersten Weltkrieges, Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom, 120 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2009)


Johnson, Trevor, Magistrates, Madonnas and Miracles: The Counter Reformation in the Upper Palatinate (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)

Koop, Volker, Hitlers fünfte Kolonne: Die Auslands-Organisation der NSDAP (Berlin: be.bra-Verlag, 2009)


Kretzer, Anette, NS-Täterschaft und Geschlecht: Der erste britische Ravensbrück-Prozess 1946/47 in Hamburg (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2009)

Kurbjuweit, Dirk, Angela Merkel: Die Kanzlerin für alle? (Munich: Hansem, 2009)


Recent Acquisitions


Malycha, Andreas and Peter Jochen Winters, Die SED: Geschichte einer deutschen Partei (Munich: Beck, 2009)

Mawdsley, Evan, World War II: A New History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)


Meyer, Annette, Die Epoche der Aufklärung (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2010)


Nissen, Martin, Populäre Geschichtsschreibung: Historiker, Verleger und die deutsche Öffentlichkeit, 1848–1900, Beiträge zur Geschichtskultur, 34 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2009)

Overy, Richard James, The Morbid Age: Britain Between the Wars (London: Allen Lane, 2009)

Overy, Richard James, 1939 (London: Allen Lane, 2009)


Poppinga, Anneliese, Adenauers letzte Tage: Die Erinnerungen seiner engsten Mitarbeiterin (Stuttgart: Hohenheim Verlag, 2009)

Preuss, Hugo, Gesammelte Schriften, ii. Öffentliches Recht und Rechtsphilosophie im Kaiserreich, ed. Dian Schefold (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009)
Rau, Susanne and Birgit Studt (eds.), Geschichte schreiben: Ein Quellen- und Studienhandbuch zur Historiographie (ca. 1350–1750) (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2010)
Recker, Marie-Luise, Die Außenpolitik des Dritten Reiches, Enzyklopädie deutscher Geschichte, 8/2 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010)
Reimann, Aribert, Dieter Kunzelmann: Avantgardist, Protestler, Radiker, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 188 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009)


Schott, Clausdieter, *Kindesannahme – Adoption – Wahlkindschaft: Rechtsgeschichte und Rechtsgeschichten* (Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 2009)


Schütz, Erhard and Peter Uwe Hohendahl (eds.), *Solitäre und Netzwerker: Akteure des kulturpolitischen Konservatismus nach 1945 in den Westzonen Deutschlands* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2009)

Schulte, Jan Erik (ed.), *Die SS, Himmler und die Wewelsburg*, Schriftenreihe des Kreismuseums Wewelsburg, 7 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2009)


Seipp, Adam R., The Ordeal of Peace: Demobilization and the Urban Experience in Britain and Germany, 1917–1921 (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)

Sommer, Robert, Das KZ-Bordell: Sexuelle Zwangsarbeit in nationalsozialistischen Konzentrationslagern (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2009)

Stadelmann-Wenz, Elke, Widerständiges Verhalten und Herrschaftspraxis in der DDR: Vom Mauerbau bis zum Ende der Ulbricht-Ara (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2009)


Stichweh, Rudolf, Der Fremde: Studien zur Soziologie und Sozialgeschichte (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2010)

Stöver, Bernd, Zuflucht DDR: Spione und andere Übersiedler (Munich: Beck, 2009)

Strom, Jonathan, Hartmut Lehmann, and James van Horn Melton (eds.), Pietism in Germany and North America 1680–1820 (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)


Thomä, Dieter (ed.), Vaterlosigkeit: Geschichte und Gegenwart einer fixen Idee (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2010)


Ullrich, Sebastian, Der Weimar-Komplex: Das Scheitern der ersten deutschen Demokratie und die politische Kultur der frühen Bundesrepublik, 1945–1959, Hamburger Beiträge zur Sozial- und Zeitgeschichte, 45 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2009)
Recent Acquisitions


Wirsching, Andreas (ed.), *Das Jahr 1933: Die nationalsozialistische Machtübernahme und die deutsche Gesellschaft*, Dachauer Symposien zur Zeitgeschichte, 9 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2009)


Library News


PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Vol. 1: Wilhelm Lenz (ed.), Archivalische Quellen zur deutsch-britischen Geschichte seit 1500 in Großbritannien; Manuscript Sources for the History of Germany since 1500 in Great Britain (Boppard a. Rh.: Boldt, 1975)


Vol. 4: Paul Kluke and Peter Alter (eds.), Aspekte der deutsch-britischen Beziehungen im Laufe der Jahrhunderte; Aspects of Anglo-German Relations through the Centuries (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978)


Vol. 43: Knut Diekmann, Die nationalistische Bewegung in Wales (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998)


Vol. 50: Jörn Leonhard, Liberalismus: Zur historischen Semantik eines europäischen Deutungsmusters (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2001)


Vol. 57: Ulrike Lindner, Gesundheitspolitik in der Nachkriegszeit: Großbritannien und die Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Vergleich (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)


Alfred Havercamp and Hanna Vollrath (eds.), England and Germany in the High Middle Ages (Oxford, 1996)


Matthias Reiss (ed.), The Street as Stage: Protest Marches and Public Rallies since the Nineteenth Century (Oxford, 2007)


Willibald Steinmetz (ed.), Political Languages in the Age of Extremes (Oxford, 2011)

FURTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds.), The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany (London: Croom Helm, 1981)


Adolf M. Birke, Hans Booms, and Otto Merker (eds.), *Control Commission for Germany/British Element: Inventory: Die britische Militärregierung in Deutschland: Inventar, 11 vols* (Munich: Saur Verlag, 1993)
Günther Heydemann and Lothar Kettenacker (eds.), *Kirchen in der Diktatur* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)


**BRITISH ENVOYS TO GERMANY**


Markus Mässlang, Sabine Freitag, and Peter Wende (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, ii. 1830–1847, Camden Fifth Series, 21 (Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2002)


**HOUSE PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON**


Adolf M. Birke and Eva A. Mayring (eds.), *Britische Besatzung in Deutschland: Aktenerschließung und Forschungsfelder* (London, 1992)


Adolf M. Birke, *Britain’s Influence on the West German Constitution* (London, 1995)

Research on British History


Annual Lectures of the German Historical Institute London


1983 Wolfram Fischer, Germany in the World Economy during the Nineteenth Century (London, 1984)


1986 Owen Chadwick, Acton, Döllinger and History (London, 1987)


1990  Not available


2002  Not available


2010  Not available
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German Historical Institute London Bulletin Supplements


No. 2  Andreas Gestrich and Margrit Schulte Beerbühl (eds.),  Cosmopolitan Networks in Commerce and Society 1660–1914 (London, 2011)