

GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Bulletin



German Historical Institute London

Bulletin

Volume XLIV, No. 2

November 2022

CONTENTS

SPECIAL ISSUE

MEMORY CULTURES 2.0: FROM *OPFERKONKURRENZ* TO SOLIDARITY

Edited by Mirjam Sarah Brusius

Introduction

by Mirjam Sarah Brusius 3

‘Victimhood is a Tricky Terrain to Negotiate’

Michael Rothberg in conversation with Mirjam Sarah Brusius 21

From *Opferkonkurrenz* to Solidarity: A Round Table

*by Manuela Bauche, Patricia Piberger, Sébastien Tremblay,
and Hannah Tzuberi* 32

Beyond Victimhood: German Muslims and the Minority Question after the Holocaust

Sultan Doughan in conversation with Mirjam Sarah Brusius 86

Memory Cultures 2.0 and Museums

Jaś Elsner in conversation with Mirjam Sarah Brusius 99

CLASSICS REREAD

On the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of an Extraordinary Book:

Anthony Grafton, *The Footnote: A Curious History*

by Helmut Zedelmaier 112

BOOK REVIEWS

Stuart Airlie, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians, 751–888*

(Daniel Schumacher) 120

(cont.)

CONTENTS

Simon Karstens, <i>Gescheiterte Kolonien – Erträumte Imperien: Eine andere Geschichte der europäischen Expansion 1492–1615</i> (Annika Raapke)	126
Carolyn Schäfer, <i>'Authority' in Ordnung und Aufruhr: Der Autoritätsdiskurs während der Englischen Revolution und des Interregnums</i> (Sibylle Röth)	130
Daniel Menning, <i>Politik, Ökonomie und Aktienspekulation: 'South Sea Bubble und Co.' 1720</i> (Tilman Haug)	137
Michael Gnehm and Sonja Hildebrand (eds.), <i>Architectural History and Globalized Knowledge: Gottfried Semper in London</i> / Michael Gnehm, Sonja Hildebrand, and Dieter Weidmann (eds.), <i>Gottfried Semper: London Writings 1850–1855</i> (John R. Davis)	143
Steven Press, <i>Blood and Diamonds: Germany's Imperial Ambitions in Africa</i> (Tristan Oestermann)	153
Marc David Baer, <i>German, Jew, Muslim, Gay: The Life and Times of Hugo Marcus</i> (Razak Khan)	159
Theodor Lessing, <i>Jewish Self-Hate</i> (Peter Bergamin)	163

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Workshop on Medieval Germany <i>by Marcus Meer</i>	168
From Cambridge to Bielefeld – and Back? British and Continental Approaches to Intellectual History <i>by Maximilian Priebe</i>	172
Education and Urban Transformations: Marginalities and Intersections <i>by Yamini Agarwal and Debarati Bagchi</i>	178

NOTICEBOARD	184
-------------	-----

CLASSICS REREAD

ON THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF AN EXTRAORDINARY BOOK

HELMUT ZEDELMAIER

ANTHONY GRAFTON, *The Footnote: A Curious History* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1997), 256 pp. ISBN 978 0 674 30760 5 (paperback), £20.95

Footnotes are peculiar things. All scholars use them to demonstrate that the statements they make in their work are not arbitrary, but based on a careful consideration of data, sources, and research findings. Inserted in greater or smaller numbers at the bottom of the page or sometimes at the end of the piece, or in sociological and scientific work as ‘parenthetical references’ in the text, they are not particularly well-liked, however. Generally set in a smaller font size than the main text, footnotes are for many people a chore that they like to ‘crack lazy jokes’ about, but which they need to attend to nevertheless.¹ Stringent argument, explanations based on evidence, and good writing in the main text constitute the tour de force that allows authors to demonstrate their skills (at least in the humanities). This is where they can put on display their specific knowledge, capacity for innovation, and ability to express themselves—where they can prove their expertise. Footnotes, by contrast, are something owed to ‘the discipline’. In other words, while the main text demonstrates individuality, footnotes document a team effort. They call up data, sources consulted, and what has already been discovered about the

Trans. by Angela Davies (GHIL)

¹ See Georg Stanitzek, ‘Zur Lage der Fußnote’, *Merkur: Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäisches Denken*, 68/776 (Jan. 2014), 1–14, at 4.

subject. To put it differently once again, footnotes point to what is possible, what makes the text dance. This is what the modern epistemic regime expects. Its professional adepts are 'tuned in to an automatic questioning of the footnote apparatus . . . What does this person know? Have I been mentioned? Have I missed anything? Is there any evidence of theoretical imagination at work? What does this person permit themselves? What *can* they permit themselves? In short, how do they work?' And the passage continues: 'one can see almost at first glance whether it is fear and obedience, or freedom and generosity that are expressed in the use of footnotes.'²

This lovely quotation is from an essay by Georg Stanitzek, a German literary scholar who, without using any footnotes at all,³ precisely analyses the present state of the footnote. Stanitzek complains about the lack of academic reflection on the footnote, about which, he claims, 'there is little empirical research worth mentioning'.⁴ But, he says, there is one exception to this: Anthony Grafton, 'a giant of research on footnotes . . . from whose shoulders one can take a look around'.⁵ In 2014, when Stanitzek's musings on the state of the footnote were published, Grafton's book *The Footnote: A Curious History* was already almost twenty years old, as the first German edition had been published in 1995.⁶ The revised English edition of 1997 (slightly expanded by comparison with the German version), translated into French (1998), Portuguese (1998), Spanish (1998), Italian (2000), and Turkish (2012), is among the Princeton professor's most successful

² Ibid. 3–4.

³ But another essay by Georg Stanitzek which looks at the footnote in light of relations between the essay and academia around 1900, published two years later, is richly equipped with interesting footnotes about the footnote and its history: 'Geist und Essay um 1900: Typografische Beobachtungen', in Michael Ansel, Jürgen Egyptien, and Hans-Edwin Friedrich (eds.), *Der Essay als Universalgattung des Zeitalters: Diskurse, Themen und Positionen zwischen Jahrhundertwende und Nachkriegszeit* (Leiden, 2016), 319–37.

⁴ Stanitzek, 'Zur Lage der Fußnote', 2.

⁵ Ibid. 11.

⁶ Anthony Grafton, *Die tragischen Ursprünge der deutschen Fußnote*, trans. H. Jochen Bußmann (Berlin, 1995). One year earlier, the basics of the book had been published as an essay: Anthony Grafton, 'The Footnote from de Thou to Ranke', in id. and Suzanne Marchand (eds.), *Proof and Persuasion in History*, special issue of *History and Theory*, 33/4 (1994), 53–76.

books.⁷ At a little over 200 pages long, the slim volume was praised internationally in numerous reviews, and reached a wider readership than a specialist academic one alone.⁸ Among other things, the strong response it evoked is demonstrated by its own lasting career as a footnote. Why has it been so successful? What sort of story is told by *The Footnote: A Curious History*?

In his quest for the origins of the footnote, Grafton consulted many printed and unprinted historical sources. But it is only the combination of a solid basis in the sources with a sparkling narrative that makes the book into a *Curious History*. Grafton's writing is vivid, rich in metaphors, and sometimes also ironic. And by not allowing his story to progress in a straight line towards a goal, he undermines the usual path of historical reconstruction, preferring to tell his story in reverse, before ultimately going 'back to the future'.⁹ The book begins with a sort of epistemological phenomenology of historical footnotes. Starting with Leopold von Ranke, Grafton traces a path back to Edward Gibbon and Jacques-Auguste de Thou, and thence to collections of early modern antiquarian and ecclesiastical sources and their prototypes from antiquity. Arriving at Pierre Bayle, a surprising end point, the narrative goes forwards again in the direction of modernity ('The Cartesian Origins of the Modern Footnote'). The arc of the story is often broken by digressions – typical of essays – relating insightful anecdotes drawn from different cultures and periods of historiographical documentation. Grafton casts light on the historical role of annotations and evidence by discussing examples in illuminating detail, thus bringing the working methods and techniques of his protagonists to life, but also their passions, politics, strategies, and carelessness.

⁷ See the precise bibliographical data in C. Philipp E. Nothaft, 'Anthony Grafton: A Bibliography to 2015', in Ann Blair and Anja-Silvia Goeing (eds.), *For the Sake of Learning: Essays in Honor of Anthony Grafton*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 2016), i. pp. li–lxxvii, at li–lii.

⁸ Despite the general admiration, the longest review (as far as I know) was critical of Grafton's historical reconstruction of the footnote (in the German version): Martin Gierl, 'Gesicherte Polemik: Zur polemischen Natur geschichtswissenschaftlicher Wahrheit und zu Anthony Graftons *Die tragischen Ursprünge der deutschen Fußnote*', *Historische Anthropologie*, 4/2 (1996), 267–79.

⁹ Chapters 5 and 6 are headed: 'Back to the Future 1' and 'Back to the Future 2'. See Grafton, *The Footnote*, 122 and 148.

But in this work Grafton is interested less in the origins of footnotes or endnotes in the narrow formal (typographical) sense, than in how the bottom part of the page came to be primarily the visible expression—the footprint, so to speak—of what is known as critical historiography. Taking the footnote as a small but revealing object of observation, Grafton wants to understand how modern historical criticism came about and to identify how it was different from traditional historiography: ‘The appearance of footnotes—and such related devices as documentary and critical appendices—separates historical modernity from tradition.’¹⁰ On his way ‘back to the future’, Grafton demonstrates that the principle governing the modern historical footnote—that is, to make historiography transparent in terms of the sources and research on which it is based—had a protracted development in the early modern period. Critical history did not start with Ranke, who successfully dramatized himself as the founder of critical historiography without any existing model.¹¹ Grafton shows that modern historiography was composed of many layers of tradition, with the footnote serving as a sort of palimpsest for this. His exposure of earlier layers of historical criticism undermines the superiority with which modern historians from the nineteenth century onwards have programmatically set themselves apart from their premodern colleagues. As a student of the great Arnaldo Momigliano and a profound philologist himself, Grafton, author of the seminal *Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*,¹² widened a narrow, disciplinary perspective out into the history of historiography. In his search for the origins of historical criticism, he was able to include the whole spectrum of early modern European scholarship, not least in its interaction with the new (natural) sciences. What came out of this is a reconstruction of the ‘origins of modern history’,¹³ which is still one of the best studies that the history of historiography has produced.

Footnotes did not always convey a serious impression of academic criticism, and this is still true today. Numerous revealing anecdotes recounted by Grafton make this clear. And there has long been some

¹⁰ Ibid. 23–4.

¹¹ Ibid. 37, 56–7.

¹² Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1983–93).

¹³ Grafton, *The Footnote*, 149.

resistance to using critical notes, as Ranke confirms, calling footnotes 'distasteful things'.¹⁴ With the establishment of the footnote, whose 'high social, if not typographical, position' was legitimated by the marriage between 'history and philology, its parents',¹⁵ narrative in the main text could no longer unfold as freely and independently as it had in the traditional history-writing of antiquity, but had to be restrained. While the text on the top part of the page presents the past as a complete, finished image, the lower part indicates that it is, strictly speaking, accessible only in a fragmentary form. Its investigation is incomplete and it is soon likely to become outdated, when historical criticism discovers new sources or new research suggests that the narrative requires revision. In this way footnotes always document the incompleteness of narrated history, and constantly issue a certain democratic appeal for scholars to undertake more careful research themselves in order to confirm the impression given by the top of the page, or to revise it where necessary. Grafton approves of this, finding it enlightened, democratic, and social, and thus ends his book with praise of the footnote: 'Only the use of footnotes enables historians to make their texts not monologues but conversations, in which modern scholars, their predecessors, and their subjects all take part.'¹⁶

Michael Bernays, a German literary scholar and author of 'Zur Lehre von den Citaten und Noten',¹⁷ had a similar view at the end of the nineteenth century. Grafton, who owes much to this work by Bernays, praises it as a 'pioneering essay on the history of the footnote'.¹⁸ Georg Stanitzek, too, mentioned above as an admirer of Grafton's book, is not only a precise analyst but a great friend of the footnote, and complains in his essay about the lack of interest in, and indeed, disdain for it. Footnotes tend to be replaced by pictograms and information boxes in introductions to academic courses for German students today.¹⁹

¹⁴ Ibid. 64.

¹⁵ Ibid. 24.

¹⁶ Ibid. 234.

¹⁷ Michael Bernays, 'Zur Lehre von den Citaten und Noten' [1892] in id., *Schriften zur Kritik und Litteraturgeschichte*, 4 vols. (Berlin, 1895-9), vol. iv: *Zur Neueren und neuesten Litteraturgeschichte; Zum deutschen Drama und Theater; Zur neuesten Litteratur; Zur Lehre von den Citaten und Noten*, ed. Georg Witkowski (1899), 253-347.

¹⁸ Grafton, *The Footnote*, 4. On Bernays' footnote analysis, see Stanitzek, 'Geist und Essay um 1900'.

¹⁹ Stanitzek, 'Zur Lage der Fußnote', 2-3.

Despite the great response it evoked in its time, Grafton's book has hardly inspired any follow-up studies on the history of the footnote, apart from a few, mainly short exceptions.²⁰ Nor has similar work been done in other disciplines as far as I know. After all, annotations, whether as footnotes or in other formats, are not limited to history, the subject Grafton largely concentrates on. On the contrary, in all modern academic disciplines they are the essential instrument of a critical dialogue between those who write academic texts and those who read and critically evaluate them in light of the evidence they cite. But its historical method, which relies on 'technical practices' rather than on 'explicit professions',²¹ has made Grafton's book a model of its kind, and one which has further sharpened our view of the history of the footnote. Many historical studies undertaken since the publication of *The Footnote* confirm this. Like Grafton, instead of placing their trust in 'explicit professions', they analyse what is actually said in historical texts, and what they provide as evidence. But the practices of generating and securing knowledge are now attracting interest in wider fields. They have become the subject of investigation internationally in the history of knowledge and science, disciplines in which Grafton himself continues to work intensively.²² In a footnote in *The Footnote*, Grafton points to the lack of a 'history of note-taking',²³ a topic that has been increasingly researched in recent years,²⁴ along with practices such as reading, collecting, information-gathering, compiling, and

²⁰ Robert J. Connors, 'The Rhetoric of Citation Systems, Part I: The Development of Annotation Structures from the Renaissance to 1900', *Rhetoric Review*, 17/1 (1998), 6–48; and id., 'The Rhetoric of Citation Systems, Part II: Competing Epistemic Values in Citation', *Rhetoric Review*, 17/2 (1999), 219–45 deserve special mention.

²¹ Grafton, *The Footnote*, 26.

²² Most recently, Anthony Grafton, *Inky Fingers: The Making of Books in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 2020).

²³ Grafton, *The Footnote*, 46, n. 19.

²⁴ I shall mention only a few publications here: Élisabeth Décultot (ed.), *Lire, copier, écrire: Les bibliothèques manuscrites et leurs usages au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 2003); Ann Blair and Richard Yeo (eds.), *Note-Taking in Early Modern Europe*, special issue of *Intellectual History Review*, 20/3 (2010); Richard Yeo, *Notebooks, English Virtuosi, and Early Modern Science* (Chicago, 2014); Alberto Cevolini (ed.), *Forgetting Machines: Knowledge Management Evolution in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, 2016); Elisabeth Décultot, Fabian Krämer, and Helmut Zedelmaier

the instruments, media, and institutions of processing and storing information. A small selection of recent work in relation to the early modern period testifies to the growing historical interest in the ‘technical practices’ with which Grafton contrasts the ‘explicit professions’ of Leopold von Ranke and his successors in *The Footnote*. It can be found – how could it be otherwise – in the final footnote of this small birthday tribute to a great book which was published twenty-five years ago.²⁵

(eds.), *Towards a History of Excerpting in Modernity*, special issue of *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte / History of Science and Humanities*, 43/2 (2020).

²⁵ Arndt Brendecke, Susanne Friedrich, and Markus Friedrich (eds.), *Information in der Frühen Neuzeit: Status, Bestände, Strategien* (Berlin, 2008); Ann M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age* (New Haven, 2010); Martin Mulsow, *Prekäres Wissen: Eine andere Ideengeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit* (Berlin, 2012); Fabian Krämer, *Ein Zentaur in London: Lektüre und Beobachtung in der frühneuzeitlichen Naturforschung* (Affalterbach, 2014); Françoise Waquet, *L'ordre matériel du savoir: Comment les savants travaillent, XVIe–XXIe siècles* (Paris, 2015); Anthony Grafton and Glenn W. Most (eds.), *Canonical Texts and Scholarly Practices: A Global Comparative Approach* (Cambridge, 2016); Annette Caroline Cremer and Martin Mulsow (eds.), *Objekte als Quellen der historischen Kulturwissenschaften: Stand und Perspektiven der Forschung* (Cologne, 2017); Markus Friedrich, *The Birth of the Archive: A History of Knowledge*, trans. John Noël Dillon (Ann Arbor, 2018); Randolph C. Head, *Making Archives in Early Modern Europe: Proof, Information, and Political Record-Keeping, 1400–1700* (Cambridge, 2019); Markus Friedrich and Jacob Schilling (eds.), *Praktiken frühneuzeitlicher Historiographie* (Berlin, 2019); Friedrich Beiderbeck and Claire Gantet (eds.), *Wissenskulturen in der Leibniz-Zeit: Konzepte – Praktiken – Vermittlung* (Berlin, 2021); Ann Blair, Paul Duguid, Anja-Silvia Goeing, and Anthony Grafton (eds.), *Information: A Historical Companion* (Princeton, 2021).

HELMUT ZEDELMAIER is a Professor of History at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich. He has worked extensively on the history of knowledge and learned practices from the early modern period to the nineteenth century. Among his many publications are *Der Anfang der Geschichte: Studien zur Ursprungsdebatte im 18. Jahrhundert* (2003), *Werkstätten des Wissens zwischen Renaissance und Aufklärung* (2015), and most recently, as editor (with Elisabeth Décultot and Fabian Krämer), *Towards a History of Excerpting in Modernity*, special issue of *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte / History of Science and Humanities*, 43/2 (2020).

BOOK REVIEWS

STUART AIRLIE, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians, 751–888* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021), xix + 435 pp. ISBN 978 1 788 31744 3 (hardback), £76.50. ISBN 978 1 350 18900 3 (paperback), £26.09

How did the Franks know that they were living in the Carolingian realm? By analogy with Hopkins's work on the Roman Empire,¹ Airlie sums up the main concerns of his recent study as follows (p. 15): how did the family rhythm of the royal household shape the political culture of the Frankish realm? How was the idea of the specialness of the Carolingians created, communicated, and maintained? What ranks and expectations developed within the royal family over the course of about 150 years when Francia was ruled only by Carolingian kings? These basic questions guide Airlie's analysis of the 'many-headed monster' (p. ix), as the Carolingian family appears to modern researchers, over 318 pages of text. The presentation throughout is both accessible and sophisticated. The book comprises nine chapters, each with three to seven sections, whose detailed contents can only be broadly outlined here.

After 'Weighing the legacy of the Carolingians' (pp. 1–4), the author introduces the methodological background he draws on when researching 'The illusion of natural authority' (pp. 4–9). Adapting Antonio Gramsci, Airlie considers Carolingian royalty as orthodoxy—a system of practices and norms which fed the idea of specialness over space and time. Pierre Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* takes this exclusive and innate Carolingian royal distinctiveness further. Finally, based on the work of Michel Foucault, 'power' is understood as a fluid social attribute of subjects, groups, or societies—something that is not only repressive, but also discursive, evolving, and productive. The contents of the methodological toolbox

¹ Keith Hopkins, *Conquerors and Slaves* (Cambridge, 1978), 197.

are demonstrated when discussing 'Frankish royalty as inheritance' (pp. 9–13), 'Carolingian specialness' (pp. 13–18), how it is portrayed in the sources (pp. 18–23), and a case study of the reception of the death of 2-year-old Louis, grandson of Louis the German, in 879 (pp. 23–5).

The following chapters present the history of the Carolingian family chronologically and in terms of the different generations of kings – that is, Pippin III (ch. 2), Charlemagne (ch. 3), Louis the Pious (ch. 5), the various royal lines after the 843 Treaty of Verdun (ch. 6), and the loss of uniqueness after 888, with a few glances forward into the post-Carolingian world (ch. 9). However, chapters on the sons (ch. 4), the women and daughters of the royal family (ch. 8), and the imaginary of Carolingian power (ch. 7) open this structure out by surveying the whole Carolingian era.

Yet the chapters on the reigns of specific kings are not regicentric. When Airlie describes the 'Building [of] Carolingian royalty 751–68' under Pippin (pp. 27–52), the sources are already centre stage, as Airlie observes how Pippin's family – his wife, sons, and daughters – were involved in representing the recently gained kingship. The benefits of taking a broader, family-inclusive perspective on events are also evident when it comes to Airlie's reflections on why Pippin sought the throne. Airlie explains that he embarked on the venture in a sticky situation between the claims of his nephews and his half-brother Grifo. Pippin eventually established a new balance of power with the lay and clerical aristocracy. Former Merovingian centres such as Saint-Denis were integrated into his system of kingship, giving Pippinid/Carolingian foundations such as Prüm a new royal quality. Airlie further interprets the rituals involved in these efforts, their transmission, and monastic remembrance (*memoria*) as links between the past, present, and future of Carolingian rulership.

The account of Charlemagne (pp. 53–92) likewise focuses on how Carolingian royalty was shaped not only through the exercise of its power, but also by the limits to its authority. On the one hand, the co-operation between the aristocracy and the king (as senior partner) is highlighted, while on the other, the competition and conflicts within the family are emphasized. Many examples show how these two major dynamics were intertwined, and in addition to well-known events, special attention is paid to lesser-known individuals. To list

but a few, Airlie considers the role of Pippin's widow Bertrada in the carefully orchestrated succession of 767; the Hardrad conspiracy of 785–6; the Carolingian legitimacy paradox of Pippin the Hunchback, who was born royal but who was later stripped of his royalty; Pippin of Italy (died 810); and the status of Charlemagne's daughters on the eve of his reign. Airlie thus integrates the research of recent decades to produce a broad picture when explaining situational reactions, instabilities, and special occasions as well as mid-term trends and long-term developments, always taking into account the views of the elite, the royal family, and the ruler. He concludes that the figure of Charlemagne was enlarged by a projection of his aura throughout the realm, and that he 'cast a much longer shadow than any of his predecessors and most of his successors' (p. 56).

While medieval research in general focuses mainly on relations between the king and his heir(s), the chapter on 'Child labour 751–88' (pp. 93–120) deals with the biological life cycle and the socio-cultural role of 'Born rulers' (pp. 93–102). (The princesses are discussed in chapter eight.) Airlie highlights the early participation of the heirs presumptive in representing the power and distinctiveness of the royal family—for example, by their given names, including in the case of the remembrance of children who had died young (pp. 102–9). The childhood of the princes is further illuminated as a period of networking with current political actors, who were their godfathers or mentors, and with future ones, by learning and playing with the offspring of the Frankish elite.

It is noteworthy that the fifth chapter, entitled 'Louis the Pious and the paranoid style in politics' is the longest in the book (pp. 121–72). I will just make two further points here. First, Airlie's discussion of Bernard of Italy's political vulnerability as the orphaned son of a king who was close to his grandfather Charlemagne, and later as king in distant Italy, is outlined in chapters three to five. For the reader it is an added pleasure that the main questions reappear as leitmotifs throughout the argument, and that Airlie also develops and interlinks the examples in a way that makes them easy to understand and encourages the reader to compare them. Second, he continues to carefully present the results of recent research in reassessing the historical image of Louis the Pious based on events up to the Treaty

of Verdun of 843. Apart from processes of differentiation within the royal family, the chapter also evaluates the evolution of family norms and their political functionalization.

Chapter six casts a dynastic glance at the post-843 kingdoms as 'Lines of succession and lines of failure 843-79' (pp. 173-216). At this point, the 'Carolingian political-familial geography' was 'broader and deeper than rule by brothers' (p. 182). 'Carolingian royalty was socially constructed in that the political elite had to recognize a king, but only Carolingians could be so recognized and their status was inborn, in social terms, and thus an integral and necessary part of their royalty along with the religious aura' (p. 183). This dominant position is illustrated by a horizontal view of 'Rule by brothers' (pp. 179-84) and a vertical view of the kingdoms under 'Rule by fathers' (pp. 184-7). In addition to the lesser-known Pippin II of Aquitaine, the case of Charles the Bald and his 'Radical options' in family politics are put under the spotlight: 'sending some of his legitimate sons . . . into monasteries, deploying fertility magic to re-activate his wife's exhausted body, building an artificial Carolingian (Boso), commissioning counsellors to advise him on disinheriting a son, Charles was the Dr Frankenstein of ninth-century politics' (p. 205).

In my opinion, chapters three, seven, and eight form the heart of the study, while the others provide a deeper and more detailed evaluation of the events and sources. However, the analyses of case studies and long-term developments are well balanced in the argument. For example, the whole book examines how the idea of exclusive Carolingian royalty was disseminated by different carriers of memory. In chapter seven these observations are brought together (pp. 217-42): the comparison of sources from the time of Charlemagne to the tenth century makes genealogies appear dynamic, customized, and goal-oriented (pp. 217-23). Nor were the notions of kinship and the legitimacy of offspring predefined (pp. 224-33), so that succession and pecking orders remained fluid. Even without a claim to the throne, closer or more distant members of the Carolingian family could radiate a special identity or political potential. Eventually, the realm was covered by a royal presence in the form of places of memory and power, or constant prayers for the king, his heirs, and predecessors (pp. 233-42).

The importance of the Carolingian women in this dynastic framework is the focus of the eighth chapter (pp. 243–72). Since it is both impossible and undesirable to summarize all of Airlie's observations here, suffice it to say that he questions the existence of marriage patterns or strategies, but notes some general developments without omitting the remarkable exceptions to these trends. Princes' marriages were predominantly arranged and dictated as political decisions by their fathers, who usually took the state of the succession into consideration. By contrast, the mainly aristocratic women who became queens were irreversibly absorbed into the Carolingian familial and royal identity. Royal daughters had political value, too, and therefore tended to be controlled strictly. Their key role in maintaining Carolingian authority by networking and memory is especially visible in monasteries (pp. 255–72).

The eighth chapter thus generates the background for the ninth and final one: 'The loss of uniqueness: 888 and all that' (pp. 273–318). The crisis is analysed chronologically from 'The incredible shrinking dynasty?' in the 870s (pp. 273–8) to the reign of Charles the Fat and his deposition and death (887–8, pp. 279–91), which finally leads to '888 and the breaking of the dynastic spell' (pp. 292–310). It is tempting to see the short 'Ending' (pp. 310–18) as an account of the slow fading of the Carolingian legacy. Increased dynastic mortality put stress on the established power mechanisms, a development interestingly discussed by historiographers at the time. It was noticed by aristocrats as well, who took their chances, but were forced to act by the rapidly shifting but nonetheless Carolingian-framed political landscape.

This review has attempted to indicate the huge effort which has gone into this monograph. Airlie's key achievement is to structure the presentation comprehensibly while also providing a coherent and well-grounded perspective. He shows how the Carolingians became special as the royal family through processes of familial and political differentiation. Political culture constantly developed between rulers and aristocrats, kings, wives/queens, heirs, and their siblings, while Carolingian dominance was established as a fixed yet dynamic framework. People and phenomena (and chapters) are always linked by spatial and temporal dimensions, for example, when the memory of Carolingians as former kings, donors, abbots/abbesses, or pupils

lived on and was concentrated in different places. Taking this holistic view, *Making and Unmaking the Carolingians* is a new standard work which assembles the international research into a full panoply. It thus demonstrates how the history of dynasties or rulers can be captured with a modern cultural-historical approach. Like Theodor Adorno, who quipped that it is 'the task of art . . . to bring chaos into order',² Airlie reveals existing questions, adds new ones, and unpicks some oversimplifications – in discussing appropriate meanings for the terms 'dynasty' and 'family' in the early Middle Ages, for example – without losing the illustrative and entertaining qualities of his accessible language. The book ends by presenting 'the silence around Charles's tomb in Maastricht' – Duke Charles of Lower Lorraine, the last agnatic Carolingian (died 991) – as 'the end of an old song' (p. 318). But as long as studies like Airlie's are written, the echo of this song will continue to enchant modern readers.

² See Theodor W. Adorno, *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life*, trans. E. F. N. Jephcott (London, 2005; 1st pub. in German, 1951), 222.

DANIEL SCHUMACHER is a research assistant in the Department of Medieval History at the University of Freiburg. He is working on his Ph.D. dissertation, provisionally entitled 'Von Markgrafen, Herzögen und "Kleinkönigen": Eine *pragmatische* Forschungsgeschichte zur ausgehenden Karolingerzeit (880er–930er Jahre)'.

SIMON KARSTENS, *Gescheiterte Kolonien – Erträumte Imperien: Eine andere Geschichte der europäischen Expansion 1492–1615* (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2021), 619 pp. ISBN 978 3 205 21207 2. €55.00

Simon Karstens has created an elephant. His *Gescheiterte Kolonien – Erträumte Imperien* is a large-format, 600-page long habilitation thesis and, in many respects, an unwieldy, cumbersome creation. It is even bound in a sturdy grey cover. Yet it is also enormously pleasing, in the improbable manner of elephants, and worthy of consideration as an important part of the research landscape.

Karstens's book is a monumental study of European colonial projects—mostly English and French—in the Americas between 1492 and 1615, which were for various reasons considered to be failures by contemporaries. It looks at the countless ways in which the notion of 'failure' was discursively produced and utilized in the creation of European colonial knowledge, as well as in the establishment of European polities as potential or putative colonial powers. The existing historiography here is often contradictory: whether a project is seen as a success or a failure depends largely on the historian's point of view and choice of material. Karstens chooses to tackle the subject and its many conflicting analyses comprehensively, taking a fresh perspective by going back to the historical sources—that is, the varied and divergent reports, analyses, justifications, and narratives written by European contemporaries, sometimes to educate or entertain a broader public or to please a monarch, sometimes to convince potential investors to pour money into new colonial ventures. The aim of this re-examination, as he puts it, is 'to analyse the source basis of these contradictory conclusions' (p. 15) in order to trace how and why colonial projects came to be seen as failures both by early modern writers and the historians who studied their texts.

The book's structure is pleasingly simple. The introduction (part one) is followed by three large parts each divided into a small number of subsections. Part two starts with a detailed overview of colonial projects during the early period of transatlantic expansion. Karstens places the well-known narratives of Spanish and Portuguese colonial successes in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries into perspective, providing a more tempered and mixed picture of success and failure in

various Atlantic spaces and social contexts. He then introduces French and English efforts in the same spaces at the same time, showing the invariable entanglements and explaining the historical actors' varied knowledge of the Americas and their peoples, and how this knowledge was intertwined with accounts of failure and the preparation of new projects.

The core of the book consists of two large analytical sections. The first (part three) deals with failed projects and how they were portrayed between 1530 and 1615. This part is an extremely thorough history of early French and English attempts at colonization, thoughtfully set against indigenous perspectives to the extent that these were available to the author, and against existing historiographical interpretations of the events. The second analytical section (part four) addresses the issue of how failure was talked about (or not, as the case may be) in contemporary texts. It critically examines spaces of failure—such as the 'Atlantic', the 'New World', or the 'colony'—and interpretations and arguments addressing failure, finally tying the two together. Here, Karstens's text is highly analytical and the book is at its most interesting in terms of its own aims—namely, to investigate narratives of failure and the ways in which they became meaningful and powerful.

The metaphor of 'weaving' may be sadly overused in many texts, but in the case of this book, it is an adequate description of its method and narrative style. Going back and forth between Europe and the Americas, Karstens is constantly pulling in and interlinking threads relating to different peoples and their various interests and knowledge, as well as a multitude of places and spaces, processes, actions, and reactions. Through the lens of failure and its discursive production, Karstens unfolds an exhaustive, multifaceted history of French and English attempts to colonize and exploit, or at least to profitably trade with, various regions and indigenous peoples in the Americas. It is interwoven not only with the multitude of European contexts which these projects sprang from or referred to, such as political developments, cultural movements, lines of religious conflict, and so on, but also (as far as possible, given the source base and perspective of the study) with various indigenous interests and strategies not just to deter and deflect European intrusion, but also

to exploit it—for example, in a variety of internal conflicts. Karstens constantly attempts to highlight the absence of such voices from European narratives, and to reconstruct the indigenous perspectives left out or distorted by European writers who, in some cases, had themselves been colonizers.

This constant weaving together of so many strands, aspects, elements, and facets creates a narrative which is, at times, slightly overpowering, but also remarkably vivid. It is a huge, vibrant structure constantly in motion, composed of countless activities, people, and spaces; of power and manipulation and interests and money; of sea and ships and land and fur; of war and peace; of journeys made and stories told. It is knowledgeable, instructive, highly useful, and often simply fascinating. It is also a good read—Karstens has a talent for selecting anecdotes, including, for example, James I's intense desire to have a 'flying squirrel' from the Americas (p. 362). Parts of the introduction cannot conceal that the book is, indeed, a habilitation thesis as they are weighed down by methodological and theoretical considerations which, while necessary, make the text rather ponderous and cumbersome. However, a habilitation thesis has to satisfy the demands and standards of the academic field as well as the author's own, and all in all, Karstens has written a highly engaging book that is easy to like. Some parts of it, especially the huge, detailed part three, seem like the kind of grand narrative which one might expect to find in the work of a much older historian. *Gescheiterte Kolonien – Erträumte Imperien* is an excellent addition to the canon of European colonial historiography, and I hope it will be accepted into the fold.

ANNIKA RAAPKE is a DFG Walter Benjamin Postdoc in Early Modern History at the University of Göttingen. She specializes in the history of the French Caribbean colonies, and is currently studying the small-scale trade in *pacotilles* and the role played in it by Women of Colour. Her most recent publications include 'Well, that escalated slowly: Prekäre Balancen, Konflikt und Eskalation in Briefbeziehungen zwischen Frankreich und den Karibikkolonien, 1778–1793', *Historische Anthropologie*, 29/2 (2021), 189–207 and 'Frauen sind überall Frauen: Versuch einer alternativen Antwort auf eine 226 Jahre alte Frage', in Muriel González Athenas and Falko Schnicke (eds.), *Popularisierungen von Geschlechterwissen seit der Vormoderne: Konzepte und Analysen* (2020), 93–120.

CAROLIN SCHÄFER, *'Authority' in Ordnung und Aufruhr: Der Autoritätsdiskurs während der Englischen Revolution und des Interregnums, Ancien Régime, Aufklärung und Revolution*, 47 (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2021), ix + 398 pp. ISBN 978 3 110 65900 9. £72.50

The basic premise of Carolin Schäfer's Ph.D. thesis, completed at the Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, is that 'authority' was a core concept in the English conflict of the 1640s and 1650s, and one that researchers have hitherto neglected. Connecting and building upon the methodological approaches of the Cambridge School and of German conceptual history (*Begriffsgeschichte*), she seeks to understand the contemporary discourse of authority by examining not just the meanings attached to the concept, but also its strategic use in specific discursive situations. The focus of her study is Thomas Hobbes, who is often categorized as a theorist of power. Schäfer, however, aims to show that in Hobbes's theory of the state, it is authority, not power, that provides 'the basic template' on which the 'entire political and religious order' is built (p. 9). In line with the approach of the Cambridge School, Hobbes is thus situated in his contemporary discursive context. From this perspective, Schäfer suggests, investigating authority promises to contribute not only to a more accurate political categorization of Hobbes, but also to the study of English republicanism – a hotly debated topic among researchers.

Hobbes's role as the focal point of the book is reflected in its structure. Instead of arranging her material chronologically, Schäfer begins the analytical part of her study in chapter three with a discussion of Hobbes's main work: *Leviathan*, published in 1651. She analyses the book for its use of the concept of 'authority' and separates it from classical tradition, arguing first that Hobbes understands authority as something that emanates from an office and therefore as a legal construct – one that comes closer to the Latin *potestas* than to *auctoritas*. In this form, it applies to the sovereign, as well as to lower secular and clerical officials. This makes it a delegated competence whose source lies outside the individual on whom it is bestowed. In the case of the sovereign, secular authority comes from the individuals who

Trans. by Jozef van der Voort (GHIL)

collectively comprise the state, and spiritual authority comes from God; with lower officials, authority is derived from the sovereign. However, Schäfer argues, there is a difference between the two forms: the sovereign's authority is limitless and irrevocable, while that of lower officials is conditional and can be withdrawn at any time.

Second, Schäfer suggests that Hobbes uses authority in the sense of reputation, in line with the classical notion of *auctoritas*. This meaning applies to scholars and especially to advisors, and in this context it refers to the recognition of personal qualities rather than to delegated competences. These qualities give rise not to formal rights, but merely to greater chances of exerting influence. Third, she argues, Hobbes writes of patriarchal authority – another kind of formal, legal authority derived from status, not personality. This authority is not delegated by the sovereign, but exists by virtue of nature and customary law. Yet even though the sovereign is not its source, he or she can still restrict or remove it at any time. In any case, Schäfer stresses, Hobbes makes a distinction between authority and power, with the former denoting the legitimacy of the hierarchical order, while the latter simply refers to de facto dominance.

Chapter four then supplies the prehistory to Hobbes's chief work. After reconstructing a kind of status quo ante with the help of Tudor and early Stuart royal proclamations, Schäfer traces the dispute over authority into the reign of Charles I and up to the year in which *Leviathan* was first published. The initial understanding of authority in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries matches Hobbes's concept of it as derived from a particular office, which he applied primarily to the person of the monarch. Under Charles I, however, this understanding grew unstable – though it was not until 1642 that the confrontation between king and Parliament became a dispute over authority. Even after the war, Schäfer tells us, MPs found it difficult to detach the concept from its association with the monarch and apply it to Parliament instead. In the early days of the Commonwealth, she argues, its defenders were unable to appeal to authority and therefore increasingly took refuge in their de facto power instead. During the engagement controversy in particular, the republicans revealed themselves to be apologists for the sheer necessity of having rulers and subjects.

On this basis, chapter five turns to the political categorization of Thomas Hobbes. Schäfer notes that he was in principle a supporter of monarchy and sympathetic towards traditional monarchy. The fact that *Leviathan* could also be used to justify the republic did nothing to change this position, since in Hobbes's view, securing peace and order took precedence over the form of government. And in 1651, the best way to secure peace was to recognize the new rulers in power. Instead of marking a change in its author's political allegiance, therefore, Schäfer argues that *Leviathan* is a concession to reality. She takes a similar view of Hobbes's exposition of the right of conquest, asserting that it represents a one-off argument produced in response to the historical context, but that the establishment of authority by consensus remains the general rule for Hobbes. Furthermore, even in cases of conquest, it is necessary for the ruler's authority to be recognized by his or her subjects. In this way, Schäfer argues, Hobbes incorporates the people as the foundation of his political model while still legitimizing absolute sovereignty.

In an attempt to gauge the impact of Hobbes's ideas, the sixth and final chapter looks at how the concept of authority was used until the end of the Interregnum. In particular, Schäfer detects a clear influence on the republican Marchamont Nedham, who in 1650 had justified the new regime simply by pointing to its superiority in terms of power, but by 1656 showed a new awareness of the need to legitimize its supremacy. She argues that this shift is reflected in Nedham's use of the concept of 'authority', which he defines similarly to Hobbes even while making antithetical arguments to those set out in *Leviathan*. On the whole, however, Schäfer suggests that Hobbes's understanding of authority did not set a new standard. His contribution was not so much to redefine the concept as to refine it, drawing on the traditional, Royalist interpretation of the word. The republican James Harrington, by contrast, took an innovative approach by developing a new understanding of authority based on classical *auctoritas* that stood in clear opposition to Hobbes's definition.

Schäfer's conclusion summarizes what she sees as the key points of her complex study. This provides a general overview of her argument—something that the reader occasionally risks losing sight of due to the non-chronological structure of the book—and is also forcefully

argued. However, despite this clarity, not all of her conclusions are convincing, and in certain places the methodology behind them seems questionable. Three examples will allow me to illustrate this.

First, Schäfer assumes that the meaning of authority was fairly clear in the early seventeenth century (see p. 21). Every study needs a starting point, which must perforce be a constructed one. Yet the decision to limit the scope here to royal proclamations seems questionable to me, or at least in need of explanation, as it means that the conceptual foundation of Schäfer's study reflects the position of only one of the parties to the conflict. The book thus lacks a complementary examination of the Parliamentary side and its own definition of authority; nor is there any analysis of law and custom as normative reference points to which both sides were bound. As a result, Schäfer's account only leaves room for a single version of royal authority that seems quietly analogous to the Bodinian definition of sovereignty as a binary quality that is either entirely present or entirely absent. In my view, however, the early Stuart conflicts between king and Parliament were not as clearly organized as Schäfer suggests. They involved concepts of different authorities as well as of shared or graduated authority, and if the term cannot adequately capture this complexity, it might not be a useful analytical tool. But in fact the phrase 'by authority of Parliament' was used even before 1642, the year Schäfer stresses as a turning point. The notion that this authority was always derived from the king, as Schäfer argues with reference to the Petition of Right (p. 207), is not borne out by the text of the Petition; nor does it seem likely in view of the contemporary debate over the ancient constitution and the origins of Parliament in an oft-conjured 'time out of memory'.

Second, when setting out the aims of her study, Schäfer suggests that her examination of authority will also help to more accurately define English republicanism. Her most incisive contribution on this front is the argument that in the early days of the Commonwealth, popular consent was a much stronger presence in Royalist and absolutist texts than in those authored by republicans – namely, Nedham and Anthony Ascham. She therefore concludes that the 'link between a monarchy and the oppression of the people, and that between a republic and the freedom or participation of the people . . . [must] be reconsidered in light of these examples' (p. 326). This extrapolation

from the specific to the general requires further evidence to support it, in my view. To start with, a definition of republicanism—a term that is highly contested by scholars, as Schäfer herself points out—is needed, which could then be used to categorize the different authors. It is not obvious that Ascham lends himself here as an example.

An explanation of Schäfer's choice of sources is also needed. Are they relevant to English republicanism, the use of authority, or the contemporary political debate? This in turn leads to a need for closer consideration of the intention behind given statements within their specific discursive context. It is true that during the engagement controversy some (though by no means all) authors argued that the existing government—which happened to be a republican one—should be accepted out of sheer necessity, rather than for the sake of republican values. However, this can also be read as a concession to readers in a specific context in which the primary aim was not to win over opponents of republicanism, but to achieve the pragmatic goal of restoring stability to the Commonwealth. It is striking that Schäfer does not consider this possibility, given that in her reading of Hobbes she frequently describes *Leviathan* as a concession to reality. At times, therefore, one has the impression that double standards are being applied. On the one hand, she considers Hobbes's idea of the right of conquest to be an exceptional product of the historical situation (though in my opinion he places authority by conquest on an equal footing with the notion of authority through consensus). On the other, although Schäfer mentions Nedham's assertion that the establishment of a government with the consent of the people or its representatives is a dictate of reason, but not one that applies in times of war, she does not consider it in detail. In fact, she overlooks it altogether when she claims that Nedham rejects the idea of a social contract in principle and instead advocates 'sovereign authority in the form of military supremacy' (p. 324). Hobbes, by contrast, is repeatedly depicted as arguing for a form of popular sovereignty (see in particular p. 372)—but elsewhere in the text this claim is explicitly rejected (p. 330). In short, Schäfer's assertion that Hobbes ascribed 'a significantly higher political value' to the people than Nedham (p. 326), even though in Hobbes's system the people are subordinate to an all-powerful sovereign, is based on a series of doubtful interpretations.

Third and finally, my criticisms of Schäfer's comparative categorization of Hobbes and Nedham are ultimately bound up with my doubts regarding her core argument that authority is central to Hobbes's theory of the state and clearly distinguished from power. In Schäfer's account, although power carried greater weight in the legal vacuum that was the state of nature, it was supplanted by the legitimate form of authority once the state had been founded (p. 45). The design of Schäfer's study forces us to assume that power and authority are terms used by contemporary authors, and not analytical categories that she applies to her sources. If we take this as a given, however, there are two very simple points that speak against the subordination of power to authority. The first of these is simply the frequency with which the two words are used. It is not the case that 'power' appears less frequently in *Leviathan* after chapter fourteen, which describes the sealing of the social contract and thus the end of the state of nature, and that 'authority' appears more often in its stead thereafter. Rather, 'power' remains a key term throughout the entire treatise, and appears substantially more often than 'authority'. Second, the very title of the book suggests that power plays a central role: *Leviathan: Or The Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil*.

These observations, based on the surface of the text, are also borne out by its content: in chapter thirteen, Hobbes asserts the necessity of establishing a 'common Power'—not authority—in order to overcome the state of nature.¹ In the key fourteenth chapter—in which the word 'authority' does not appear once—he emphasizes that the social contract can only be effective when guaranteed by power. For as chapter seventeen makes clear: 'Covenants, without the Sword, are but Words, and of no strength to secure a man at all.'² Similarly, in chapter twenty-nine, we learn that the duty of obedience comes to an end when sovereigns no longer have the power to protect their subjects. This is by no means to deny that authority takes centre stage in other chapters; however, I do not see any pattern across the book as a whole that supports the argument of a clear distinction between power and authority. In fact, the two terms are often used interchangeably as synonyms, with the adjectives 'sovereign', 'legislative', and 'supreme' applied by turns to

¹ Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan: Or the Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil* (London, 1965), 98.

² Ibid. 128.

both words. There may nonetheless be complex and subtle differences between the two concepts, but Schäfer would have needed to demonstrate this in order for her readings to be plausible. Yet even if it were the case that 'legislative power' always referred to the force of the law, while 'legislative authority' denoted the legitimacy of the law-giver, the overall argument that power clearly plays a less important role than authority in the functioning of the state would remain unconvincing.

Leaving aside these criticisms, however, Schäfer's Ph.D. thesis has resulted in a book that tackles an important topic and draws on an impressive breadth of source material. She is also unafraid to expand her findings into incisive arguments that encourage readers to go back to the original text of *Leviathan* in order to re-examine their habitual interpretations. Although not every reader will be willing to buy into all of Schäfer's interpretations, her study therefore promises to inspire lively debate.

SIBYLLE RÖTH teaches early modern history at the University of Konstanz. Her research focuses on the history of ideas in early modern Europe. Her most recent publication is *Grenzen der Gleichheit: Forderungen nach Gleichheit und die Legitimation von Ungleichheit in Zeitschriften der deutschen Spätaufklärung* (2022). She is currently working on a new project on the challenges of confessional plurality for societies in England and France during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

DANIEL MENNING, *Politik, Ökonomie und Aktienspekulation: 'South Sea Bubble und Co.' 1720* (Berlin: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2020), x + 458 pp. ISBN 978 3 110 42614 4 (hardback), £86.50; ISBN 978 3 110 77672 0 (paperback), £24.00

Daniel Menning's book was published, appropriately enough, in 2020, on the 300th anniversary of the South Sea Bubble, a crucial phenomenon in early modern European economic and cultural history. In 1720 the British South Sea Company, and the similarly constituted French Mississippi Company set up by John Law, monopolized the capitalization of state debt by certain chartered trade companies and introduced investing in stocks to a broader public in France and Britain. After a brief stock trade mania, the share prices of both companies plummeted later that year, subjecting Britain and France to the gruelling experience of a large-scale crash in domestic financial markets. This disaster, along with the widespread metaphor of the bubble, has become part and parcel of collective European memory and is almost invariably cited as a historical point of reference for stock market crashes up to the most recent financial crises of the early twenty-first century.

The author's aim is to write a new economic, cultural, and institutional history of the 1720 stock euphoria that goes beyond the more conventional and often narrower approaches to the subject in two respects. First, he expands the dominant Anglo-French perspective centred on the South Sea and Mississippi companies to include a multitude of lesser-known joint-stock companies in Western and Central Europe, and to a lesser extent in the Atlantic world, that were modelled on the well-known 'big players' in Britain and France. Menning analyses the 1720 joint-stock company boom as a pan-European, partially even global phenomenon and looks at the financial and economic interdependencies that accompanied a veritable wave of newly founded or planned companies. Second, the general approach differs from many previous accounts of the 1720 stock market boom which focus on economic history or the history of finance and stock-trading in a narrow sense, the cultural history of the bubble and learned or popular perceptions of it, or on case studies of European offshoot companies, taking a rather limited local or regional history

perspective. Menning, by contrast, outlines an interconnected history centred around one of the key features of what has been called (shunning more restrictive or slightly outdated terminology such as ‘mercantilism’) an early modern ‘economic reason of state’¹—that is, the commercial rivalry between states, the so-called ‘jealousy of trade’ which, as John Shovlin has pointed out, had grown into a veritable ‘jealousy of credit’ by 1720.² This saw commercial rivals constantly observing, imitating, and improving on economic ideas, institutions, and achievements in the hope of eventually surpassing them. Menning identifies this dynamic of mutual emulation as the key practical driving force behind the rapid emergence of joint-stock companies in various places in Western and Central Europe. Yet the scope of the study is not limited to mere mutual perceptions. Menning presents a *histoire croisée* of the 1720 bubble which considers transfers of knowledge and the individuals promoting company projects in particular to be factors that enabled the transnational spread of joint-stock companies.

In order to underline the interconnectedness and the dynamism of this very dense and rapid, almost revolutionary transformation of trade and finance in 1720–1, Menning arranges the chapters of his study in a chronological narrative that focuses on the eighteen months or so that the stock mania and its immediate economic and political aftermath lasted. The author is therefore only briefly concerned with what are traditionally seen as the more immediate origins of the events of 1720—that is, the establishment of the first joint-stock insurance company in London, and the more general interest in new trade companies in various parts of Europe. These initially remained mere plans, and earlier proposals for a monopoly on converting state debt into South Sea Company stocks were rejected. But in France, John Law was charged with restructuring and eliminating much of the royal debt by means of a super joint-stock company to exploit new colonial riches in Louisiana. The initial success of his Mississippi company and the ensuing British fear of being overtaken by an arch-rival, as well

¹ See e.g. Philipp R. Rössner (ed.), *Economic Growth and the Origins of Modern Political Economy: Economic Reasons of State, 1500–2000* (Abingdon, 2016).

² John Shovlin, ‘Jealousy of Credit: John Law’s “System” and the Geopolitics of Financial Revolution’, *Journal of Modern History*, 88/2 (2016), 275–305.

as noticeable capital flight to the Continent, eventually enabled the similarly functioning South Sea Company to be set up. Its meteoric rise stimulated a multitude of projects within the British world, adapting the South Sea Company's business model to other long-distance trading companies and to different economic sectors such as construction or even fishing, and eventually triggering limitations on this model through a legal framework: the Bubble Act (1720). As Menning points out, this legislation was less an attempt to effectively limit or suppress the spread of the joint-stock company model and its potential risks than to rein in the speculation of stock-jobbers and restore parliamentary control over public credit.

In the meantime, the temporary success of the two major joint-stock companies in Western Europe inspired many attempts at emulation all over Western and Central Europe. In the Habsburg monarchy, for example, a rival West Indies company operating from the Austrian Netherlands attracted intense scrutiny from the worried British. These plans and projects can be placed in the context of transfers of economic knowledge promoted by highly active projectors who were (often self-appointed) experts in this type of business model. They were combined with ambitious schemes in other economic sectors, such as banking or textile manufacturing. This was the case, for example, with the banking project presented by the English promoter Ebenezer Corr in the Duchy of Brunswick, and the Harburg Company in the neighbouring Electorate of Hanover. Nevertheless, these companies and their business models, along with the very concept of stocks as an economic instrument, had to be shaped to specific local institutional environments and expectations. This was the case in the German states, where they were adapted to the interests and priorities formulated by contemporary cameralist discourse. The establishment of such companies was also often accompanied by judicial and institutional conflict between various actors, especially in polities where authority was divided between a plurality of political players, as in many territories of the Holy Roman Empire and the Dutch Republic.

The eventual downfall of both the Mississippi Company and the South Sea Company and the ensuing domestic financial and political fallout, however, did not discourage emulation in other parts of Europe.

Menning argues that this cannot be easily attributed to informational asymmetries between the centres and peripheries of early modern finance economies. After the disastrous failures in Britain and France, some projectors, would-be entrepreneurs, and their sponsors attempted to redirect the flow of investment capital in Europe in their favour. They also nimbly modified their plans to account for the consequences of recent financial disasters—for example, by attempting to restrict trade in their companies' stocks to foreign markets to prevent domestic hyperspeculation, or by incorporating lotteries into their business model in order to attract wider circles of investors. After a sometimes breathless account of this entangled history of an extraordinarily eventful and dynamic eighteen months, a synopsis concisely summarizes the role of key economic concepts, transfers of entrepreneurial knowledge in Europe, and the adaptability of the notion of stocks to various institutional contexts.

Menning offers an engaging and insightful account of the 1720 stock market boom as a shared and intertwined experience of European societies and economies (including various overseas entanglements) and presents a fascinating case study of the stunning acceleration in economic development produced by early modern capitalism. Introducing broader European and global perspectives, tracing the circulation of economic knowledge, and locating the phenomenon in a transnational space of mutual perceptions by various actors and institutions, the author not only focuses attention on the histories of lesser-known companies and projects that have until recently been largely neglected. He also convincingly demonstrates that joint-stock companies which entered the game very late, after the crashes in Britain and France, did so not despite operating in an intertwined space of communication, but because of this. Menning also addresses the importance of early modern projects and projecting. By contextualizing this phenomenon with reference to contemporary cultures of economic expertise and entrepreneurship, he goes beyond historiographical clichés of abject failure and fraud perpetrated by disreputable 'adventurers'; yet he does not fully explore this aspect. From a larger cultural point of view, the events of 1720–1 also shaped very different visions for the future of society and the economy. Novel company projects and the initial experience of accelerated financial

and economic development surrounding the stock market euphoria encouraged contemporary ideas and visions of open socio-economic futures shared by projectors, entrepreneurs, government officials, and other observers, well before the fundamental transformation of socio-political mindsets during the last third of the century. By contrast, the disappointments and negative consequences of the English experience inspired more 'regressive' concepts of economic order and traditionalist notions of trade, production, and craftsmanship.

Menning's adherence to the timeline of simultaneous and inter-related events in many respects highlights the underlying dynamic of 'jealousy' and 'emulation' in 1720-1, a time bristling with new, quickly evolving business models and economic ideas, along with new ways of raising capital. Nevertheless, presenting so many chronological case studies on the heels of intertwined developments also disperses the threads of these stories throughout the book. The chapters often require the hasty introduction of many institutional, political, judicial, and economic contexts, particularly as the book's opening 'Overture' (pp. 19-50) is somewhat sketchy and does not completely introduce the relevant contexts, actors, institutions, and economic discourses. The relatively short synopsis at the end is also burdened by having to redraw connections and point out most of the typological and comparative aspects of the themes presented. The author admits that this approach, with its shifting contexts, is 'highly demanding to the reader' (p. 17), and indeed, difficulties in following this vast, rhizomatic structure should not be exclusively blamed on the reader's attention span or lack of persistence. Perhaps an outline less strictly wedded to the chronology of events, along with a more stringent exploration of fewer carefully selected case studies and their wider ramifications and relations of 'emulation', would have helped reader and author alike to navigate the narrative. The book's important insights might have benefited from this without its entangled history approach being affected. It could also have highlighted the methodological advantages of examining an economic and social phenomenon through case studies – namely, the close analysis of how certain entrepreneurial concepts and contemporary economic discourses and practices were enacted in precise social and institutional contexts, as Menning himself points out in the introduction (p. 16).

The focus on 1720–1 also seems to cut short any analysis of the aftermath of the events and their long-term significance for British economic history in the eighteenth century. The impact of the Bubble Act on investment in early industrial manufacturing deserves more elaboration, as does Menning's own engaging assumption that despite the immediate backlash, the South Sea Bubble helped to prepare for the Industrial Revolution by enabling new horizons of expectation for future economic progress and development. Moreover, a more thorough treatment of the contemporary media, the communication infrastructure, or the conditions under which news and economic information travelled might have further shown how '1720', as a synchronized event in an interconnected European (and global) space of communication, was at all possible in practical terms. Such critiques, however, do not diminish the indisputably great merits and the enormous scope of this impressive synoptic and entangled history of a key event in early modern economic and cultural history. It would be truly beneficial if the book were soon to be made accessible to an English-speaking readership.³

³ For related English-language publications by the same author, see e.g. Daniel Menning, 'The Economic Effect of the South Sea Bubble on the Baltic Sea Trade', in id. and Stefano Condorelli (eds.), *Boom, Bust, and Beyond: New Perspectives on the 1720 Stock Market Bubble* (Berlin, 2019), 161–78.

TILMAN HAUG is a postdoctoral researcher in early modern history at the University of Münster. His publications include *Ungleiche Außenbeziehungen und grenzüberschreitende Patronage: Die französische Krone und die geistlichen Kurfürsten (1648–1679)* (2015). His current research focuses on the history of lotteries in eighteenth-century Germany, and he is also working on a research project funded by the Gerda Henkel Foundation on Paul Jacob Marperger and the history of economic knowledge in the early eighteenth century.

MICHAEL GNEHM and SONJA HILDEBRAND (eds.), *Architectural History and Globalized Knowledge: Gottfried Semper in London* (Mendrisio: Mendrisio Academy Press / gta Verlag, 2021), 215 pp. ISBN 978 3 856 76409 8. €35.00

MICHAEL GNEHM, SONJA HILDEBRAND, and DIETER WEIDMANN (eds.), *Gottfried Semper: London Writings 1850–1855* (Zurich: gta Verlag, 2021), xliii + 591 pp. ISBN 978 3 85676 403 6. €79.00

Born on 29 November 1803 in Altona, Gottfried Semper was one of the most important architects and theorists of art and architecture of nineteenth-century Europe. His professional activity might be divided into four periods: Dresden between 1834 and 1849, where he was professor of architecture at the Academy of Fine Arts; London between 1850 and 1855, where he worked on the Great Exhibition of 1851 and its successor, the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, and was appointed in 1852 as professor of ornamental art at the newly founded Department of Practical Art under the direction of Henry Cole; Zurich between 1855 and 1871, where he took the chair of architecture at the Federal Polytechnic School (*Polytechnikum*); and a later period working on projects in Vienna lasting until his death in 1879 in Rome.

Semper's architectural output in the German-speaking world was impressive. In Dresden it included the art gallery completing the Zwinger complex, the Hoftheater (later replaced after fire by today's Semperoper), a synagogue, and numerous other prominent buildings. In Zurich, Semper designed the *Polytechnikum* building that still houses the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH). In Vienna, he played a leading part in the transformation of the city and the creation of the new Ringstraße, with plans for a museum and cultural quarter including the Kunsthistorisches and the Naturhistorisches Museum and the Burgtheater. As Sonja Hildebrand and Michael Gnehm bravely claim in their introduction to *Architectural History and Globalized Knowledge*, 'No other architect in the nineteenth century created buildings that continue to shape the cityscape today in so many different places which at the same time represented stages in his life' (p. 8).

The two volumes reviewed here deal with Semper's London period. In Britain, his architectural building work was much more limited.

A great deal of insight is provided into the reasons for this. Yet as the authors argue, the London period was a particularly significant one. Both works testify to the importance of Semper's time there in terms of his theoretical development and publications. For alongside his architectural output Semper was a leading participant in contemporary discussions about art and design history and aesthetics. The authors reveal Semper's encounter with modern, industrializing Britain as crucial to the evolution of his thinking and subsequent architectural and written output. And even without major architectural commissions, Semper left his mark in the United Kingdom.

Both volumes arise out of the project 'Architecture and the Globalization of Knowledge in the 19th Century: Gottfried Semper and the Discipline of Architectural History'. Funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation, the research involved collaboration between the Institute for the History and Theory of Art and Architecture at the Università della Svizzera italiana and the Institute for the History and Theory of Architecture at ETH Zurich. Symptomatic of well-funded and well-organized research, both volumes are notable for their high-quality presentation. Despite the challenges of language (Semper worked in German, English, and French) and orthography, the editors and authors have achieved a high degree of precision.

As Sonja Hildebrand and Michael Gnehm state in *Architectural History and Globalized Knowledge*, 'With the exception of Paris, none of the many places where Semper lived – neither Hamburg nor Dresden, Zurich nor Vienna – had as great an influence on his thought as London' (p. 9). Like countless other Germanic and European visitors to mid-Victorian Britain, Semper was fascinated both by the process of modernization and the international and imperial culture he encountered. Exiled from reactionary Saxony in 1849, he was forced to engage with this new environment not just intellectually, but also professionally. The success or failure of his engagement outlined here reveals much about Semper himself, as well as the wider context of British-German and European cultural developments.

The first volume under review is an edited collection of essays exploring Semper's experiences and work in London. Murray Fraser usefully provides an opening frame of reference for understanding the course of Semper's career while in London. He points to the high

standing of German art and architecture in Britain from at least the 1830s, particularly among art reformers. Semper's early work on classical architecture and polychromy – the use of colour on Greek and Roman sculpture – was already known. Semper also visited Britain in 1838 as part of his preparatory research for the Hoftheater in Dresden and met Thomas Leverton Donaldson, a founder member of the Royal Institute of British Architects, proponent of classicism, and member of the committee to explore polychromy in connection with the Elgin Marbles. Donaldson would become a lifelong friend. The rising number of British visitors to German capitals to admire new museums and buildings, meanwhile, meant Semper's Hoftheater and other Dresden projects attracted attention.

Fraser also sets the thematic tone by pointing to the significance to Semper's work of London's global character and, in particular, his interaction with the Great Exhibition of 1851. Commissioned by Henry Cole to arrange colonial displays there, Fraser shows how Semper consequently reflected in his writings on the evolution of architecture, the relevance of historical styles – including polychromy – in modern architectural settings, and universal principles of design and decorative art. Such reflection facilitated Semper's appointment under Cole at the Department of Practical Art, where he taught and researched for almost two years and enjoyed a professional basis for numerous further projects. Also highlighted by Fraser, not re-examined in this volume, and certainly noteworthy here are Semper's design work for the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich and the astounding commission by Prince Albert in 1855 of a design for the layout of the new South Kensington estate.

Claudio Leoni provides an in-depth explanation of Semper's work on the Canadian court at the Great Exhibition, the image of which, he judges, 'has had an almost iconic status in architectural discourse, illustrating the beginning of material culture in mid-nineteenth-century architectural theory' (p. 39). Following what seems a pattern of Semper's life, the mission soon crept, as it were, to include the displays of Turkey, Sweden, Denmark, and the Cape of Good Hope. Leoni notes the united Canadian display's political significance pre-confederation. He provides striking detail on the exhibits – including a Canadian fire-engine 'of unusually large proportions, and remarkably

elegant design and workmanship', trialled on the Serpentine, and 'capable of throwing two streams of water 156 feet high, or a single stream of 210 feet high' (p. 43). Leoni also explains how the Canadian court expressed Semper's evolving thought regarding the relationship of architect to decorator, the technique and meaning of display, and museology.

In an initially eyebrow-raising but ultimately rewarding chapter, Philip Ursprung imagines a round-table discussion including Semper, his contemporary and co-exile Karl Marx, Crystal Palace architect Joseph Paxton, and Herman Melville. Ursprung is perhaps over-candid in admitting to being no expert on Semper and having done no archival research for the chapter. Involvement with the project and access to its findings proves enough to enable valuable insights regarding the Crystal Palace and the participants' engagement with themes of the industrialization and commercialization of architecture, the decoration of modern buildings, and gigantism. Semper's qualified approach to modern architecture is clarified by comparison with Paxton. The ambivalence generated in many contemporaries by such patently modernist buildings as the Crystal Palace is conveyed. Ursprung reiterates the unique opportunity the exhibition provided for Semper:

with this event and its enormous impact on visual culture, the issue of representation moved to the centre stage in architecture, economy, science, and culture in general. For a brief moment, the whole scale of society, economy, art, and science was made visible simultaneously at a single level of representation, in one space. Such a concurrence of factors had never arisen before, and it was never again repeated (p. 61).

Mari Hvattum follows with a chapter devoted to one of Semper's most discussed commissions: the Duke of Wellington's funeral car, designed during his time at the Department of Practical Art. Hvattum notes Semper's collaboration on the car with both Cole and Richard Redgrave and consequent debates about ultimate responsibility. She emphasizes the contemporary significance of the Duke of Wellington's funeral in 1852 and, drawing on contemporary media, shows the intense public discussion of the car's meaning. Central to

the chapter — as to Semper — is the question of how far historical precedent should be applied to modern design. Among the many such precedents Semper considered, it is pleasing to this reviewer to be directed towards Andrea Mantegna's *Triumphs of Caesar*, then as today located at Hampton Court Palace. Ultimately, however, the funeral car demonstrated the dangers of weighing down modern design with history. Paxton's Crystal Palace managed to be both functional and aesthetically pleasing. Semper's funeral car was, Hvattum judges, marked by its 'ponderous monumentality' (p. 80). In the public mind it was upstaged by the simple pathos of Wellington's riderless horse, boots hanging from the saddle.

The main focus of Dieter Weidmann's chapter is Semper's use of English, an unusual subject focus but one that provides insights and entertaining detail, and also allows reflection on challenges to acclimatization faced by migrants. Weidmann describes Semper's travels before his arrival in Britain. He studied in Paris and travelled widely, including in France, Italy, Sicily, and Greece. Weidmann reminds us of the continuing French influence in Semper's life, linguistically and intellectually. Using lists of his grammar books drawn from customs records and Semper's own translation exercises, gathered as part of the research project, Weidmann traces how Semper learned English. It remained cumbersome, despite his many public duties. Semper jumbled French, German, and English to create words such as 'barches', 'fricture', 'sutt', and 'didges' (p. 96). Cole would describe Semper's draft lectures diplomatically as 'suggestive' (p. 91). The importance of Semper's difficulties with English to his removal to Zurich is left open.

In her chapter on Semper and curvilinearity, Sonja Hildebrand demonstrates how Semper, drawing on German Romantic precedents, and building on his own interest in mathematics and natural science, engaged with contemporary British discussions on the nature and laws of beauty and the problem of perception. With the help of call slips Semper used during his research at the British Museum Library, Hildebrand identifies Semper's interaction with theorists including Francis Penrose, James Fergusson, and David Ramsay Hay. She successfully demonstrates the importance of this to Semper's own work on the interrelationship of form and function, an immediate

illustration of which was his work on the shape of Greek slingshots and Prussian musket balls.

Elena Chestnova examines Semper's lectures at the Department of Practical Art to trace the development of his ideas regarding decoration and design. Responsible at the outset for metalwork design, his brief expanded quickly to decorative arts more widely and especially pottery. At Cole's suggestion, Semper visited Herbert Minton's factory at Stoke. Drawing on this and the work of writers including Karl Otfried Müller, Georges Cuvier, and the director of the Sèvres porcelain manufactory Alexandre Brongniart, Semper developed further his theories regarding national differences of ornamentation. He considered function and spirit as influences on ornamentation, producing thereby a hierarchy of material culture. Like others in the art reform movement, he identified a deterioration in decorative art connected with mechanization and shared their admiration for non-European design.

Kate Nichols looks at Semper's work for the Crystal Palace at Sydenham. Semper argued for an architectural history based on divisions of space, including through hung textiles. It was appropriate, then, that his (limited) practical contribution there was the design of the mixed textile court. Yet as Nichols shows, he had a far more important impact indirectly. Both Semper and Owen Jones had been interested in Greek sculpture and polychromy since the 1830s. Jones, influenced by Semper, displayed plaster casts of Greek art in colour. Nichols effectively and entertainingly conveys the outrage caused. She also argues that Semper's writings were 'foundational to what was to become one of the lasting, and most controversial, aspects of the Sydenham Palace: its display of brightly painted copies of the Parthenon frieze' (p. 144).

Semper's views on textiles lead into Caroline van Eck's chapter: the architect's anthropological interest in body art among indigenous peoples in such things as tattoos and masks. A central concern was its representational function. Van Eck shows how Semper's thought built on a century or more of anthropological interest, but also how, by tracing degrees of representation and symbolism, he 'unfolds a view of the nature of architecture, its origins, the laws that govern its development, and its aesthetics that is completely new' (p. 173). Beat Wyss

continues the discussion of Semper's textile paradigm and its facilitation of an evolutionary history of architecture. In this respect, Wyss shows, Semper belonged to a broad intellectual concern with evolution predating Darwin.

The concluding chapter by Alina Payne appropriately seeks to summarize Semper's significance. Central, she argues, was his ability to combine disciplines and develop global theories of art and architecture. Semper's universalism was particularly triggered by the Great Exhibition. This 'enormous *Handelsraum*', as Payne puts it, was a 'Humboldtian playground of cultural simultaneities and comparisons . . . it was a visual display of things compared to each other. And comparative aesthetics comes straight out of it' (p. 205). Semper's interdisciplinary work fed back into disciplinary discourse and, even if not always accepted, was deeply influential:

What Semper had done was to reinterpret the Great Exhibition, as a mentality-changing event, into a methodology for analysis—of art, architecture, crafts, and the relation of man to the products of mind and hands, of labour and memory. He laid the foundations of a first global art history, as well as providing a site for the globalization of knowledge—meaning not only that he engaged with territorial geography but also with disciplinary territories, with a broad geography of disciplines (pp. 207–8).

The second volume under review, *Gottfried Semper: London Writings 1850–1855*, presents an extensive collection of Semper's works written in London but hitherto unpublished. Sections include: materials Semper produced on arrival and as he attempted to set up a private school of architecture; letters, articles, and notes written in connection with the Great Exhibition; essays on polychromy; works written in connection with his duties as professor at the Department of Practical Art—including his report on the arms at Windsor Castle; his lectures during this time; and other supplementary texts, some of which are not by Semper, but relate directly to his career.

The editors provide a highly valuable general introduction offering contextual detail regarding Semper's life before Dresden, his connections and work in France, his involvement with the revolutions of 1848–9, and his aborted intention to emigrate to the USA. They point

to his time in Rome and acquaintances there, including Emil Braun, who was crucial in his decision to come to Britain. They allude to Semper's connections to other Germanic migrants in London, reveal the significance of his work on polychromy, and explain his transfer to the Department of Practical Art. His move to Switzerland is also rationalized under the heading 'The Will to Architecture' (p. xxviii) as a desire to return to architectural practice that had been stymied in Britain.

The general introduction begins a hierarchy of analysis. After the main documents comes an 'Apparatus' containing an introduction to each section, an explanatory note on separate documents, multiple variants of the documents, and then references to other versions of documents published elsewhere. This meticulous, scientific structure is complex. Yet here the excellent production work comes to our assistance: sections are colour coded. There are even useful bookmarks in corresponding tones. More importantly, the volume allows access not just to Semper's curious orthography, but also to the way his ideas gestated and evolved. In astounding detail the editors record Semper's own emendations to documents. Appendices provide extensive bibliographies of Semper's writings, works used by Semper, and secondary literature. This impressive rigour makes the volume a central and lasting reference work.

Taking the two volumes together, the research team's centre of gravity in art and architectural history means some subjects demand further consideration. Semper's politics and the significance of his participation in the revolution in Dresden remain opaque. Despite intermittent mention of his siblings, wife, and children, the roles, demands, and practicalities of his extensive family are largely unaddressed. More acknowledgement is needed of the broad Victorian interest in Germanic culture that predated and accompanied Semper. Murray Fraser makes mention of this, but the British-German cultural hinterland was far more extensive than is conveyed. The editors and authors point to Semper's often close connections to other German migrants, including Lothar Bucher, Julius Faucher, Gottfried Kinkel, and William Siemens, and provide much information useful to research in this area. The inclusion of Bucher's 'London' article is particularly insightful. Yet greater analytical focus on this area is possibly required.

The authors provide a wealth of detail regarding Semper's networks and make mention of his closeness to figures such as William Siemens and fellow Dresden revolutionary Richard Wagner. Again, one is left wanting more information. Perhaps this is to be viewed as one of the values of the project.

Across both volumes, Prince Albert, in particular, remains a vague and yet undeniable shadow, his agency at times clear, at other times implied or left to be suspected by the reader. It is almost unimaginable, even if Cole made the approach, that Albert did not know about—and give his consent to—Semper's employment at the Great Exhibition. As the *London Writings* show, Albert commissioned Semper to write for a German readership about the exhibition and to design Wellington's funeral car, and agreed to a report on the arms at Windsor. Albert's decision to ask Semper to come up with a solution for planning the South Kensington estate—and his enthusiasm for the resulting proposals—is remarkable. This is especially so considering Semper's status as a revolutionary with a death penalty for treason hanging over him in Dresden until 1863. Doubtless, ubiquitous Prussian intelligence conveyed to Berlin Semper's involvement in the exhibition. Seen in this light, Albert's sustained support for Semper was soft, yet clear and powerful liberal propaganda in the Germanic political context.

Albert, meanwhile, had also travelled to Rome and knew Emil Braun. So, too, had Ludwig Grüner, also from Dresden, a close contemporary of Semper and employed as Albert's art adviser between 1845 and 1855, though curiously not mentioned in these volumes. Semper's concern to combine historical styles with modern production chimed entirely with Albert's position and also with his moderate liberal political views. Murray Fraser notes in *Architectural History* that four years after Albert's death, 'one General Grey' (pp. 32–3) attempted to have Semper appointed as architect for the Royal Albert Hall. By this point, Grey was Victoria's private secretary. Much more may be said on all these fronts.

Together, these volumes constitute a substantial and lasting contribution to knowledge and understanding of Semper. The analysis of Semper's work during his time in London is excellent in relation to the history of art, architecture, and aesthetics. The volumes also,

however, have wider relevance for scholars of German migration, British–German cultural relations in the Victorian period, the history of exhibitions, and the art reform movement. The production of the volumes is outstanding and supports the success of the research process. Where the architectural focus means important aspects of Semper’s life and significance are downplayed or absent, the volumes are important in raising questions and encouraging further research. The extensive primary materials produced by the project have undeniable intrinsic value for future research.

JOHN R. DAVIS is Director of Heritage Management at Historic Royal Palaces and Honorary Professor at Queen Mary University of London. His publications include *Britain and the German Zollverein, 1848–66* (1997), *The Great Exhibition* (1999), and *The Victorians and Germany* (2007); as editor, *Richard Cobden’s German Diaries* (2007); and as co-editor, *Migration and Transfer from Germany to Britain 1660–1914* (2007), *The Promotion of Industry: An Anglo-German Dialogue* (2009), and *Transnational Networks: German Migrants in the British Empire, 1670–1914* (2012).

STEVEN PRESS, *Blood and Diamonds: Germany's Imperial Ambitions in Africa* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2021), 352 pp. ISBN 978 0 674 91649 4 (hardback), \$35.00 / £28.95 / €31.50

After years in which cultural history dominated the study of German colonial rule in Africa, interest in its economic history is back on centre stage. In the wake of the new history of capitalism and other approaches, historians are increasingly researching the economic basis of German colonial rule. Steven Press's book on the economics of diamond mining in the German colony of South West Africa is an important example of this renaissance. And Press does not limit himself to this colony. He also looks at how German diamond production was embedded in – and changed – the economic structures of global diamond trading in South Africa, Britain, Belgium, and the United States, thus breaking up the national perspective which irritatingly still prevails in German colonial history. Press asks many important questions about the economic significance of the German colonial empire. While historians have generally viewed Germany's colonies as economically insignificant, Press argues that we should rethink this. Not only was colonial business more profitable than usually acknowledged; it also played a large role in domestic politics and debates.

Press starts with a tour de force through the history of German colonial rule in South West Africa. It began with Otto von Bismarck's unfortunate approach to colonialism as company rule, when he backed Adolf Lüderitz and his successor, the Deutsche Kolonialgesellschaft für Südwest-Afrika (DKGSWA), in pursuing their dubious claims in South West Africa. The DKGSWA eventually became a prosperous diamond company, but at first it failed to govern the new colony, and Bismarck had to establish a conventional colonial administration to take over. However, the DKGSWA continued to claim rights over large swathes of land in which it was prospecting for mineral wealth – especially for diamonds, which had made nearby South Africa rich. Minerals, however, did not materialize. Instead, Germany promoted South West Africa as a settler colony. The arid country offered only limited possibilities for farming. The settlers therefore soon ran into violent conflicts over land and water with the African inhabitants, which escalated into a genocidal war against the Herero and Nama in

1904. South West Africa was a burden for Germany, marred by failing businesses, scarcity, and violence, until 1908, when diamonds were finally found, unleashing a mining boom.

Consumers in Europe and North America used diamonds to store value. This only worked because diamonds were regarded as scarce, and people paid huge amounts for them. Diamond finds in South Africa near Kimberley had endangered the idea of scarcity and, therefore, the high prices diamonds fetched. In the 1880s, Cecil Rhodes and the diamond company De Beers brought this threat under control by buying up almost all South African mines, thus re-establishing the scarcity of diamonds by limiting production. By 1900, Rhodes and a London-based syndicate that collaborated with him had established a quasi-monopoly over the global diamond trade, and wholesalers, cutters, importers, and retailers depended on them.

In South West Africa, diamonds turned up from time to time near Lüderitz Bay, but prospectors were unable to find large deposits. They were searching geological formations similar to those in neighbouring South Africa – and walked past diamond fields without noticing. The search was not successful until 1908. Press links the diamond strikes to the genocidal military campaigns of 1904–8. In the destruction of the Nama in particular, ‘the turning of the German military eye to the stretch abutting Lüderitz Bay improved the odds of large-scale diamond discovery and created a new momentum toward it’ (p. 53). Sometimes the military deliberately directed violence to areas where diamonds were expected to turn up: ‘Prospective diamond riches and violence . . . reinforced one another’ (p. 53).

Diamonds were discovered in the desert near Lüderitz Bay by Zacharias Lewala, a South African railway worker with mining experience, but it was the engineer August Stauch who secretly bought up land along the railway and became South West Africa’s first diamond tycoon. What followed was a chaotic rush which Press colourfully describes. Within months, Lüderitz became a boom town as people flocked to the desert to make their fortunes. There was a risk that prospecting could descend into chaos. Miners made conflicting claims and sold diamonds at rock-bottom prices. Most of them did not know that diamonds were precious because they were rare. In reaction, the German colonial secretary, Bernhard Dernburg – the secret

hero of this book—recognized the claims of the moribund DKGSWA. He declared large swathes of the Namib Desert a Forbidden Zone where only the company could decide who would be allowed to mine. To control production and marketing, Dernburg established the diamond Regie—a ‘state-approved, national cartel’ (p. 88)—and put an end to the first chaotic months of prospecting to ensure that diamonds remained scarce. He had a larger plan: to establish a corporation to rival De Beers and its London-based syndicate. Press shows that the potential was there: stones from South West Africa were easier to mine, of superior quality, and smaller in size, corresponding to the wishes of US middle-class buyers. This was a relevant consumer group, as around 75 per cent of all diamonds mined went to the United States, where many of them graced engagement rings, which were becoming ever more popular.

Here Press for the first time abandons his narrative style and lays out the importance of his work for the history of German colonial rule in general. He argues that historians have underestimated the significance of the diamond economy. While Horst Gründer writes that German diamond exports accounted for 52 million marks between 1908 and 1913, Press points to statements by De Beers that in 1913 alone, South West Africa exported diamonds worth 59 million marks. Including smuggled stones, Press estimates that the real value of diamonds from the German colony was closer to 118 million marks in 1913. I can confirm from my own research on the rubber trade in the German colony of Kamerun that official data often did not reflect the sums actually exported.¹ Press, therefore, rightly sees a ‘need to reexamine the anatomy of the German colonial economy. There was more money motivating this colonial regime, and more money generated from its exploitation of Indigenous peoples, than has been acknowledged in curt dismissals’ (p. 90).

In the chapter on labour, Africans move more into the centre of the narrative. Germany’s policy of extermination in 1904–8 had exacerbated the problem of labour in a colony which was only thinly populated. Labourers for the diamond industry had to come from

¹ Tristan Oestermann, ‘Kautschuk und Arbeit in Kamerun: Soziale Mobilität, Zwang und Militanz unter deutscher Kolonialherrschaft’ (Ph.D. thesis, Humboldt University of Berlin, 2021).

elsewhere. Some Africans went from the Cape Colony to South West Africa. Ovambo migrants from the colony's north, however, provided a lasting solution to the problem. Thousands travelled to the diamond fields, where they faced appalling working conditions—bad sanitation, housing, and violence at the workplace. Many found an early death in the desert. Press explains this as a result of the colonists' racist mindset and the fact that the state had little say in the Forbidden Zone, where the DKGSWA ruled out government standards for working conditions. However, Press's account of African labourers remains superficial. While he mentions Ovambo authorities making deals with their German counterparts to provide labour, young men wanting to earn money so that they could marry, and migrants from the Cape choosing South West Africa because of higher wages, the social conditions enabling the emergence of this system of labour migration remain hidden. Rather than stressing their agency, Press reproduces the story of Africans as helpless victims of all-powerful colonial actors.

In Germany, the diamonds led to a frenzy on the stock markets—with the DKGSWA as the rising star. Before 1908, shares in colonial companies had not been of any interest for most investors. But now, diamond companies paid unbelievable dividends of up to 3,800 per cent. According to Press, this diamond mania was a 'singular phenomenon in Imperial German financial history' (p. 136), which soon turned into a bubble. Fraudsters and bogus companies mushroomed on the colonial stock market, which lacked proper state regulation by design. Illicit activity did not stop there. The exclusive role of the Regie also created a large black market for diamonds. Smuggling was not a marginal phenomenon, according to Press. At least 50 per cent of all South West Africa's diamonds found their way on to the world market illegally. Even though the state tried to stop smuggling by employing a diamond police and secret agents and introducing measures to control the African population, it was unsuccessful. While the public connected smuggling with Jewish networks and Africans, it was, in fact, settlers, officers, soldiers, and especially women who used every loophole to take the stones out of the country.

Obviously, many people felt left out by the diamond boom. Dornburg not only excluded individual miners, but also ignored German

diamond cutters and struck a deal with Antwerp, an old but ailing centre of the diamond industry. Antwerp was well connected with the world market for diamonds, and especially with the USA, home to most of their consumers. This connectedness was important to Dernburg, even though co-operating with Antwerp meant losing a share of the business associated with the stones and facing furious reactions in German politics. Social Democrats, antisemites, and others criticized Dernburg's capitalist colonial policies. Equally, criticism came from settlers in South West Africa, who feared the rapid industrialization of the agrarian colony and wanted to have a say in how the new wealth was spent. Thus Dernburg and his policy were under pressure from the start. Political forces in Germany and South West Africa criticized the fact that diamonds only benefited wealthy capitalists.

In 1910, the diamond stock bubble burst. Dernburg lost his last backers and left office in June. A Reichstag commission now freed the way for the diamond Regie to be reformed. New people who became members of its board, such as Stauch and the journalist Paul Rohrbach, gave the Regie a more populist agenda. Dernburg's cartel, designed to steer production in order to maintain the impression that diamonds were scarce, came to an end. Production rates increased. However, Press argues, this undermined the future of the diamond industry in South West Africa. Diamond prices plunged and the Antwerp syndicate ran into financial problems. In 1914, the Germans entered into an agreement with De Beers, putting an end to the idea of a competitive German diamond industry. During the First World War, diamonds from South West Africa continued to be of global importance. Smuggled stones funded the German war effort. Diamonds also played a part in arms production and storing wealth in societies with devaluing currencies. After the war, Ernest Oppenheimer, a South African businessman, bought up Germany's mining rights and became the world's most powerful diamond tycoon.

Press provides a strong and convincing narrative which suggests that further studies in German colonial economics will be very revealing. He deserves praise for placing German South West Africa's diamond boom into a global framework. Nevertheless, he rarely presents generalizing arguments, and when he does, he is often in danger of overstretching them. Writing that 'genocidal violence and

diamonds' were 'the defining traits of Germany's short-lived overseas colonies' (p. 10) makes his topic too big. Similarly, when he writes that 'Diamond labor dynamics . . . constitute a new kind of link "from Windhoek to Auschwitz"' (p. 232), he is searching for relevance in the wrong place and ignoring the ample literature on similar colonial labour conditions elsewhere in the world, which obviously did not lead 'to Auschwitz'. Generally, Press singles out German colonial rule and presents it as especially ruthless and brutal, silently implying a German *Sonderweg* or special path in Africa. While diamond mining was hard and often deadly work, comparing it with contemporary practices in the neighbouring South African mining industry and its labour migration patterns would have put this into perspective. Finally, African agency is of only marginal importance to Press. His book is a history of colonial economics, centred on European actors, which is totally legitimate as he provides us with a strong and compelling narrative, revealing hitherto unknown connections of Germany's colonial economy. This narrative may motivate others to follow him and to pick up parts of this history lying hidden in the past, like diamonds in the desert.

TRISTAN OESTERMANN is a research assistant at the Humboldt University of Berlin. His Ph.D. thesis, which will be published as *Kautschuk und Arbeit in Kamerun* (forthcoming), is a labour history of the colonial rubber economy in German Kamerun. His current research focuses on the history of global pharmaceutical companies in the colonial and post-colonial world, especially the Belgian Congo/Zaire. He is also working on the impact of steamship lines on the history of migration in West Africa.

MARC DAVID BAER, *German, Jew, Muslim, Gay: The Life and Times of Hugo Marcus* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2020), 320 pp. ISBN 978 0 231 19670 3 (hardback), \$95.00/£74.00; ISBN 978 0 231 19671 0 (paperback), \$30.00/£25.00

The book under review here has received attention and appreciation from scholars of religion and of Islamic, Jewish, and sexuality studies. It is an important book, and in five well-written chapters, the author narrates the life and times of Hugo Marcus (1880–1966). Marcus lived a difficult but interesting life as a Jewish gay man who converted to Islam in interwar Berlin. His intellectual biography provides a chance to explore various facets of German history in turbulent times.

Chapter one examines Marcus's involvement in the gay rights movement led by Magnus Hirschfeld and a wider scholarly and activist circle in Berlin. The second chapter documents Marcus's queer conversion to Islam at the Ahmadiyya mosque and maps out the vibrant Muslim community in interwar Berlin. The third chapter looks at Hugo Hamid Marcus's changing fortunes as he navigated his Jewish past and Muslim convert identity during the violent rise of the Nazi regime and the transformation of German society. Chapter four takes us through the difficult history of Jewish persecution and Marcus's escape from Nazi Germany to a relatively safe but discriminatory exile in Switzerland. The significant final chapter examines the literary expression of Marcus's complex life as a gay writer, his literary influences, and the friends who supported him in his lonely last years until his death in 1966. The introduction looks at the existing historiography and the resulting conceptual problems and possibilities for working on the life and writings of a queer German-Jewish convert to Islam. In Baer's analysis of Marcus's life, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe emerges as an important intellectual influence. The conclusion ends with the recent establishment of the queer-friendly Ibn Rushd-Goethe Mosque in Berlin. Through carefully interwoven chapters, we get a nuanced intellectual biography of a difficult life and challenging times with various personal contradictions and intellectual confluences. It thus provides an entry point for understanding more significant issues about Muslims, Jews, and queer life in German history.

Baer's book contributes to debates in various disciplines and fields of research, including connected German-Asian studies—mainly of the South Asian Ahmadiyya Muslim community or Ahmadis, who formed a modernist religious movement that established the first major mosque in Berlin. This review will engage with the book to explore the new direction it has opened up in the discipline of German-Asian history. How can scholars of global history maintain a comparative perspective as they negotiate the demands of transnational actors and multilingual archives? Moving beyond the polarized contemporary debate on Islam and Muslim migrants in Germany, the book offers a historical reading of Islam, conversion, and German subjectivity in the interwar years, which is valuable as the chosen case study is an interesting and complex one. Ahmadiyya Islam in Germany allows for a new reading not just of Ahmadis, but also of Islam: what one might call Weimar Islam in interwar Berlin. This expression of Islam maintained a dialogue with German debates on education, science, psychoanalysis, gender, and life reform (*Lebensreform*). This allows us to see Ahmadiyya Islam as the first significant movement within South Asian Islam to engage with Europe through a mosque and multilingual English and German publications in Britain and Germany.

While the book under review is a meticulous reading of Marcus's understanding and adaptation of Islam, the South Asian Ahmadis who were foundational to his views remain marginal. This might be because the focus remains on Hugo Marcus, even when the author documents his role in gay rights circles and the Muslim community in Berlin. This is a methodological problem that stems not so much from the question of archives as from the genres of global intellectual history and biography. The Ahmadiyya mosque in Berlin has slowly but steadily attracted academic attention, not least because it had some notable European converts, such as Marcus, Muhammad Asad (born Leopold Weiss), and Omar Rolf von Ehrenfels. However, by focusing on European converts without paying attention to the Ahmadi actors who brought the knowledge which allowed the possibility of translation and adaptation and helped build dialogue between the two cultures and languages, Baer achieves only a partial understanding.

Moreover, presenting Ahmadiyya actors solely as religious missionaries is not very productive. Indeed, the imam and regular visitors

to the mosque were also university students and scholars pursuing various fields of knowledge, particularly science, economics, and philosophy. These actors included not just the mosque leaders Sadruddin and Abdullah, but also regular participants such as Syed Abid Husain, Zakir Husain, and K. Abdul Hamied, among many others. The Ahmadiyya mosque was intellectually connected with the German secular university and emerged as an important public arena for studying secularism and Islam in Germany. It was open to a range of scholars, including those who engaged with minority status and persecution. This may explain their openness to sexual minorities. In other words, thinking in terms of minorities instead of identity markers became a more productive way to understand the presence of a variety of political, religious, and sexual minorities. The Ahmadis understood the issue of persecution of Jews and homosexuals because they had themselves been confronted with persecution in the increasingly communalized and sectarian polity of British India. Here, some attention to the comparative dimension of South Asian history would have helped to contextualize and better understand Ahmadi politics in Europe.

The author does an admirable job of mapping the world of Hugo Marcus. However, Baer does not decentre or examine the complexities of Marcus's intellectual influences, instead confining himself to German intellectuals and knowledge formation. Apart from the works of Goethe, the remarkable and prolific writings of the influential Ahmadi writer and leader Muhammed Ali on questions of modernity, religion, and subjectivity are mentioned but not explored. The author reveals that the Ahmadis continued to support Marcus personally, despite many threats, even as German society and institutions were Nazified. Not only did they help Marcus escape from Germany to Switzerland, but they also made travel arrangements for his stay in British India. Unlike Omar Rolf von Ehrenfels, who moved to British India and worked with Ahmadis, Marcus made a different choice. He returned to Switzerland, where he relied on his Jewish and homosexual connections. Ahmadi friends continued to support him financially, emotionally, and intellectually, as is clear from the letters they exchanged. They also engaged critically with his translations and helped him develop his scholarly work on Islam and modernity.

Ahmadiyya Islam sought a new form of connection and affinity over difference. This made it appealing to many Germans, particularly Jewish converts to Islam. However, this sense of identification must be critically analysed. Queer conversion is an extremely interesting phenomenon and can be understood as an act of translation. Baer is one of the finest scholars on the issue of conversion, as is evident in this book. However, it seems to me that the case study reveals conversion not just as a religious act but as an intellectual and emotional translation. Marcus negotiated the meaning of what was available and what he desired personally. This brings us to questions of subjectivity and desire, both conscious and subconscious, and to the issue of conversion. It seems that Islam appeared as a queer religion, at least in the version understood by Marcus. This is an important point in the contemporary debates about Islam and homosexuality.

The book reveals fascinating facets of Marcus's life as a Jewish, Muslim, and gay German. Yet Marcus belonged to all and none of these categories. If anything, his life and death are a testament to the failure of compartmentalizing identity and intellectual history.

RAZAK KHAN is a Research Fellow at the Centre for Modern Indian Studies, University of Göttingen. He works on connected South Asian Muslim and German-Jewish intellectual histories.

THEODOR LESSING, *Jewish Self-Hate*, trans. Peter C. Appelbaum, ed. Benton Arnovitz (New York: Berghahn Books, 2021), 186 pp. ISBN 978 1 789 20986 0 (hardback), £110.00; ISBN 978 1 789 20992 1 (paperback), £23.95

The idea of Jewish self-hatred is certainly not a new one, neither has its meaning changed much. The term originated in Germany with the dawn of Reform Judaism, which sought to bring Jewish communal practice more into line with that of its German counterparts, and which caused a split within German Jewry as a result. The split effected further communal splintering, as groups now found an urgent need to (re)define themselves against the emergent ideology. Consequently, we see 'Conservative' and 'Orthodox' Judaism emerge in Germany as a reaction to Reform Judaism (much as conservatism found its own ideological voice only after, and as a result of, the dawn of liberalism). Thus the term is used amongst Jews themselves to denote apparent internalized antisemitism.¹ Today it is most often applied to Jewish detractors of either Israeli policy or indeed the existence of the state itself. And the title of 'self-hating Jew' is often lobbed against actors such as Woody Allen and Larry David, although probably both and certainly the latter, perhaps unsurprisingly, would disagree. In a now-classic episode of *Curb Your Enthusiasm*, upon being called a 'self-loathing Jew' for whistling Wagner, David's eponymous character retorts: 'I do hate myself, but it has nothing to do with being Jewish.'²

However, it was only with the publication of the German-Jewish philosopher Theodor Lessing's *Der jüdische Selbsthaß* (Jewish Self-Hate) in 1930 that the term gained widespread use. Lessing used a case study of six intellectuals who, through their own Jewish self-hatred, he believed stoked the fires of German and Austrian antisemitism. The book's publication date is noteworthy; appearing only three years before Hitler became Germany's chancellor, it

¹ See, inter alia, Sander L. Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore, 1986), 361; Antony Lerman, 'Jewish Self-Hatred: Myth or Reality', *Jewish Quarterly*, 55/2 (2008), 46–51.

² Larry David, 'Trick or Treat', *Curb Your Enthusiasm*, Season 2 Episode 3, HBO (2001).

was almost immediately included in the Nazi book-burning rituals that began the same year. Only two months after Hitler assumed his chancellorship, Lessing fled with his wife to Marienbad. It was a short-lived escape: he was shot by assassins while working on 30 August, a price having been put on his head by the Nazi regime. He died the next day, aged only 61. *Der jüdische Selbsthaß* became an underground classic, and Lessing was elevated to the status of cultural-historical philosophical clairvoyant.

It is thus perhaps surprising that this volume, translated by Peter C. Applebaum and published in 2021, is the first English translation of the work. As such, it represents a valuable contribution to the body of scholarship dealing with the phenomenon of internalized antisemitism. Applebaum's translation preserves Lessing's own angst-ridden writing style: at times clear and concise, at other times rambling and murky. Five short chapters on 'Jewish Destiny' and a 'scientific' excursus on Jewish self-hate are followed by six 'life stories' which, in Appelbaum's words, 'delve into the complex nature of German Jewish self-hate during the latter part of the nineteenth century through the Weimar Republic' (p. ix). Nonetheless, and perhaps unsurprisingly, the book betrays as much about Lessing's own psychological state at the time of writing as it does about the six figures whom he vignettes, and indeed this is the overwhelming feeling that the reader is left with upon completion of the volume. And therein perhaps lies the book's weakness: it all seems rather dated. Lessing's prose is characterized by a hypersensitivity and pathos that are at times simply too much for today's reader to bear. His theorizing rarely approaches the cool neutrality and scientific methodology that one would expect from a philosopher and mathematician today.

In the first chapters Lessing summarizes the situation of 'Eastern' and 'Western' Jews that are all too familiar to today's reader: the book was written in the wake of the 1929 Arab anti-Jewish riots in British Mandatory Palestine, which erupted over the question of access to the Western Wall and in which hundreds of Jews and Arabs were killed and many more injured. For Lessing, the riots proved nothing more than that the Jews were always damned to persecution. Even when 'tired of ever-repeating cycles of mass hysteria, which no nobility of

thought, culture, or action can ever reconcile', the 'oldest of all peoples [had] decided to take its destiny into their own hands' (p. 4) and return to their ancient homeland. His conclusion that '[w]hen we stand up for our own rights, they respond, "Have you not yet learned that dogged self-preservation of a special people is nothing more than treachery against universal human, *transnational* values?"' (p. 4) is indicative of the style of argumentation that he employs throughout the book. Although one might not argue with the truth of such conclusions, they are presented in a manner that is just too personal for what is supposed to be a study of a particular sociological phenomenon.

Figures such as Moses Mendelssohn, Moses Hess, Karl Marx, Heinrich Heine, Max Nordau, and Theodor Herzl (although the latter only in passing) are all mentioned in the opening chapters, but there is nothing new for today's reader to glean from Lessing's discussion, although it certainly would have been more *au courant* in 1930. And his chapter that promises a discussion about the psychology, pathology, logic, and morality of self-hate is philosophical at best, and only at a stretch. There is little scientific discussion, in spite of the chapter's title, and statements such as, 'Jewish spiritual development reveals a fateful exaggeration of the spiritually conscious over the aesthetic-religious' and 'Within the spiritually conscious life, ethical intension predominates over logical perception' (p. 21) are presented with no proof.

The six 'self-hating Jews' whose life stories Lessing tells – Paul Rée, Arthur Trebitsch, Max Steiner, Walter Calé, Maximilian Harden, and Otto Weininger – are, with the possible exception of Weininger, all but forgotten today, except perhaps in academic circles. The essay on Weininger – certainly a conflicted soul whose book *Geschlecht und Charakter*³ is still presented today in any robust discussion on racial theory – promised the most, but contributes little to any real understanding of Weininger's tragic figure. The essay on Trebitsch is the most illuminating and comprehensive. There are also glaring omissions: why, for example, Paul Rée, of whom, in Lessing's words, 'nothing . . . remains for posterity' (p. 37), and not, say, Karl Kraus,

³ Otto Weininger, *Geschlecht und Charakter: Eine prinzipielle Untersuchung* (Vienna, 1903).

who would have provided a more interesting and multidimensional study?

All six men met early and tragic deaths, probably all by suicide (although Rée's 'shattered [*sic*] body' (p. 48) was found at the foot of a glacier, so accidental death cannot be ruled out). Lessing's implication of course is that Jewish self-hate could be internalized only so much. And such conclusions betray Lessing's main methodological weakness. In his attempt to highlight the pseudoscientific methods employed by the six 'self-hating' Jews whom he discusses, Lessing himself employs a methodology that is no less so. Perhaps all six men committed suicide as a consequence of their inability to reconcile their own Jewishness with their internalized Jewish self-hate. But Lessing's 'conclusions' can be no more than theories. Indeed, Weininger at least was likely also homosexual. Perhaps also Max Steiner, if we are to believe Lessing's cryptic claim that, as in the case of Weininger, 'newspapers indulged in vague speculations' as to the reason for his suicide, but 'only a few friends knew the truth' (p. 92). Were these men racked with Jewish or homosexual self-hate? Did one win out over the other? These are questions, one suspects, that Weininger and Steiner themselves would have been hard pressed to answer. Thus Lessing's pseudoscientific reasoning seems not only dated, but also guilty of a confirmation bias that the modern reader cannot shake off.

Rather fittingly, Sander Gilman provides an excellent introduction that contextualizes both Lessing's work and the era in which he felt compelled to write it. One wishes that Lessing himself could have read and drawn on Gilman's contribution to the volume. Paul Reitter's afterword fulfils a similar function, and is more directly critical of Lessing than either Gilman or Appelbaum. The latter's translation, it should be noted again, is first class, and his notes very helpful indeed, although they could have benefited from critical analysis of Lessing's prose in addition to providing context to his narrative.

Thus we are presented with an uneven volume. On one hand – due to the fact that it represents the first (and very good) English translation of Lessing's *Der jüdische Selbsthaß* and is well annotated with excellent contributions from Gilman and Reitter – it is a worthy

addition to the body of scholarship that deals with German-Jewish cultural history, antisemitism, and racial theory; on the other, it is a work that fails to convince due to an outdated methodology and prose style.

PETER BERGAMIN is Lecturer in Oriental Studies at Mansfield College, University of Oxford, and Research Fellow at the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies. He specializes in the British Mandate for Palestine, with a particular interest in Maximalist–Revisionist Zionism. His first monograph, *The Making of the Israeli Far-Right: Abba Ahimeir and Zionist Ideology* (2020), focused on the ideological and political genesis of one of the major leaders of pro-fascist, far-right Zionism in the 1920s and 1930s. His most recent research examined British archival sources in order to suggest reasons for Britain's premature withdrawal from its Palestine Mandate. He is currently conducting research on the British Zionist Paul Goodman and British Zionism in the first half of the twentieth century.