Challenging Separate Spheres—Female Bildung in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Germany (review)

Adrian Daub

Goethe Yearbook, Volume 17, 2010, pp. 405-406 (Review)

Published by North American Goethe Society
DOI: *https://doi.org/10.1353/gyr.0.0039*

man bisher entweder ignoriert oder überhaupt nicht als etwas erkannt hat, das erwähnt oder untersucht zu werden verdiente. Es geht Schillemeit nicht darum, Fontane blanken Antisemitismus vorzuwerfen, aber er weist doch nach, dass sich auch Fontane "gewissen gefühlsmäßigen Stereotypen und Vorurteilen . . . antisemitischer, zeittypischer Strömungen" (516) nicht entziehen konnte. Ein Zitat aus einem Brief Fontanes an Philipp zu Eulenburg belegt das deutlich: "Ich liebe die Juden, ziehe sie dem Wendo-Germanischen eigentlich vor—denn es ist bis dato mit letztrem nicht allzuviel—aber regiert will ich nicht von den Juden sein" (499). Diese zwischen Philosemitismus and Antisemitismus schwebende Haltung, die natürlich nicht nur bei Fontane zu belegen ist—man denke hier nur an Georg Christoph Lichtenberg—ist nicht leicht zu erklären. Schillemeit spricht in diesem Zusammenhang von "Ambivalenz," die sich bei Fontane aber auch auf andere Bereiche wie etwa den Adel, das Preußentum oder Frankreich beziehen kann und damit Fontanes Haltung zum Judentum auf ein sehr viel komplexeres Diskussionsniveau hebt und zu einem Teilaspekt "seiner Gesellschaftsinterpretation und -kritik" (503) macht.

Viele der von Schillemeit behandelten Themenkreise beschäftigen auch heute noch die Germanistik und wenn diese auch andere Forschungswege beschreitet, bleibt Schillemeits Werk doch ein wichtiger Bestandteil der deutschen Literaturgeschichtsschreibung, das die Zunft der Literaturwissenschaftler auch in Zukunft zu Rate ziehen wird.

Chapman University *Walter Tschacher*

Marjanne E. Goozé, ed., **Challenging Separate Spheres—Female Bildung in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Germany**. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007. 317pp.

This lively and wide-ranging collection of essays edited by Marjanne Goozé focuses on mostly nineteenth-century women writers who "reframe, revalue, redefine, renegotiation, subvert, reject and otherwise challenge social, legal, educational, and developmental gender models" (11). While the volume takes the question of *Bildung* as its central guiding thread, it is significant that nearly all the texts included in the volume take this *Bildung* as something closer to an *éducation sentimentale* than an *Ausbildung.* Concomitantly, this means that they tend to focus on literary texts as mediators, purveyors, or indices of *Bildung*—hardly any of them have anything to say about the very concrete proposals for educational techniques, educational reform, and educational equality to emerge from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. While the resulting emphasis on "strategies" for "subversion" of dominant constructions of gender relations can get a bit repetitive at times, the texts nevertheless highlight and illuminate an astonishing variety of texts from women authors ranging from the aristocratic Sophie von la Roche to the Swiss factory worker Verena Conzett.

Of course, part of the problem of "separate spheres" was that women writers not only could not aspire to *Bildung* as defined by their male counterparts, but dominant ideology prevented them from propounding a theory of *Bildung,* to reflect on the *topos,* except by implicitly addressing such issues in genres generally considered more appropriate to women, such as the letter and the moral weekly. Anca L. Holden's contribution to the volume focuses on Marianne Ehrmann's journals and moral weeklies, which focused on charting out a path of *Bildung* the eighteenth century emphatically reserved for men. Laura Deiulio's essay on the letters of Rahel Levin Varnhagen and Pauline Wiesel reads letter writ-

ing as a venue for an alternative, specifically feminine form of *Bildung,* while Tamara Zwick's consideration of the letters of Magdalena Pauli and Johanna Sieveking posits letter-writing as always already subverting the public/private distinction (the "separate spheres" of the volume's title) that subtend the standard nineteenth-century narrative of *Bildung.* Another such genre was the personal memoir, and accordingly, Wendy Arons's article (which readers of the *German Quarterly* will already be familiar with), on the actress Karoline Schulze-Kummerfeld's two autobiographical texts from the last decades of the eighteenth century, charts how Schulze-Kummerfeld could locate herself as actress and woman in a discursive environment that valorized anti-theatrical authenticity and insistently gendered that authenticity male.

If in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century ideology a *Bildung* was complete only once it left the intramural confines of the home for the wider fields of university, military, and commerce, *Bildung* was in some sense always already allied with historical time and development. As Bonnie Smith's magisterial study *The Gender of History* has showed, not just the experience of and attempt to make history, but even the prerogative of commenting on history was largely withheld from the domestic sphere and thus from women. Debbie Pinfold's contribution to the volume deals with three women authors who attempted to come to terms with an epochal event (the revolution of 1848) within the limits allotted them by the ideology of domesticity.

Another focus of the volume are women authors unjustly eclipsed by the men in their lives, reduced to muses, shrews, confidantes, rather than getting billing as authors in their own right. Elizabeth Krimmer's fine contribution to the volume, for instance, deals with Charlotte von Stein's *Die zwey Emilien* and Dorothea Veit-Schlegel's *Florentin.* While in the case of *Die zwey Emilien,* the connection to *Bildung* remains rather tenuous (although the question of how *Bildung* and cross-dressing may be said to interact is an interesting one), *Florentin,* on the other hand, with its insistence on frustrated reproduction and its often-invoked status as "anti-*Bildungsroman*" (Martha Helfer) offers a fine example of how the ideology of gendered *Bildung* could be slyly subverted or frustrated. Christine Kanz's contribution to the volume similarly draws on the analogy between *Bildung* and reproduction at the turn of the twentieth century.

As an ensemble, the essays collected in this volume chart out an impressive history of women's literary agency in the long nineteenth century. While the majority of the essays remain concerned with literary texts, there is a refreshing breadth of approaches, texts, and genres to the volume's contributions. Given the volume's combination of established authorities in the field and emerging voices, any scholar working on questions of gender in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Germany will ignore this book at his or her own risk.

Stanford University *Adrian Daub*

Andrew Cusack, **The Wanderer in 19th-Century German Literature: Intellectual History and Cultural Criticism**. Rochester, New York: Camden House, 2008. 257 pp.

Interested in the diachronic history of the wanderer in various texts of the German nineteenth century, Andrew Cusack has written a book rich in information and ideas. While drawing on a wide range of works related to wandering or