CHAPTER 1

The Book as Cosmopolitan Object

Anna Vandenhoeck, Publisher, and Philippine Charlotte of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, Collector

Heinrich Heine’s speaker of the 1840s ridicules the border guards who inspect his luggage for smuggled texts and thereby critiques the censorship, repression, and exile suffered by liberals in the Vormärz period.
Though Heine’s poem did not save his political allies from persecution, his image defiantly conveys the free and cosmopolitan status of the book, an object that will elude reactionary authorities and, bird-like, fly into minds and chirp unrestrainedly in subversive dialogue with other texts. Heine’s depiction of books thus figures unhindered cultural transfer, a smooth movement of oppositional ideas across mental and political borders and an efficacious occupancy and activity in new territories. For all the satirical bitterness of his poem, the upshot of the image is idealistic and hopeful.

It may be surprising to find Heine introducing my chapter featuring two establishment late-eighteenth-century women who would perhaps have winced at his strident political stance, could they have seen into the future. However, I wish to suggest that Heine’s capacity to imagine the efficacy of books as cosmopolitan objects, challenging a parochial and nationalistic politics in the 1840s, follows upon decades of intense interest, exemplified by my protagonists, in unimpeded literary transfer for the purpose of promoting enlightenment, internationalization, and the expansion of sociocultural authority. Heine will reappear in chapter 4; here, I will focus on how Anna Vandenhoeck, a British woman who became bookseller to the University of Göttingen, and Duchess Philippine Charlotte, a princess of Prussia who married the Duke of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, contributed significantly to the enlightenment transfer project in a milieu of increasing multilateral cross-Channel exchange.

Literary historians have delineated the major roles played by women in the eighteenth-century book market and the shape they gave to the republic of letters. Given women’s centrality to each national culture, what part can they be said to have played in intra-European cultural transfer overall? It is a complex undertaking to contemplate simultaneously trade, gender, and nation, but doing so reveals facets of international exchange that have been inadequately studied and that alter the common story. I will consider books as material objects of transfer in eighteenth-century Europe, and I will ask how these texts, moving throughout the region in spite of wars and political tensions, shed light on feminist questions, particularly as they relate to cosmopolitanism and the rise of nationalism. Such questions are especially interesting with reference to Germany, not yet a country in the eighteenth century but a region with a confusing array of principalities and political alliances. Since Germany was not a unified nation, we can learn much from examining how the absorption of books from another culture, in this instance
the British, paradoxically aided in national self-definition and at the same time furthered international connection.

Moreover, precisely because France dominated continental literary culture in the eighteenth century, there is much to learn from studying English-German links. Delving into relationships between Britain and the German principalities after the Hanoverian succession and before the French Revolution brings to light aspects of cultural exchange that scholars, both from the English and the German side, have largely ignored. Books as objects of exchange can tell us about the history of two nations generally viewed separately, but which were tied politically and in complex sociocultural ways.

For one thing, such a study aids our understanding of European literary history and highlights the political role of women as producers, consumers, and cultural promoters. Duchess Philippine Charlotte’s role as a book collector is augmented by her goals as a hostess; her activities ultimately draw attention to the gradual displacement of French products from dominance in Germany. This meant both an opening for English books as well as German, and what has been viewed as incipient nationalism based on a bourgeois demand for an indigenous, German literature is shown simultaneously to have carried an international element. In addition, a look at the book trade allows us to revise how we think about class distinctions. The standard story is that of a court culture dominated by the products of French culture, and, again, a rising bourgeoisie demanding and producing German goods. The two are said to have come together only in the 1780s, especially in the court of Anna Amalia of Weimar. But a view of book publishing and collecting, particularly among women, suggests that a merging of aristocratic and bourgeois interests occurred earlier. Finally, the eighteenth-century European book market reveals what might at first appear to be a paradox: gendered cosmopolitanism. Rather than engaging in nonnational detachment based on notions of liberté and fraternité, as would the supporters of the French Revolution, bluestocking women display a patriotic cosmopolitanism characterized by cultural attachment. Tracing the movement of books between Britain and (what came to be) Germany thus offers fascinating insights into general European cultural links in the eighteenth century and suggests that women, despite their lack of a legal and political identity, were shaping politics by cultural means. In so doing they were beginning to create a class of their own, characterized by cultural and intellectual pursuits and a distinctive bluestocking ethos.
Some cultural ties between Britain and Germany clearly had political origins. After the establishment of the Personal Union, which made the Elector of Hanover, Georg Ludwig, King George I of England in 1714, the most prominent cultural link was represented in the founding of the University of Göttingen by George II in 1734. This institution was the brainchild of Gerlach Adolf von Münchhausen, a privy councillor of Hanover who became curator of the university and who energetically encouraged British-German transfer. The University of Göttingen was to be a modern institution, engaging in practical subjects to create a well-educated class of public servants and citizens. It would emphasize not only law, medicine, and theology but also political science and history. It would develop a botanical garden and an observatory. It would promote religious tolerance in order to appeal to students from beyond the borders of the electorate; and, indeed, it drew students from all over Europe. Among international students British were the most numerous. Matriculation records suggest that in a representative decade, 1770–80, up to 5 percent of students were British. George III sent his three youngest sons to study there, and many aristocratic and gentry families followed his example.

Professors had strong ties to Britain. Münchhausen encouraged Göttingen scholars to spend time there and to update their knowledge, especially in fields where British thinkers were at the forefront. Albrecht von Haller, for example, undertook educational travels in England, wrote a travel account, and remained influenced by things English his entire career, even publishing in late life a novel on Alfred the Great (1773) that touted the British political system and lionized George III. Extracts of his writings on physiology and blood circulation were translated and published in the *Monthly Review* and the *Scots Magazine* in the 1750s, his novel *Usong* was translated within a year of its German publication, and his *Letters to his Daughter on the Truths of the Christian Religion* appeared in three separate British editions between 1780 and 1807. He became first president of the Göttingen Academy of Sciences and the first editor of its internationally respected critical journal, the *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrten Sachen*. He promoted the German translation of Samuel Richardson’s novel *Clarissa* and wrote influential early reviews; these were translated into French and English, were published in the *Gentleman’s Magazine*, and persuaded Richardson to revise the novel by adding footnotes to clarify Lovelace’s character.
Other professors with strong ties to Britain included Gottfried Achenwall, a prominent political theorist who traveled to England and wrote extensively on what he viewed as the sources of English freedom; Johann David Michaelis, a renowned Biblical scholar who also traveled and corresponded with colleagues in England, was invited to join the Academies of Sciences in Paris and London, had works excerpted in the *Monthly Review* before they were fully issued in several British editions, and translated *Clarissa* into German (1748–53), which I will discuss in the next chapter.

Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (1742–99), however, is the best known of the Göttingen professors to travel to England. He first came to accompany Göttingen students William Irby and Thomas Swanton home in April-May 1770. His connection with these high-ranking families (the young men were sons of a lord and an admiral) made possible introductions into elevated social circles, and he was even invited by King George III to visit the observatory in Richmond. The king then financed Lichtenberg’s second trip to England, September 1774 to December 1775. Lichtenberg was a royal guest at Kew for the winter. He followed the political fortunes of John Wilkes and reported on the crisis with the American colonies; he observed English ways closely, commenting vividly on English street life, theater, manufactures, science, philosophy, and literature. Clarissa Campbell Orr has recently delineated his connections to Queen Charlotte. Surely with the queen’s blessing he eventually became tutor to the three English princes who came to study in Göttingen. He was elected a member of the London Royal Society in 1793. Although he was a professor of physics, with interests in mathematics and astronomy, he is best known today for his trenchant aphorisms. His literary flair led him to coedit, with Georg Forster, the *Göttingische Magazin der Wissenschaften und Literatur* (1780–85), and in his last years he introduced Germans to the work of William Hogarth with his *Ausführliche Erklärung der Hogarthischen Kupferstiche* (1794–99). Among his prized possessions were a copy of Newton’s death mask and a picture of the English king and queen that hung over the sofa in his garden house.

Other Göttingen institutions furthered the anglicization of the region. Münchhausen paid particular attention to the university library. He hired energetic and ambitious librarians, Joachim Matthias Gesner and later Christian Gottlob Heyne, who were themselves professors and developed a first-rate collection. From the start the Göttingen library vigorously bought English books; Bernhard Fabian calls it the “greatest repository of English books in eighteenth-century Germany.”
books were quickly reviewed in the *Göttingische Anzeigen von gelehrt en Sachen*, and they were incorporated into the first full bibliography of eighteenth-century English authors compiled, surprisingly, not by an Englishman in England but by the Göttinger assistant librarian Jeremias David Reuss: *Alphabetical Register of all the Authors Actually Living in Great-Britain, Ireland, and in the United Provinces of North-America, with a Catalogue of their Publications* (1791). Reuss wrote that since he possessed “most of the literary resources upon which an English author could draw . . . it may perhaps not be too daring if he attempts to supply a work [i.e., this bibliography] which the English have not yet produced.” From 1799 one could also consult the Göttinger Johann Gottfried Eichhorn’s *Litterärgeschichte*, which, according to Fabian, represented “one of the most incisive accounts of literature and learning in England that were written in eighteenth-century Germany.”¹⁵ Scholars in the area participated in an early form of interlibrary loan: Georg Forster in Kassel and Johann Gottfried Herder in Weimar requested that Heyne send them English volumes from Göttingen since the books could not be obtained any other way.¹⁶

The founding of the university naturally had an impact on Göttingen’s commercial life. Most notable was the creation of the influential publishing firm Vandenhoeck. Abraham Vandenhoeck, a Dutch bookseller born in The Hague around 1700 and active in London, was called to be bookseller and printer to the university in 1735. Münchhausen’s international ties and his ambitions for the university clearly led him to choose Vandenhoeck for the job. Vandenhoeck died soon, however, in 1750. As a result his English wife, Anna, took over the firm. Born Anna Parry in 1709, she married Vandenhoeck in the 1720s. His London shop was to be found “at Virgil’s Head over against the New Church in the Strand,” and a broad variety of publications were sold there, including medical and theological and political titles in Latin and French as well as in English, alongside fictional, historical, and travel texts from all over Europe.¹⁷ Vandenhoeck expanded the business to Hamburg in 1732, and they moved to that city for a short period before being recruited to Göttingen in 1735.¹⁸ It took time and effort to import their equipment and set up shop; even procuring type and paper could prove difficult. But their position must have improved substantially by 1749, when we learn that Anna was able to afford a pleasure trip to Kassel via post coach, accompanied by English friends.¹⁹

When Abraham Vandenhoeck died, Göttingen professors lamented his loss but expressed confidence in the capability of his wife to take over
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the work. In a letter to Johann Matthias Gesner, Albrecht von Haller wrote: “Nuper obiit Van den Hoeckius (magna mea cum iactura), sed vidua inceptos libros ad finem perducet” (“Vandenhoeck died recently, a great loss for me, but the widow will bring the initiated books to completion”), and Münchhausen too announced to the university his readiness to leave the business in Anna Vandenhoeck’s hands under the current terms (“man [ist] nicht abgeneigt, der Wittwe das Capital auf den bisherigen Fuß in der Handlung zu lassen”). Vandenhoeck was not alone; she ran the operation with the help of her business manager Carl Friedrich Ruprecht, to whom she ultimately willed the establishment when she died in 1787. (The company, still going strong, is now called Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht and was run by the Ruprecht family for seven generations.) Vandenhoeck published landmark works of celebrated professors—Haller, Michaelis, Johann Stephan Pütter, August Ludwig Schlözer among them—alongside printing the necessary catalogs, notices, and incidental items for the university. By 1751, however, she found it expedient to divest herself of the printing side of the business in order to concentrate entirely on book publishing and selling.

For over thirty years Vandenhoeck was pivotal in making her company into one of the most respected publishers in Germany, and the shop in Göttingen was a destination for intellectual exchange. The law professor Johann Stephan Pütter explained how, especially during the Seven Years’ War when French troops occupied Göttingen and citizens’ movement was restricted within the town gates, Vandenhoeck’s shop was the place for scholars to meet and enjoy conversation. She set special emphasis on foreign books, and English volumes in particular were available: the firm published the German translation of Samuel Richardson’s Clarissa as early as 1748–53, and it created a reading circle so that foreign-language journals and newspapers would be available to customers. But Vandenhoeck’s was not alone in promoting an English connection. Another later, prominent Göttinger bookseller, Johann Christian Dieterich, planned an entire series of English works to be edited by Georg Christoph Lichtenberg, and the Weidmannsche Buchhandlung began translating English books with amazing rapidity. This firm was based in Leipzig, not Göttingen, but perhaps encouraged by the practice of booksellers exchanging volumes among themselves at the book fairs (gradually displaced in this period by payment in hard currency), it meant that Anna Vandenhoeck always had hundreds of English books, in the original and in translation, on offer at her shop. Friedrich Wilhelm Unger would later write, “It was Vandenhoeck’s widow and Diet-
FIG. 1. Anna Vandenhoeck. Courtesy of Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, Germany.
erich from Gotha who first brought life to the local book trade. . . . There was hardly another place in the position of Göttingen to offer foreign and especially English books.”

Given the interest in international publications, a plan was developed around 1751 for a “world book company” to be established by selling stocks to 250 parties in order to raise the considerable capital of one hundred thousand taler, with the aim of facilitating the import and export of books to and from other European countries. A formal proposal was drawn up, an advertisement generated, and another Dutch bookseller, Elias Luzak, contracted to become the commercial organizer of this project, which was much favored by the Hanover regime. However, the scheme was never realized, though Luzak settled in Göttingen anyway and became a competitor for Van denhoeck.

Göttingen was therefore a node of expanding internationalization and especially anglicization, a characteristic it shared with Hamburg, which had long had close commercial ties with Britain. In Hamburg there was an Anglican church; British diplomats resided there; social organizations with international ties, such as the Patriotische Gesellschaft and the Freemasons, were very active. An English bookshop and English journals emerged, and many of the people spreading Anglophilia during the eighteenth century had some Hamburg or Göttingen connection.

Anna Van denhoeck’s commercial activities thus formed part of a larger tendency in the culture toward increasing interest in England and demonstrate how the market was opening up to non-French literature and language. German buyers of English books were of course people with means, mostly aristocrats and rich bourgeois. I will therefore consider aristocrats and their ties to the bourgeois expansion of trade, considering the aristocratic approach to book-buying and focusing on Braunschweig (Brunswick), which was allied both with England and Prussia.

2. Braunschweig: Cosmopolitanism and Court Culture

Göttingen, in the Electorate of Braunschweig-Lüneburg (which was generally called Hanover), was closely tied not only to England through the Personal Union but also to other Brunswick duchies as well as to Prussia, since they were territorially contiguous and linked through intermarried ruling families (see figure 2). Especially noteworthy was a family dynasty of female intellectuals, beginning with Sophie of Hanover. These women—with the exception of one crucial male figure, Frederick the
Great, and a lesser one, Karl I—were central in fostering the intellectual and cultural growth of northern Germany in the period and promoting the type of cosmopolitanism I will be describing. There is a significant salon tradition to be witnessed in provincial courts that culminated in Anna Amalia’s late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century Weimar. And while the bluestocking aristocrats who were central in this process are familiar to Germanists and royal historians, they remain virtually unknown to other scholars. I will therefore offer brief introductions to these dynamic noblewomen before turning to the example of Philippine Charlotte, Duchess of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel.

1. Sophie von Hannover was Electress of Hanover and slated to become queen of England, but she died only months before Queen Anne. She traveled extensively, collected books and paintings, corresponded with significant figures, and possessed enormous energy. She was the patron of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz and took an active part in shaping his career, for example setting up and mediating his productive theological correspondence with the Huguenot Paul Pellisson. On the day that she died, in her eighties, she was taking a vigorous walk in her beloved garden in Herrenhausen.

2. Sophie Charlotte von Preussen was the only daughter of Sophie von Hannover. She also supported Leibniz, whose *Essais de Théodicee* derived from conversations with her; he is said to have been “in despair for weeks” when she died. Lietzenburg castle was the location of her renowned salon, and her husband renamed it Charlottenburg in her honor.

3. Caroline of Ansbach learned much at Sophie Charlotte’s gatherings. She was orphaned and came under Sophie Charlotte’s guardianship. In this context Leibniz became her instructor; he suggested books to her and they corresponded for years. Caroline was courted by and encouraged to marry Archduke Karl, the future Holy Roman emperor. This would have meant converting to Catholicism. Caroline, however, was devout and independent-minded and debated the formidable Jesuit Father Ferdinand Orban for hours in front of an open Bible before she turned down the marriage proposal. She finally married Sophie Charlotte’s nephew, Georg August, who became George II of England and who felt so confident of her powers that he appointed her regent during his long trips to Hanover. As Sophie von Hannover and Sophie Charlotte had done, Caroline mediated and moderated the correspondence of Leibniz, this time with Samuel Clarke.

4. Sophie Dorothea, sister of George II, married Sophie Charlotte’s son Friedrich Wilhelm, the irascible and miserly “Soldier King” of
Fig. 2. Connections between the Houses of Hanover, Brunswick, and Prussia
Prussia. She instilled in her children a love of music and the arts. She worked indefatigably to arrange twin marriages between her daughter Wilhelmine and the Prince of Wales and her son Frederick and Princess Amalia, but her plans were thwarted by her husband, who greatly disliked his cousin George and wanted to create stronger German and imperial connections while frustrating British continental ambitions.

(5) Wilhelmine von Bayreuth was the favorite sister of Frederick the Great, with whom she corresponded for over thirty years. She built a famous rococo opera house, where the latest compositions, including many of her own, were performed; she was close to Voltaire; she helped to found the University of Erlangen; she introduced innovations in the gardens of the court at Bayreuth; and she amassed a book collection of five thousand volumes.

(6) Philippine Charlotte was a younger sister of Frederick the Great, and also kept up a lifelong correspondence with him. She was lively and apparently appealed to everyone, even her moody father. She married Karl I, the Duke of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel, and in what appears to have been an unusually peaceful partnership they created a court atmosphere in the tradition of Sophie Charlotte and Sophie Dorothea. I will expand on her role below.

(7) Anna Amalia of Sächsen-Weimar-Eisenach was a daughter of Philippine Charlotte and is perhaps the best known of these learned noblewomen. The patron of Goethe and Friedrich von Schiller and “muse of Weimar,” she transformed that small town into a cultural center where the brightest talents of the era congregated. It has been said that her parents’ court epitomized the baroque, while Anna Amalia brought court culture into the classical era. Though her contributions are better known than those of her predecessors, she was clearly drawing on a family history of promoting arts and letters, a family history that moved mostly through the women. Only recently has her education in Wolfenbüttel and Braunschweig received closer attention; thanks to Joachim Berger we now have a thoroughgoing biography of this significant figure in German political-cultural history.30

3. Book Collecting and Borrowing in Braunschweig

In addition to promoting salon discourses, the Prussian-Braunschweig women participated in the book market. They created substantial collections and some of these were then donated to public libraries; the
Herzog August Bibliothek, central to this story, possesses manuscript catalogs of the aristocratic book collections that were willed to this remarkable library. Not only do these catalogs offer fascinating evidence of continental European reading habits but they also reveal how the collections were gendered (the duchesses kept libraries separate from the dukes), and what the nature of influence from one generation to another might have been (we have catalogs from parents as well as sons and daughters). Jacqueline Pearson, in her book on *Women’s Reading in Britain, 1750–1835*, has lamented the dearth of evidence concerning English women’s libraries: “Following the fortunes of women’s libraries is . . . problematic since few women had independent libraries . . . though they might have access to those of fathers, husbands, or sons.”\(^{31}\) In contrast, there is ample German evidence of independent women’s collections, as for example that of Duchess Philippine Charlotte. She is not well known—incredibly, we have no full biography—but her social centrality makes her a good representative.

Philippine Charlotte was a formidable woman, proud of her birth and rank, which she enjoyed displaying (figure 3). Visitors commented on her diamonds and lavish table, to which she frequently invited her preferred guests, professors from the Collegium Carolinum and the University of Helmstedt. Because she left her library to the Herzog August Bibliothek, we know that she had about four thousand volumes, a very impressive number for a private library in this period—about the same size as the other most notable libraries of female aristocrats of the time, including those of her sister Wilhelmine of Bayreuth, her daughter Anna Amalia, Luise-Dorothea of Sachsen-Gotha, and Caroline of Hessen-Darmstadt.\(^{32}\) She had a catalog compiled of this impressive collection and even spent an afternoon reading the catalog to a visitor. Despite Philippine Charlotte’s penchant for show, she clearly intended the catalog and the library for personal edification. In the sermon preached at her funeral J. W. G. Wolff, the cathedral clergyman, said that Philippine Charlotte saw the collection more as a useful means to enlightenment and inner development than for outward display. Indeed a letter to her librarian confirms this; she wrote that he should remove 140 volumes and exchange them for thirty-three others, since the 140 she had identified “aren’t helpful and are more for show than use.”\(^{33}\)

Philippine Charlotte demonstrated a remarkable cosmopolitanism in her collecting habits and in this she appears representative of the other aristocratic women I have mentioned. Hers were the choices of a liberal, enlightened, and well-informed intellectual, even if there are
no works in Latin and Greek. In fact most works are in French, the language in which she always wrote and often spoke. Subject headings in the systematic catalogue include Theology and Church History, Morals, Politics, History, Natural History, Law, Medicine, Math, the Arts, Games, Logic, Literature, Comedies, and Novels. The library is dominated by male authors, including, among the English, Joseph Addison and Richard Steele, Gilbert Burnet, Daniel Defoe, David Hume, Samuel Johnson, John Law, John Locke, John Milton, Alexander Pope, the Earl of Shaftesbury, William Shakespeare, Laurence Sterne, and Jonathan Swift. There does not appear to be much self-censorship; the authors often reflect controversial and reformist points of view. Among the French and Italian authors are Jean Barbeyrac, Cesare Beccaria, Niccolò Machiavelli, François Rabelais, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Bernardin de Saint Pierre, Voltaire, and the Comte de Volney. She collected politically provocative works, edifying moral tracts and philosophical treatises, as well as gossipy secret histories and novels about love.
Despite the preponderance of male authors, Philippine Charlotte was particularly interested in works by and about women, something typical of engaged aristocratic women in this period. Philippine Charlotte collected women’s translations, letter collections, biographies, autobiographies, poetry, novels, scientific works, courtesy books, and secret histories. Wide-ranging, cosmopolitan, women-oriented collecting habits are true also of Philippine Charlotte’s sisters Wilhelmine and Anna Amalia. (This Anna Amalia is not to be confused with her daughter; her sister was the abbess of Quedlinburg and an accomplished musician.) Marc Serge Rivière and Annett Volmer have helpfully compared Anna Amalia’s library with that of her brother, Frederick the Great, and concluded: “Amalia was far better read and more cosmopolitan than her celebrated brother; she grew into a more universal and a more rounded individual who, admittedly, had much more time to use her library than the warring king . . . He read mostly in French translation; she was very proficient in French, English and German, though not in Latin and Greek,” and she “was true to her sex” in collecting works by women writers and about female figures. Philippine Charlotte’s library, nearly twice the size of Amalia’s, reveals the same differences from Frederick’s and the same preoccupations. If Frederick encouraged the reading of his sisters, they were inspired to move beyond his particular predilections.

In addition to feeling solidarity with women of different nationalities, Philippine Charlotte maintained a cosmopolitan outlook that was prompted by her ambitions for her family. There were marriages to be arranged, and Philippine Charlotte had her sights on England. That she and her brother had strongly differing views on this is evident in her half of an exchange of letters. She wrote to Frederick how she enjoyed a visit from the English king George II, who was polite and gracious and reminded her of their mother (George II’s sister): the same face, eyes, manner, and way of speaking. She was forced abruptly to change her tune, however, in a response to what must have been an angry letter from Frederick. She wrote: “You are quite right that there’s no comparison to be made between him and our worthy mother”; he is ignorant, vain, conceited, and believes no one to be more powerful than he is. “I expect nothing from his breed.” But she then went on to ask why Frederick was angry with her husband, so that one gets the distinct impression that her backtracking on George II was intended to appease her impetuous sibling.

This conclusion is supported by her undiminished pursuit of family links with England: she worked to arrange a marriage between a daughter and George’s grandson, the future George III. Having borrowed a
copy of a *History of England* from the Herzog August Bibliothek to prepare for her trip to Hanover, she traveled with her daughters Caroline and Anna Amalia to meet George II, who offered “every distinction imaginable.” He was most impressed with Caroline and gave Philippine Charlotte hope that “l’affaire en question sera bientôt décidée.” That match was not to be, but Philippine Charlotte eventually married her son to George III’s sister and her granddaughter Caroline to George IV. Philippine Charlotte respected her brother, but felt no compunction about resisting his will when it served her own family.³⁹

The same independent spirit manifested itself in her ideas about reading. Frederick made suggestions, but Philippine Charlotte came to her own conclusions. When Frederick sent her a volume of Cicero, for example, she challenged the ancient author’s notions about the virtue of denying pain and defended what she felt constituted a natural human response: “On voit bien que Cicéron n’est jamais accouché.” In her next letter she expressed delight that Frederick agreed with her, and went on to mention that she was reading Epictetus, Bernard Le Bovier de Fontenelle, “la mort de Socrate,” and Johann Gustav Reinbeck on the immortality of the soul.⁴⁰

Most of all, however, Philippine Charlotte’s international interest was fostered by the Collegium Carolinum professors. To be mentioned in this regard are especially Johann Friederich Jerusalem (1709–89), Johann Arnold Ebert (1723–95), and Johann Joachim Eschenburg (1743–1820). The latter two were prominent German translators from the English. Ebert is best known for his translation of Young’s “Night Thoughts”; he also taught the crown prince. Eschenburg is best known for translating Shakespeare as well as aesthetic works, for instance of John Brown, Daniel Webb, Richard Hurd, and Charles Burney.⁴¹ He was trained in Göttingen, where he studied with Michaelis. Most notable of all was Jerusalem, whom Karl and Philippine Charlotte hired in 1742 to be tutor to their sons and preacher to the court. Jerusalem had traveled in Holland as well as in England, where he resided for three years. There he made the acquaintance of important intellectuals and clergy (Archbishop Potter, Bishop Sherlock, Daniel Waterland, William Whiston, James Foster) and was swayed by latitudinarianism. He almost decided to stay in England but returned to Germany. He was the most prominent intellectual in the court; he must have been one of Philippine Charlotte’s favorite dinner guests and exercised some influence on the choices of books for her collection. He became head of the Collegium Carolinum, a new-style institution that emphasized modern languages, the sciences,
engineered, and practical subjects rather than a classical curriculum. It fostered religious tolerance, emphasized the development of judgment and taste, and sought to minimize class distinctions. According to Jerusalem, the performance of students alone, not their rank, would determine how they were judged.42 The sons of the duke and duchess attended alongside members of the bourgeoisie. Like the University of Göttingen, it was influenced by English ideas and it too attracted British students.43

Certainly the book collection of Philippine Charlotte’s son, Wilhelm Adolf, reflects his education at Jerusalem’s hands: when he died in battle at age twenty-five in 1770 his collection came to the Herzog August Bibliothek, where it remains to this day. The manuscript catalog compiled at that time lists dozens of English authors, most of whose books are in the original: represented are works by Addison, Francis Bacon, Henry St John Bolingbroke, Burnet, Defoe, John Dryden, Henry Fielding, Sarah Fielding, Adam Fitzadam, Thomas Hobbes, Hume, Locke, Delarivier Manley, Sherlock, Steele, John Tillotson, William Warburton, Isaac Watts, Francis Wollaston, Edward Young. He also owned a two-volume edition of *English Miscellanies* edited by John Tompson, which must have served him as a language-acquisition text. Tompson was the first English professor at the University of Göttingen, and his anthology, first published in the 1730s, went through four editions published by Vandenhoeck. The full title reads: *English Miscellanies consisting of various pieces of divinity, morals, politics, philosophy and history; as likewise some choice poems; all collected out of the most approved authors in the English Tongue Viz. Tillotson Nichols Lock Milton Cowley Waller Denham Dryden Buckingham Prior Addison Pope etc. And chiefly intended for the Advantage of such, as are willing to apply themselves to the Learning of this usefull Language.* Wilhelm Adolf acquired the third edition, published in Göttingen “for the widow of Abram Vandenhoeck, 1755.”44 We therefore see the direct connection between Göttingen and the provincial courts, between Anna Vandenhoeck and Philippine Charlotte, between the anglicized milieu of the Hanoverian university town and the Braunschweig duchy that was on so many levels—geographically, politically, ideologically, maritally—located directly between England and Prussia.

Unlike her brother Frederick, Philippine Charlotte collected not only English books but also German ones, and in a number of ways the welcome given to British texts occurred simultaneously for German ones—both were reactions against French hegemony. Though the emphasis on German language authors in this period is generally associated with bourgeois writers and thinkers, there were crucial aristocratic
supporters of the new intellectual developments. For her part, Philippine Charlotte is credited alongside her husband with hiring Gotthold Ephraim Lessing to be librarian at the Herzog August Bibliothek, and her book collection contained many of his works in German. He was a leader among bourgeois eighteenth-century German writers who first produced his celebrated tragedy, *Emilia Galotti*, in Wolfenbüttel to honor Philippine Charlotte on her birthday. If that play critiques aristocratic ways, Philippine Charlotte herself was ready to take up progressive points of view. She, together with her sister Amalia over dinner on a visit to their brother, argued the value of German literature and thereby provoked Frederick’s famous and disparaging essay, “De la littérature allemande, des défauts qu’on peut lui reprocher, quelles en sont les causes, et par quelles moyens on peut les corriger” (1780).  

Philippine Charlotte also inspired, in rebuttal, Jerusalem’s letter-essay, “Über die Teutsche Sprache und Litteratur. An Ihro Koenigliche Hoheit die verwittwete Frau Herzogin von Braunschweig und Lueneburg” (1781). Addressing his arguments to his patron Philippine Charlotte, Jerusalem defended German authors from Frederick’s criticisms. He insisted that recent indigenous writers had come far and achieved a national literature worthy of international recognition. He wrote that far from being provincial, the productions of Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, Solomon Gessner, Christoph Martin Wieland, Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, and Lessing “are classic for all of Germany.” Jerusalem’s focus on national literature had as its goal not only the development of a German identity but also participation in international exchange. He argued, for example, that because it is only the difficulty of the German language and the illegible script that keeps other nations from benefiting from German productions, German orthography should be changed. Jerusalem’s argument challenged French domination and made space for indigenous German writing as well as English contributions. The essay was considered important enough to be summarized and evaluated in the British critical journal, the *Monthly Review*, in the same year, 1781; clearly Britain’s intellectual elite was intensely interested in the literary developments of the Germans, who, alongside increases in commercial, diplomatic, and intellectual exchanges between the countries, had done so much to support British interests in the Seven Years’ War.

Indeed, in the last four decades of the eighteenth century British magazines published a good deal of German material that appealed to an ever-expanding audience. First, for example, the poetry and oratory of Frederick the Great offered British readers a picture of the intellectu-
al and artistic warring king; religious texts by the Count von Zinzendorf, resident in England in the early 1750s, allowed an understanding of the Herrenhuters and Moravian practices; and medical work of Albrecht von Haller gave insight into state-of-the-art experiments undertaken at the University of Göttingen. The purview then broadened in the 1760s and 1770s to more general works catering to a bourgeois and feminine audience, for example the periodicals offered translations of Gessner and Gellert, travel literature, poetry of Anna Karsch, Sophie von LaRoche’s novel Sophia Sternheim, Goethe’s sensational Sorrows of Young Werther, and eventually the popular plays of August von Kotzebue. Journals then backtracked as well to translate earlier works, for example of Lessing, Klopstock, and Wieland.49

Increasing two-way transfer, buttressed by arguments of accommodation such as those of Jerusalem’s, encouraged rather than discouraged cosmopolitanism. This therefore calls into question overly simplified interpretations reinforced by such recent theorists as Benedict Anderson: that is, that a tradition of humanist, universalist cosmopolitanism deriving from an early modern tradition and depending on Latin communication was overtaken in the eighteenth century by nationalist tendencies promoting indigenous writers and a national literature. When one considers the evidence of the literary-cultural activities of a provincial German court, its energetic duchess, and the thinkers she sought out to surround her, we see that the arguments in favor of German literature went hand in hand with enlightened internationalist ideas. At the same time, the enthusiasm of the British magazines and their lay English readership for translations from the German attests to a corresponding interest in European productions beyond the French.50

This more complex view is corroborated by larger economic trends. Bernhard Fabian has pointed out that, in the early decades of the eighteenth century, journals in Germany, like those in England, moved from addressing an elite educated audience to reviewing, in German, literature for a regional readership. This did not mean a retreat to parochialism, since editors consistently “drew attention to significant foreign publications,” thereby “opening new perspectives on the intellectual life abroad.” That is, long-standing humanist paradigms were giving way to an era of general cosmopolitanism. Already before the French Revolution, cultural movement was away from the intellectual elite to the mainstream, and away from being female-exclusive to female-inclusive. In the reviews, Fabian notes, foreign works were evaluated “not in the older tradition as contributions to an international body of scholarly literature,
but in a more modern fashion as the products of a foreign literature.\textsuperscript{51} Despite being written in foreign languages and therefore seemingly nation-bound, works of literature were actually becoming more available, crossing borders, more likely to be translated, and reaching more diverse readers rather than being limited to a small scholarly circle. The content of British magazines reflects this moment as does Philippine Charlotte’s library and Vandenhoeck’s translation of \textit{Clarissa}.

Moreover, such increased availability of foreign works is resoundingly reinforced by the astonishing catalog of books available in Vandenhoeck’s shop in 1785, a fascinating and rare document from which, for the sake of space, I will mention only titles by British women authors available in German translation (along with the year of that edition): Aphra Behn, \textit{Oroonoko} (1770); Frances Brooke, \textit{History of Emily Montague} (1769); Hester Chapone, \textit{Letters} (1774); Sarah Fielding, \textit{Countess of Delloyn} (1761); Sarah Fielding, \textit{David Simple} (1746); Sarah Fielding, \textit{Familiar Letters} (1759); Sarah Fielding [?], \textit{Life of Octavia} (1761); Sarah Fielding, \textit{Ophelia} (1763); Mary Hamilton, \textit{Duchess de Crui} (1776–77); Eliza Haywood [?], \textit{History of Miss Jenny} (1770); Charlotte Lennox, \textit{Henriette} (1761); Delarivier Manley, \textit{New Atalantis} (1740); Mary Wortley Montagu, \textit{Letters} (1763); Sarah Scott, \textit{History of Cornelia} (1762); Sarah Scott, \textit{Millenium Hall} (1768); Frances Sheridan, \textit{Miss Sidney Bidulph} (1770); Elizabeth Singer Rowe, \textit{Friendship in Death} (1777); and Elizabeth Singer Rowe, \textit{Poetical Works} (1772).\textsuperscript{52} Since this list represents only the books on her shelves in the early 1780s, one can imagine the wealth of volumes that moved through her shop over the course of three decades.

The democratization implied by this development concerned class as well as gender. The Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel—remarkably, a public library from the 1660s—offers a special opportunity to examine this revolutionary shift. For it possesses not only the manuscript catalogs of the aristocrats such as Philippine Charlotte and her son Wilhelm Adolf but also the Ausleihbücher (withdrawal books) that show what the lower classes read. Mechthild Raabe has published and analyzed the astonishing withdrawal books of the library, which show that readers of all classes and both sexes checked out volumes: carpenters, servants, soldiers, students, clergy. Their participation reached a peak in the period 1760–80; they brought about an enormous increase in the withdrawal of belles-lettres. Many foreigners visited the library and consulted volumes; Philippine Charlotte herself checked out books she could not consult in her own collection, for example the Koran and a book concerning Indian philosophy. After the French Revolution many
French émigrés settled in Wolfenbüttel and Braunschweig, and judging from the number of their withdrawals, they were clearly delighted to have a library so well stocked for their use.55

A study of the eighteenth-century European book trade, its relation to the political ties between England and Germany, and the interesting picture of bookselling and book-buying that we can glean from transnational case studies transpiring in Lower Saxony offer us occasion for revising our views of eighteenth-century international understanding. Pauline Kleingeld has documented how cosmopolitanism in the eighteenth century was advocated by German thinkers on various levels—moral, political, intellectual, cultural, economic, and spiritual—and she traces how it gave way to growing nationalism after the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars.54 Yet the women’s version evident in the court of Philippine Charlotte and the shop of Anna Vandenhoeck, situated within the broader cultural movements I have traced, suggests that their orientation and type of cosmopolitanism was of a more pragmatic, embedded nature.

Studies of the rise of nationalism in the eighteenth century have tended to concentrate on individual nations and their imperial strivings, privileging analysis of colonial competition between European lands while downplaying intra-European ties. Consequently the place of gender in the international political European context has hardly been broached. I have therefore chosen to emphasize case studies from the same geographic region, Lower Saxony, that involve women of different national origins and classes in an attempt to show how politically marginal figures such as Anna Vandenhoeck and Philippine Charlotte nonetheless contributed to the larger picture. The expansion of the book trade, as Benedict Anderson has pointed out, was crucial for national self-definition in this period, but I am suggesting that it simultaneously enabled internationalism on the ground. These women’s cosmopolitan inclinations shared certain sources, being closely related to their social positions and family fortunes within a context of growing British-German transfer. Vandenhoeck in Göttingen supported the translation of significant British publications, encouraged British journals through a reading circle, and offered great numbers of British volumes, in the original and in translation, for sale at her shop. She willed substantial money—and she was one of the richest citizens of Göttingen—to two telling groups: the Reformed Church, a congregation at this time involved with Huguenot immigrants and perhaps even conducting services in French, and the fund for professors’ widows.55 Philippine Charlotte likewise remem-
bered the widows of the Helmstedt professors in her will. She also left an income to the émigré French princess of Montmorency to be sure this aristocratic, exiled Frenchwoman would not be left without resources in another land. These monied women sought to the end to mitigate the adverse effects of a restrictive sociopolitics of gender and nation; their wills demonstrate acute sensitivity to the plight of vulnerable ladies in donations that saw beyond national boundaries.56

The evidence we have from female participants in the eighteenth-century book market thus reinforces a sense of the depth of gender identification and the importance of family connections. Women’s lack of political identity and clout contributed to their interest in promoting a quotidian rather than transcendent cosmopolitanism that can be contrasted with the type derived from theories of liberty and fraternity that inspired revolutionary activity. Cosmopolitanism has been seen to derive from a sense of detachment, where universal notions of human behavior and the well-lived life outweigh a person’s loyalty to hearth and home. But I argue that a look at women’s activities and intellectual preoccupations demonstrates that gender position can trump rigid national and social identities, that there is a type of cosmopolitanism deriving from some women’s experience that allows for both patriotism and international identification. Anna Vandenhoeck and Duchess Philippine Charlotte thus demonstrate what Kwame Anthony Appiah has called “patriotic cosmopolitanism” in the process of furthering their political inclinations by cultural means.57 In their literary activities they foreshadow the impatience of Heine’s Deutschland narrator, shirking suspicion of foreign products, defying artificial borders, and delighting in the capacity for intellectual transfer in spite of customs threatening to thwart them.