<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Introduction : Cameralism and the Enlightenment

Nokkala, Ere

Routledge
2019

Nokkala , E & Miller , N B 2019 , Introduction : Cameralism and the Enlightenment . in E Nokkala & N B Miller (eds) , Cameralism and the Enlightenment : Happiness, Governance and Reform in Transnational Perspective . Enlightenment World-Political and Intellectual History of the Long Eighteenth Century , Routledge , Abingdon , pp. 1-20 . <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429343551-1>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/330257>

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429343551-1>

unspecified
acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Ere Nokkala

[Orcid.org/0000-0002-3905-1679](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3905-1679)

Nicholas B. Miller

[Orcid.org/0000-0002-4037-642X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4037-642X)

Abstract

Building on recent research on the transnational dimensions of Enlightenment as well as Enlightenment in German-speaking contexts, this introduction sets out the stakes of studying cameralism against the backdrop of the Enlightenment. Setting the stage for the following contributions in the volume, we suggest an actor-focused approach to idea transfer that overcomes a reductive dichotomy between practice and theory and an untenable separation of the intellectual from the social and the cultural. We develop an approach to the study of past thinkers that takes their individual creativity and multiple commitments seriously, particularly in the process of adapting ideas to various local contexts, whether linguistic, national, political, confessional, administrative or institutional. Through a methodological reconsideration of boundaries and units of analysis in cultural and intellectual history, we encourage an approach to cameralism as a porous political-economic field rather than a set of fixed commitments. Further, we suggest how cameralists reconciled their views on commerce, colonialism and natural law in consonant ways to other varieties of enlightened political economy, lending new insights into the importance of cameralism to Enlightenment studies and the history of eighteenth-century Europe more broadly.

Eighteenth-century practices and discourses of statecraft known as cameralism have not often been studied in connection with the transnational philosophical phenomenon of the European Enlightenment. Defined by an Anglo-French perspective, classic scholarship portrayed the ideas of French physiocrats and British political economists as constitutive of an Enlightenment approach to questions of state and economy. Other viewpoints, particularly those of officials actually working for eighteenth-century European states, were judged as either *beyond* Enlightenment thought, or continuing in traditions that *predated* the Enlightenment. But what do we do with the fact that these individuals—named in the scholarship as cameralists—lived lives beyond the princely chamber? Seventeenth-century cameralists, advisors of rulers in the German princely states, were mainly interested in questions of unlimited monarchy and administration. Their arguments reflected a discourse of allegiance, crafted as they were in a political setting defined by princely ascendancy. However, over the course of the eighteenth century, they entered new domains, namely universities, and turned cameralism into an academic and theoretical discipline that took diverse and changing forms.

Conceiving statecraft as an art of secrecy, the state built the walls of the princely chambers and universities of central Europe solid and thick; but we propose in this volume that they were hardly thick enough to drown out the wider world of ideas that swept Europe and beyond over the course of the eighteenth century. Building upon recent methodological shifts in Enlightenment studies and intellectual history, this volume develops a cultural and intellectual history of cameralism that goes beyond the supposed tension between ideas and practice

stipulated in the existing literature.¹ Our starting point is a reconceptualisation of the terms in question, borne from a position of scepticism towards the unity of the labels of “cameralists” and “cameralism”. Cameralism here is not defined as a stable category of analysis; rather, we use it as a signifier for a field of thinkers situated within the dynamic intellectual milieu of the European Enlightenment.

In this volume, we approach cameralism as a political-economic field in dynamic interaction with the historiographical concept of Enlightenment. Let us unpack this complex manoeuvre. Cameralism can be seen doubly as a set of practices and ideas relating to state administration during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, centred in though by no means exclusive to central Europe, which underpinned an emergent university discipline with similar geographical configurations during the eighteenth century. Particularly in the eighteenth century, practitioners such as Johann Heinrich Gottlob von Justi, Joseph von Sonnenfels and Johann Beckmann explicitly named themselves as cameralists. Enlightenment is approached here, in the sense that defines the burgeoning field of Enlightenment studies, as a heuristic, rather than an actor category. As suggested by Hans Erich Bödeker and more recently Elisabeth Décultot, we take it as an epochal historiographical concept defined by “certain hermeneutical prerequisites” emergent from a reading of Enlightenment as a set of medial practices, intellectual frameworks and processes of communication that characterised the long eighteenth century.² To study the conjuncture of cameralism and Enlightenment is far more than to study the disciplinisation of cameralism at universities in the eighteenth century, or *late* rather than *early* cameralism. Rather, we aim here to reconfigure cameralism as an historical unit of inquiry. Instead of a tightly

bounded domain of unchanging ideas, we approach cameralism as a porous field open to the influence of alternate and competing intellectual strains, impulses and traditions.

Our approach is a simultaneously methodological and thematic reconsideration of boundaries and units of analysis in intellectual history. We theorise discourse here as a complex of ideas, rather than as a coherent doctrine, as Lars Magnusson proposed in his recent study on mercantilism.³ Our intervention is one of historicisation, approaching the subject of cameralism as a changing rather than static unit of analysis. Together with this, we suggest a study of discourse conducted at the level of individual intellectual agents who were cameralists only alongside other professional, confessional and personal commitments. By homing in on the role of individual agents and local settings in the transnational dissemination of cameralist thinking during the eighteenth century, we address long-standing gaps in the historiography, including the vogue of university chairs in the cameral sciences beyond Germany and the systematic translation of cameralist texts across Europe. Rather than approaching the production of local valences of cameralism as a process of dilution, we instead demonstrate how the blending of cameralism with other strains of thought was constitutive of a process of its adaptation in different academic, political and administrative environments.

1. Point of Departure

Christian Wolff in Halle, Joseph von Sonnenfels in Vienna, J. H. G von Justi in Vienna and Göttingen, are only the three best known among a tribe of authoritarian rationalists whose ideas and ideals all seem cast from the same mould or copied from one another.

Their aims were ambitious, though, and from their point of view, realistic: they sought to

produce and increase happiness by reasonable enactments. Their political theory constitutes an escape from politics into management, the tactful evasion of a challenge to real power that would have been hopeless. Without a historical, social, or educational basis for liberalism, liberalism seemed to them Utopia, paternalism the only way to general betterment.⁴

Peter Gay, one of the doyens of Enlightenment studies, put forth his classic interpretation of cameralism in 1969. His quote exemplifies several problems in how cameralism has been, and often still is, studied in its relation to the Enlightenment. First, cameralism is pronounced to be a bounded field of ideas defined by negligible diversity or originality, with cameralists dismissed as mass-produced copycats. Second, cameralists are judged as seeking “an escape from politics to management”, alluding to the older interpretative stereotype of the “apolitical” German Enlightenment and the assumption that absence of liberalism denoted lack of political engagement. This line of scholarship takes liberalism, and above all, Atlantic liberalism, as the yardstick against which everything else can be measured.⁵

Gay’s account would not be much of a problem were it not still being reproduced. Many of his points continue to be repeated without hesitation. Cameralism is variously essentialised as German, paternalistic and absolutist, and approached as merely an apolitical theory of management of princely domains.⁶ Analytically, cameralism is simultaneously associated with Prussian or Austrian absolutism for seventeenth-century contexts and described as the legitimising discipline of the centralising efforts of Frederick II of Prussia and Maria Theresa of Austria against the backdrop of Enlightenment.⁷ Interpretively, this account is often offered in

order to indicate how fundamentally different cameralism was from a so-called “Western political economy” which advocated individual agents to pursue happiness as they themselves conceived it. That is, cameralism was long spatially restricted to German-speaking Europe, a region defined as an exceptional part of Europe.

Taking cameralism as a German *Sonderweg* of political economy parallels the larger problem of the notion of a *Sonderweg* in defining a specifically *German* Enlightenment, in contrast to the transnational approach of studying Enlightenment in Germany. *Sonderweg*, a historiographical thesis dating from the nineteenth century that emphasised Germany’s “special path” in its transition to modernity, is today largely considered out-dated, though legacies of its analytical power remain in the way that German particularities are historically studied. We take issue with the implication that cameralism was a typically apolitical German tactic of governance, or simply as John Gagliardo would have it, a “German brand of mercantilism” focused on fiscal approaches to social-political reform.⁸ The old narrative that eighteenth-century German thinkers were apolitical, preoccupied with literary aesthetics or government administration, conveniently dovetails with the judgement that cameralism and Enlightenment were circumscribed territories, one “practical” and the other “literary”. This demarcation is untenable at the level of studying individual cameralists, who straddled worlds of administration and letters.

Going beyond *Sonderweg*, we argue that cameralism must be studied as part of what Kaplan and Reinert have recently termed the “economic turn” that took place in diverse ways across Europe and farther afield during the Enlightenment.⁹ In this volume, we are not revisiting the old question of whether cameralism was a German variation of mercantilism as a set discourse.

Rather, we consider how cameralism acted as a lens in the transition of political economy in specific intellectual contexts during the Enlightenment. In John Robertson's influential interpretation, "the core of the Enlightenment's contribution to Western thought" is "political economy as the prospect of human betterment in this world rather than the next, in the present over the past".¹⁰

Many scholars have tracked the emergence of enlightened political economy in the mercantile literature of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and how, during the Enlightenment, political economy transformed by engaging natural law and a new conviction of the capacity of human beings to improve their conditions.¹¹ Enlightened political economy was not an entirely "new science of economics", as suggested by Jonathan Israel.¹² What was new was a conception of progress as doubly founded on the "discovery" or "invention" of a future that could be imagined as something fundamentally different than the past or present.¹³ Below, we demonstrate how cameralism, rather than a static, unchanging discourse, was affected by this broader politicisation of society.

We thus also problematise the classic tendency to interpret cameralism through the framework of Enlightened Absolutism, which, despite the modifying adjective, often situated it beyond Enlightenment, as Enlightenment in these studies was often anachronistically read as a breeding ground of liberalism. In this line of thought, with its liberal blinders that saw the only politics worthy of the name as those of liberal democracies, cameralist thinkers were seen as non-political.¹⁴ More recently, there has been an opposite problem, with some going so far as to occlude the difference between both concepts, naming cameralism as "an Enlightenment philosophical doctrine" of particular potency in the Habsburg Realms.¹⁵

By systematically reflecting on the relationship between cameralism and the Enlightenment, this volume goes beyond paradigms of *Sonderweg* and German particularism to propose new directions for the study of political ideas in action. Further, by exploring how eighteenth-century cameralist thinkers engaged with broader Enlightenment inquiries relating to the new process of global commercialisation, we evidence how cameralists and German-thinkers more broadly were intellectually enmeshed in the expansion of global horizons well documented for European Atlantic contexts.

2. Interventions

Our study is born from revived interest in the study of cameralism, particularly in Anglophone and Francophone contexts, following Michel Foucault's consideration of the topic during his lectures on governmentality in Paris and Berkeley in the late 1970s.¹⁶ Foucault identified cameralist theoreticians, particularly Justi, as crucial agents in the development of what he termed "governmental thought", or "the new form of governmentality born in the eighteenth century", the transformation of governmentality by the emergent discourse of "reason of state". He defined this as taking shape through four commitments: (i) the identification of "civil society" as the state's necessary correlate, (ii) the aspiration to apply scientific method to governance and administration, (iii) the "sudden appearance of the problem of population in new forms", and (iv) the justification of state power in its management of nature and the promotion of security.¹⁷

Alluding to Kant's critique of reason, Foucault judged the cameralist discipline of *Polizeiwissenschaft*, as encapsulated in Justi's *Elements of Police*, to epitomise "the aim of the modern form of government, or state rationality; viz, to develop those elements constitutive of individuals' lives in such a way that their development also fosters that of the strength of the state". In a nutshell, Foucault argued that *Polizei* was committed to the mutual fostering of "both citizen's lives and the state's strength".¹⁸

Foucault's lectures acted as a catalyst for renewed interest in cameralism. Classic scholars of *Polizeiwissenschaften* in Germany, such as Michael Stolleis, dismissed Foucault as simply confirming what specialists had long known, but Foucault's notion of governmentality inspired several important new studies on the topic, namely those by Marcus Sandl and Pascale Laborier.¹⁹ Foucault may indeed have contributed little to the empirical study of cameralism, but he posed important questions concerning the place of cameralism within the *longue durée* history of state power that suggest the need for a historicised analysis of discourses of state. Inverting his approach to privilege the power of discourse over the scope of individual agency, we seek to historicise his speculative philosophy of the development of governmentality. Drawing upon careful, context-specific and agent-focused inquiries of the adaptations of cameralist thought in view of the wider field of Enlightenment, we study how major shifts in cameralist thought occurred during the eighteenth century that put into question the notion of cameralism as a set unit of analysis.

Not unlike Foucault, the most prominent Anglophone scholar of cameralism, Keith Tribe, emphasised the normative character of cameral sciences. Instead of focusing on state building

and governmentality, Tribe's aim was to interpret cameralism as an economic discourse. To challenge the blueprint history of the rise of modern economics, Tribe proposed a complex history of disciplinisation, focusing on the institutional discursive domain—namely, universities—in which cameralism developed into cameral sciences. His *Governing Economy* thus recovered the theoretical configuration and institutionalisation of cameralism as a pedagogical practice over the course of the eighteenth century.²⁰

Interest in cameralists in Anglophone scholarship has been present as early as 1909, when sociologist Albion Woodbury Small considered them pioneering “political scientists”, and a focus on the university as a primary context of cameralism was set as early as 1968 by Pierangelo Schiera.²¹ Tribe's innovation was to focus on the biographical character of the various professors holding chairs in cameral sciences and to analyse the institutional settings of the large corpus of cameralist textbooks generated by these professors. He studied over six hundred textbooks, treatises and tracts written by German university professors to determine how they thought their aspirations of “good government” were to work in reality. In so doing, Tribe demonstrated how these university professors created a new normative language. By seeking to understand cameralism in its own terms, he deprioritised questions of originality and invention, pursuing instead why different thinkers often accepted received ideas. This constituted a novel approach to the history of modern economic thought, shifting the focus away from theoretical novelty or the assessment of the soundness of past arguments in the light of modern economic knowledge.

Whereas Tribe's book was, broadly speaking, a work of intellectual history, Andre Wakefield's *Disordered Police State*, the most recent major monograph on cameralism, took its lead from a history of science conceived as a history of cultural practices. Emphasising the social construction and circulation of knowledge in cameral sciences under local circumstances, Wakefield contended that cameralism never completely left the princely chambers of the German principalities and questioned the importance of the university context for studying cameralism. Wakefield subordinated an inquiry into the development of normative languages to his judgement that cameral sciences served mainly as fiscal propaganda for the deeply disordered state administrations of German principalities. The title of his work was itself a critique of Marc Raeff's *Well-Ordered Police State* of 1983.²² "Cameral sciences were *strategic* [emphasis original]" devices for casting a strengthening fiscal state in the most positive light possible. Cameralism was the "public discourse of the cameral sciences and the secret discourse of the Kammer". And cameralists were self-serving careerists who flattered their rulers, scrambled for positions in state administration and universities, and paid lip service to the people. "Cameralism was the public face of secret things; cameralists were publicists for the Kammer".²³

We think it worth confronting squarely the question of what drives reform proposals. "Secret practice" does not necessarily go against the grain of intellectual justification. Reformers commit to their proposals at multiple levels, and intellectual content cannot be easily disentangled from institutional practice. The justification by cameralists of specific social and political reforms was not merely the business of sugar coating the will of an expansionist state. A fundamental outcome of this combination of ideas with practice was what Foucault termed the "disciplinary dream" of cameralism: the rise of the "well-ordered" police state as a normative concept, rather

than achieved reality, in eighteenth-century European universities and public administration. Wakefield is right to emphasise the gap between aspiration and reality in the social history of eighteenth-century German governance. However, further research is needed on the level of ideas to understand the contribution of cameralism to the broader history of the discursive underpinnings of state power.

Going beyond a no longer productive dichotomy between ideas and practice, we propose their joint study through the prism of cultural and intellectual history, aiming for a non-reductionist account of the intellectual, cultural and social settings of state practice during the eighteenth century. This might alternately be called a “cultural history of ideas”. To suggest that a focus on practice can resolve this issue rests on a facile notion that ideas themselves are not a form of practice, and indeed not acts of agency.²⁴ The mobility of individual cameralists and their written production need to be studied beyond the prism of careerist ambition.

As we evidence in this volume, cameralist thinkers authored important theoretical and philosophical discussions of note for scholars concerned with the study of the Enlightenment, particularly in reference to natural law, the most significant tradition of ethics, politics and the philosophy of justice in early modern Europe, whose ambits went far beyond the limits of what we now understand as law.²⁵ We study the creativity of individual agents together with local institutional contexts and conventions, and the broader transnational circulation of Enlightenment ideas. Continuing a transnational refocus in the field during the past decade, we approach cameralism as a trans-European phenomenon that cannot be restricted to German-speaking Europe. Thus, we propose a corrective to the study of cameralists through a focus on

Enlightenment entanglements and local specificities, building on Hans Erich Bödeker and Martin Gierl's contention that "Enlightenment meant communication with local characteristics, of supralocal significance".²⁶ Studying the engagement between cameralism and Enlightenment through cultural and intellectual history, we argue, does away with a false distinction between ideas and institutional practices.

An overarching aim of this volume is thus to reinsert the force of individual agency into the study of cameralism by rethinking the figure of the cameralist and the scope of intellectual creativity exerted by cameralist actors. As emphasised recently by Anthony La Vopa, studying the actions of individual thinkers together with the content of their thoughts can overcome a reductive "segregation of the intellectual from the social and the cultural".²⁷ Rather than attempting to excavate a historical language of cameralism, we indicate how individual thinkers used language to make specific points. While Andre Wakefield has thought-provokingly argued that the "academic cameralist was a peculiarly German beast, ill adapted to the wide-open conditions of the New World", this volume proposes a more nuanced consideration of how cameralists engaged with their social and intellectual contexts.²⁸ Cameralist actors grappled in distinct ways, and with varying degrees of creativity, with what they understood to be a field of cameralist questions, producing in the process a field of diversity.

To return to Gay, a closer look at the ideas and opinions held just by his three named cameralists, Wolff, Justi and Sonnenfels, reveals a world of difference. Wolff was a fundamentally traditional political thinker, Justi introduced the concept of freedom into German political thought and Sonnenfels distinguished himself as an advocate of state paternalism. More serious inquiry into

cameralist writings reveals that the intellectual world in which cameralists moved was more open and varied than has previously been acknowledged, an insight that also holds true for the study of eighteenth-century cameral sciences. Building upon early insights into the European dimensions of cameralism offered by Ernest Lluch and Hildegard Kremers, we continue current inquiry into how cameralists engaged with the new intellectual resources of Enlightenment and the onward march of commercialism and global trade.²⁹ Cameralists participated in idea exchange and reflection on a European scale, and developed a pan-European political and economic discourse in parallel with French physiocracy and British political economy.³⁰ This volume investigates the transnational and global character of cameralism, and reveals the surprising origins of many of the most distinctive ideas. Cameralists reconciled their views on natural law, commercialism and colonialism in a distinctly wide framework of political economy.³¹

Further, studying cameralism in connection with the Enlightenment underlines how the development of the cameral sciences occurred in a changing media environment. The process of the disciplinisation of cameralism occurred simultaneously with the broader intellectual phenomenon of European Enlightenment, through a set of diverse and highly mobile actors. This recognition requires us to both take the ideas developed by cameralists seriously as well as carefully study their engagement with contemporary forms of communication. German-language scholarship on police has emphasised the importance of shifting communication practices in the construction and development of normative language in the eighteenth century.³² Through their personal mobility and activities within and beyond the princely chamber, cameralists played an important role in shaping normative languages of governance. This was not simply the

communication of a normative language of the state to a pre-existing public; rather, the production of normative political language during the Enlightenment coincided with the formation of a contemporary public. From the institutionalisation of cameralism in dialogue with the Enlightenment, a concept of happiness inflected by natural law emerged as a normative concept of rule that simultaneously served to legitimise governmental power and to define its limits.

3. Organisation

This volume includes a total of twelve chapters organised into three sections: (i) Interactions; (ii) Widening Perspectives; (iii) Dissemination and Local Mediation. Collectively, they bring the study of cameralism into dialogue with Enlightenment studies, providing case studies of cameralism as a conceptually diverse discourse undergoing change. These findings are then synthetically analysed by two epilogues that reflect upon the methodological implications of crossing the study of cameralism with Enlightenment studies.

“Interactions” engages the encounters between cameralism, natural law and political economy in the intellectual context of European Enlightenment, with an eye towards broader political debates and economic theory. Cameralist discussions of happiness, governance and reform were part of broader concerns across Europe with the foundations and characteristics of commercial society. Moreover, cameralists’ engagement with the welfare state, protectionism and tariffs offers unique ways of contemplating our contemporary political challenges.

Lars Magnusson and Hans-Erich Bödeker outline the philosophical underpinnings of cameralism, particularly the recognition of a free sphere of human action and the pursuit of happiness, allowing us to rethink the relationship between ideas and practices of governance in eighteenth-century political economy.³³ Lars Magnusson suggests the legacies of cameralist thought for the ideological underpinnings of the European welfare state, emphasising that it is reductionist to attribute the welfare state to some nebulous northern European commitment to protectionist paternalism. Contrary to old stereotypes, we emphasise how cameralists were well aware of increasing levels of commercial interactivity at regional, European and global scales. Ere Nokkala reveals how late cameralists identified commercial society as the preferred model for development and advocated the primacy of foreign trade. Additionally, we consider how reading publics beyond the university deployed cameralist texts in unique ways. Koen Stapelbroek's contribution considers the politics of translation of cameralist texts, and the surprising ways in which different texts were deployed in Dutch debates on political economy and the balance of trade.

In "Widening Perspectives", new fields of inquiry for the study of cameralism are proposed by taking up two of Foucault's main interests in cameralism: populationism and the management of nature. Nicholas B. Miller's chapter shows how cameralism yielded a distinctive critique of the conceits of Eurocentrism, which offers a compelling contrast with the more famous contributions of theoreticians of philosophical history in Scotland and France such as Smith and Montesquieu. Further, in reconsidering the parameter of change in cameralist approaches to population management, particularly immigration, assimilation and integration, Miller suggests the

importance of cameralist actors for reflecting upon shifting attitudes towards the governance of mobility and community during the Enlightenment.

Richard Hölzl, through a contribution to the ecological history of ideas, indicates how cameralists conceptualised the human-nature interface in an innovative manner, rather than treating nature, society and populations as separate fields. Hölzl not only empirically grounds Foucault's contention that the eighteenth-century European state legitimised itself on the basis of managing natural risks beyond the scope of any individual actor, but further challenges broad generalisations about "Western" or "modern" attitudes towards conservation. Cameralist politics of nature thus did not simply represent a state power grab, but an important turning point in the discursive underpinnings of the reason of state, with its attendant responsibilities.

"Dissemination and Local Mediation" considers how cameralism served as a porous field of ideas during the Age of Enlightenment, adaptable through individual mediation to the specificities of local contexts, whether linguistic, national, political, confessional, administrative or institutional. Alexandra Ortolja-Baird fills a major research gap by considering the case of the most famous university chair in the subject founded outside the German-speaking lands, that of Cessare Beccaria in Milan. By situating Beccaria against the backdrop of institutional reforms carried out in Austrian-controlled Lombardy, Ortolja-Baird re-considers a prominent Enlightenment thinker in his part-time capacities as cameralist. Jonas Gerlings continues this line of inquiry by focusing on Immanuel Kant and the reform of cameral sciences at the University of Königsberg.

A major common theme in this section is how individual actors in the Enlightenment, whether illustrious philosophers or obscure bureaucrats, mediated competing intellectual traditions and fields to reconfigure cameralism. Alexandre Mendes Cunha takes up the question of how transnational actors acted as vectors of ideas between diverse intellectual settings in his study of the Portuguese diplomat Rodrigo de Souza Coutinho. Adriana Luna-Fabritius considers the politics of translating cameralist textbooks in Spain as part of a broader state reformist project of translation and compilation undertaken during the Bourbon Reforms. In a brief afterword to Luna-Fabritius' piece, Keith Tribe emphasises that cameralism can only be studied through its agents, viz, cameralists, their biographies, activities and use of language. Danila Raskov wraps up this section through a study of the prominence of cameralists and cameralist theory in Russia during the Enlightenment, a dissemination of ideas made possible by the appointment of large numbers of German-trained cameralist academics at newly founded Russian universities.

Anthony La Vopa concludes this volume in an epilogue reflecting on the outcomes of this volume for the fields of Enlightenment studies and cameralism. Reflecting on the question of how to write intellectual history today, La Vopa emphasises the necessity of a social history of ideas for discursive formations that have long been seen as independent units of analysis themselves.

4. The Mediation of Ideas in Transnational Perspective

Studying the entanglements between cameralism and the European Enlightenment reveals the shifting commitments of individual cameralist thinkers over the course of the eighteenth century.

In line with insights observed elsewhere for the Enlightenment, we interrogate the boundaries of cameralist thought via the prisms of global and transnational history and readdress the legacy of natural law for eighteenth-century cameralists. We also consider the processes of mediation between ideas and practices in a sustained fashion, evidencing how cameralism cannot be seen as internally split between these two dimensions. Given the extent of cameralists' prominence in universities and state chambers across central Europe and beyond in the eighteenth century, we suggest that cameralism is an important site for investigating the transnational development of normative political languages during the Age of Enlightenment.

Taking on board the perspectives of global and transnational history extends the range of concerns with which we identify cameralists during the Age of Enlightenment, and also helps us rethink how to situate cameralists within the Enlightenment.³⁴ We evidence how cameralists became increasingly occupied with the question of commercialisation over the course of the eighteenth century, as part of the wider contemplation of the globalisation processes that occurred in European Enlightenment.³⁵ Ere Nokkala indicates how cameralists not only recognised the reality of an emerging global economy, but also advocated the direct intervention of central European states in this system. Nokkala's indication of cameralist commercial commitments builds upon Ulrich Adam's work in situating cameralists thinkers within Istvan Hont's landmark discussion of the Jealousy of Trade, a direction also taken up in this volume by Koen Stapelbroek on the politicised discussion of cameralist texts in the Dutch Republic during the second half of the eighteenth century.

Our study of cameralism thus contributes to questioning the more general notion that German Enlightenment contexts were land-locked rather than maritime-focused, as recently critiqued by Iwan-Michelangelo D'Aprile.³⁶ Expanding upon Jürgen Osterhammel's reflections on Justi, Nicholas B. Miller shows how cameralism provided a distinctive comparative lens for thinkers to interrogate Enlightenment-era materials about other worlds, developing unique approaches to global intersocietal comparison. Connected to this was a reflection upon global mobility and the creation of European settler populations in other world regions, as discussed in their cameralist connections by Alexandre Mendes Cunha and Adriana Luna-Fabritius for South American contexts.

Careful analysis of the continuing legacy of natural law in the eighteenth century has also revealed new directions for research into the history of political economy during the Enlightenment, with important implications for the study of cameralism. It is now well understood that natural law influenced diverse writers in the Enlightenment in ways that make it untenable to cleanly divorce traditions of economic thought from other domains, such as law or philosophy, during this period. Ere Nokkala, Lars Magnusson and Hans-Erich Bödeker contest the notion classically developed by Hans Maier and Jutta Brückner that natural law was of only marginal concern for cameralists in the face of the continuity of the Aristotelian tradition.³⁷

In contrast to accounts that describe cameralism as a pre-Enlightenment tradition, Nokkala, Magnusson and Bödeker indicate how cameralism belongs to a line of Enlightenment political thought that stretched from natural law to political economy. In so doing, their essays indicate how cameralists mobilised and built upon continuously changing variations of natural law. In

particular, cameralists used natural law as a theoretical device in their attempt to bring all cameral sciences under one umbrella. Taking cameralism and natural law as open sets of ideas permits us to detect conceptual changes and innovations that otherwise have been judged in the past as “outside” influences. These shifts were at times the innovation of individual authors, and at other times a result of the dissemination of cameralist vocabulary to new political and linguistic contexts.

Approaching cameral thinkers as creative agents in relatively peripheral settings to Enlightenment can also help us reflect upon the mediation and adaptation of Enlightenment ideas by actors beyond Western Europe, and rethink how we establish relations of core and periphery in terms of intellectual history. Scholarship at the intersection of colonial studies and the history of science has brought new methodological impulses to querying assumptions about core-peripheral relations of innovation and reception. Kapil Raj and Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra have indicated the creativity and importance of thinkers previously neglected as middlemen or intermediaries in eighteenth-century contexts beyond Europe.³⁸

The process of dissemination often changed the particular focus of local cameral sciences, as individual agents adapted the ideas to suit their own purposes and the needs of local contexts. Dissemination thus was a process of communication modulated by specific agents, which is best studied closely at the level of individual case studies. To this effect, Alexandre Mendes Cunha’s essay in this volume is exemplary in demonstrating the complex way in which ideas from the cameral sciences disseminated across different regions through the decisions actively made by specific thinkers.

Our focus on global, transnational and intellectual aspects of cameralism goes hand in hand with attention to the complex process of localisation and mediation. Scholarship on the Enlightenment, which in the early twentieth century approached the subject as a borderless exchange of ideas between scholars, has focused in recent decades on the varieties of Enlightenment that can be discerned on a more local scale. At first, this tendency towards subunits was most pronounced at the national and vernacular level, an approach that has been sustained until the present.³⁹

More recent work has focused on confessional contexts, including Judaism, Catholicism, and Arminianism, or ideological cleavages, such as Jonathan Israel's Radical Enlightenment. Importantly, this approach has revealed the importance of boundaries that channelled (but in no case blocked off) the movement of ideas and peoples in eighteenth-century Europe, and has been most convincing in so far as it indicated the social and cultural particularities of different settings. While influenced by this work, our approach here is by no means to claim that there was such a thing as a "Cameralist Enlightenment". By contrast, we approach cameralism as a filter by which individuals mediated Enlightenment ideas in ways sometimes cognisant of and sometimes different from those exerted by other community formations. Our approach to this mirrors recent scholarship on German Pietism during the Enlightenment.⁴⁰

Cameralism, constituted by cameralists, consisted of commitments that conditioned actors' engagement with Enlightenment ideas. We are not proposing to reveal a set of neglected cameralist *philosophes*; rather, we are critiquing the notion that cameralists, *simply by virtue of*

being cameralists, can be fenced off from the shifting European intellectual scene during the Age of Enlightenment. We should neither juxtapose the two phenomena nor collapse one entirely into the other. We thereby approach the cameralist mediation of Enlightenment ideas in synchronisation with the mediation of cameralist concerns according to the local settings of actors, which were not simply national or vernacular, but also institutional and professional.

Universities were a critical structural feature of Enlightenment in a central Europe defined by a relative abundance of them. The disciplinisation of cameralism at universities thus should not be seen as a phenomenon apart from Enlightenment. Rather, as suggested recently by Thomas Ahnert, it should be approached as part of the entwined history between the Enlightenment and the emergence of university disciplines.⁴¹ As Hans Erich Bödeker and Martin Gierl have argued, “The other side of the Enlightenment, beyond discourse, was that of the institution”. That is, institutions such as the university were the *Lebenswelt*, the lived reality, of the Enlightenment.⁴²

Greater engagement with the social and communication history of Enlightenment has put any easy division between ideas and practice into question. This line of inquiry, particularly strong in German-language scholarship, emphasises the need for a history of the practice of the communication of ideas. Political ideas were not transmitted simply through personal mobility, but mainly through specific media forms and instances of material culture.⁴³ Thus, as Martin Gierl has argued, Enlightenment ideas need to be studied in terms of the sites and forms of their communication, such as journals. The understanding of Enlightenment as integrated in a process of communication can thus resituate the question of politicisation during the Enlightenment. The old adage of Enlightenment as “critical thinking with practical intentions” can be seen with a

new lens through cameralism. That is, the transformation of cameralism through Enlightenment produced a new politicisation of governing practices through sustained reflection on a consciousness of the interconnected nature of the state, the social fabric and individuals in society.

In promoting the rise of a new civil consciousness and new ways of conceiving state and society, this process of politicisation extended beyond the realm of ideas to affect practical conduct towards the world and environment. The politicisation of society constituted a reform movement that encompassed all spheres of life.⁴⁴ Reconsidering cameralism's relation to this process may help us address questions like those posed by Elisabeth Décultot, of whether the transformation of state administration in the eighteenth-century Holy Roman Empire “really occurred in and together with the age of Enlightenment”, as contended by Georg Schmidt.⁴⁵

A more encompassing approach to the politics of cameralism allows for new perspectives into the historical process of politicisation during the eighteenth century, in terms of the emergence of a public political debate, the rise of politics as a topic of analysis, and even, in rare cases, the fundamental questioning of the foundations of the existing political regime. Rather than analysing cameralist texts within a cleanly bounded field of cameralist discourse, we instead put them into their broader cultural, political and intellectual settings. In this respect, we aim to do full justice to the complexity of cameralist thought and the intellectual and political traditions from which it emerged.

Theorising mediation processes thus helps resolve a crucial yet deceptively complicated question of intellectual history: ideas clearly travel, but how do they change? People are obviously crucial to this process, but approaches diverge in terms of the priority they grant to individual actors as part of network analysis. The case of the actors and networks studied here is further complicated by the definition of both along lines of a shared discourse. Our approach in this volume gives a priority to the analysis of the ideas of individual actors in their dynamic and individually differentiated relationship with broader networks and discourses. We carefully consider intellectual shifts in the writings of individual cameralist thinkers, who creatively navigated local contexts, vagaries of professional careers and the specificities of their personal networks. Discourse, we argue, is ultimately only a heuristic unit of analysis recoverable via the rigorous synthesis of the ideas of individual intellectual agents.

5. A New Way Forward

By reconsidering the trail of ideas in eighteenth-century cameralism, we propose a method of intellectual history focused on the porosity of discourse. Through its engagement with Enlightenment, cameralism increasingly exhibited the rhetoric of system simultaneously with its growing diversification and disaggregation. To dismiss this as dilution, as suggested by a rigid, schools-based approach to the history of ideas however is to miss an important point. More constructive and insightful, we argue, is the metaphor of blending.

We thus approach notions of the unity of cameralism as a set discourse with scepticism. Rather than travelling *in toto*, cameralist ideas were adapted and intermixed with other lines of thought

by complex agents whose fidelity to an abstraction of cameralism as a set, internal doctrine was never complete. In this regard, we contribute to the investigation of the historical sites and personal networks in which transnational idea exchange occurred, as inspired by Avi Lifschitz's landmark study on the Berlin Academy as a transnational centre of European Enlightenment featuring the physical clustering of mobile thinkers as well as through the networks emergent from its prize competitions.⁴⁶ Our essays also contribute to reflecting upon Enlightenment histories of book purchasing and reading habits. Books had larger publics than those explicitly intended, and most of our essays deal with how cameralist thinkers read works by Enlightenment *philosophes* and other contemporary authors, often in multiple languages. We hope our work here will inspire future research in this regard, particularly relating to the market for cameralist textbooks and more popular texts.

In sum, this volume proposes a nuanced methodology for the study of change in intellectual history and political thought during the Age of Enlightenment. We emphasise the blending of Enlightenment patterns of thought in cameralist discourse and practice over the course of the eighteenth century. We do not find it tenable to define Enlightenment as a set of given ideas, whether freethinking, atheism or political economy, but rather, a plurality of strands of thought which, in a complicated process of inter-communication, self-critically developed into a cultural-political and social reform movement.⁴⁷ Given this, we fully concur with Dorinda Outram's insight that "it is probably a misconceived enterprise to try to untangle the specifically Enlightenment contribution to cameralism".⁴⁸ This was not a question of a dilution of cameralism, but rather, its blending within the broader intellectual environment of the eighteenth century, defined by the dominance of Enlightenment ideas.

Over the course of the eighteenth century, Enlightenment and cameralism became inextricably entangled, which was nothing particularly unique. An overarching methodological point of our volume is the challenge of drawing hard lines between discourses. A fascinating paradox developed over the course of the eighteenth century, the era in which the pursuit to create a university discipline based upon cameralism was undertaken. The greater the push for the disciplinisation of cameralism became over the century, the more disparate it became, as different thinkers intermixed it with different resources, ranging from natural law to critical histories of European colonialism.

Despite the pretensions of cameralist discourse, cameralism did not function as a complete system even for its greatest theoreticians. Rigid models of competing intellectual traditions have prevented scholars from perceiving the fundamental changes that took place in cameralist discourse through the influence of Enlightenment ideas over the long eighteenth century.

Cameralism is more systematic *in memory* than it was as a living discourse. Carefully recovering the thoughts of individual cameralist agents confirms cameralism to be an aspirational rather than achieved practice. However, the engagement by cameralist actors with core Enlightenment concepts of happiness, governance and reform during the eighteenth century resulted in distinctive contributions to the broader history of political theory and state administration. By recognising the translocal, porous and variegated character of cameralism in its full extent, we reveal how it is an important chapter of the global history of state building and political and economic thought during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

¹ Marten Seppel and Keith Tribe, eds., *Cameralism in Practice: State Administration and Economy in Early Modern Europe* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2017). Andre Wakefield, *The Disordered Police State: German Cameralism as Science and Practice* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2009).

² Avi Lifschitz, Thomas Ahnert, Iwan-Michelangelo D'Aprile, Elisabeth Décultot and Simon Grote, "Forum: The German Enlightenment", *German History* 35:4 (2017): p. 589. Hans Erich Bödeker, "Aufklärung als Kommunikationsprozeß", *Aufklärung* 2:2 (1988): 89-111; Hans Erich Bödeker and Martin Gierl, "Einleitung", in *Jenseits der Diskurse: Aufklärungspraxis und Institutionenwelt in europäisch komparativer Perspektive*, eds. Martin Gierl and Hans-Erich Bödeker (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), pp. 11-21.

³ Lars Magnusson, *The Political Economy of Mercantilism* (London: Routledge, 2015), p. x.

⁴ Peter Gay, *The Enlightenment: An Interpretation. The Science of Freedom* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1996 [1969]), pp. 488-9.

⁵ Keith Tribe, "Concluding Remarks", in Seppel and Tribe, *Cameralism in Practice*, pp. 263-8.

⁶ For instance, "cameralists were a conservative lot in questions of social policy, and their prescriptions tended to be overlaid with a heavy cloak of paternalism", Franz AJ Szabo, "Cameralism, Josephinism, and Enlightenment: The Dynamic of Reform in the Habsburg Monarchy, 1740–92", *Austrian History Yearbook* 49 (2018): 1-14. Also see: Wakefield, *Disordered Police State*, p. 137, and Douglas Moggach, "Freedom and Perfection: German Debates on the State in the Eighteenth Century", *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 42 (2009): 1003-23. For cameralists as absolutists see: Diethelm Klippel, "Reasonable Aims of Civil Society: Concerns of the State in German Political Theory in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries", in *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and*

Germany, eds. John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 71-98.

⁷ Szabo, “Cameralism”, pp. 1-14.

⁸ John G Gagliardo, *Germany under the Old Regime 1600-1790* (London: Routledge, 2014), p. 116.

⁹ Stephen Kaplan and Sophus Reinert, “The Economic Turn in Enlightenment Europe”, in *The Economic Turn: Recasting Political Economy in Enlightenment Europe*, eds. Steven Kaplan and Sophus Reinert (London: Anthem Press, 2019), pp. 1-33, especially p. 23.

¹⁰ John Robertson, *The Enlightenment: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 80, which builds upon his seminal account in John Robertson, *The Case for the Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples 1680–1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

¹¹ José Luís Cardoso, “Liberalism and Enlightened Political Economy,” *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 22 (2015): 934–8. For recent literature on the political economy of mercantilism see Philip J Stern and Carl Wennerlind, *Mercantilism Reimagined: Political Economy in Early Modern Britain and Its Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) and Lars Magnusson, *Political Economy of Mercantilism* (London: Routledge, 2016).

¹² Jonathan Israel, *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights 1750-1790* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 7.

¹³ Lucian Hölscher, *Die Entdeckung der Zukunft* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag, 1999).

¹⁴ Charles Ingrao, “The Problem of ‘Enlightened Absolutism’ and the German States”, *Journal of Modern History* 58, suppl. (Dec. 1986): 161-80. Eli F Heckscher considered cameralism as a kind of mercantilism although it did not fully fit to the framework of his main work

Merkantilismen: ett led i den ekonomiska politikens historia (Stockholm: Norstedts, 1931). In large part, the commonplace character of characterising cameralism as a variety of mercantilism has its origin in Heckscher's influential interpretation.

¹⁵ Klemens Kaps, "Creating Differences for Integration: Enlightened Reforms and Civilising Missions in the Eastern European Possessions of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1750-1815", in *Enlightened Colonialism: Civilisation Narratives and Imperial Politics in the Age of Reason*, ed. Damien Trocoire (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave, 2017), pp. 134-40.

¹⁶ Michel Foucault, "'Omnes et Singulatim': Towards a Criticism of 'Political Reason'", in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1981), vol. 2, pp. 224-54.

¹⁷ Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College De France, 1977–78*, eds. Michel Senellart, François Ewald and Alessandro Fontana (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 348-54.

¹⁸ Michel Foucault, "Politics and Reason" [1979], in Michel Foucault, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984*, ed. Lawrence D Kritzman (New York: Routledge, 1990), p. 82.

¹⁹ Michael Stolleis, "Review of Andrea Iseli, *Gute Policey* (2009)", *Zeitschrift Der Savigny-Stiftung Für Rechtsgeschichte. Germanistische Abteilung* 128:1 (2011): 705-7. Pascale Laborier (ed.), *Les sciences camérales: activités pratiques et histoire des dispositifs publics* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2011). Marcus Sandl, *Ökonomie des Raumes: der kameralwissenschaftliche Entwurf der Staatswirtschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Köln: Böhlau, 1999).

²⁰ Keith Tribe, *Governing Economy: The Reformation of German Economic Discourse 1750–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

²¹ Albion Woodbury Small, *The Cameralists: The Pioneers of German Social Polity* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1909). Pierangelo Schiera, *Dall'arte di governo alle Scienze di Stato. Il Cameralismo e l'Assolutismo tedesco* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1968).

²² Marc Raeff, *The Well-Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional Change through Law in the Germanies and Russia, 1600-1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).

²³ Wakefield, *Disordered Police State*, p. 137.

²⁴ Marten Seppel, “Introduction: Cameralism in Practice”, in Seppel and Tribe, *Cameralism in Practice*, pp. 1-16.

²⁵ Hans Erich Bödeker and Istvan Hont, “Naturrecht, politische Ökonomie und Geschichte der Menschheit: Der Diskurs über Politik und Gesellschaft in der frühen Neuzeit”, in *Naturrecht, Spätaufklärung, Revolution*, eds. Otto Dann and Diethelm Klippel (Hamburg, Meiner, 1995), pp. 80-9.

²⁶ Hans Erich Bödeker and Martin Gierl, “Einleitung: Jenseits der Diskurse”, p. 14.

²⁷ Anthony J La Vopa, “History, Philosophy and the Imagination in Enlightenment Studies”, *Modern Intellectual History* (2018), doi:10.1017/S1479244318000355.

²⁸ Andre Wakefield, “The Practical Enlightenment: German Cameralists and Yankee Economists”, in *Jenseits der Diskurse: Aufklärungspraxis und Institutionenwelt in europäisch komparativer Perspektive*, eds. Martin Gierl and Hans-Erich Bödeker (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), p. 161.

²⁹ Ernest Lluch, “El Cameralismo más allá del Mundo Germánico”, *Revista de Economía Aplicada*, 10:IV (1996): 163-75; Ernest Lluch, “Der Kameralismus, ein vieldimensionales

Lehrgebäude: seine Rezeption bei Adam Smith und im Spanien des 18. Jahrhunderts”, *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 41 (2000): 133-56. Hildegard Kremers, *Quellenkritische Analyse des ökonomischen Denkens von Joseph von Sonnenfels* (Diss: University of Graz, 1983). Hildegard Kremers, “L’oeuvre de Joseph von Sonnenfels et ses sources européennes. Problèmes de réception au XVIIIe siècle”, *Francia* 14 (1986): 331-67.

³⁰ Seppel, “Introduction: Cameralism in Practice”, pp. 1-16; Philipp R. Rössner, “New Inroads into Well-Known Territory? On the Virtues of Rediscovering Pre-Classical Political Economy”, in *Economic Growth and the Origins of Modern Political Economy: Economic Reasons of State, 1500–2000*, ed. Philipp R. Rössner (London: Routledge, 2016), pp. 3-25.

³¹ Jürgen Osterhammel, *Die Entzauberung Asiens: Europa und die asiatischen Reich im 18. Jahrhundert* (München: CH Beck, 1998), p. 72. English translation: Jürgen Osterhammel, *Unfabling the East: The Enlightenment’s Encounter with Asia*, trans. Robert Savage (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018), p. 77.

³² Michael Stolleis, “Was bedeutet ‘Normdurchsetzung’ bei Policeyordnungen der Frühen Neuzeit?”, in *Grundlagen des Rechts: Festschrift für Peter Landau zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Richard H Helmholz (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2000), pp. 739-57. Michael Stolleis (ed.), *Policey im Europa der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1996). Thomas Simon, “Gute Policey”: *Ordnungsleitbilder und Zielvorstellungen politischen Handelns in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2004). Andrea Iseli, *Gute Policey. Öffentliche Ordnung in der frühen Neuzeit* (Stuttgart: UTB, 2009).

³³ Bertram Schefold, “Glückseligkeit und Wirtschaftspolitik: Zu Justis ‘Grundsätze der Policey-Wissenschaft’”, in *Vademecum zu einem Klassiker des Kameralismus: Johann Heinrich Gottlob*

von Justi, *Grundsätze der Policy-Wissenschaft*, ed. Bertram Schefold (Düsseldorf: Verlag Wirtschaft und Finanzen, 1993), pp. 5-44.

³⁴ Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori (eds.), *Global Intellectual History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013).

³⁵ Sankar Muthu, *Enlightenment Against Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

³⁶ Iwan-Michelangelo D'Aprile, "Aufklärung global—global Aufklärungen. Zur Einführung", *Das Achtzehnte Jahrhundert* 40:2 (2016): 159-64.

³⁷ Hans Maier, *Die ältere Deutsche Staats- und Verwaltungslehre (Polizeiwissenschaft): ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Wissenschaft in Deutschland* (Neuwied am Rhein: Luchterhand, 1966). Jutta Brückner, *Staatswissenschaften, Kameralismus und Naturrecht: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Wissenschaft im Deutschland des späten 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhunderts* (München: Beck, 1977).

³⁸ Kapil Raj, *Relocating Modern Science: Circulation and the Construction of Knowledge in South Asia and Europe, 1650-1900* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). Kapil Raj, Simon Schaffer, Lissa Roberts and James Delbourgo (eds.), *The Brokered World : Go-betweens and Global Intelligence, 1770-1820* (Sagamore Beach, MA.: Science History Publications, 2009). Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra, *How to Write the History of the New World: Histories, Epistemologies, and Identities in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2002).

³⁹ Steffen Martus, *Aufklärung: das deutsche 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Rowohlt, 2010).

⁴⁰ Martin Gierl, "Pietism, Enlightenment and Modernity", in *A Companion to German Pietism, 1660-1800*, ed. Douglas H Shantz (Brill: Leiden, 2015), pp. 348-92. Martin Gierl, *Pietismus und*

Aufklärung. Theologische Polemik und die Kommunikationsreform der Wissenschaft am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997).

⁴¹ Lifschitz, et al., “Forum: The German Enlightenment”, p. 593.

⁴² Bödeker and Gierl, “Einleitung: Jenseits der Diskurse”, p. 11.

⁴³ Lifschitz, et al., “Forum: The German Enlightenment”, p. 596.

⁴⁴ Hans Erich Bödeker and Ulrich Herrmann, “Aufklärung als Politisierung - Politisierung der Aufklärung: Fragestellungen”, in *Aufklärung als Politisierung - Politisierung der Aufklärung*, eds. Hans Erich Bödeker and Ulrich Herrmann (Hamburg: Meiner, 1987), pp. 3-9.

⁴⁵ Lifschitz, et al., “Forum: The German Enlightenment”, p. 597. Georg Schmidt, *Wandel durch Vernunft: Deutsche Gesellschaft im 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich: CH Beck, 2014).

⁴⁶ Avi Lifschitz, *Language and Enlightenment: The Berlin Debates of the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

⁴⁷ Bödeker and Gierl, “Einleitung: Jenseits der Diskurse”, pp. 13-6.

⁴⁸ Dorinda Outram, *The Enlightenment*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), p. 35.