

**Cultural Memory and National Representation: The Franco-Prussian War in French
and German Literature, 1871-1900**

Christina B. Carroll

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of History.

Chapel Hill
2010

Approved by:

Karen Hagemann

Lloyd Kramer

Donald Reid

© 2010
Christina B. Carroll
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

CHRISTINA CARROLL: Cultural Memory and National Representation: The Franco-Prussian War in French and German Literature, 1871-1900
(under the direction of Lloyd Kramer)

This thesis examines the memory of the Franco-Prussian War in nineteenth-century French and German literature from a transnational and comparative perspective. It focuses on how four writers – Alphonse Daudet, Émile Zola, Theodor Fontane, and Detlev von Liliencron – used representations of the war to construct visions of their respective nations, which they defined against the enemy “other” and delineated in political, social, gendered, and racial terms. As it makes clear, although these authors directed their texts at a national audience, many of their works crossed the border – so even as the writers posited themselves against each other, they remained in dialogue. The thesis also incorporates reviewers’ responses to these writers’ representations, and considers the scope of their popular appeal. It contends that this ongoing, contested, and transnational process of negotiation between writers, reviewers, and readers helped shape the memory of the war and understandings of nation in nineteenth-century France and Germany.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapters

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE WAR, THE AUTHORS, AND LITERARY CULTURE.....	10
III.	REPRESENTATIONS OF WAR, THE NATIONAL SELF AND OTHER.....	18
IV.	LITERARY CRITICS: TRANSNATIONAL RESPONSES.....	37
V.	PUBLICATION HISTORY AND POPULAR RESPONSE.....	58
VI.	CONCLUSION: COMPETING MEMORIES OF THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR.....	68
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	71

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1892, Émile Zola published *La Débâcle*, a fictional account of the Franco-Prussian War written, he claimed, as a rational, objective, and scientific investigation of the reasons behind the French defeat and civil war that had occurred some twenty years earlier. Advertised as the penultimate book in his famous and controversial *Rougon-Macquart* series, which traced the fortunes of two branches of one family tree through the Second Empire, it attracted immediate attention. But the book outstripped even the fame of the series. It sold one hundred thousand copies in the first four weeks, and half as many again in the next four months. It went on to become Zola's most popular novel during his lifetime: there were eight French editions before the First World War. It also met with considerable success in Germany, where it appeared as *Der Zusammenbruch* in 1893, and went through several editions.¹

The novel included two interrelated plot arcs. Zola narrated the story of most of the main political figures – the French Emperor and Empress, the Prussian King, and the generals – while simultaneously personalizing the war through descriptions of its effect on a French family and village. He offered a highly political explanation for French loss that primarily blamed Napoleon III and his officers, whom he characterized as sickly and effeminate. They spread their dissoluteness through the non-democratic structures of the Second Empire and corrupted, divided, and feminized the French people. As a result, the weak and disorganized

¹ Frederick Brown, *Zola: A Life* (New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1995), 641.

French army could not stand against the mechanized Prussians and their barbaric Bavarian allies. But the novel, while sharply critical of Second Empire politics and society, held out hope to the French nation; at the end, Zola implied that the terrible military defeat and civil war had swept the effete autocracy away, and replaced it with an uncertain but healthy republican order that might redeem the country.

French literary critics, on the whole, responded positively to the book. They complimented Zola's narrative gifts, his characters, and his ability to "capture the spirit" of 1870/71. Gaston Deschamps, writing in the highbrow *Journal des Débats*, labeled it a "masterpiece" that expressed "eternal sentiments" and classified Zola among the "great poets."² Moreover, he maintained, by bringing his abilities to this topic, Zola had performed a service to the French nation, because "one perceives... beneath the wreckage of the Empire, a living France that it is necessary to make again... it is necessary to thank [Zola]... because we need his difficult but comforting lesson."³ In other words, Zola's literary vision (or, as other critics put it, "genius") enabled him not only to reveal the truth about the war, but also to show France and the French people the way out of defeat.

Nevertheless, Zola's interpretation of the war, his reputation, and his book's popularity led to an immediate negative response in French conservative circles. Literary reviewers writing for *Le Figaro* and *Le Gaulois* criticized *La Débâcle* as "inaccurate" and maintained that its criticism of the French army made it anti-French.⁴ Nor was this condemnation confined to the limited and sophisticated world of literary reviews. By 1895, two former military officers separately issued pamphlets to expound upon the book's errors.

² Gaston Deschamps, "La Débâcle," *Journal des Débats*, July 1, 1892, 2.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ See Philippe Gille, "La Débâcle," *Le Figaro*, June 20, 1892; J. Cornély, "La Débâcle," *Les Gaulois*, July 26, 1892. *Le Figaro* was a daily newspaper while *Le Gaulois* was a literary and political journal, but both targeted an affluent, well-educated readership. See Clyde Thogmartin, *The National Daily Press of France* (Birmingham, AL: Summa Publications, 1998), 65.

The second and longer of the two, titled *Gloria Victis: L'Armée Française devant l'invasion et les Erreurs de La Débâcle*, published anonymously by a “captain of the army at Metz,” vehemently attacked the “misleading nature” of Zola’s interpretation of the war and claimed that it “masqueraded” as history.⁵ Moreover, the “captain” contended that Zola’s misrepresentations of the war enabled him to articulate a “pernicious” vision of French national identity. *La Débâcle* therefore not only obfuscated the truth about France’s past, but threatened its future: its vision of France was corrupt and hence “dangerous from a national standpoint.”⁶

The book also provoked controversy in German literary journals. Even figures in the same literary circles disagreed about its relative merits. While Michael Georg Conrad argued in his review for *Die Gesellschaft* that the book expressed “inner truth” and that it represented the “most monumental and artistic expression of all modern Naturalism,” Karl Bleibtreu claimed in the same magazine that Zola’s work was too “prejudiced” and “political” to be truly artistic.⁷ Like many other reviewers, he objected to Zola’s portrayal of the German army and the German people.⁸ But above all, he was deeply concerned about the sheer extent of the book’s popularity, and in fact highlighted *La Débâcle* as the symbolic epitome of Germany’s unhealthy infatuation with French literature. Zola’s work not only misrepresented the German people, he maintained, it embodied a particularly debauched kind

⁵ *Gloria Victis. L'Armée Française devant l'invasion et les erreurs de La Débâcle*, par un capitaine de l'armée de Metz (Paris: Lavauzelle, 1895), 14.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁷ See Michael Georg Conrad, “Kritik: Der Zusammenbruch,” *Die Gesellschaft*, XVIII (1892), 1645; Karl Bleibtreu, “Zola’s Kriegerroman,” *Die Gesellschaft*, XVIII (1892), 1148-1158. Michael Georg Conrad and Karl Bleibtreu were both prominent German naturalist writers who founded *Die Gesellschaft* together in 1885. It became the primary literary journal of the “Munich Naturalist” school. See Hans Mahr, *Michael Georg Conrad: Ein Gesellschaftskritiker des deutschen Naturalismus* (Greß: Marktbreit, 1986); Michel Durand, *Michael Georg Conrad à Paris* (Berne: Peter Lang, 2004).

⁸ See Erich Schmidt, “La Débâcle,” *Deutsche Literatur Zeitung*, XIV (1893): 665-666; Georg Lebedour, “La Débâcle,” *Nord und Süd*, LXII (1892), 407.

of French writing that threatened the integrity of the German national character. Moreover, its popularity in Germany was inhibiting the development of a healthy and independent German literary culture.⁹

Few books incited as much public controversy over their representations of the Franco-Prussian War and national identity as *La Débâcle*. However, the firestorm the book generated in both France and Germany points to not only the war's ongoing importance in popular and literary discourses, but also to the complex, controversial, and transnational nature of those discourses and the cultural memory they informed. This conversation was expansive in scope and ranged across a variety of cultural media but found particular resonance in the literary world. After the war's conclusion, a large number of works emerged in both countries on the subject, encompassing a broad range of perspectives and voices.¹⁰ In books, pamphlets, newspapers, and magazines, writers carved out distinct visions of the meaning of the war and its relationship to French and German national identities, which they defined against each other and delineated in political, gendered, and cultural terms. Their interpretations were by no means identical, however, even within the same country. They varied according to writers' experiences, their politics, and their social standing - not to mention personality. Their publications therefore worked both with and against each other in broader public discourse. And although these writers often wrote their works for a national audience, prominent or commercially successful fiction, as Zola's case makes clear, usually crossed the border. As a result, even as French and German writers posited themselves against each other, their representations remained in dialogue.

⁹ Karl Bleibtreu, "Zola's *Kriegsroman*," *Die Gesellschaft*, XVIII (1892), 1148-1158.

¹⁰ In 1895, Barthélémy-Edmond Palat published a bibliography of all of the novels, histories, and memoirs published in French and German after the war. It came to over six hundred pages. See Barthélémy-Edmond Palat, *Bibliographie générale de la guerre de 1870-1871: répertoire alphabétique et raisonné des publications de toute nature concernant la guerre franco-allemande parues en France et à l'étranger* (Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1896).

Émile Zola, along with his French and German contemporaries Alphonse Daudet, Theodor Fontane, and Detlev von Liliencron, were influential voices in this ongoing negotiation. Their narratives about combat, soldiers, and civilians - drawn from their memories of the war and informed by their political, ideological, and aesthetic sympathies - were widely distributed and read, and attracted a great deal of critical attention. But as the responses to *La Débâcle* make clear, the reviewing process was far from neutral. Critics themselves articulated yet another interpretation of the war's meaning, couched in a discourse of national identity and artistic genius. Judging the talent or literary contributions of an author was thus fraught with national and political tension and framed by the reviewer's particular interpretation of the war. The assessments also varied between adherents to different political parties and literary movements as well as between the two countries. Ordinary readers in turn commented upon and sometimes rejected the interpretations of authors and reviewers alike, creating a complex, transnational, multilayered conversation about the war and its implications for the nation.¹¹ Their responses show that literary works played a significant role in defining national identity.

Much of the scholarship written about the Franco-Prussian War traditionally focused on its military and political significance, although the war has also figured in Marxist and social history studies of the Paris Commune.¹² More recently, as scholarship emphasizing the

¹¹ Astrid Erll has developed a three-stage model of literature's relationship to memory culture that tracks this movement. As she argues, in the first stage, authors, before they begin to write, are immersed in a particular memory culture. In the second stage, they compose their works, at least partially in response to that memory culture. And in the third stage, readers and reviewers read and interpret their work in terms both drawn from the work itself and broader memory culture. See Astrid Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen* (Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2005), 159.

¹² For political and military studies, see Michael Howard, *The Franco-Prussian War; the German Invasion of France, 1870-1871* (New York: Routledge, 1961); Allan Mitchell, *Bismarck and the French Nation, 1848-1890* (New York: Pegasus, 1971); Eberhard Kolb, *Der Weg aus dem Krieg: Bismarcks Politik im Krieg und die Friedensbahnung 1870-71* (Munich: Eberhard Kolb Oldenbourg, 1989); Stéphane Audon-Rouzeau, *1870: La France dans la Guerre* (Paris: Éditions Armand Colin, 1989); François Roth, *La Guerre de 1870* (Paris: Hachette, 1990); Roger Price, *Napoleon III and the Second Empire* (New York: Routledge 1997); Scott W. Murray, *Liberal Diplomacy and German Unification* (Santa Barbara: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000); David Baguley, *Napoleon III and his regime* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001); David Wetzel, *A Duel of Giants* (Madison: University of Wisconsin

importance of memory and representation in the formation of national identities has emerged, several historians have begun to look at representations of 1870/71 in German and French newspapers, journals, literature, and artwork.¹³ However, most of this new work does not look at these representations in a transnational context or does not adequately consider the complicating factors of gender, race, and other categories of difference. By focusing on the intersection of four comparable popular authors within a wider literary culture, this paper teases out the scope of the transnational cultural memory of the war. It also emphasizes the ways in which various categories of cultural or social difference interacted with that memory and the construction of national identity.

Its argumentation borrows from a number of different theoretical schools. Most importantly, it draws on the body of collective memory scholarship that has developed across academic disciplines in the past twenty years. Specifically, it employs Jan Assmann's notion of "cultural memory": a particular form of collective memory he defines as "oligarchic" and "institutionalized." In other words, it is formulated by elites, cultivated by specialists, and manifested in objects (such as literary texts). But it also affects the way that ordinary individuals understand the past and their own identity.¹⁴ In recent years, cultural and literary

Press, 2001); Geoffrey Wawro, *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

¹³ For memory in the formation of national identities, see Wolfgang Leiner, *Das Deutschlandbild in der französischen Literatur* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1989); Michael Jeismann, *Das Vaterland der Feinde: Studien zum nationalen Feindbegriff und Selbstverständnis in Deutschland und Frankreich 1792-1918* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1992); Etienne François, Hannes Siegrist, and Jakob Vogel, *Nation und Emotion: Deutschland und Frankreich im Vergleich 19. Und 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); Charlotte Tacke, *Denkmal im sozialen Raum: nationale Symbole in Deutschland und Frankreich im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1995); Jakob Vogel, *Nationen im Gleichschritt: Der Kult der "Nation in Waffen" in Deutschland und Frankreich, 1871-1914* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1997); Mark Hewitson, *National Identity and Political Thought in Germany: Wilhelmine Depictions of the French Third Republic, 1890 -1914* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000); Michael E. Nolan, *The Inverted Mirror: Mythologizing the Enemy in France and Germany, 1898-1914* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2005). For representations, see Catharine Savage Brosman, *Visions of War in France: Fiction, Art, Ideology* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999); Michele Martin, *Images at War: Illustrated Periodicals and Constructed Nations* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006); Karine Varley, *Under the Shadow of Defeat: The War of 1870-71 in French Memory* (New York: Palgrave, 2008).

¹⁴ Jan Assmann distinguishes between three kinds of memory: cultural, communicative, and collective. Communicative memory is formed by individuals of a social exchange while it is taking place. This memory gives the

historians have outlined several ways literature interacts with this process.¹⁵ Astrid Erll in particular has argued that it is necessary to distinguish between two types of literature to understand the different effects it can have. Namely, she differentiates between literature that acts as a medium of “circulation” (popular literature, usually about the more immediate past, and tied more directly to contemporary identities and politics) and literature that acts as a medium of “storage” (canonized, high-brow literature, less directly tied to contemporary issues).¹⁶ All four authors’ works lay somewhere on the boundary between these two categories; to varying degrees, they tried to navigate between popular and literary impulses.¹⁷ Throughout the paper, I therefore pay attention to the shifting roles their works could play at different times.

The paper also draws on the rich body of theoretical work on transnational history, especially research that examines the role of “transfer” and “crossing” in the development of

participants a sense of mutual experience that they draw upon to identify themselves as members of the group that shared in the exchange. Formed through interaction, communicative memory therefore resides in individuals and is inherently temporally limited. Memory, however, can also be objectified in buildings, images, monuments, and texts. Assmann refers to this as “cultural memory” and argues that it also affects the way that people understand the past and their own identity. He stresses that communicative and cultural memories often exist simultaneously, and both are subsumed under the term “collective memory.” See Jan Assmann, “Communicative and Cultural Memory,” in *Cultural Memory Studies: An Interdisciplinary and International Handbook* (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 110.

¹⁵ Although Pierre Nora’s *Lieux de Mémoire*, which precipitated the rise of scholarly interest in memory, did not include literature, both cultural and literary historians have recently looked to literary debates as an influential component of cultural contestations over national identity. See Renate Lachmann, *Memory and Literature*, trans. Anthony Wall (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); Aleida Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlung des kulturellen Gedächtnisses* (Munich: Beck, 1999); Ansgar Nünning, Marion Gymnich, and Roy Sommer, eds., *Literature and Memory: Theoretical Paradigms, Genres, Functions* (Tübingen: Francke, 2006).

¹⁶ It is worth noting that Erll defines collective and cultural memory differently from Assmann; she links “circulating” literature to collective memory, and “storage” literature to cultural memory (whereas Assmann would link most literature to cultural memory). But Erll’s categorization is rather difficult to draw on cleanly for this particular project, as it is hard to place any of the four authors neatly in one category or another – all four had aesthetic pretensions and considerations, and aspired to canonization in a way that makes labeling their works uncritically as “collective” or “circulating” memory somewhat problematic. The contemporary appeal of these authors, I would argue, was that they lay somewhere between the popular and the literary, between circulation and storage. Moreover, I think that Assmann’s description of “cultural memory” as “oligarchic” and “institutionalized” helps describe the sort of cultural influence these writers exerted. So while I recognize the complications in the terminology, I will continue to use “cultural memory” throughout the paper, although I will try to indicate where the works verge closer to “circulating” or “collective” memory. See Astrid Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen: Eine Einführung* (Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2005), 160.

¹⁷ This was especially true of Zola’s and Fontane’s writing, because their works both intersected with contemporary issues and then later became canonized.

national identity.¹⁸ This scholarship has demonstrated that the boundaries of nineteenth- and twentieth-century European nation-states were usually defined in dialogues that repeatedly crossed national borders. Its contention that ideas about nation and even national difference thus developed through this lengthy and complicated process of mutual reception and influencing forms the framework of my study.¹⁹ I also rely on the insights of gender historians, who have shown the importance of gendered signifying systems in the construction of these borders and national identities.²⁰ Finally, I use discourse analysis to tease out the multiple meanings of these writers' and reviewers' representations in these ongoing, gendered, and transnational debates about war and its implications.²¹

In order to analyze the intersection of memory, national identity, and literature in the works of Daudet, Zola, Fontane, and Liliencron (and the responses to those works), this paper poses three questions. First, how did these authors imagine the national self and other in their writing on the Franco-Prussian War? What factors influenced their portrayals? Second, how did literary critics in both countries respond to the authors' work on the war, particularly their

¹⁸ There are several different theoretical approaches to this problem; most notably, transfer history, *l'histoire croisée*, and transnational history. For a study of the methodological concerns of transfer history see Michel Espagne, *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands, perspectives germaniques* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1999); Matthias Middel, "Kulturtransfer und historische Komparistik. Thesen zu ihrem Verhältnis." *Comparativ* 10 (2000), 7-41; for *l'histoire croisée* see Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmerman, Michel Werner and Bénédicte Zimmerman, "Penser l'histoire croisée: entre empirie et réflexivité," *Annales: Histoire, Science Sociales* 58, no. 1 (Jan-Feb 2003), 7-36; for transnational history see the 2006 debate on H-German; Sebastian Conrad, "Doppelte Marginalisierung. Plädoyer für eine transnationale Perspektive auf die deutsche Geschichte." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28 (2002): 145-169.

¹⁹ Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmerman, "Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity," *History and Theory* 45 (February 2006), 30.

²⁰ See Patricia Herminghouse and Magda Mueller, eds. *Gender and Germanness: Cultural Productions of Nation* (Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, 1997); Ida Blom, Karen Hagemann and Catherine Hall, eds., *Gendered Nations: Nationalisms and Gender Order in the long Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, New York: Berg, 2000); Mrinalina Sinah, "Gender and Nation" in *Women's History in a Global Perspective*, ed. by Bonnie G. Smith (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004): 229-274; Angelika Schader, "The Challenge of Gender: National Historiography, Nationalism, and National Identities" in *Gendering Modern German History: Rewriting Historiography*, ed. by Karen Hagemann and Jean Quataert (Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, 2007): 39-62.

²¹ J. P. Gee, *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method* (New York: Routledge, 2005); Gabrielle Spiegel, ed. *Practicing history: new directions in historical writing after the linguistic turn* (New York: Routledge, 2005); Hayden White, *The content of the form: narrative discourse and historical representation* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1987).

construction of the national self and other? What role did their understanding of writing and “the poet” play? Third, how popular were these war stories in France and in Germany? How did literary markets and the media influence who accessed them, who read them, and in what form? How transnational was their reach?

Zola, Daudet, Fontane, and Liliencron all wrote numerous stories about the war, which appeared multiple times in various collections. This paper focuses primarily on their most successful works: Zola’s novel *La Débâcle*, Daudet’s collection of short stories titled *Contes du lundi*, Fontane’s memoir *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes*, and Liliencron’s short story collection titled *Unter flatternden Fahnen*. It also considers reviews of their writings printed in literary journals, magazines, and newspapers. Structurally, it begins with a brief description of the Franco-Prussian War’s ramifications in France and Germany and the writers’ personal experiences during the war. It continues with a comparative analysis of their writing and an examination of different critics’ responses to their work. The discussion then widens out to the national cultural context and assesses the popularity and influence of these stories in late nineteenth-century French and German society. It concludes by bringing all these themes together in a more general claim that both fiction and literary criticism should be seen as key components in the national memory and identities of the post-war era.

CHAPTER TWO

THE WAR, THE AUTHORS, AND LITERARY CULTURE

Despite the thematic similarities in their works, Daudet, Zola, Fontane, and Liliencron were writing about the war from countries in asymmetrical positions. Though the Wars of Unification brought the separate German territories closer politically, Germany was a confederation rather than a centralized nation-state at the war's outset. But intellectuals, politicians, writers, and journalists had been engaged in nation-building projects even before the Napoleonic period, and most inhabitants of the German states identified with a wider cultural German nation.²² Austria's defeat in 1867 enabled Prussia to consolidate many of the smaller independent German territories into the North German Confederation and bring Baden, Bavaria, and Württemberg into a military alliance.²³ It had also increased regional anxieties, however, particularly in Bavaria, about Prussia's growing power.²⁴ The quick German victory and the accompanying patriotic fervor put Bismarck and Wilhelm I in a position to formally unite the confederation and its allies into one state, but even after unification there was still some tension in Hannover and Bavaria about membership in the new German Empire.²⁵

²² There is a long scholarly debate about the nature of the nation-building process in Germany, which there is no space for here. For theories of nationalism in general see John Breuilly, *Nationalism and the State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 1985); Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 1991); Miroslav Hroch, "From National Movement to the Fully-Formed Nation: The Nation-Building Process in Europe," in *Becoming National: A Reader*, ed. by Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 62.

²³ Abigail Green, *Fatherlands: State-Building and Nationhood in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 57.

²⁴ Geoffrey Wawro, *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 31.

²⁵ Green, *Fatherlands: State-Building and Nationhood in Nineteenth-Century Germany*, 298.

France, on the other hand, had not only maintained relatively consistent geographic borders since the late seventeenth century, but it had also engaged in a self-conscious nation-building project since the Revolution. Although the country had gone through political turmoil in the past eighty years, the Second Empire marked a period of relative political stability and growing wealth among the bourgeois and upper classes. Louis-Napoleon had presided over a series of wars, but none of them had been on French soil. In contrast to the shifting borders in Germany, France directed most of its expansionary policy toward new colonial conquests outside of Europe.²⁶ However, this apparently stable French Empire disintegrated in barely a month and a half. By mid-September, the Emperor was in captivity, a republic was declared, but no elections were held, and the city of Paris was besieged, bombarded, and starved for close to four months. This dramatic loss to a united Germany that seemed to have emerged overnight shocked the French and led to internal recriminations.²⁷ The end of the war brought only more division: both geographic and political. Germany forced France to surrender Alsace and most of Lorraine, and following the armistice the country disintegrated into a vicious civil war that ended in May 1871 with a conflagration in Paris and the slaughter, imprisonment, or exile of many of its inhabitants.²⁸ Functionally, the war pulled Germany together and moved it into an ascendant position within Europe, while unraveling France's political system and shaking its social order.

²⁶ Roger Price, *The French Second Empire: An Anatomy of Political Power* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 409.

²⁷ Newspapers, journals, magazines, court cases, novels, and political cartoons following the war blamed generals for betraying the troops, workers for sedition, and the troops for laziness and disorganization. And in 1873, Marshal Achille-François Bazaine, who surrendered at Metz, was tried for treason and sentenced to life imprisonment. See Wolfgang Schivelbusch and Jefferson S. Chase, *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery* (New York: Macmillan, 2003), 119.

²⁸ Robert Tombs, *The Paris Commune, 1871* (London: Longman, 1999); David A. Shafer, *The Paris Commune: French Politics, Culture, and Society at the Crossroads of the Revolutionary Tradition and Revolutionary Socialism* (London: Palgrave, 2005).

The Franco-Prussian War was not, of course, the first conflict between France and the German states. The Thirty Years War, the War of Spanish Succession, and especially the more recent Revolution and Napoleonic Wars functioned as earlier historical memories through which people in both countries understood the Franco-Prussian War. In most of these conflicts, France had been the stronger military power, prevailing against German (Holy Roman Empire until 1806) weakness and division. But the legacy of the Napoleonic Wars was open to debate. In France, the history of that era could support a discourse of French strength, as the French had conquered much of Europe and held it for some time against most of the other European states. However, the French were ultimately defeated, and foreign armies had occupied France.²⁹ In Germany, conversely, when the German states came together to throw off the French aggressor, victory and independence followed defeat and occupation.³⁰ The (anti-) Napoleonic Wars and legacy therefore could fit into an arc of both French and German greatness. In 1870/71, newspapers and political figures in both countries drew upon the memory of these wars to inspire the populace and interpret contemporary events.³¹ This memory also reappeared in the conversations about the Franco-Prussian War after its conclusion, especially since another Napoleon had been leading the French Empire.³²

²⁹ As Alan Forrest has made clear, the first half of this formula usually appeared considerably more strongly in nineteenth-century French political rhetoric, especially as time went on and the more controversial aspects of the Napoleonic regime faded from view. See Alan Forrest, *The legacy of the French Revolutionary Wars: the nation-in-arms in French republican memory* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 73.

³⁰ Karen Hagemann has argued that the nineteenth-century German nation-building process was shaped by the experience of the Napoleonic Wars, at least in Prussia, as a result of the transformation in the military to fight Napoleon. The Wars of Liberation were billed as “patriotic wars” that would be fought by the people, and after the war, at least some political rights were distributed based on veteran status. See Karen Hagemann, “Of ‘Many Valor’ and ‘German Honor’: Nation, War, and Masculinity in the Age of the Prussian Uprising Against Napoleon,” *Central European History* 30, no. 2 (1997): 187-220.

³¹ Martin, *Images at War*, 33.

³² Alan Forrest has argued that Napoleon III’s defeat actually in certain ways led to the reinvigoration of the “citizen-in-arms” ideal associated with the Revolutionary and Napoleonic army, at least during the war. Napoleon III had relied on a small, professionally trained army; its swift defeat discredited contemporary French military strategy and led people to turn back to the Napoleonic period for new solutions. But the Commune, which drew heavily on the rhetoric of the citizen-in-arms, again complicated this legacy. See Forrest, *The legacy of the French Revolutionary Wars*, 113.

Because the Franco-Prussian War transformed the boundaries and the internal structure of France and Germany, it became an important part of the debates about national identity that had been thriving among intellectuals (and increasingly the middle classes as well) in both countries since the beginning of the nineteenth century. These debates now took on a new salience in the redefined states. Building on Napoleonic narratives and existing national stereotypes, politicians, journalists, and other public figures used the events of the most recent war to propound their particular interpretations of French and German identity, which often had political and social implications.³³ Their popular appeal enabled memoirs and fictional writing to provide particularly influential frameworks for this ongoing process of contestation. Writing about the war appeared in two distinct waves in both countries: the first immediately following its conclusion, and the second in the late 1880s and 1890s.³⁴ Both Fontane and Daudet published their writing during the first period, while Liliencron and Zola published during the second. But Fontane's and Daudet's work, unlike most of the other early literature, was republished to even greater acclaim in the 1880s and 1890s. As a result, all four authors were most influential during this second, more extended wave of interest and controversy.

Although all of the authors lived through the Franco-Prussian War, their connections to it were quite distinct. Of the four, Detlev von Liliencron was most thoroughly immersed in its campaigns and military life; he had served as a Prussian officer since 1863, and fought in both the War of 1866 and 1870/71 as a second lieutenant.³⁵ Alphonse Daudet also fought, but

³³ The war was enshrined in enshrined cultural institutions, memorials, holidays, and ceremonies as well as literature. See Brent Orlyn Peterson, *History, Fiction, and Germany: Writing the Nineteenth-Century Nation* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2005); Pierre Nora, "Entre Mémoire et Histoire," in *Les Lieux de mémoire: La République*, v. 1, ed. Pierre Nora (Paris: Gallimard, 1984).

³⁴ Karine Varley, *Under the Shadow of Defeat*, 23.

³⁵ Liliencron was born in Kiel in 1844, which was part of Schleswig-Holstein and technically Denmark until the Second Schleswig War in 1864. Although he joined the Prussian military the year before, he does not seem to have participated in that conflict. His military career was mixed; he was promoted to second lieutenant after only two years

he did not join the regular French army; because he broke his leg right before the war began, he spent several months convalescing before going to Paris and joining the National Guard. He defended Paris during the siege, and fled to the countryside after the declaration of the Commune in March 1871.³⁶ Theodor Fontane, on the other hand, was no longer of military age when the war broke out. But he accompanied the Prussian army into France as a war correspondent for the *Vossische Zeitung*, intending to conduct research for a lengthy history of the war.³⁷ He did not stay with the army long, however, because a group of *franc-tireurs* took him captive.³⁸ The French held him for several months as a prisoner of war before Bismarck secured his release.³⁹ Zola remained farthest away from the battlefield; like Fontane, he was exempted from combat because he was nearsighted and the only son of a widow. After the Empire fell, he fled Paris for a village near Marseille.⁴⁰ However, Zola did witness most of the events of the French Commune. When the fighting was over, Zola returned to Paris in February 1871 to work as a reporter for *La Cloche*, a parliamentary

of service, but his career stagnated as he developed a reputation for drinking, gambling, and impulsiveness. Frustrated, he left the military and in fact the country in 1875 to go to America, where he lived for two years, teaching music and doing odd jobs before deciding that his future lay in writing and returning to Hamburg in 1877. See Jean Royer, *Detlev von Liliencron: itinéraire et évolution du poète lyrique* (Berne: Peter Lang, 1993), 44.

³⁶ Daudet had been immersed in the Parisian literary world since the early 1860s, working as a teacher, journalist, and secretary to Morny, one of Napoleon III's ministers, to support his literary career, although like Liliencron, he published most of his most popular works in the post-war era. See Anne-Simone Dufief, *Alphonse Daudet: romancier* (Paris: Editions Champion, 1997), 83.

³⁷ Fontane had been working as a journalist, war correspondent, and travel writer since the 1860s. This work he was researching was to be the third and final installment of Fontane's war histories about the German wars of unification; he did eventually publish it, in three volumes, under the title *Der Krieg gegen Frankreich*. See Gordon A. Craig, *Theodor Fontane: Literature and History in the Bismarck Reich* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 94.

³⁸ *Franc-tireurs* were irregular extra-military groups waging guerrilla warfare against German troops.

³⁹ John Osborne, *Theodor Fontane: Vor den Romanen: Krieg und Kunst* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 63.

⁴⁰ He ran a radical newspaper in Marseille, *La Marseillaise* for approximately two months, and spoke out against the Second Empire. But once the Republic was declared, he sympathized with the conservative faction at Versailles. See Brown, *Zola: A Life*, 197.

newspaper. He stayed and worked in Paris until finally fleeing on May 10, right before the Bloody Week.⁴¹

The authors also occupied very different positions on the political spectrum in their respective countries. Although Fontane's early, more radical inclinations had become considerably more moderate by the time of the Franco-Prussian War, he remained staunchly on the liberal side of German politics.⁴² He supported the Prussian King and German unification, but his beliefs were quite distinct from Liliencron's romantic, monarchical, and nationalist sympathies. Liliencron belonged to a conservative bohemian culture that rejected middle-class liberalism as inauthentic and inartistic.⁴³ As he wrote in a letter to one of his friends, his "political program [was]: Kaiser and fatherland," because he found the national liberals and the socialists too boring.⁴⁴ Fontane certainly had clear patriotic feelings, but was critical of the kind of chauvinistic, aggressive nationalist agenda Liliencron embraced.⁴⁵ Daudet and Zola, on the other hand, occupied a closer position on the French political and

⁴¹ *La Cloche* shut down when the Parisians established the Commune, but Zola obtained a correspondent position with *Le Sémaphore de Marseille*. While he was initially sympathetic to the plight of the starving Parisians, the Commune horrified him. He criticized the violence the government employed against the Communards, but his newspaper articles and personal letters make it evident that his sympathies lay with Versailles. See Julie Moens, *Zola L'Imposteur: Zola et la Commune de Paris*, vol. 1 (Bruxelles: Editions Aden, 2004), 53.

⁴² The nature of the shift in Fontane's political opinions has been debated by scholars, partially because his own writings on the subject are somewhat less than clear. Fontane was living in Berlin during the March Revolution of 1848, and according to his own memoirs in *Von Zwanzig bis Dreißig* [From Twenty to Thirty], he participated at least at the fringes of the March Revolution, and spent some time at a barricade. By the time he was writing his memoirs, some twenty years later, however, he was inclined to make fun of this participation, and made fun of himself for it. Whether he viewed his participation quite so light-heartedly at the time is difficult to say. See A. R. Robinson, *Theodor Fontane* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976), 24; William L. Zwiebel, *Theodor Fontane* (New York: Twayne, 1992), 13; Charlotte Jolles, *Theodor Fontane* (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1983), 8; Craig, *Theodor Fontane: Literature and History in the Bismarck Reich*, 16.

⁴³ Liliencron's anti-liberalism was not an entirely uncommon political position for the Munich naturalist literary school he belonged to, although most of the writers were more sympathetic to Nietzsche than he was. Their criticism of the bourgeois political parties therefore did not necessarily translate into sympathy towards the Kaiser. The Berlin school had, at least initially, more connections to the socialist party, but this affiliation had fallen away by the 1890s. See Vernon L. Lidke, "Naturalism and Socialism in Germany," *The American Historical Review* 79, no. 1 (1974), 18; Burns, *The Short Stories of Detlev von Liliencron*, 4.

⁴⁴ "18 February 1888" in *Detlev von Liliencron und Theobald Nöthig: Briefwechsel* vol. 1, ed. by Jean Royer (Herzberg: Bautz, 1986), 276. Liliencron also admittedly professed admiration for what he termed the "violent integrity" of anarchism. See Royer, *Detlev von Liliencron: Itinéraire et évolution du poète lyrique*, 292.

⁴⁵ Marc Thuret, *Theodor Fontane: Un promeneur dans le siècle* (Asnières: Institut d'Allemand d'Asnières, 1999), 20.

cultural spectrum. Both were supporters of the French republic, and fell on the liberal side of the French politics. Like Liliencron, both also initially interacted with (a more liberal version of) late nineteenth-century bohemian culture. But Daudet had much clearer nationalist sympathies than Zola did, which led him to become increasingly politically conservative as he grew older.⁴⁶ He also eventually married into a respectable bourgeois family and embraced its cultural values.⁴⁷

Despite the national, cultural, and political experiences and opinions that divided them, Daudet, Zola, Fontane, and Liliencron entered the ongoing national conversations about the Franco-Prussian War from similar literary positions. All four were well-known authors who wrote popular, relatively respected poetry, memoirs, short stories, and novels usually classified in the naturalist or sometimes the realist/impressionist school.⁴⁸ Although naturalism in France and Germany did not take exactly the same shape, the movement evolved in both countries under the assumption that art should refer to “actual” experience and historical reality in order to convey its higher aesthetic truths.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Baguley, *Naturalist Fiction*, 172.

⁴⁷ Daudet’s commitment to republicanism also only had emerged after the war, and his writing remained more culturally conservative than many of the other naturalists’. He also was less critical of the post-war government. See David Baguley, *Naturalist Fiction: The Entropic Vision* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 172; Wanda Bannour, *Alphonse Daudet: bohème et bourgeois* (Paris: Perrin, 1990), 65.

⁴⁸ The Naturalist literary movement began in France in the second half of the nineteenth century, and became a European-wide phenomenon. Émile Zola’s publication of *Thérèse Raquin* in 1868 in France is often cited as its starting date. It became popular in Germany in the early 1880s, ending in the early to mid 1890s in both countries. The naturalists attempted to combine science, philosophy, and art, interpreting reality with a “scientific” approach adapted from Darwin. See Baguley, *Naturalist Fiction*, 44. But all of these literary movements were rather porous; Zola stood at Naturalism’s center, but while Daudet and Liliencron were usually described as naturalists, not all critics always agreed. Alphonse Daudet maintained a close if sometimes contentious relationship with Émile Zola, who devoted large sections of the *Roman expérimental* (Paris: Charpentier, 1880) and *Les Romanciers naturalistes* (Paris: Charpentier, 1881) to his *Contes du lundi*. Detlev von Liliencron, on the other hand, had connections to the Munich naturalist school, centered on M. G. Conrad’s literary journal *Die Gesellschaft* and the literary society *Die Gesellschaft für modernes Leben*. Fontane’s links to Naturalism are the most uncertain, but critics sometimes grouped his work (more often classified as “realism” in with naturalism too. See Peter Jelavich, “The Censorship of Literary Naturalism, 1890-1895: Bavaria,” *Central European History* 18, no. 3/4 (1985), 351.

⁴⁹ Joseph Jurt, “The Transnational Reception of Literature: The Reception of French Naturalism in Germany,” *Participations* 2, no. 1 (2005), 4.

Perhaps most significantly, Daudet, Zola, Fontane, and Liliencron, like most of their critics, shared the underlying assumption that the war's outcome was largely a result of national character. They believed, in short, that the war functioned as a lens through which immutable national characteristics revealed themselves. Studying the war could therefore reveal underlying truths about national identity that were central to the past and future of both countries. But national characteristics are themselves constructs – which is not to imply they are arbitrary, but that people and discourses, rather than nature or biology, define them. When these four authors “read” French and German national identities in the events of the war, they were therefore constructing their own vision of those identities, based partially on the history of the war, but also on stereotypes, and political opinions, and perceived cultural differences. Of course, they neither interpreted the war nor constructed identity in a vacuum. They were part of broader cultural systems, and wrote in response to other circulating national interpretations and constructions. Moreover, French and German readers who picked up these authors' works in turn commented upon, contested, and sometimes rejected their interpretations, creating a complex, multilayered conversation about the cultural memory of the war and its implications.

CHAPTER THREE

REPRESENTATIONS OF WAR, THE NATIONAL SELF, AND OTHER

Although Fontane, Liliencron, Daudet, and Zola often used similar narrative techniques and comparable aesthetic standards in their stories about the Franco-Prussian War, structural differences in their works affect how their vision of national identity emerges. On the most basic level, variations in literary form influenced the way they constructed their interpretations; most noticeably, because Daudet and Liliencron wrote short stories, their constructions read as more fragmentary than Fontane's or Zola's. Divergent national perspectives also affected the focus of their writing; Fontane and Liliencron were more interested in the war's legacy for the emerging German state, whereas Daudet and Zola paid more attention to its disruptive effects on French civilians. Similarly, variations in setting lend their works rather distinctive flavors. Fontane's memoir, for example, unfolds inside courtrooms, French houses, and prisoner of war camps, so his characters are primarily French officials and incarcerated German soldiers. Because Liliencron frames his short stories around battle scenes, military comradeship, and the experience and fighting itself, his main characters consist almost entirely of German soldiers, although some French civilians also appear. In Daudet's and Zola's work, on the other hand, French and German soldiers, civilians, *franc-tireurs*, and the National Guard intermingle in various constellations within the same war-torn world.

Of the four authors, Fontane presents his vision of German national character most directly; he makes it quite clear that he is examining the characteristics of the German

officers interned with him at the *Ile d'Oléron* as a microcosm of the new German nation.⁵⁰ Interestingly, instead of searching for commonalities between them, he emphasizes their personal, cultural, and political differences, and directly ascribes those differences to the various German states they come from. Fontane describes the officer from Bavaria, for example, as “brave,” but “naïve,” and notes that all Bavarians “have a certain manliness, an individual freedom, and are ready to face any danger... but until that point they are like children and have great respect for the authority of office, knowledge, and wealth.”⁵¹ The soldier from Pomerania, on the other hand, came from an officer family and attended a military academy. Like most Pomeranians, Fontane implies, he is used to command, and is politically conservative, “sharp,” “just,” and “proud.”⁵² The Saxons, Fontane maintains more regretfully, are prone to radically liberal political opinions, but are at least “energetic, tenacious, and have an average education,”⁵³ while the two Prussian officers are “highly educated,” “reflective,” “thoughtful,” more politically moderate, and usually modest.⁵⁴

Although Fontane clearly is more critical of some of these states than others – he is somewhat condescending towards the Bavarians, and concerned about the Saxons – he implies that the German nation requires all of them to be complete. His Germany, moreover, does not transcend or replace these distinct identities, but is composed of them; it is open and inclusive rather than monolithic, and has room for men of various cultural backgrounds,

⁵⁰ As he notes, “...never have I so reveled in ethnic psychology (*Völkerpsychologie*) and comparative racial research as at my fireplaces in Oléron... I lectured freely then on the world-ruling-qualities (*Weltherrschaftsqualität*) of the German race, on the invulnerability of Pan-Slavism, on the undulations in national life, on authentic and inauthentic democracies...” See Fontane, *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes* (Berlin: T. Fontane & Co., 1915), 122.

⁵¹ Fontane is in many ways the most condescending about the Bavarian officer. He notes, “These Bavarians, when one tries to understand them and looks over their small weaknesses, and above all when one does not try to put oneself above them, are entirely delightful...” See *ibid.*, 125.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 124.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 125.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 126.

political opinions, and personal strengths.⁵⁵ Indeed, he implies that what defines the men he is interacting with as “German” is their ability to see beyond their differences and unite through shared experience and a mutual recognition of each other’s strengths. The dangers, deprivations, and boredom of life in a large prisoner-of-war camp further foster this sense of unity.⁵⁶ But while Fontane therefore indicates that war has made German unity possible, the military does not define Fontane’s Germany; these men do not unite through the glory of victorious battles but by remembering their civilian lives amidst adverse conditions.

Of the four authors, Fontane most carefully attributes both positive and negative attributes to the enemy country. Despite the fact that he was captured illegally by extra-military troops, shuffled around France, and held in a variety of rather unsanitary prisoner-of-war camps, he goes out of his way to note that everyone he encountered was “obliging, full of deference, thankful for the smallest favor, never offended by contradiction, and completely free of scheming and jealousy. From that perspective, we could learn much. I found an inexhaustible fount of sociability, free-spiritedness, and good humor....”⁵⁷ Not only do the French have certain intrinsic character strengths, in other words, but some of their qualities – especially in individual interpersonal relations – outshine the Germans’. Though he does comment with some irony on the bumbling drunken incompetence of the *franc-tireurs* who captured him,⁵⁸ he acknowledges, “in terms of their degree of culture, the French that I met were at about the same level as the Germans in their corresponding social category.”⁵⁹ While

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 121.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 154.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 56.

he finds the *franc-tireurs* uncivilized, he clearly attributes it to their lowliness in French society, and never uses them to represent France.⁶⁰

Although Fontane highlights the strengths of the French people as individuals, he nevertheless is sharply critical when he considers them as a group. He notes that together, the French have

no cohesion, no common feeling at all, except the love of France and the preoccupation with its glory. That feeling is something, but it is not much... removed from any major reason, the love of the fatherland... does not contain anything. I did not find belief in anything in the visible or invisible world anywhere.⁶¹

The French tendency towards individualism and skepticism, Fontane implies, has kept them from finding a true sense of overarching purpose. The only thing they share is an abstract love of France, which is effectively contentless: each person has his or her own ideas about what the France that he or she is devoted to should look like. This is further compounded by French lack of respect for authority; Fontane claims that because the French make fun of their clergy, their generals, and their Emperor, there is no person or common set of values that would give their patriotic sentiment bounds and make it rational.⁶² Fontane also links their lack of unity to a certain superficiality and “theatricality” that he identifies as intrinsic to the French character. The French are concerned with clothes, with color, and with ornamentation; they do not look beneath the surface to the more important things that might bring them together.⁶³ In his account, they are perhaps not degraded, corrupt, or weak, but their vanity, superficiality, and concern with appearances mark them as effeminate, which

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 82.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 40.

stands in particularly sharp contrast to his depiction of a Germany embodied in the rational, unified men that he interacts with.⁶⁴

Liliencron also centers his meditation on German national identity and German unity around the German army. But unlike Fontane, he highlights the military as the model for the new emerging German society. In fact, he makes the image of the perfect military officer, characterized by his masculinity, physical strength, and leadership, the symbol of the new state.⁶⁵ These idealized military officers dominate his plots and drive his narratives, and, he makes clear, they were responsible for the German army's victory. Their masculine strength, bound to a highly developed sense of intellectual sophistication,⁶⁶ duty, and sacrifice, enabled them to make the complicated, gruesome decisions necessary to win.⁶⁷ As a result, they represent the "best" of Germany. But although these military values found their greatest

⁶⁴ For a lengthy account of gender roles in *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes*, see Gudrun Loster-Schneider, „Die Ordnung der Dinge ist inzwischen durch keine übergeschäftigte Hand gestört worden: Zur Interaktion von National- und Geschlechter-stereotypen in Theodor Fontanes *Kriegsgefangen*“ in *Theodor Fontane: Am Ende des Jahrhunderts*, ed. Hanna Delf von Wolzogen and Helmuth Nürnberger (Potsdam: Peter Lang, 1998), 228-236.

⁶⁵ Though he does occasionally portray officers who do not live up to these standards, for the most part the men manage to perform difficult, strenuous tasks without complaint. Their endurance serves as an example that allows them to lead their companies on long marches through the rain and the heat, and inspires their troops to fight into the night. See for example: Detlev von Liliencron, „Der Richtungspunkt,“ in *Anno 1870: Kriegsnovellen* (Boston: Heath, 1903), 27; Detlev von Liliencron, „Der Narr“ in *The Short Stories of Detlev von Liliencron*, ed. Barbara Burns (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1998), 240.

⁶⁶ In *Umzingelt*, for example, the narrator derives purpose from reading an English volume about Greek mythology he found in a deserted aristocrat's home while waiting for a French attack. Inspired by this literary model, he goes on to lead his company to victory despite great odds. See Liliencron, „Umzingelt“ in *The Short Stories of Detlev von Liliencron*, 259.

⁶⁷ Liliencron's stories provide ample examples of their heroism in difficult situations. In *Adjutantenritte*, for example, an officer must take a battery to the front lines to rescue a stranded German battalion, but he can only reach the front in time by rolling the heavy cannon through a gully full of dead and wounded German soldiers. At first, he hesitates, but a wounded officer riding back from the front lines reminds him of his duty, so he decides to do what it is necessary, „We climbed, as quickly as possible, onwards... the bodies of the dead and wounded turned beneath the gyrating screeching wheels; ... Finally the battery had reached the top of the hill, with hair, brains, blood, bowels, and pieces of uniforms in its spokes.“ The decision to roll the battery across the bodies of the dead and wounded was clearly not easy, and its immediate consequences were painful and appalling. But the battery saves the lives of all the men on top of the hill, and the commanding general ultimately commends the captain for his decision. See Liliencron, „Adjutantenritte,“ in *The Short Stories of Detlev von Liliencron*, 235.

expression in Germany's soldiers, they also characterize the population as a whole. Even German women are marked by this highly developed sense of duty and sacrifice.⁶⁸

Like Fontane, Liliencron also highlights the military experience during the Franco-Prussian War as central to German unity. As he makes clear, although the soldiers in his Prussian regiment come from a variety of German territories, ranging from the countryside of Schleswig-Holstein to Berlin, they look after each other, pool their food and resources, and form close emotional friendships.⁶⁹ But there is little sense that these relationships are built on shared acknowledgement of difference; instead, their soldierly relationships come to replace their civilian identities.⁷⁰ Liliencron also emphasizes the troops' close, devotional relationship with their stern, caring, and fatherly commanders. In *Nachtlicher Angriff*, for example, the narrator notes that before sending the men into a particularly difficult battle, the general, who "indefatigably cares for his people," sits and jokes with them over dinner before warning of the difficulties that lie ahead.⁷¹ The Kaiser himself contacts the general to inquire after the troops' well-being and morale, an act that stresses the importance of the soldiers' hard work and devotion to the German nation.⁷² This personal, familial relationship, which demands sacrifice and rewards service, provides a model of an effectively run, hierarchically organized, patriarchal society.⁷³

⁶⁸ As one dying officer comments to Liliencron, "My elderly mother – would be happy – over this death – she said – love your fatherland even into death." Detlev von Liliencron, "Unter flatternden Fahnen," in *Anno 1870: Kriegsnovellen* (Boston: Heath, 1903), 16.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁷⁰ Liliencron, "Umzingelt," 256.

⁷¹ Detlev von Liliencron, "Nachtlicher Angriff," in *Unter flatternden Fahnen: Militärische und andere Erzählungen* (Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1895), 107.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 109.

⁷³ After battles, officers reward successful or valorous soldiers. See, for example, Liliencron, "Adjutantenritte," 238.

Considering the prominence of the German military in Liliencron's vision of Germany, France, and the French army remain oddly absent in most of Liliencron's stories – a sharp contrast to Fontane's memoir, which is largely devoted to a study of France. Liliencron rarely describes the actions of individual French soldiers in battle scenes. Indeed, he often does not even identify his opponents specifically as French, but simply refers to them as “the enemy.” Though he provides great detail about their weapons, he usually only describes individual French soldiers after they have died.⁷⁴ In contrast to German masculine military might, France is feminized and embodied in its civilians, especially women, children, and the elderly.⁷⁵ With a few exceptions, this population is helpless and even turns to the Prussian army for assistance, as there are no responsible French men to protect them.⁷⁶

The only living French fighters that Liliencron describes in any detail are the *franc-tireurs*, irregular extra-military groups waging guerrilla warfare against the invading German troops, and the Algerian regiments.⁷⁷ Neither of these groups, however, actually defends the French civilian population. The *franc-tireurs* are little more than scavenging bandits, who eventually turn against the civilians who try to help them.⁷⁸ And if the *franc-tireurs* are uncivilized, wild, and uncontrollable, the Algerians are barbaric, ferocious, and inhuman.⁷⁹ In fact, these African troops are so unruly that German troops actually have to rescue a French family from their attack. In *Umzingelt*, two German companies are defending themselves in a

⁷⁴ Liliencron, “Unter flatternden Fahnen,” 15.

⁷⁵ In *Adjutantenritte*, for example, an old French woman whose son has been wounded asks a German soldier to bring her water, despite the fact that she is standing next to a river. Her French emotions have so overwhelmed her that she is entirely incapable of helping her son herself. See Liliencron, “Adjutantenritte,” 228.

⁷⁶ In “Portepeefähnrich Schadius,” the wealthy French owner of the house they are billeted in attempts to betray the German soldiers to the *franc-tireurs*. See Liliencron, “Portepeefähnrich Schadius,” in *Unter flatternden Fahnen*, 167.

⁷⁷ This is clearly an attempt to disgrace the French army by associating it with what Liliencron would think even the French army viewed as its least “honorable” allies – irregular troops and its “barbaric” colonial subjects.

⁷⁸ Liliencron, “Portepeefähnrich Schadius,” 169.

⁷⁹ Liliencron, “Unter flatternden Fahnen,” 7.

fortified manor where a wealthy, cowardly, effeminate French baron has been hiding from the war with his very pregnant wife. Attended by the German medical officer, the wife safely gives birth in the basement during the battle. But when the African troops breach the walls, they attempt to run into the basement:

The woman in childbed lay exhausted on the pallet, next to her crying infant: her husband, the coward, pleaded on his knees in a corner... The Turks intruded in, blood-spattered and filthy: from their appearances, animals. Immediately one moved with his short flaming sword towards the bed... People from my company were around me; we threw the black (*Schwarzen*) out again.⁸⁰

Although the Algerians are ostensibly part of the French army, instead of fighting the Germans, they try to rush by the soldiers in a frenzied, raging attempt to murder a convalescing woman and her newborn child. Neither the French troops nor the cowering husband attempt to interfere, leaving the helpless woman at the mercy of an armed force that is African, amoral, and out of control.⁸¹ In Liliencron's account, the German soldiers thus become both the embodiment of manliness and the defenders of civilization, who must protect both themselves and the French against a menace the French themselves have unleashed.⁸²

Fontane and Liliencron's portrayals of German and French national character converge on a number of points. Both tend to view the two in opposition, to portray the Germans as masculine and the French as feminine (an old construction, dating back to the eighteenth century or before), and to highlight German unity. But these constructions take on very different meanings in their respective works. Even the significance of "masculine" and

⁸⁰ Liliencron, "Umzingelt," 260.

⁸¹ The most courageous French character in the story is the pregnant woman's elderly aunt, who attempts to hit the attacking Algerian soldier over the head with a saucepan. See *Ibid.*, 260.

⁸² In "Portepeefähnrich Schadius," the German company also has to rescue the wife and daughter of the bourgeois French man helping the *franc-tireurs* when they come and attempt to kill his family. See Liliencron, "Portepeefähnrich Schadius," 172.

“feminine” diverges widely. Fontane binds German “masculinity” to rationality and to an ability to cooperate, while Liliencron links it to physical strength and intellectual cultivation. Liliencron ties what he sees as French femininity, on the other hand, to helplessness, whereas Fontane sees it in division and superficiality. These differences have political as well as symbolic implications – Liliencron’s vision of German masculine strength and French feminine weakness envisions a much more imbalanced relationship between the two countries than Fontane’s vision of German unity and French division. The differences in their conception of the nature of German unity are also striking; Fontane’s portrayal of German unity is concretely laid out, and predicated upon harmony through internal diversity, while Liliencron’s depiction of Germany is more symbolic, and rests upon a harmony made possible by the patriarchal military system. This difference is perhaps a reflection of the fact that Fontane was writing his memoir during the process of unification, and Liliencron’s stories were reflecting back on it in an already unified country twenty years later. But both also envision very different kinds of society within the new state.

A number of these themes emerge in the French authors’ works as well, although they take on distinct forms. Like Liliencron, Daudet also defines Germany through its military. But unlike Liliencron, he characterizes the Germans as uncivilized, disorderly, and ruthless soldiers who take advantage of their military victory to wreak havoc against France and its people.⁸³ They loot and steal French goods, destroy houses and farmland, and kill French soldiers and civilians in dishonorable ways.⁸⁴ In his stories, the Bavarians epitomize the worst of this German national spirit. Daudet suggests in *Empereur aveugle* that they

⁸³ As Karine Varley has made clear, this was one of two main stereotypes that emerged about Germany during the Franco-Prussian War. After the war, French nationalistic politicians and writers tended to characterize Germans (or at least the German army) as either barbaric or as machine-like and inhuman. See Varley, *Under the Shadow of Defeat*, 181.

⁸⁴ Alphonse Daudet, “Le Prussien de Bélisaire,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 3 (Paris: Librairie de France, 1929; 1931), 62.

should commemorate their actions in the War of 1870/71 by erecting a statue with two reliefs depicting “Bavarian warriors setting fire to the town of Bazeilles” and “Bavarian warriors murdering wounded French soldiers at the field-hospital of Worth.”⁸⁵ All Germans, he implies, to some degree adopt these unfair, illegal, and unnecessarily violent tactics. The annexation of Alsace and Lorraine – which Daudet portrays as unambiguously culturally French – and the German state’s efforts to impose a new regime in those territories also provide additional evidence of their ruthless and barbaric impulses.⁸⁶

This barbarism, Daudet maintains, both supports and is supported by Germany’s syllogistic, pseudo-scientific, and chauvinistic intellectual culture. One of Daudet’s most popular stories, *La Pendule de Bouvival*, follows a French clock stolen by Bavarian soldiers back to Munich. Once it is there, a German professor decides to study it, and, based upon his findings,

composed his famous *Paradox upon Clocks*, a philosophico-humorous study of six hundred pages, which studies the influence of clocks upon the character of various nationalities, and logically demonstrates that a nation so senseless as to regulate the employment of its time by such erratic chronometers as that frail, dainty clock of Bouvival could no more expect to escape every sort of catastrophe than a ship that put off to sea with its compass gone astray.⁸⁷

The fact that this professor articulates a causal relationship between French defeat and a Parisian clock, Daudet implies, reveals that German intellectuals write overly long books on clearly ridiculous topics and then use their findings to articulate their absurd opinions about broader contemporary issues. This professor dresses an inanimate object in the language of logical objectivity to propound his preconceived notion of France as a senseless, erratic,

⁸⁵ Daudet, “L’Empereur aveugle,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 4, 182.

⁸⁶ See Daudet, “Le Bac,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 4, 25; Daudet, “La dernière classe,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 4, 4.

⁸⁷ Daudet, “La Pendule de Bouvival,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 3, 55.

feminine country. The claim that a piece of mechanical equipment enables him to interpret French national character, coupled with his apparent indifference to what the theft of this equipment might imply about German character, highlights the absurdity of his argument. There is nothing “objective” in his unreflective nationalist prejudice, which Daudet implies also shapes both elite and popular opinion, particularly in Bavaria. Indeed, Daudet argues that the Germans are the most “boastful, vain, and self-satisfied” people in Europe, despite what he describes as their absence of cultural achievements.⁸⁸

Daudet defines France, on the other hand, through a highly developed sense of honor and culture. Although he portrays the French officer corps as unambiguously incompetent and self-indulgent, he implies that the principles of most French soldiers would have ensured a just invasion of Germany if military fortunes had swung in the opposite direction.⁸⁹ This commitment to principle and justice, moreover, goes hand in hand with French cultural, intellectual, and artistic refinement, which is reflected in the French language itself.⁹⁰ Like Fontane, however, Daudet portrays French society as unraveling even before the disaster of 1870/71. While some indulged in misguided chauvinism, others abandoned patriotic feeling – namely, spies and communards in Paris, along with townsfolk in southern France, who joined

⁸⁸ It is worth noting that Daudet’s positioning of Germany as chauvinistic directly contradicted most circulating stereotypes, which posited France as the more jingoistic of the two countries. Daudet himself addresses this tension in “L’Empereur aveugle.” See Daudet, “L’Empereur aveugle,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 4, 181.

⁸⁹ In “La Partie de billard,” a general allows his troops to be massacred because he does not want to be distracted from his rigged billiard game. See Daudet, “La Partie de billard,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 4, 8. But “La Siège de Berlin” has a more positive vision of the army. It begins with a veteran of the Napoleonic Wars suffering a stroke right after the declaration of war. Afraid that a shock would kill him, his granddaughter tells him that the French are winning the war and invading Germany. As a result, he writes a series of letters to his son in the French army, full of advice about how to treat a conquered people: “Never forget that you are French... Do not make the invasion too terrible.” ...he then continued on about the right observance of propriety, courtesy towards women – a real military code of honor for the *conquerors*... he outlined the conditions of the peace to be imposed upon the vanquished, ‘A war indemnity, only that; what good would it do to seize their provinces? How would it be possible to make France out of Germany?’” This advice stands in opposition to Daudet’s depiction of German behavior in France. See Daudet, “La Siège de Berlin,” *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 3, 70.

⁹⁰ Daudet, “La Dernière classe,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 4, 6.

singing societies instead of the military.⁹¹ This division reflected a broader crisis of faith in French society. In *Les Fées de France*, a *petroleuse*⁹² on trial after the Commune introduces herself as a fairy and offers the following explanation for the German victory:

We have all seen our well-fed, sneering peasants open their huts for the Prussians... [they] no longer believe in sorcery, and also no longer believe in [their] country... If we had been there, none of the Germans who entered France would have returned alive... That is how one makes a national war, a holy war. But in a country that does not believe anymore... such a war is no longer possible.⁹³

“Fairies” clearly symbolize a mystical faith in country, nature, and nation, which the speaker argues has disappeared. As a result of scientific textbooks, secularization, industrialization, and urbanization, she goes on to argue, peasants have become disaffected. They had no interest in uniting against the invasion, and even aided the Germans.

In the postwar era, however, Daudet, not unlike Liliencron, posits victimhood as France’s primary defining feature across all levels of society. From the soldiers abandoned by their officers to be slaughtered in the rain, to the civilians whose homes have been leveled or taken from them, destruction has enveloped the country. France’s defeat is etched into the landscape itself; not only have the Prussians looted houses and destroyed gardens, they have literally torn apart the French countryside. The effects in Alsace are the most devastating, Daudet maintains, as mass exile has followed the ravages of war.⁹⁴ Describing the inhabitants’ desertion of their homes after German annexation, he writes:

They do not move without groaning; even their oxen pull them in pain, as if the ground was attached to the wheels, as if the particles of dry earth

⁹¹ Daudet, “La Mort de Chauvin,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 3, 36; Daudet, “Paysage d’insurrection,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 3, 75; Daudet, “La Défense de Tarascon,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 3, 47.

⁹² The *petroleuses* were women accused of burning Paris down during the Paris Commune. See Gay Gullickson, *Unruly Women of Paris: Images of the Commune* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996).

⁹³ Daudet, “Les Fées de France” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 4, 88.

⁹⁴ Approximately 5% of the population of the annexed territories had immigrated to France by 1876. See Dan P. Silverman, *Reluctant Union: Alsace-Lorraine and Imperial Germany* (Pittsburgh: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1972), 66.

clinging to plow and harrow, to rake and pickaxe, increased the weight of the burden they bore – as though this departure were indeed an uprooting of the soil.⁹⁵

The Alsatians, forced to sever their ties to their country, literally strip it bare as they move with their belongings into exile. Even outside Alsace, however, Daudet shows a French population impoverished and suffering. Daudet's France may have cultural superiority, but internal strife and German barbarism have left it enslaved, desecrated, and despoiled.⁹⁶

Zola too defines Germany, German national identity, and even the German political system around the military.⁹⁷ But he defines that military as cold and disciplined rather than as brave, strong, or inspiring, like Liliencron, or as disorderly and uncivilized, like Daudet. Indeed, Zola links the German army to the calculating rationality of the machine age.⁹⁸ There is nothing patriarchal or even human about the bonds that tie the army together, or by extension, German society. General Moltke himself is “clean-shaven like some mathematician, winning battles from inside his office, wielding algebra.”⁹⁹ The King – who is also the commander of the army – is a calculating, unfeeling, and disembodied god. He interacts with the rest of the world as if he inhabits a higher plane. Zola's account of his behavior at the battle of Sedan is particularly revealing. He positions the King on a hilltop, watching his armies approach the fortifications, perfectly still. Finally, “the King asked a question. He wanted to know every particle of this human dust under his command on the

⁹⁵ Daudet, “La Vision du juge de Colmar,” in *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*, vol. 4, 16.

⁹⁶ Karlene Varley has made clear that this notion of France as culturally superior but despoiled was a central interpretative framework of French defeat, which characterized much French literature, especially immediately after the war's conclusion. See Varley, *Under the Shadow of Defeat*, 26.

⁹⁷ Of the four authors, Zola spends the least time outlining the contours of German national identity. There are only a handful of developed German characters in *La Débâcle*, and the majority of them are Prussian, although Zola does devote quite a bit of attention to the Bavarian attack on Bapaume, which he maintains that they burned to the ground on purpose. See Émile Zola, *La Débâcle: Oxford World's Classics*, trans. by Elinor Dorday, and Robert Lethbridge, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 242.

⁹⁸ This notion of the German army as “inhuman” is the second major stereotype (after “barbaric”) that Varley claims emerged in French political discourse after the war. See Varley, *Under the Shadow of Defeat*, 158.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 319.

giant chessboard; he wanted to hold it in the palm of his hand.”¹⁰⁰ Tellingly, not only are the French soldiers “human dust”; the German soldiers are as well. In Zola’s account, the King has no personal feelings towards anyone: he approaches war as a logical rather than a human endeavor.¹⁰¹ He commands his generals and armies without contestation, pulling at them like a “black tide” in ordered lines across the countryside.¹⁰² Zola’s Germans are not united by loyalty or common sentiment, but controlled by their commanders – the result, he implies, of their authoritarian patriarchal system.

Zola, like Daudet, also implies that national chauvinism is intrinsic to German culture, although in his novel it takes a rather different form. Towards the end of *La Débâcle*, Henriette, one of the main French characters, encounters her Prussian cousin Otto on the battlefield. The fact that this leading French character has a cousin from Berlin might highlight the flexibility of national borders and “national character.” But Otto denies his family bonds. When Henriette recognizes him on the battlefield and asks for his help, he pretends not to recognize her, and does not care when she tells him that her brother Maurice is caught in a prisoner-of-war camp:

...when she had spoken to him of her brother being held prisoner... he had refused to get involved. His orders were quite categorical. He spoke of German wishes as if he were discussing religion. As she left him, she had the distinct impression that he saw himself in France as a kind of upholder of justice, full of intolerance and haughtiness towards the hereditary enemy, brought up to hate the race he was now punishing.¹⁰³

Otto’s jingoistic nationalism, in other words, simply underscores the fact that he, like the other Germans, has no human feelings; he is a sort of automaton who is unwilling to question

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 228.

¹⁰¹ The King shows no remorse for even his own fallen: “[Sedan] was an un hoped for, crushing victory, and the King felt no remorse at the sight of the tiny corpses, all these thousands of men who took up less room than the dust on the roads.” See *ibid.*, 294.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 401.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 373.

his orders, and who places his country above familial affairs. Like Daudet, then, Zola places the most jingoistic nationalism in the mouth of the enemy. The term “hereditary enemy” only occurs once in the book, in the mouth of a German character. But this nationalism is not linked to vanity or circuitous intellectual thought, but an arctic and dogmatic sense of duty.¹⁰⁴

On the whole, however, Zola is much less interested in Germany or the German army than he is in France; the Germans, for the most part, occupy little more than the margins of the story. The main opposition in his work is between pre-war and post-war French society, which he paints much more starkly than even Daudet does.¹⁰⁵ His depiction of pre-war France shares certain similarities with Liliencron’s, Fontane’s, and Daudet’s; like them, he implies that structural problems in pre-war French society led to French defeat. But his interpretation of those problems is quite distinct. Unlike Fontane, who emphasizes French divisiveness, Liliencron, who looks to French colonialism, or Daudet, who highlights the evils of modernization, Zola points to what he believes are the deleterious effects of the imperial government. He describes the Empire as

...cheered by the people but rotten at the core, having undermined the nation’s pride in itself by taking away liberty... poised to crumble and fall the moment it failed to satisfy the appetite for worldly pleasures it had itself unleashed...¹⁰⁶

The Empire, he maintains, was marked by decline and excess; Napoleon III’s despotic rule caused the people to lose all self-respect. They turned instead to decadence, particularly in Paris – to alcohol, cafes, and illegitimate sexual relationships. This “rotten” political and social culture weakened the French military and led directly to French defeat by creating a class of nervous, hysterical men who were swept away by the prospect of war but who were

¹⁰⁴ This is in line with many late nineteenth century French stereotypes of Germany. See Jeismann, *Das Vaterland der Feinde*, 376.

¹⁰⁵ Zola does not spend as much time as Daudet laying out a sense of French culture per se.

¹⁰⁶ Zola, *La Débâcle*, 19.

too disorderly and emotional to execute it.¹⁰⁷ Court culture encouraged officers in particular to think less about strategy than social standing and turned them into self-centered, incompetent, foppish buffoons.¹⁰⁸ Most were straightforwardly effeminate, like the “coquettish” officer who habitually wore “a faint perfume of Persian lilac, the scent of a pretty woman’s plush dressing room” onto the battlefield.¹⁰⁹ The others were deluded by the old Napoleonic myth of French military greatness that Napoleon III consciously kept alive.¹¹⁰

If Zola, like Fontane, Liliencron, and even Daudet, therefore posits Second Empire France as feminine – and, in fact, his vision of that femininity is in many ways the most negative – he nevertheless emphasizes that a section of the population was left untouched by the influence of the Empire’s political culture: *la France profonde*. Outside of Paris and the machinations of the court, the peasants and the old bourgeoisie remained pure. They were not cold and mechanical, like Zola’s Germans, but they were rational and had a clearly defined sense of duty.¹¹¹ After military defeat and civil war swept away the corruption tied to the Emperor and his officials, and burnt out the disease they have allowed to fester in Paris, these

¹⁰⁷ One of the main characters, Maurice is described as possessing “a women’s nervous disposition, [and is] shaken by the sickness of the age.” He is prone to both hysteria and irrationality: the volatility of his emotions, rather than logical deduction, drives his actions. His family had him educated in Paris, but the vices of the city fed on his weaknesses and led him astray. After his parents died, his sister Henriette worked to continue to support his education and lavish tastes: although they are twins, she acted his caretaker. He accepts money from her and her husband, Weiss, throughout the first half of the book: an obvious reversal of gender roles. The sheer exhilaration of the crowd and a few badly-articulated ideas about Bonaparte, rather than thoughtful deliberation, swept him into volunteering. As a result, he cannot commit to army life; he vacillates between ecstasy and despair. See *ibid.*, 11, 49.

¹⁰⁸ Like Liliencron, Zola also links the problems of the army to French colonial wars in Africa: the officers “got stuck in the old routine of the African school, and was too confident of victory to think of trying to develop new techniques.” While he does not imply that Algerian soldiers were wreaking havoc in France, fighting in Africa encouraged overconfidence and a certain lack of military creativity. See *ibid.*, 19.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 196.

¹¹⁰ As Alan Forrest has made clear, the Franco-Prussian War put major dents in the credibility of the Napoleonic myth – Zola’s interpretation was shared by many. See Forrest, *The Legacy of the French Revolutionary Wars*, 112.

¹¹¹ Henriette, Maurice’s sister, and Jean, his comrade-in-arms, represent this other France. Henriette is Maurice’s twin and his opposite: Maurice personifies unhealthy, hysterical femininity, she embodies its self-denying and sensible aspects. Jean, on the other hand, is Henriette’s masculine counterpart; his strength derives from “his common sense and his ignorance, [he is] still healthy from having grown up apart from all that, in the land of toil and thrift.” Unlike Maurice, who is effeminate and nervous, Jean is calm and thoughtful; he has “serenity and rational equilibrium.” See Zola, *La Débâcle*, 8.

peasants and townspeople could redeem the country. Even Maurice, the character in the novel most associated with the Second Empire, could remark during the Bloody Week,

It was the healthy part of France, the reasonable, level-headed part, the peasant part, the part which had stayed closest to the soil, which was now suppressing the insane part, the frustrated part, spoiled by the Empire, unbalanced by dreams and decadence.¹¹²

Zola therefore interprets defeat, civil war, and the slaughter in Paris as part of a process of purification through which French decadence was eliminated. And by the end of the novel, the corrupt, unhealthy, disordered, and effeminate France disappears, replaced by the rural, sensible, masculine, and hard-working French peasant and townsmen who come to power during the Third Republic – a much more positive vision than Daudet’s post-war France of brokenness and defeat.¹¹³

Daudet’s and Zola’s visions of French and German national identity clearly share at least some similarities that distinguish them from their German counterparts. Unlike Fontane and Liliencron, neither Daudet nor Zola is particularly interested in German unity: they focus instead on what they describe as German chauvinism, and devote more attention to distinguishing between pre-war and post-war France. But many of the divergences in all four works’ interpretations do not line up cleanly along national lines. Liliencron, Daudet, and Zola all define Germany through its military, for example, while Fontane does not; similarly, Daudet, Zola, and Fontane all characterize at least pre-war France as divided, which Liliencron does not. On a certain level, Daudet’s and Liliencron’s vision of German and French national character have, in fact, the most in common – in both of their short story collections, German masculine military strength operates in opposition to French feminine

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 509.

¹¹³ The association of the French peasantry with purity and moral goodness astounded some of Zola’s critics, as his previous book, *La Terre*, had stressed the pettiness and brutality of village life. See Helen La Ru Rufener, *Biography of A War Novel: Zola’s La Débâcle* (New York: King’s Crown Press, 1946), 31. There is one miserly peasant character in this novel, but ultimately he, unlike the characters associated with the Second Empire, finds redemption.

weakness and victimhood. Of course, Daudet interprets this binary in terms quite distinct from Liliencron. While Liliencron links German masculine strength to intellectual cultivation and locates both in the figure of the educated, dutiful, and self-sacrificing officer, Daudet characterizes German masculinity as barbaric and uneducated and ties cultural and intellectual sophistication to feminine, victimized France.¹¹⁴ This military-masculine/ victim-feminine paradigm is simply not present in either Fontane's or Zola's account – as less nationalistically-inclined writers, they did not divide the two countries in such stark terms. Nor were they disposed, like Liliencron and Daudet, to claim cultural or intellectual superiority for their respective countries – at least not as explicitly or emphatically.

Both Fontane and Zola, however, also invoke a gendered binary opposition to define the edges of their comparisons, even if they deploy it differently than Liliencron and Daudet. Fontane, of course, also defines France as feminine and Germany as masculine. But those terms take on distinct meanings in his memoir. And Zola uses this binary contrast to highlight a different kind of comparison; he ties effeminacy to the Second Empire and locates masculinity in the Third Republic. In his account, the Germans are neither masculine nor feminine; they are militarized, unfeeling, and in fact inhuman. In fact, they are quite literally the mechanism that pushes France into its violent process of self-renewal. While Zola certainly contrasts German and French national identity in binary terms – order/disorder, obedience/independence, unfeeling/feeling - his most clearly drawn comparison is between the Second Empire and the Third Republic.

This cacophony of interpretations reveals, if nothing else, that there was no clear consensus in France or Germany – at least among writers – about either the content of French and German national identity or the nature of the war's relationship to those identities. The

¹¹⁴ This opposition appeared widely in a certain subset of French nationalistic literature. See Varley, *Under the Shadow of Defeat*, 181.

literary reviews would only further complicate these interpretative contradictions. But the differences between them point to an underlying set of interlaced and overlapping concerns that inflected these writers' portrayals of national identity, albeit in different ways: namely, concerns about the relative value of French and German culture, about whether the war had changed that balance, and about the kind of societies the changes wrought by the war would lead to. These issues would also affect literary reviewers' assessment of all four writers' works, and inflect their own constructions of French and German national identity.

CHAPTER FOUR

LITERARY CRITICS: TRANSNATIONAL RESPONSES

The literary critics reviewing *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes*, the *Contes du lundi*, *La Débâcle*, and *Unter flatternden Fahnen* did not necessarily assess them in the same terms. Some commented explicitly on the interpretation of the war they believed the collections propounded, while others were more concerned with their aesthetic qualities and the nature of their author's abilities. But even reviews focused on aesthetics and talent connected both to questions of national identity. Critics redeployed the authors' constructions of victimhood, gender, and civilization in aesthetic language to articulate their own ideas about the national self and other. Moreover, the repetition of these constructions across reviews and publications reveals the ways that Daudet's, Zola's, Fontane's, and Liliencron's stories interacted with broader anxieties about war, literature, and national identity in each country.

Throughout the nineteenth century, literary reviews served multiple purposes: they publicized new work, interpreted it, and promoted critical opinions about its relative merits.¹¹⁵ Published in literary magazines, illustrated magazines, and literary or ordinary newspapers, they spoke to different audiences depending on the type and influence of the publication. A positive review in a literary journal or elite newspaper might be an important signifier of a particular writer's acceptance among a literary elite (and perhaps the highly educated middle and upper classes as well), but it did not necessarily induce wider readership. A positive review in a mass press newspaper, such as *Le Petit Journal* or the

¹¹⁵ Martyn Lyons, *Reading Culture and Writing Practices in Nineteenth-Century France* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2008), 3.

Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger, might attract casual readers, but probably would have had little salience in scholarly or literary circles.¹¹⁶ Although literary reviews do not translate into sales numbers, they nevertheless provide some indication as to the nature of a work's readership and elucidate the frameworks that general readers employed to interpret what they read.

The first reviews of Fontane's *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes* appeared in a number of German newspapers immediately after its publication in 1871, amid the first flood of German literature about the war and German unification. Although the reviews were very positive, they were relatively short, and did not engage with the book's actual content in detail. The anonymous critic writing for the national-liberal *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, for example, wrote at greater length about the illegality of Fontane's capture and the "perfidy" of the French than about the content of the book per se. But he also spoke positively, if briefly, about the merits of the section set on the *Ile d'Oléron*, which he contended both read "like a novel" and made "the German heroes... immortal thanks to [Fontane's] talent."¹¹⁷ The critic writing for the liberal *Königlich privilegierte Berlinische Zeitung*, on the other hand, emphasized the merits and "long-lasting value" of Fontane's study of the French people, which he tied to its freedom from "one-sided particularist patriotism."¹¹⁸ The value of Fontane's work, the early reviews seem to have agreed, lay in the "objectivity" of its examination of French strengths and weaknesses, and its clear demonstration of German virtues.

¹¹⁶ For information about *Le Petit Journal*, see Maria Adamowicz-Hariasz, "From Opinion to Information: The Roman-Feuilleton and the Transformation of the Nineteenth-Century French Press," in *Making the News: Modernity and the Mass Press*, ed. Jeannene Przyblyski (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 161. The *Berliner*, on the other hand, was founded in 1883, and by 1900, distributed 260,000 copies per day. See Rudolf Stöber, *Deutsche Pressegeschichte: Einführung, Systematik, Glossar* (Konstanz: UVK Medien, 2000), 233.

¹¹⁷ Anon, „Kriegsgefangen. Erlebtes 1870 von Th. Fontane," *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* 69, March 22, 1871.

¹¹⁸ Anon, „Kriegsgefangen. Erlebtes 1870 von Theodor Fontane," *Königlich privilegierte Berlinische Zeitung von Staats- und gelehrten Sachen* 71, no. 2, July 3, 1871, 5.

After the initial post-war period, *Kriegsgefangen* received little notice in literary publications until it was republished in 1892 at the height of Fontane's literary career. This second publication received considerably more critical attention than the first; reviews appeared in respected literary journals as well as in newspapers. The reviews were also more emphatically positive, although they echoed earlier criticism thematically. Robert Lange, writing in the highbrow *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, praised Fontane's "keen observation of humanity," and highlighted the "impartiality of his judgment." Moritz Necker, writing for the weekly national-liberal magazine *Die Grenzboten*, agreed, but also underscored the book's literary qualities, and maintained that the book was "important on all levels: the poetic, the artistic, the moral, and the national."¹¹⁹ In fact, he went on to contend that the book provided such insight into the German character that "all Germans today must read it to know what it is to be German!"¹²⁰

Daudet's *Contes du lundi* received considerably more critical attention after its first publication in 1873 than Fontane's *Kriegsgefangen*. From the well-established *Le Revue de deux mondes*, *Le Figaro*, and *Le Temps*, to the popular illustrated periodical *Le Charivari* and the more avant-garde naturalist *L'Avenir national*, Daudet's work met with largely positive commentary.¹²¹ Reviews of later editions were even more numerous, as Daudet's literary fortunes climbed higher in the late 1870s and 1880s. Although the *Contes* undeniably continued to attract the most attention within critical circles sympathetic to the naturalist literary movement, naturalism itself was quite popular in France at the time. Daudet's

¹¹⁹ Moritz Necker, „Altes und neues von Theodor Fontane,“ *Die Grenzboten*, no. 4, January 21, 1892, 175.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 176.

¹²¹ *Le Revue de deux mondes* was the literary, political, and economic review in France, founded in 1829, whose political leanings during the Third Republic were conservative-republican. See Gabriel de Broglie, *Histoire politique de la Revue des Deux Mondes de 1829 à 1979*, (Paris: Perrin, 1979), 22. *Le Figaro*, on the other hand, was founded by Hyppolyte de Villemessant in 1854, and became daily in 1866. Along with *Le Temps*, it targeted an affluent, well-educated readership, and was particularly well known for its book and theater reviews. See Clyde Thogmartin, *The National Daily Press of France* (Birmingham, AL: Summa Publications, 1998), 65.

reputation as a naturalist writer therefore only enhanced the critical attention paid to his work.¹²²

Most of the reviewers of the *Contes du lundi*, especially those writing immediately after the war, focused less explicitly on the stories' insight into national character, and pointed to their value as a medium of memory instead. Shortly after the first collection's publication, Emmanuel des Essarts, a professor of literature at the University of Paris, wrote a lengthy review article for *Le Bien Public*, a popular liberal regional newspaper. He argued that the primary value of the collection lay in its ability to keep the past alive:

Daudet is right to reassemble memories of the terrible year in a book of episodes about our disastrous wars... patriotism does not consist of forgetting, but demands that we redouble and fortify the memory for future instruction. It is thus with sympathy that we have accompanied the storyteller through the Alsace whose image will follow us through all times and in all places.¹²³

Though Essarts continued by praising the quality of Daudet's writing, he clearly believed that the book's primary importance rested in its ability to remind the French of what they had lost and why. By physically inscribing Alsace into his stories, he maintained, Daudet had anchored the annexed province to the French past even if it was lost to the present. Essarts did not believe that this act of memorializing was apolitical or disinterested. Instead, it was a patriotic endeavor enabled by Daudet's realistic, detailed portrayal of war and defeat.¹²⁴

¹²² Baguley, *Naturalist Fiction: The Entropic Vision*, 18.

¹²³ Emmanuel des Essarts, "Les Contes du lundi," *Le Bien Public*, April 3, 1873.

¹²⁴ Many other reviewers made similar arguments, maintaining that its realist/naturalist principles, its attention to detail, and its sensitivity to the emotions of the time made it a "real" encapsulation of the French experience in 1870/1871. As Jules Lemaître rhetorically asked, "Do you know of anything more real [than his *Contes du lundi*]? ...I don't believe that anyone has recounted that terrible year better than Alphonse Daudet..." See Jules Lemaître, "M. Alphonse Daudet," *Revue Politique et Littéraire* (March 1883). This interest in whether Daudet was telling the "truth" about the past perhaps reflects the fact that at least during this initial period, the *Contes* was operating more as what Astrid Erll terms "circulating" or collective instead of "storage" or cultural memory. She identifies questions about whether a work refers to the reality of a particular situation as a telling sign of popular, "circulating" memory. See Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 159.

Even critics who did not dwell on the value of the *Contes du lundi* as a carrier of cultural memory but instead interpreted it in more traditionally aesthetic terms connected those aesthetics to French national identity, and framed both against the memory of war. Édouard Drumont, a French nationalist and in many ways proto-fascist writer, invoked Daudet's writing about the war as evidence of the continuing value of French culture and the French nation. Enumerating Daudet's qualities, Drumont maintained,

The *Partie de billard*, the *Porte-drapeau*, and the *Empereur aveugle* are masterpieces in the complete sense of the word... you will be amazed at the profundity of the art that defines the smallest of these compositions... M. Alphonse Daudet is inspired by nature and life itself, which he interprets marvelously, and by a complex and shifting model of Paris, which incorporates its diverse and undulating characteristics.¹²⁵

According to Drumont, Daudet's ability to produce "masterpieces" came from his connection to both universalized and particular sources of inspiration: he could draw not only on nature and "life itself" but also on the city of Paris. Together, these enabled him to write "profound" and meaningful works that also showed, in careful detail, what actually happened to people during the Parisian siege. This description of Daudet effectively positions him as a literary genius in touch with the universal while simultaneously securing his identity as a specifically French writer, thereby implying that French culture and talent remained undiminished by defeat.¹²⁶

These themes emerged, if anything, more strongly in the reviews of Zola's *La Débâcle*. The novel attracted even more critical attention than Daudet's *Contes*; the majority of the newspapers and literary journals in France made at least some mention of it following

¹²⁵ Édouard Drumont, "Les Contes du lundi," *Le Bien Public*, April 13, 1873.

¹²⁶ Although the notion of "genius" is usually associated with the romantic rather than the naturalist literary movement, it is clear that it remained an important trope in both French and German literary reviews in the late nineteenth century. While it is clear that different reviewers used the term to refer to different things, this notion that the "genius" transcended the particular and access the universal represents one of its earlier incarnations. For more information, see Penelope Murray, ed. *Genius: The History of an Idea* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

its publication in 1892, reflecting Zola's visibility at the time.¹²⁷ Particularly lengthy reviews appeared in prestigious publications such as *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, the *Journal des Débats*, and *La Revue Bleue*. But unlike Daudet's short stories, *La Débâcle* met with immediate controversy that centered on whether its interpretation of the war and its criticism of French political culture were accurate.¹²⁸ These debates extended far beyond military-sponsored pamphlets. For several weeks in October, critical commentators, interested citizens, and professional historians participated in a vehement argument about several especially contentious plot points in *Le Figaro*.¹²⁹

Many of the positive reviews echoed earlier criticism of Daudet's work by emphasizing the importance of *La Débâcle* in capturing and preserving the "truth" of the war. Charles Leser, in a review for the French literary journal *Gil Blas*, commended Zola's treatment of the trials of the French army and contended that the book was

not a novel, but a history in the most expansive and highest sense of the term... no detail is apocryphal, every date is exact; from a huge volume of authentic information, brought together with patience, the author's genius has freed an eternal truth.¹³⁰

Zola's genius, Leser maintained, enabled him to reconstruct the truth about the war in a literary work that transcended fiction. The influential literary critic Émile Faguet similarly argued in *La Revue Bleue* that Zola had accurately "showed us our faults" and in doing so

¹²⁷ La Rue Rufener, *Biography of a War Novel*, 62.

¹²⁸ Similarly to Daudet's case, this interest in "accuracy" and "truth" indicates that at least originally, Zola's work would fall into Erll's category of "circulating" literature. See Erll, *Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 159.

¹²⁹ Zola's portrayal of Napoleon III – particularly his claim that he wore makeup – incited some of the most incendiary comments from his critics. While Napoleon III was highly unpopular in postwar France, some thought that Zola's portrayal nevertheless crossed boundaries. Gaston Libre wrote an angry article, claiming that Zola was not only mistaken but blatantly disrespectful. See "Napoléon a mis du Rouge," *Le Figaro*, October 29, 1892. Zola wrote back, first in letter form, later in a pamphlet, claiming that he had drawn the information from a historical source. For details on the controversy, see Bernadette Lintz, "L'Empereur fardé: Napoléon III des Châtiments à *La Débâcle*," *Nineteenth Century French Studies*, v. 35, no. 3 & 4 (2007): 610-627.

¹³⁰ Charles Leser, "La Clef de *La Débâcle*," *Gil Blas*, July 25, 1892.

had performed a national service.¹³¹ But he implied that most of that service lay not in Zola's preservation of the memory of the war (like Daudet), but in his vision of French redemption through defeat. By providing a path for France to follow out of destruction, Faguet maintained, Zola had redeemed the nation in a way that its own soldiers, generals, and politicians could not.¹³²

Significantly, however, Faguet couched Zola's political act of national redemption in aesthetic terms. He described the novel as a "wonderful" and "well-written" book that the French "could present to Europe with dignity and pride."¹³³ Zola – even more, it seemed, than Daudet – had therefore provided both a model for the French people and literary evidence of France's powerful and untarnished culture. Gaston Deschamps' review in the *Journal des Débats* went even farther, and offered Zola's literary abilities as proof of the national redemption his book could offer.¹³⁴ He maintained that Zola's genius pointed to a positive model of strong French masculine identity undiminished by victimhood or defeat. Zola's sensitivity and artistic cultivation – characteristics that Deschamps posited as central to his ability – had little in common with general understandings of military masculinity.¹³⁵ But it was these very characteristics that pointed to another kind of masculine France beyond the battlefields, which had allowed Zola to articulate his vision of French redemption.¹³⁶

¹³¹ Founded in 1863, *La Revue Bleue* (also known as *La Revue politique et littéraire*) was an influential weekly political, intellectual, and literary journal. See Claude Bellanger, Jacques Godechot, Pierre Guiral and Fernand Terrou, eds., *Histoire Générale de la Presse Française* vol. 2, (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1969).

¹³² Émile Faguet, "La Dêbâcle," *La Revue Bleue*, XLIX (1892), 822.

¹³³ *Ibid.*

¹³⁴ Gaston Deschamps, "La Dêbâcle," *Journal des Débats*, July 1, 1892, 3. When he wrote the review, Deschamps, a well-known journalist, writer, and archaeologist, was the primary editor of the highbrow journal.

¹³⁵ In fact, Deschamps implied that part of the virtue of Zola's book was that it might cause its readers to rethink the "saber- rattling" of certain contemporary French politicians.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

Even reviewers who disagreed with Zola's interpretation of war emphasized the continued importance of the Franco-Prussian War and the specific power of Zola's vision; in fact, they stressed the idea that by misleading the country about its past, Zola was sending the country astray. Pro-monarchical and conservative commentators, or those allied closely with the military, found the connections Zola made between French redemption and republicanism highly unsettling and in fact politically threatening.¹³⁷ But they did not condemn his desire to capture and preserve the war's truth; some, like Christian Franc, called upon Zola to remake *La Débâcle* more accurately,¹³⁸ while others pointed to writers like Alphonse Daudet, who they believed had accomplished the task more effectively.¹³⁹ But critics invoked other authors as well; in a lengthy review for the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Eugène-Melchior de Vogüé, a literary critic with connections to the military, criticized Zola's misinterpretation of the French army and pointed to Fontane's recently translated *Kriegsgefangen* as a less biased account of the 1870 war. He called Fontane an "honest man" and noted

he observes coolly and well... He describes here and there certain disorders, but the dominant impression is of respect and sympathy... The nation studied by M. Fontane differs as much from the one that crumbles in *La Débâcle* as a Chinaman (*Chinois*) from a Negro (*Nègre*).¹⁴⁰

By employing a popular model of racial hierarchy, de Vogüé indicated that while the French and the French army may have been inferior, they possessed more positive qualities than Zola's work implied. It is clear that de Vogüé invoked Fontane's work at least somewhat rhetorically – to stress that Zola was so biased and ideologically driven that even a German

¹³⁷ Most of the negative reviews were published either by the military or in more conservative journals such as the nationalist *Le Gaulois* or *Figaro* by more conservative literary commentators. See, for example Philippe Gille, "La Débâcle," *Figaro*, June 20, 1892; J. Cornély, "La Débâcle," *Les Gaulois*, July 26, 1892.

¹³⁸ Christian Franc, *A Réfaire La Débâcle* (Paris: Dentu, 1892).

¹³⁹ This was an established trend even before the publication of *La Débâcle*. See, for example, Ferdinand Brunetière, "Le Roman réaliste en 1875" *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1875), 706; René Doumic, *Portrait d'Écrivains* (Paris: Librairie Paul Delaplane, 1892), 258.

¹⁴⁰ Eugène-Melchior de Vogüé, "La Débâcle," *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, CXII (1892), 455.

could see France more clearly. But it is also evident that de Vogüé's conservatism led him to find Fontane's relative sympathy for the Second Empire and the French Emperor preferable to what he saw as Zola's anti-military, pro-republican propaganda – even if he found Zola's work aesthetically superior. The accuracy of the work's interpretation, he maintained, was much more important than its relative literary merits.¹⁴¹

German literary magazines and newspapers also reviewed both the *Contes du lundi* and *La Débâcle*. The earliest notices for the *Contes* appeared in the early 1880s, immediately after its translation into German, but literary scholars and writers continued to comment on new editions into the early twentieth century. The collection attracted the attention of internationally-oriented journals, such as the *Zeitschrift für neufranzösische Sprache und Literatur*; mainstream, well-respected, high-brow journals such as *Die Zukunft*, *Die Grenzboten*, *Die Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, and *Nord und Süd*; and the naturalist literary journals *Die Gesellschaft* and *Magazin für die Literatur des In- und Auslandes*. Admired by the literary avant-garde, Daudet also drew praise from conservative reviewers who viewed him as a more palatable version of Émile Zola, even before the release of *La Débâcle*.¹⁴² German naturalist circles were the most enthusiastic. They lauded his “freshness, clarity, and imagination” and his precise observations of character.¹⁴³ In fact, the very popularity of Daudet's writing meant that his interpretations of the war became a background for a wide variety of debates in Germany about the relationship between patriotism, genius, culture, universality, and French and German literature. These issues had also emerged in French reviews of Daudet's work. But the debates about them took on rather distinct forms in

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 458.

¹⁴² See Rudolf von Gottschall, “Literarische Charakterköpfe,” *Blätter für Literarische Unterhaltung*, no. 38, September 20, 1884, 596.

¹⁴³ “Alphonse Daudet,” *Die Gegenwart* (1876).

Germany, as they intersected with different if overlapping sets of cultural and political concerns.

Unlike French critics, German reviewers did not tie the value of the *Contes du lundi* to its ability to preserve the memory of the war. Most maintained that the stories' aesthetic quality shone through not because of but in spite of their interpretations, which they characterized as untrue and biased against Germany.¹⁴⁴ Many critics even went out of their way to excuse this "bias" by arguing that it stemmed from a misdirected manifestation of the despair that true patriots must feel when their country collapses.¹⁴⁵ As Karl Busse, a naturalist poet, argued in *Die Zukunft*, Daudet's inaccurate understanding of Germany could be excused, as he had proven the sincerity of his patriotism by fighting in the Parisian siege.¹⁴⁶ Unlike other poets, who abandoned France during the war, Daudet

fought against the Germans with a rifle in his arms; he never ran. And when you compare this to other gentlemen, who remained *litterati* while their people struggled despairingly, then one must say of Daudet "Honor him!" The highest good of man is his people.¹⁴⁷

Daudet, Busse claimed, was entitled to his opinions because he had the courage to fight for them in a military conflict. Because he showed his devotion to his nation by defending it with weapons, he could continue to defend it in his writing, no matter how unfairly. His literary talent and, equally importantly, his patriotic courage, compensated for his stories' prejudices and made them worth reading - unlike Zola, who Busse believed had not only misunderstood

¹⁴⁴ German critics also tended to praise the stories that coincided with their perception of the war, and to de-emphasize the more vociferously anti-German ones. While "La Dernière lesson," "Le Petit stenne" and "La Partie de billard," therefore attracted high praise, along with the stories about the colonies, "La Pendule de Bouvival" and "L'Empereur aveugle," were less popular.

¹⁴⁵ Benno Diederich, *Alphonse Daudet, sein Leben und seine Werke* (Berlin: Schwetschke und Sohn, 1900), 126.

¹⁴⁶ *Die Zukunft* was an influential modernist political and literary magazine edited and printed by Maximilian Harden between 1892 and 1922, which over the course of its existence moved politically from support of the monarchy to a position of skepticism regarding a number of Wilhelm II's policies. In 1898, it had a distribution of approximately 10,000. See Stöber, *Deutsche Pressegeschichte*, 250.

¹⁴⁷ Karl Busse, "Alphonse Daudet," *Die Zukunft* (1898), 476-482.

his own people but had misrepresented both the war and the Germans because he had not actually fought.¹⁴⁸

La Débâcle attracted, if possible, even more critical attention in Germany than the *Contes du lundi*. Immediately after its translation into German, reviews emerged in many of the same literary journals that had devoted so much space to Daudet, but other commentaries also appeared in more broadly oriented publications, including the more academically oriented *Kunstwart*, the avant-garde *Freie Bühne*, and the SPD political journal *Die Neue Zeit*. Over the next few years, several critics also published scholarly studies of *La Débâcle*, although there seems to have been no German equivalent to the popular pamphlets released by French military officers.¹⁴⁹

While most German literary critics agreed that Daudet's work was an inaccurate representation of the war and prejudiced against the German people, they did not come to the same kind of consensus about Zola's novel. Many disapproved of his portrayal of the Prussian and Bavarian army, but some nevertheless maintained that Zola's representation of the war was largely correct.¹⁵⁰ In the *Deutsche Literatur Zeitung*, Erich Schmidt noted that Zola's work was "as impartial as could be expected," and praised his ability to capture the "feeling" of war and the state of the French army so precisely.¹⁵¹ Similarly, Clemens Sokal noted with some surprise in *Nord und Süd* that Zola's portrayal of war was "masterly"

¹⁴⁸ Patriotism and talent thus become a bridge between France and Germany, something that can make the art of one understandable to the other, even if they direct prejudice against each other.

¹⁴⁹ Most of these works combined an analysis of *La Débâcle* with an analysis of Zola's other work. See, for example Benno Diederich, *Emile Zola* (Leipzig: Schwetschke und Sohn, 1898); Michael Georg Conrad, *Emile Zola* (Berlin, Bard-Marquardt, 1906)

¹⁵⁰ Georg Lebedour, for example, objected to Zola's character Goliath Steinberg, a Prussian spy who infiltrated the French countryside, but spoke positively about his overall portrayal of the war. See Georg Lebedour, "Emil Zolas Kriegerroman," *Freie Bühne* (1892), 879.

¹⁵¹ Erich Schmidt, "La Débâcle," *Deutsche Literatur Zeitung*, XIV (1893): 665-666

despite the fact that he had never been in the army himself.¹⁵² The naturalist writer and philosopher Fritz Mauthner, on the other hand, expressed disappointment that an author who claimed his work was “scientific” had fallen prey to the same national chauvinism that characterized most of his fellow countrymen.¹⁵³ But Karl Bleibtreu’s criticism was by far the most virulent; he claimed that Zola had “caricatured” the German army and that his book portrayed all Germans as violent barbarians. He accused him, in fact, of attempting to stir up French “hatred for Germany,” by portraying the German army in such a false, negative light.¹⁵⁴

Most of the controversy in Germany around Daudet’s and especially Zola’s work, however, had less to do with its portrayal of Germany or even the perceived accuracy of its interpretation of war. Instead, critics expressed concern about the sheer popularity of these two French authors, who they believed thrived at the expense of (implicitly better) German authors.¹⁵⁵ An anonymous critic, writing a review of *La Débâcle* for *Die Grenzboten*,¹⁵⁶ noted with some despair that all Germans seemed to be reading was Zola’s novels; they could even

¹⁵² Clemens Sokal, „La Débâcle,“ *Nord und Süd*, LXII (1892), 408.

¹⁵³ Fritz Mauthner, “Das Neueste Werk Zolas,” *Das Magazin für Literatur* 61 (1892), 433.

¹⁵⁴ Karl Bleibtreu, „Zolas Kriegerroman“ *Die Gesellschaft* (1892), 1156. Bleibtreu’s negative response may have partially stemmed from deeply felt nationalist sentiment, but it certainly contained a competitive edge as well. Karl Bleibtreu was a popular contemporary naturalist author as well as a literary critic, and in the same review, he implied that Zola’s description of troop movements had been plagiarized from his work (rather unlikely, as Zola had at best an elementary knowledge of German.) He expanded on this claim in a later letter to the same magazine. See Karl Bleibtreu, “Letter,” *Die Gesellschaft* (1892), 1663.

¹⁵⁵ Karl Bleibtreu, for example, expressed this concern in a letter he wrote to *Die Gesellschaft* after the publication of his article. See Karl Bleibtreu, “Letter,” *Die Gesellschaft* (1892), 1663.

¹⁵⁶ Founded in 1841 in Vienna by Ignaz Kuranda, an Austrian writer and politician, *Die Grenzboten* had a long legacy. Throughout the nineteenth century, the magazine steered a careful political course, condemning, for example, the revolutionaries in 1848, but supporting German unification under Prussian leadership. Indeed, it became a leading voice in the promotion of *Kleindeutschland* before 1871, and consciously engaged with the wider nation-building project throughout the century, helping to construct and celebrate a national German culture. It also became one of the most articulate champions of the realist literary movement. Unillustrated, rather theoretical, staffed largely by professors and professional writers, the paper was aimed at a well-educated, bourgeois, liberally inclined, professional audience. See Stöber, *Deutsche Pressegeschichte*, 250.

be found on the shelves of small provincial lending libraries.¹⁵⁷ But Zola's popularity, he maintained, was not a result of his talent, but reflected the "need for reading, artificially awoken everywhere through partial education (*Halbbildung*), which no aesthetic judgment or literary understanding has kept within bounds."¹⁵⁸ Unfortunately, he concluded, most Germans were therefore simply unable to see that Zola's work was ultimately tasteless and overdrawn, and they were blinded to better literature written by superior German authors. In order to advance the cause of German literature, he claimed that the educational systems needed to be improved.

The critic continued, moreover, by admitting that he believed that *La Débâcle* represented the best of Zola's work. Its primary aesthetic and conceptual weakness, he contended, was quite simply the same failing that characterized all French writing about the Franco-Prussian War, including Alphonse Daudet's: it was too sentimental to capture the true flavor of battle. As a result, he noted, "it seems that French writers are not capable of producing an artistically suitable representation of the war. A German poet would be best suited to the great subject, and would succeed better than Zola's *La Débâcle*."¹⁵⁹ This comment, which presumed that the Germans would be better able to write about this war because they won it, bound literary ability to military prowess and excluded the French from both. In combination with his characterization of French writing as "sentimental" – a word usually applied to women's writing – it posited the French as the feminine and second-rate counterpart to German masculine artists. This vision stood in direct opposition to the numerous French critics, who invoked Daudet's and Zola's talents as evidence of the continuing superiority of French culture in spite of defeat.

¹⁵⁷ Anonymous, „Zolas Kriegerroman *La Débâcle*,“ *Die Grenzboten*, 51.3 (1892), 353.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 367.

Another author writing for the same journal six years later at the time of Alphonse Daudet's death attempted to remove at least Daudet from the controversy over the relative value of French and German literature by describing him as a universal figure.¹⁶⁰ Daudet's talent, Groth contended, lay in his ability to capture character, nuance, and detail, and in his tendency to refer to broad human experience; there was nothing especially French about it. Although Groth acknowledged that some of his *contes* were anti-German, he believed that this sentiment was little more than an unfortunate flaw that periodically marred Daudet's otherwise impressive objectivity. The fact that most German readers could overlook these intermittent prejudices, moreover, was testimony to their cultural sophistication and tolerance. Groth maintained,

If a German writer (*Schriftsteller*) expressed such malice against France, he would be branded for all time... We are in this regard less peevish. We overlook the failures of a conquered opponent... We find the dangerous hatred that filled Daudet's patriotic soul explainable: we understand his pain, his internal conflict, his impassioned outbreaks over his country's fall, and our indignation transforms into indulgence.¹⁶¹

If the Germans were as petty and chauvinistic as the French, they would dismiss Daudet's writing outright for its fallacious bouts of anti-German slander. But German readers could see through the politics and national animosity, and appreciate the talent that stands beyond it.¹⁶² Daudet was not, as Édouard Drumont had implied, a symbol of the connection between France and universal genius. According to Groth, Daudet was only a genius insofar as he was universal rather than French. In fact, it was Daudet's German audience, and implicitly the

¹⁶⁰ Ernst Groth studied history and modern languages at the University of Berlin and the University of Paris, before becoming a gymnasium teacher in 1885, at first in Lauenberg, and later in Danzig, and finally in Leipzig in 1891. He began working as a regular writer for *Die Grenzboten* in 1888, and in 1898, he became its editor. See Fritz Raeck, *Pommersche Literatur. Proben und Daten* (Hamburg: Pommerscher Zentralverband, 1969), 332.

¹⁶¹ Ernst Groth, "Alphonse Daudet," *Die Grenzboten* (1898): 134-140.

¹⁶² Several underlying assumptions enable Groth to come to this judgment. First, he clearly believes that literature should stand separate from politics. Literature should access universal experience and feeling, which it cannot do if tied to a particular party or interest group. Second, partisan literature is therefore inherently second-rate and perhaps not true literature at all. Third, national sympathies, in excess, become chauvinism and perhaps even jingoism – and hence just as partisan as any political agenda.

German nation, that was most in touch with the universalized language of genius. His positive reception in Germany was above all evidence of German readers' fine appreciation of literary aesthetics and their ability to put past conflicts behind them – and hence German cultural superiority.¹⁶³

This debate over the relative virtues of French and German literature also informed German criticism of Liliencron's short stories. German reviewers rarely assessed Liliencron's work in terms of its accuracy as a portrayal of the Franco-Prussian War. Indeed, the reviews overall referenced the Franco-Prussian War even less straightforwardly than the German assessments of Daudet's and Zola's work did. It is true that *Unter flatternden Fahnen* did not appear until 1888, more than fifteen years after the conclusion of the war, when its events had faded somewhat into the past. However, most of the German reviews of Daudet's and Zola's work date from approximately the same period, and even the reviews of the second edition of Fontane's memoir paid close attention to its insights into French and German national character during the war. But Liliencron's stories do not lend themselves to a direct commentary on their interpretation of the war, as the only implicit explanation Liliencron offered for German victory rested on the valor of its troops. He did not comment extensively on the strategic consequences of specific battles, so his reviewers did not either.¹⁶⁴

Instead, German critics couched their assessment of Liliencron's aesthetics and the quality of his work in military terms. They implied that the primary value of his stories rested in their depictions of battle and warfare and in Liliencron's ability to capture the danger, bravery, and beauty of armed life. As Leon Wespy, a German literature and philosophy

¹⁶³ This stands in sharp contrast to Groth's depiction of Daudet's French critics who, he maintained, did not appreciate or understand the true nature of his work, because they were so committed to claiming him as an emblem of French national genius.

¹⁶⁴ The literary sympathies of many of Liliencron's German critics may have also contributed to this absence. The naturalist movement in Germany, particularly in Munich, was more focused on aesthetics than overtly political issues. Roy Pascal, *From Naturalism to Expressionism: German Literature and Society 1870-1918* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1973), 60.

teacher in Wiesbaden maintained, Liliencron's "military sketches, in which the lively style and the vivid narrative of the author shine through, are beautiful."¹⁶⁵ These perfect portrayals of combat, Wespy went on to imply, reflected Liliencron's literary talent, but they were made possible by his personal military experience and soldierly prowess. Although Wespy did not discuss the Franco-Prussian War at length in his review, he implicitly invoked German victory on the battlefield against France as proof of this soldierly prowess and hence as foundational to the success of Liliencron's stories about war.¹⁶⁶

German reviewers also referenced Liliencron's experiences as a soldier to emphasize his distance from (and superiority to) the French naturalist movement. Liliencron, most agreed, was certainly a naturalist. Indeed, they often argued that the movement's aesthetics had inspired his poetic, choppy, realistic prose.¹⁶⁷ But they were also quick to differentiate. *Unter flatternden Fahnen*, the poet and literary scholar Hans Benzmann argued, managed to escape from many of French naturalism's problems; most significantly, French effeminacy and decadence did not mar it.¹⁶⁸ Benzmann noted:

[Liliencron] does not dream of distant ideals, of utopias, he does not contrive any philosophical systems, nor lose himself in the wonders of the universe or in psychological and sexual problems... His natural, fresh

¹⁶⁵ Leon Wespy, "Unter flatternden Fahnen," *Blätter für Literarische Unterhaltung*, no. 4, January 26, 1888, 63. For more information on Leon Wespy, see Dirk Böttcher, *Hannoverches biographisches Lexicon* (Hannover: Schlütersche, 2002), 386.

¹⁶⁶ As these reviews make clear, the notion of "genius" was as slippery and as contested as the understanding of France, Germany, or the war itself. The model of military-inspired genius invoked by German critics in response to Liliencron's work was quite distinct from the sensitivity that critics used to describe Daudet's genius in France. While it might be simple to imply that this divergence reflected different conceptions of the ideal writer in France and Germany, the vision of the universal, objective genius that Ernst Groth drew upon in his review of Daudet had little to do with the military. It is true that Karl Busse celebrated Daudet's "patriotism." But that the "patriotism" in that model excused Daudet's bias: it was posited as central to the merits of Daudet's stories, not to the nature of Daudet's literary abilities. The divergence therefore seems to reflect at least somewhat the difference in Daudet and Liliencron's work as much as fundamentally different understandings of the writer in France and Germany.

¹⁶⁷ See, for example, Karl Bleibtreu, *Magazin für die Literatur des In- und Auslandes*, no. 3, January 14, 1888, 35-37; Theobald Nöthig, "Litterarisches," *Breslauer Zeitung*, no. 51, January 20, 1888, 3; Heinrich von Reder, "Unter flatternden Fahnen," *Die Gesellschaft*, February 2, 1888, 160-164.

¹⁶⁸ Many of the debates about the problems of decadence centered on the naturalist movement in late nineteenth-century Germany. See Dieter Kafitz, *Décadence in Deutschland* (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 2004), 219.

stories come not from conscious observation but from the enjoyment of life... Vigorous, healthy optimism, manly self-esteem, and a courageous attitude towards life appear and bloom throughout Liliencron's work...¹⁶⁹

Unlike other writers in the movement, Benzmann maintained, Liliencron did not write about depraved women or the degradations of the city, nor did he agonize over his personal problems. His talent stemmed not from a sensitive, dreamy personality, or a pessimistic, overly sexualized neuroticism, but from a vigorous, masculine courage. Although Benzmann did not reference Liliencron's military career, his choice of adjectives reminded the reader that Liliencron excelled at both physical and artistic activity, and implied that this allowed him to craft stories that were both "healthy" and "manly."¹⁷⁰ He was able to use the aesthetics of the naturalist movement without falling prey to their decadent French tendencies. The naturalism in *Unter flatternden Fahnen* was thus not just a derivative copy of a French movement; Liliencron's German military prowess transformed and improved it.¹⁷¹

Friedrich Böckel, another writer associated with the naturalist movement, argued explicitly that both Liliencron's military and literary abilities resulted from his deep-seated German identity. As he contended,

Liliencron is German through and through. In ever-new variations, he shows his devotion to his fatherland, to the country of his mother tongue, to German blood and German art... The *Adjutantenritte* embody this; the flaming patriotism... which the truly German and especially the artistic can portray, along with the poetic ability to observe sharply and truly portray his compatriots.¹⁷²

¹⁶⁹ Hans Benzmann, "Detlev von Liliencron," *Neuland* (Berlin: Sasse Johan Bach, 1896), 347.

¹⁷⁰ In a review of *Adjutantenritte*, Johannes Schlaf maintained that Liliencron was "one of the healthiest naturalists... his strong, natural sense of home (*Heimatsgefühl*) has not been damaged by sickly cosmopolitanism, but is bound to the seaside Schleswig-Holstein and its people." See Johannes Schlaf, "Detlev von Liliencron: Ein litterarisches Bild," *Die Gesellschaft* (March 1887), 227.

¹⁷¹ Hans Benzmann wrote a number of positive reviews of Liliencron's war stories. See Hans Benzmann, "Kriegsnovellen," *Berliner Neuste Nachrichten* June 25, 1901; Hans Benzmann, "Detlev von Liliencrons Kriegsnovellen," *Deutsches Tagblatt*, no. 257 (September 1907), 1.

¹⁷² Friedrich Böckel, "Detlev von Liliencron als Dichter," *Deutsche Monatschrift für das gesamte Leben der Gegenwart* (June 1904).

The talent apparent in Liliencron's work reflected not just his abilities or aesthetics but also his devotion to Germany. In fact, his writing drew literary merit from the fact that it was above all a celebration of German society. Böckel believed that Liliencron's secure immersion in that society, along with his native literary abilities, allowed him to portray war realistically. His status as a writer/warrior, moreover, made him the highest example of German cultural achievement. He was a genius warrior-poet, whose ability to lead troops into battle blended into his ability to write compellingly about those battles. And even if Böckel did not reference it explicitly, the memory of victory in the Franco-Prussian War provided the context in which this new poetic/artistic identity could take shape.¹⁷³

Despite its accolades in Germany, *Unter flatternden Fahnen* attracted almost no critical attention in France. Although the *Revue Internationale*, a journal specifically devoted to foreign literature, praised some of Liliencron's non-military poems in 1890, none of the mainstream literary journals or newspapers published reviews of this work.¹⁷⁴ It seems likely that at least part of this absence of critical commentary was the result of a pervasive sense in France that German literature was aesthetically derivative or uninteresting.¹⁷⁵ Even Charles Andler, a professor of German literature at the Sorbonne, who wrote a positive review of Liliencron's poetry in the *Revue de Paris* after his death, began the article by noting, "there is little place [in the Empire] for art. Poetry is a pastime for women... the German people are easily impressed, and they have less taste than other people when they attempt to distinguish

¹⁷³ The use of the word "poet" (*Dichter*) here instead of "writer" (*Schriftsteller*) is worth noting, as the naturalists discriminated between these two terms: a *Dichter* created higher, apolitical writing, as opposed to the journalistic, quotidian *Schriftstellers* who wrote in journals. See Paul Levesque, "Jahrhundertewende, Fin de Siècle, Wilhelmian Era: Re-examining German Literary Culture 1871-1918," *German Studies Review* 18, no. 1 (1990), 12.

¹⁷⁴ Otto Krack, "Le Mouvement Littéraire en Allemagne," *Revue Internationale*, September 15, 1890: 581-589.

¹⁷⁵ Venita Datta, *The Birth of A National Icon: The Literary Avant-Garde and the Origins of the Intellectual in France* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1999), 63.

the real value of art.”¹⁷⁶ He went on to explain why the French should read Liliencron’s poetry (he hardly mentioned *Unter flatternden Fahnen*), but it is clear that he entertained a poor opinion of the German reading public and literary world, which he depicted as feminized and tasteless.

Fontane’s work met with more success in France than Liliencron’s. Shortly after the release of the second German edition, a French translation by Jean Thorel with an introduction by the former symbolist Téodor de Wyzewa appeared under the title *Souvenirs d’un prisonnier de guerre prussien*.¹⁷⁷ Although there seem to have been relatively few literary reviews of the book, de Wyzewa himself published his lengthy introduction along with two excerpts in *La Revue Bleue* before it appeared in volume form. He described the book as “surprisingly impartial,” and noted with some asperity that unlike most other German work on the same topic, “it has the advantage of being well-written.”¹⁷⁸ Unlike Fontane’s German critics, however, de Wyzewa did not dwell at length on Fontane’s portrayal of the French or German people, although he complimented his “indulgence” towards his subjects. Instead, he launched into a lengthy discussion of the book’s aesthetic qualities, which he couched in highly nationalistic terms. While he clearly found Fontane’s work valuable, he was quite condescending about the relative value of German literature, and stressed on several occasions “one must be acquainted with the subjects and the manner of German writers (and it is an acquaintance that I cannot really recommend to anyone) to appreciate the

¹⁷⁶ Charles Andler had been born in Alsace in 1866, just before the war. Although he hardly mentions his short stories, he celebrates Liliencron as “the only German poet that can concretely show the beautiful barbarity of modern warfare.” See Charles Andler, “Detlev von Liliencron” *La Revue de Paris*, October 15, 1909, 688. *La Revue de Paris* was a popular literary/cultural journal that rivaled *La Revue des Deux Mondes*.

¹⁷⁷ Günter Jäckel, “Introduction,” in *Wanderung durch Frankreich* (Berlin: Verlag der Nation, 1984), 44.

¹⁷⁸ Téodor de Wyzewa, “Notes sur les littératures étrangères: un romancier naturaliste allemand” *La Revue Bleue* (December 1891), 751.

true boldness of M. Fontane's work."¹⁷⁹ He then continued by going out of his way to insist, "M. Fontane is not a novelist of genius," and to emphasize that all his writing, including his memoir "lack something of the *je ne sais quoi* that makes works eternal."¹⁸⁰ He nevertheless recommended the book for those interested in reading work by a German author "written according to the theories of M. Zola." By implication, then, Fontane's work was interesting for the purposes of comparison, but was modeled on French theories, somewhat derivative, and ultimately forgettable. In other words, despite its somewhat improved reception, Fontane's work therefore met with the same prejudice about the relative value of German literature that Liliencron's encountered. French notions of cultural sophistication were certainly nothing new; they dated back at least to the Old Regime era of the seventeenth and eighteenth century. But it seems possible that military defeat strengthened this self-identification and oriented it more strongly against a vision of Germany defined as non-artistic and unsophisticated.¹⁸¹

As these reviews make clear, French and German critics alike framed their assessment of Fontane, Daudet's, Zola's, and Liliencron's stories around the perceived accuracy of their respective representations and their relative aesthetic merit, but they related those concerns to war and national identity differently in response to circulating national anxieties. In France, the "accuracy" of Daudet's and Zola's representation of war and memorialization of French defeat stood at the center of literary debates. Critics who believed that they had captured the war accurately tended to posit them as geniuses who demonstrated the continuing value of French culture, and even invoked Zola as a positive non-military

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 754.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 757.

¹⁸¹ Marcel Mauss, "Nation, Nationalism, Internationalism," in *Nationalism: A Reader*, ed. by Geoff Eley (New York: Routledge, 1996). 89; Schivelbusch and Chase, *The Culture of Defeat*, 185.

model of undefeated French masculine identity. But critics who disagreed with Zola's work worried about the political ramifications of his "misrepresentation" of the past.

In Germany, on the other hand, concerns about the content of representations of the war seem to have been less pressing – perhaps because differing interpretations were less threatening in a victorious country.¹⁸² Although critics praised Fontane's work for its objectivity, the relative scarcity of critical attention the book received seems to indicate that this objectivity did not do enough to recommend the book to its critical audience. And the critical assessment of Daudet's and Zola's work became less caught up in debates about the "truth" of their portrayals than in concerns about the unequal relationship between French and German literary culture. German reviews of *Unter flatternden Fahnen* also responded to this tension. Grounded in the memory of victory, critics used Liliencron to articulate an image of a specifically German warrior-poet who could produce a kind of art superior to that which could be produced in France. The relative absence of critical attention paid to Liliencron and Fontane in France, conversely, while clearly part of larger literary trends, was perhaps symptomatic of a solidification of French identity around a notion of cultural sophistication following military defeat, in opposition to a Germany conceptualized as soldierly and non-literary.

¹⁸² A number of studies on defeat have indicated that the experience of defeat makes its commemoration more contentious. See Varley, *Under the Shadow of Defeat*, 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

PUBLICATION HISTORY AND POPULAR RESPONSE

As the number of reviews makes clear, Fontane's, Daudet's, Zola's, and Liliencron's writing about the war attracted critical attention in elite literary circles. But the reading public of *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes*, the *Contes du lundi*, *La Débâcle*, and *Unter flatternden Fahnen* extended beyond literary figures and scholars. Judging the sales and readership of these collections is complex, because print runs and sales numbers in nineteenth-century France and Germany are both difficult to reconstruct and rather misleading: they often undercount distribution. Most books in both countries sold not to individuals but to private libraries or lending libraries, which lent out books for slight fees. Numerous people therefore often read one copy of the same book.¹⁸³ Fontane, Daudet, Zola, and Liliencron also published their stories in the *feuilleton* section of newspapers, which further increased their circulation.¹⁸⁴ All four authors – especially Zola and Daudet – were relatively financially successful, which, considering the financial straits of most literary figures in late nineteenth century Europe,

¹⁸³ Between 1865 and the early twentieth century, the number of lending libraries in Germany increased from 617 to 1216, after which a slow decline began, based on the increasing popularity of the *roman-feuilleton*, imported from France, and the declining price of books. See Georg Jäger, "Die deutsche Leihbibliothek im 19. Jahrhundert: Verbreitung, Organisation, Verfall," in *Buch und Leser*, ed. by Herbert Göpfert (Hamburg: Dr. Ernst Hauswedell & Co.: 1977), 195. In France, the library reform movement also took off starting in about 1860. Private groups such as the Franklin Society began to build libraries in the cities for workers and the lower middle classes, and an ever-growing network of bookshops that both sold and lent books spread into small towns. See Martyn Lyons, *Reading Culture and Writing Practices in Nineteenth-Century France* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 48.

¹⁸⁴ The *feuilleton*, which was popular in both France and Germany, was a section of the newspaper that printed novels in serial form. See Maria Adamowicz-Hariasz, "From Opinion to Information: The *Roman-Feuilleton* and the Transformation of the Nineteenth-Century French Press," in *Making the News: Modernity and the Mass Press in Nineteenth Century France*, ed. Dean de la Motte and Jeannene M. Przyblyski (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999), 160.

indicates that their literature as a whole sold well.¹⁸⁵ But to ascertain who actually read their portrayals of war, it is worth looking at the specific kinds of publications in which their work appeared.

Fontane first published *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes* in thirteen segments in the *Vossische Zeitung* between December 25, 1870 and February 2, 1871, before the war was actually over.¹⁸⁶ The *Vossische Zeitung* was a Berlin-based liberal-leaning newspaper with approximately 60,000 largely middle-class subscribers in the 1870s, which indicates that at least the initial newspaper audience was fairly substantial.¹⁸⁷ The Decker publishing house then printed it in late 1871 in volume form, although the print run was not large. In 1871, after all, Fontane was still not well known; he had made a name for himself in certain circles with his *Wanderung durch der Mark Brandenburg* and his chronicles of the wars against Denmark and Austria, but he had not begun to write the novels that would make him famous at the end of his life. By 1892, when the second edition appeared, the publication of *L'Adultera*, *Stine*, and *Effie Briest* had made him something of a household name.¹⁸⁸ Perhaps unsurprisingly, demand picked up considerably after the new printing; there were five subsequent editions in Germany printed before 1900.¹⁸⁹ Nor did publication fall off in the

¹⁸⁵ Although it is difficult to measure the extent of literary distribution through book sales, simply because so many people accessed books through other means, Daudet and Zola were undeniably two of the most financially successful writers in late nineteenth-century France. By the late 1870s, both were making enough money off their literary work that they did not require other forms of employment. At the end of his life, Fontane was similarly financially successful, and was able to give up newspaper work to focus on novels. Liliencron, on the other hand, struggled financially throughout most of his life until Kaiser Wilhelm II gave him a stipend of two thousand Marks per year in 1901, but he was also a gambler and something of a spendthrift. Royer, *Detlev von Liliencron: Itinéraire et évolution du poète lyrique*, 523.

¹⁸⁶ John Osborne, "Die Kriegsbücher," in *Fontane Handbuch*, ed. by Christian Grawe and Helmut Nürnberger (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 2000), 852.

¹⁸⁷ Stöber, *Deutsche Pressegeschichte*, 212.

¹⁸⁸ *Wanderung* is four-volume series of literary essays, stories, and histories gathered that Fontane gathered during his travels through the Mark. The work was extremely popular, and in fact perhaps what Fontane was best known for during lifetime. But in 1870, even it was still incomplete. See Jolles, *Theodor Fontane*, 15.

¹⁸⁹ John Osborne, "Die Kriegsbücher," in *Fontane Handbuch*, 852.

early twentieth century; the book went through several more printings before the First World War. Between 1910 and 1914, the Velhagen & Klasing publishing house alone printed 12,000 copies for gymnasium and university students.¹⁹⁰ Especially in the early twentieth century, then, *Kriegsgefangen* attracted a relatively wide, if highly educated, liberal-leaning audience, but its popularity never reached anything approximating that of the majority of Fontane's novels.

Despite the fact that Fontane's and Liliencron's work both reached the height of their popularity in Germany at about the same time, Liliencron's stories reached a somewhat different audience. He first published the majority of his stories not in a newspaper but in naturalist literary magazines with smaller circulations; *Nächtlicher Angriff*, for example, appeared in *Die Gesellschaft* in 1887.¹⁹¹ Liliencron found most middle-class mainstream newspapers and journals – such as *Die Gartenlaube* – highly distasteful, which limited his willingness to publish in them.¹⁹² Wilhelm Friedrich, the editor of the naturalist review *Magazin für die Litteratur des In- und Auslandes* and the mentor of many novelists (including Theodor Fontane), first published *Unter flatternden Fahnen* in 1888.¹⁹³ Schuster & Loeffler, a press founded specifically to print Liliencron's work, reprinted the volume in 1895.¹⁹⁴ They simultaneously released an even more popular collection of Liliencron's war stories under the title *Kriegsnovellen*, which sold approximately 150,000 copies by 1914 – considerably more than Fontane's *Kriegsgefangen*.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁰ Günter Jäckel, „Nachwort,“ in *Wanderungen durch Frankreich*, v. 1 (Berlin (Ost): Verlag der Nation 1984), 298.

¹⁹¹ Royer, *Detlev von Liliencron: Itinéraire et evolution du poète lyrique*, 274.

¹⁹² Paul Levesque, “Jahrhundertewende, Fin de Siècle, Wilhelmian Era: Re-Examining German Literary Culture 1871-1918,” *German Studies Review* 13, no. 1 (Feb. 1990), 19.

¹⁹³ Royer, *Detlev von Liliencron: Itinéraire et evolution du poète lyrique*, 203.

¹⁹⁴ Schuster & Loeffler also published a number of studies of classical and contemporary German music.

¹⁹⁵ Many of those copies admittedly sold immediately before the outbreak of the First World War. See Jean Royer, *Detlev von Liliencron und Theobald Nöthig*, vol. 2 (Herzberg: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1986), 386.

Liliencron was perhaps above all popular among literary elites and political conservatives – including the Kaiser, who granted him a stipend in 1901 – but this popularity at least sometimes translated into popular distribution.¹⁹⁶ In 1904, for example, on his sixtieth birthday, the *Deutschen Dichter-Gedachtnis-Stiftung* [The German Poets' Memorial Foundation] published five hundred volumes of *Unter flatternden Fahnen* and distributed them to five hundred libraries in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland.¹⁹⁷ Liliencron also received quite a bit of attention in mainstream and local newspapers such as the *Berliner Neueste Nachrichten*, the *Deutsches Tagblatt*, and the *Schlesische Zeitung*.¹⁹⁸ Later in his life, school editions of his war stories emerged as well, although they were intended for the gymnasium rather than university level. Leo Langer, an educator in Billach, remarked with pleasure in 1905 on the number of volumes for schools and children in which Liliencron's war stories appeared.¹⁹⁹ Most notably, several stories from *Unter flatternden Fahnen*, including the title piece, *Der Narr*, *Umzingelt*, and *Adjutantenritte* were published in a shortened version of *Kriegsnovellen*, which was aimed specifically at youth studying for writing tests.²⁰⁰

Daudet's short stories were, if anything, more popular in France than even Liliencron's in Germany. Most of the stories eventually published in the *Contes du lundi*

¹⁹⁶ Royer, *Detlev von Liliencron: Itinéraire et evolution du poète lyrique*, 523.

¹⁹⁷ Oskar Sireicher, "Detlev von Liliencron," *Zeitschrift Allgemeinen Deutschen Sprachveriens*, no. 5 (May 1904), 144.

¹⁹⁸ Max Heinzel, "Literarisches," *Schlesische Zeitung*, February 23, 1888, 2; Hans Benzmann, "Kriegsnovellen," *Berliner Neueste Nachrichten* (25 June 1901); Hans Benzmann, "Detlev von Liliencrons Kriegsnovellen," *Deutsches Tagblatt*, no. 257 (September 1907), 1. All three were major national-liberal publications. See Mark Hewitson, *National Identity and Political Thought in Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 132.

¹⁹⁹ Langer cites Liliencron as a modern writer who is "safe" to introduce to children, because "there is nothing decadent about Liliencron... his healthy, compassionate masculinity is expressed [in his stories]." Leo Langer, "Kinder und Getier bei Detlev von Liliencron," *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht* (1905), 342.

²⁰⁰ Detlev von Liliencron, *Kriegsnovellen: Auswahl für die Jugend herausgegeben auf Veranlassung des Altonaer Prüfungsausschusses für Jugendschriften* (Berlin and Leipzig: Schuster & Loeffler, 1899). This sold particularly well during the war years; approximately 50,000 copies were sold and distributed in schools between 1914 and 1917. See Royer, *Detlev von Liliencron und Theobald Nöthig*, vol. 2, 387.

were first printed in *Le Soir* in 1872, a popular Parisian newspaper directed at a middle-class audience.²⁰¹ Alphonse Lemerre, one of the most renowned contemporary editors, published the first collected edition, and in 1877 Charpentier published a lower-end pocket edition that contained almost all of the original stories, making the book more affordable for a broadly middle-class audience.²⁰² Advertisements for the *Contes du lundi* appeared in literary journals and newspapers from across the political spectrum. Nevertheless, even most of the newspaper ads were limited to elite organs such as *Le Temps* and *Le Figaro*, which circulated mainly among the upper reaches of the bourgeoisie. By the time that the *Contes de lundi* was reprinted in 1878, however, advertisements also appeared in popular publications like *Le Petit Journal* and *Le Petit Parisien*.²⁰³ In 1881, *L'Illustration*, the extremely popular illustrated journal, went so far as to compare Daudet's popularity to Dickens in a lengthy illustrated biographical article, and reported that he had become wealthy by "charming women's hearts" with his short stories and later novels.²⁰⁴ A number of the stories in *Contes du lundi* also appeared in school textbooks and in several illustrated editions aimed at children.²⁰⁵ Despite the lack of good publication numbers, it seems safe to argue that the

²⁰¹ Brosman, *Visions of War in France: Fiction, Art, Ideology*, 114.

²⁰² Alphonse Lemerre was one of the most prestigious publishers in France in the late nineteenth century; he also published work by Anatole France, Sully Prudhomme, Théodor de Bainville, and Paul Verlaine. See Robert F. Byrnes, "The French Publishing Industry and its Crisis in the 1890s," *The Journal of Modern History* 23, no. 3 (1951), 236. The Charpentier publishing house was known for publishing less expensive editions, and also had ties to the naturalist movement. As one critic in the times commented, "I am happy to announce that M. Alphonse Daudet's *Contes choisis* will appear in the *petite bibliothèque Charpentier*. This pocket-format is cute and coquettish, printed with taste in a style that is easy to read... the short story is very French; these short forms, where the action is necessarily condensed, best demonstrate the French genius for concision and clarity." See "Chronique" *Le Temps*, May 15, 1877, 2.

²⁰³ These two newspapers, printed for the petty bourgeois and working classes, had among the widest distribution in nineteenth-century France. See Clyde Thogmartin, *The National Daily Press of France* (Birmingham, AL: Summa Publications, 1998),

²⁰⁴ Jules Claretie, "Alphonse Daudet," *L'Illustration* (1881), 267.

²⁰⁵ J. Hetzel, the primary children's publisher in France in the late nineteenth century, published them, along with extracts from *Lettres de mon moulin* in 1884. See Dufief, *Alphonse Daudet: romancier*, 138.

Contes du lundi attracted attention across France in groups ranging from the petty bourgeoisie to the literary elite and students.²⁰⁶

Of the four works, however, *La Débâcle* undoubtedly met with the most far-reaching success. First published in chapters in the weekly Parisian journal *La Vie populaire* between February 21 and July 21, 1892, the Fasquelle publishing house printed it in volume form on June 21, 1892. As noted earlier, it sold one hundred thousand copies in four weeks and half again as many in four months, and became Zola's best-selling book during his lifetime.²⁰⁷ Considering that Zola was one of the wealthiest and most successful authors in late nineteenth-century France, the scope of the book's success was therefore quite noteworthy. Significantly, it sold not only in Paris, but in towns across France.²⁰⁸ The controversy that it provoked only serves to emphasize the range of its influence. Even in the early twentieth century, *La Débâcle* was still included on Catholic and school lists of "dangerous" books, and it was banned in many of the libraries established by groups like the Franklin Society for working-class patrons.²⁰⁹ But it did appear, much to reformers' dismay, along with his earlier book *Germinal*, in trade union-run libraries. Based on the number of times patrons checked out both books, it is clear that they were two of the most popular works in such establishments.²¹⁰ While Zola's audience remained, on the whole, largely educated and

²⁰⁶ In an article in *Le Mercure de France*, a symbolist journal that associated self-consciously with Nietzschean ideals, Remy de Gourmont pointed to Daudet as the epitome of a mediocre writer raised to unwarranted literary heights by uncritical popular acclaim. See Remy de Gourmont, "M. Alphonse Daudet," *Mercure de France* (January 1898), 218.

²⁰⁷ Henri Mitterand, *Zola: L'homme de Germinal, 1871-1893* (Paris: Fayard, 2001), 1076.

²⁰⁸ Jean-Sébastien Macke, *Émile Zola Oeuvres Complètes: Tome 15, La cloture des Rougon-Macquart* (Paris: Nouveau Monde, 2007), 16.

²⁰⁹ Martyn Lyons, *Readers and Society in Nineteenth-Century France: Workers, Women, Peasants* (Houndsmill: Palgrave, 2001), 34.

²¹⁰ Lyons, *Readers in Nineteenth-Century France*, 69.

middle-class, it seems that the novel also reached at least somewhat beyond class boundaries into a wider audience, despite the best efforts of a number of groups to limit its appeal.

Zola's book not only attracted a broad popular audience, it also had reverberations in French political life as well. In fact, part of the reason for the book's popularity and notoriety lay in the fact that it immediately elicited political responses in military, royalist, and religious circles. Its critics expressed their disapproval of the book's political leanings in literary journals, highbrow newspapers like *Le Figaro*, and in religious publications and popular pamphlets. A number of Catholic priests went out of their way to condemn the book's political implications as immoral. The *l'abbé* Delmont, for example, wrote in *L'Université catholique* that *La Débâcle* was "a hideous nightmare, both diseased and antipatriotic."²¹¹ But the military's response was far more vehement, and only became sharper and more politicized when Zola became involved in the Dreyfus affair by publishing *J'Accuse* in *L'Aurore* in January 1898.²¹² In the late 1890s, another round of pamphlets emerged, condemning Zola as an "enemy alien" – a reference to his father's Italian heritage – with titles such as *Émile Zola et les Dreyfus ou La Débâcle des Traîtres* [Émile Zola and Dreyfus or the Debacle of Traitors]. The prosecution in Zola's trial even used the book's popularity across the Rhine to prove that Zola's accusations against the military had their roots in his longstanding unpatriotic sentiments.²¹³ At the same time, left-leaning French politicians came increasingly to defend Zola's book as well as his defense of Dreyfus as both honorable and strong evidence of a higher form of patriotism.²¹⁴

²¹¹ L'abbé Delmont, "La Débâcle," *L'Université catholique*, December 15, 1892.

²¹² See Christian Franc, *À refaire La Débâcle* (Paris: Dentu, 1892); Jules Arnaud, *La Débâcle de M. Zola* (Nîmes: Imprimerie de Lessertisseux, 1892); un capitaine de l'armée de Metz, *L'Armée française devant l'invasion et les erreurs de La Débâcle* (Paris: Lavauzelle, 1895).

²¹³ Sven Kellner, *Emile Zola et son Oeuvre* (France: Les Deux Colombes, 1994), 202.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 249.

La Débâcle was also extremely successful in Germany, although it did not provoke the same kind of political debates there. First translated in 1893, it appeared in a very popular illustrated edition in 1898, and in fact went into thirteen more editions before 1935. No less than four separate “schoolbook” editions were published before 1910.²¹⁵ Tellingly, the literary journal *Das litterarische Echo* included it in its list of “The Most Often Read Books” in 1901.²¹⁶ Nor was its audience solely middle-class. The socialist periodical *Die Neue Zeit* included it as one of the most important titles in an article published in 1895 that asked, “What does the German worker read?”²¹⁷ The journal went on to point to its presence in workers’ libraries across Germany. While the sheer number of editions make the publication numbers unreliable, it seems clear that the book had sold at least 202,000 copies in Germany by 1900.²¹⁸

Although Daudet’s *Contes du lundi* were also popular in Germany, they could not compete with *La Débâcle*’s broad appeal. Championed by the naturalist movement, especially in Berlin, Daudet’s translated stories nevertheless appeared in both naturalist and more mainstream publications.²¹⁹ Translated as *Montagsgeschichten* in 1880 by Stephan Born, a professor of French and German literature at the University of Basel, they were reprinted in a number of different volumes, including a collection of complete works.²²⁰ By the time of Daudet’s death, his stories were also available in the inexpensive *Reclam-Verlag*

²¹⁵ La Rue Rufener, *Biography of a War Novel*, 117.

²¹⁶ N. N., “Die meistgelesenen Bücher,” *Das litterarische Echo* 4 (1901): 496-502.

²¹⁷ Anon., “Was liest der deutsche Arbeiter?” *Die Neue Zeit*, January 14, 1895: 631-635.

²¹⁸ Rolf Sältzer, *Entwicklungslinien der deutschen Zola-Rezeption von den Anfängen bis zum Tode des Autors* (Berne: Peter Lange Publishing, 1989), 17f.

²¹⁹ Alan Marshall, *The German Naturalists and Gerhart Hauptmann* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1982), 60.

²²⁰ “Literarische Neuigkeiten” *Magazin für die Literatur des Auslandes*, no. 20, May 15, 1880, 286. See Alphonse Daudet, *Gesammelte Romane*, trans. by Robert Brandt, (Berlin: Alfred Fried, 1892).

universal library series, along with French-language textbooks intended for use in schools.²²¹ But even though German literary critics hailed (or condemned) his work, it did not share Zola's "best-seller" popularity.

Neither Fontane nor Liliencron's work received anything approximating the same kind of critical attention in France that either Zola or Daudet received in Germany. Because Liliencron's work was never translated into French, it was only available for a small multilingual elite interested in German writing.²²² Fontane's *Kriegsgefangen*, on the other hand, was translated in 1892. But only one edition ever appeared, and it remained Fontane's only book available in translation until the Nazi occupation.²²³ French gymnasiums and universities used it in its original language as exercise material for German classes, however, which indicates that it received at least some attention among well-educated elites.²²⁴ Part of the lack of broader interest may have simply been due to the flow of literary markets in the late nineteenth century; at that point, most of the foreign literature the French read originated from Britain, rather than Germany. Dickens' books appeared in lending libraries across the country, but German books were few and far between.²²⁵ French notions of cultural sophistication doubtlessly contributed to the structure of those literary markets, and it seems likely that French readers might have been particularly uninterested in German books about the Franco-Prussian War.

²²¹ Benno Diederich, *Alphonse Daudet* (Hamburg: Theo Hoffman, 1901), 2; Gottfried Ebener, *Französisches Lesebuch* (Hanover: Carl Meyer, 1890).

²²² Several of Liliencron's short stories were translated in the Ludovic Roustan, ed., *Anthologie de la littérature allemande des origines aux XXe siècle* (Paris: Delagrave, 1920).

²²³ Thuret, *Theodor Fontane: Un promeneur dans le siècle*, 255.

²²⁴ Günter Jäckel, „Introduction,“ *Wanderungen durch Frankreich*. Bd. 1: *Kriegsgefangen. Erlebtes 1870/ Briefe 1870* (Berlin (Ost): Verlag der Nation, 1984), 44.

²²⁵ If the French read foreign literature, it was usually British. There seems to have been a sense in contemporary France that the novel was a British – and perhaps a French – but certainly not a German art. Lyons, *Readers and Society in Nineteenth-Century France*, 29.

The popularity of *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes, Unter flatternden Fahnen*, the *Contes du lundi* and *La Débâcle* and their widespread distribution among the upper and middle classes – and sometimes beyond – reveals that large numbers of French and German readers encountered all four authors' portrayals of war and national identity throughout the late nineteenth century. Published in multiple editions, interpreted by journalists and scholars, widely available in newspapers and libraries, and taught in schools, these works were important voices in the ongoing negotiation over the cultural memory of war and national identity. Of course, some were more important than others; in the 1890s, at least, Émile Zola in many ways dominated the literary scene in both France and Germany, while Fontane's book never became as popular as most of his literary critics had hoped that it would. In fact, the differences in these works' publication histories seems to point to two trends; first, because French literature found audiences in Germany while German writers found few readers in France, the literary memory of the war seems to have moved across borders primarily in one direction. In the country where the literary public addressed the value of literature more directly as a medium of memory and staged fierce debates about that memory's content, in other words, the dimensions of the debate over the interpretation of the war were less transnational. Second, the two authors who sold the most successfully in their respective countries – Zola and Liliencron – published later, and wrote, ultimately, more colorful, more exciting, and careful interpretations of the war than their respective counterparts.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION: COMPETING MEMORIES OF THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes*, the *Contes du lundi*, *La Débâcle*, and *Unter flatternden Fahnen* were some of the most widely read books about the Franco-Prussian War among the middle and upper classes in France and Germany. It is true that they were not equally popular, and that their respective readerships were not necessarily coextensive. But all four works were influential enough to attract multiple audiences and appear in many different publications: if their appeal was not identical, it certainly often overlapped. The content of these authors' interpretations, the nature of the critical response to their works, and the scope of their literary markets therefore reveal important insights into the shape of French and German memory of the Franco-Prussian War.

Evaluating Fontane's, Daudet's, Zola's, and Liliencron's stories makes it clear that all four authors believed that the war had revealed the nature of French and German national character. They described these national characters in largely oppositional terms through overlapping notions of gender, political organization, and culture, and by drawing on a common set of pre-existing cultural tropes and stereotypes. However, these authors deployed these terms, notions, and stereotypes in very different ways to construct visions of national identity that had quite distinct cultural, social, and political implications. Even if, for example, all four authors described France to some degree as female and Germany as male, the meanings they ascribed to that femininity and masculinity were not the same. These differences lent both their visions of French and German identity and their beliefs about the

relationship between the two countries very dissimilar flavors. In fact, the variation in their respective models of national identity demonstrates clearly that there was not a consensus in either country about the content of either French or German national character. Instead, divergent visions of war and national identity operated in direct and indirect contestation with each other both economically, in the literary marketplace, and ideologically, in public debates, literary journals, and inside private homes.

However, these authors' belief that war had revealed the "truth" about national identity was clearly quite widespread. Reviewers in both countries judging the value of these authors' works also connected the memory of the war to national identity, even if they interpreted both in different ways. But if these reviewers similarly did not necessarily agree on the content of French or German national identity, their critiques nevertheless reveal distinct patterns about the ways that at least literary elites in France and Germany attempted to deal with the memory of war. The French reviewers sought and found reassurance that through French literary genius they could transcend the causes of their defeat, while the Germans in victory remained insecure that their demonstrated military superiority had not brought commensurate recognition of German cultural superiority, even among themselves.

These novels, literary reviews, and distribution patterns therefore make clear that if French and German national identity remained contested in both countries after the Franco-Prussian War, the memory of the war took on distinct shapes in response to different underlying anxieties. In France, the defeated country, the memory of the war itself remained contentious; questions about who was responsible for defeat retained political and cultural importance well into the 1890s. Moreover, attempts to reconstruct a positive image of France around cultural and literary superiority closed France off to German interpretations of the war, or at least ones promulgated in literary form. In Germany, the victorious country, the memory of the war was much less controversial, and took shape in dialogue with French

literature. But the very openness of Germany's literary culture and its memory of war was what became the center of controversy, at least among literary reviewers.

By the second decade of the twentieth century, Alphonse Daudet's and Detlev von Liliencron's work was becoming less popular among a group of self-identified "modernist" writers, who found both too conservative and old-fashioned. Even in 1902, Thomas Theodor Heine published a caricature of Liliencron in *Simplizissmus*, a satirical weekly paper, mocking him as a reactionary, stodgy, second-rate poet.²²⁶ Between 1900 and 1920, Daudet's literary reputation suffered a similar, slow decline; publication numbers dropped, and critical attention turned elsewhere.²²⁷ On the other hand, both Zola's and Fontane's work made it into the French and German literary canons; they continued to be published, taught, and discussed throughout the twentieth century.

The fact that both Daudet and Liliencron were explicitly political, nationalist writers probably did not contribute to their longevity in highbrow literary cultures that increasingly defined "high" literature as apolitical. But if *La Débâcle* and *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebtes* influenced twentieth-century French and German memory and identity more than the *Contes du lundi* or *Unter flatternden Fahnen*, the interpretations that readers and critics drew from these books did not, of course, stay the same. A changing political landscape, marked by two world wars, a cold war, and a reunited Europe, reframed the Franco-Prussian War in cultural memory and transformed notions of national identity in both France and Germany on multiple occasions. Cultural memory, even if it is "institutionalized" in objects, is, after all, never static: both it and the identities it speaks to are in a continual process of negotiation and transfiguration.

²²⁶ Burns, *The Short Stories of Detlev von Liliencron*, 2.

²²⁷ Murray Sachs, *The Career of Alphonse Daudet* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), 3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Alphonse Daudet

“Alphonse Daudet.” *Le Charivari*, September 2, 1886.

“Alphonse Daudet.” *Dresdner Journal* (1897): 294.

Babou, Hippolyte. *Les sensations d'un juré: vingt figures contemporaines*. Paris: A. Lemerre, 1875.

Brunetière, Ferdinand. “Le Roman realist en 1875.” *Revue des deux mondes* (1875): 700-713.

Burger, Emil. *Émile Zola, Alphonse Daudet und andere Naturalisten Frankreichs*. Dresden und Leipzig: G. Bierson's Verlag, 1889.

Busse, Karl. “Alphonse Daudet.” *Die Zukunft* (1898): 476- 482.

“Chronique.” *Le Temps*, May 15, 1877: 2.

Claretie, Jules. “Alphonse Daudet.” *L'Illustration*, October 22, 1881: 268-270.

Conrad, M. G. “Emil Burger.” *Die Gesellschaft: Monatsschrift für Litteratur und Kunst* (1889): 1655.

“Contes du Lundi.” *Le Temps*, November 1, 1875: 3.

Daudet, Alphonse. *Oeuvres complètes illustrées*. Paris: Libraire de France, 1929; 1931.

“Daudet, Zola, und die Dreyfus-Angelengenheit.” *Allgemeine Zeitung*, December 19, 1897: 5.

Delay, C. “Le Roman Contemporain en France.” *Zeitschrift für neufranzösische Sprache und Literatur* (1880): 491-506.

Diederich, Benno. *Alphonse Daudet, sein leben und seine werke*. Berlin: Schwetschke und Sohn, 1900.

Drumont, Édouard. “Contes du Lundi.” *Le Bien Public*, April 13, 1873.

Essarts, Emmanuel des. “Contes du Lundi.” *Le Bien Public*, April 3, 1873.

France, Anatole. “Alphonse Daudet.” *Le Temps*, November 2, 1882.

- Gabriel, C. "Variétés: Les Romanciers." *Journal des Débats*, January 7, 1876.
- Gabriel, C. "Variétés: Les Romanciers." *Journal des Débats*, March 15, 1877.
- Gerstmann, Adolf. *Alphonse Daudet; sein Leben und seine Werke bis zum Jahre 1883*. Berlin: Auerbach, 1883.
- Gottschall, Rudolf von. "Literarische Charakterköpfe." *Blätter für Literarische Unterhaltung* 38, September 20, 1884: 596-597.
- Gourmont, Remy de. "Alphonse Daudet." *Mercure de France* (January 1898): 316-319.
- Groth, Ernst. "Alphonse Daudet." *Die Grenzboten: Zeitschrift für Politik, Litteratur, und Kunst* (1898): 134-140.
- "Kleine Bücherschau." *Neue Monatshefte für Dichtkunst und Kritik* (1876): 86.
- Le Roux, Hughes. "M. Alphonse Daudet à l'étranger." *Revue Politique et Littéraire: Revue Bleue* (1885): 444-446.
- Lemaitre, Jules. "Alphonse Daudet." *Revue politique et littéraire*, March 31, 1883.
- Stapfer, Paul. "M. Alphonse Daudet." *Le Temps*, November 2, 1882: 3-4.
- Zola, Émile. "Les Contes du Lundi." *L'Avenir national*, April 6, 1873.
- Zola, Émile. *Les Romanciers naturalistes*. Paris: G. Charpentier, 1881.

Theodor Fontane

- Anonymous. „Kriegsgefangen. Erlebtes 1870 von Theodor Fontane.“ *Königlich privilegierte Berlinische Zeitung von Staats- und gelehrten Sachen*, no. 71, March 17, 1871: 5
- Anonymous. „Kriegsgefangen. Erlebtes 1870 von Th. Fontane.“ *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, no. 69, March 22, 1871.
- Anonymous. „Notiz-Blätter, Literatur: Theodor Fontane, der bekannte Geschichtsschreiber.“ *Über Land und Meer* 26, no. 32 (May 1871): 9.
- Anonymous. „Theodor Fontane, der Verfasser des deutschen Krieges.“ *Kölnische Zeitung*, no. 76, March 17, 1871: 2.
- Fontane, Theodor. *Der Krieg Gegen Frankreich, 1870-1871*. Zurich: Manesse Bibliothek der Weltgeschichte, 1985.
- Fontane, Theodor. *Kriegsgefangen: Erlebnis*. Berlin: T. Fontane & Co., 1915.

Fontane, Theodor. *Souvenirs d'un prisonnier de guerre allemand*. Translated by Jean Thuret. Paris: Perrin et Cie, 1892.

Lange, Robert. „Theodor Fontane.“ *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung*, no. 12, March 24, 1892: 177-179.

Necker, Moritz. „Altes und neues von Theodor Fontane.“ *Die Grenzboten*, no. 4, January 21, 1892: 175-181.

Wyzewa, M. T. de “Un romancier naturaliste allemand: M. Théodore Fontane.” *Revue Politique et Littéraire: Revue Bleue* (December 1891): 754.

Detlev von Liliencron

Andler, Charles. “Detlev von Liliencron.” *La Revue de Paris*, October 15, 1909: 673-700.

"Detlev von Liliencron." *Westermanns Illustrierte Deutsche Monatsheft* (March 1904): 912.

Benzmann, Hans. “Detlev von Liliencron.” *Neuland Monatsschrift für Politik, Wissenschaft, Literatur und Kunst* (1897): 345-362.

Benzmann, Hans. “Detlev von Liliencrons Kriegsnovellen.” *Deutsches Tagblatt*, no. 257 (September 1907): 1.

Benzmann, Hans. “Kriegsnovellen.” *Berliner Neueste Nachrichten*, June 25, 1901.

Biedemann, Friedrich. “Unter flatternden Fahnen.” *Blätter für Literarische Unterhaltung*, no. 4, January 26, 1888: 63.

Bleibtreu, Karl. *Magazin für die Literatur des In- und Auslandes*, no. 3, January 14, 1888: 35-37.

Böckel, Fritz. “Detlev von Liliencron als Lyriker.” *Deutsche Monatschrift in das gesamte Leben der Gegenwart* (June 1904): 368-388.

Genestoux, Calamard du. “Detlev von Liliencron.” *La Nouvelle Revue* (September 1906): 89-101.

Gesellhofen, Julius. "Literarische Neuheiten." *Monatsblätter*, no. 2 (February 1888): 23.

Heinzel, Max. "Literarisches." *Schlesische Zeitung*, February 23, 1888: 2.

Krack, Otto. “Le Mouvement Littéraire en Allemagne.” *Revue Internationale*, September 15, 1890: 581-589.

Langer, Leo. “Kinder und Geiter bei Detlev von Liliencron.” *Zeitschrift für den deutschen Unterricht* (1905): 342-367.

- Lessing, Theodor. "Detlev von Liliencron." *Die Gegenwart* (1902).
- Liliencron, Detlev von. *Anno 1870: Kriegsnovellen*. Boston: Heath, 1903.
- Liliencron, Detlev von. *Ausgewählte Briefe*. Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1910.
- Liliencron, Detlev von. *Kriegsnovellen*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags Anstalt, 1885.
- Liliencron, Detlev von. *Unter Flatternden Fahnen: Militärische Und Andere Erzählungen*. Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1895.
- Nöthig, Theobald. "Litterarisches." *Breslauer Zeitung*, no. 51, January 20, 1888: 3.
- Oppenheimer, Franz. *Detlev von Liliencron*. Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1898.
- Partels, Adolph. *Die Deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart: Die Alten und die Jungen*, Leipzig: Eduard Avenarius, 1908.
- Reder, Heinrich von: "Unter flatternden Fahnen." *Die Gesellschaft: Monatsschrift für Litteratur und Kunst* (1888): 161-164.
- Remer, Paul. *Detlev von Liliencron*. Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1904.
- Schlaf, Johannes. "Detlev von Liliencron: Ein litterarisches Bild." *Die Gesellschaft: Monatsschrift für Litteratur und Kunst* (1887): 226-230.
- Sireicher, Oskar. "Detlev von Liliencron." *Zeitschrift Allgemeinen Deutschen Sprachveriens*, no. 5 (May 1904): 144.
- Stanislas, R. "Detlev von Liliencron." *Deutsche Zeitschrift: Nationale Rundschau für Politik und Volkswirtschaft, Litteratur und Kunst* (1902): 423-438.
- "Unter flatternden Fahnen." *Nord und Süd* (April 1888): 143.
- Wolff, Emil. "Literatur. Neuere Lyrik." *Zeitung für Literatur, Kunst und Wissenschaft des Hamburgischen Correspondenten*, no. 32, November 12, 1893.

Émile Zola

- Anonymous. *Gloria Victis. L'Armée Française devant l'invasion et les Erreurs de La Débâcle*, par un capitaine de l'armée de Metz. Paris: Lavauzelle, 1895.
- Anonymous. "Was liest der deutsche Arbeiter?" *Die Neue Zeit*, January 14, 1895: 631-635.
- Arnauld, Jules. *La Débâcle de M. Zola*. Nîmes: Imprimerie de Lessertisseux, 1892.

- Bleibtreu, Karl. "Letter." *Die Gesellschaft: Monatsschrift für Litteratur und Kunst* (1892): 1663.
- Bleibtreu, Karl. "Zola's Kriegsroman." *Die Gesellschaft: Monatsschrift für Litteratur und Kunst* (1892): 1148-1158.
- Conrad, Michael Georg. "Kritik: Der Zusammenbruch." *Die Gesellschaft: Monatsschrift für Litteratur und Kunst* (1892): 1645-1646.
- Cornély, J. "La Débâcle." *Les Gaulois*, July 26, 1892.
- Deschamps, Gaston. "La Débâcle." *Journal des Débats*, July 1, 1892.
- Faguet, Emile. "La Débâcle." *Revue Politique et Littéraire: Revue Bleue*, XLIX (1892): 819.
- Franc, Christian. *A Refaire la Débâcle*. Paris: Dentu, 1892.
- Gille, Philippe. "La Débâcle." *Le Figaro*, June 20, 1892.
- Lebedour, Georg. "La Débâcle." *Nord und Süd*, LXII (1892): 407.
- Libre, Gaston. "Napoléon a mis du Rouge." *Le Figaro*, October 29, 1892.
- Monod, Gabriel. "Letter." *Journal des Débats*, September 13, 1892.
- N. N. "Die meistgelesenen Bücher." *Das litterarische Echo* 4 (1901): 496-502.
- Sautour, Auguste. *L'Oeuvre de Zola, à propos de La Débâcle* (1893).
- Schmidt, Erich. "La Débâcle." *Deutsche Literatur Zeitung*, XIV (1893): 665-666.
- Sokal, Clemens. "La Débâcle." *Nord und Süd*, LXII (1892): 403-408.
- Vogüé, Eugène-Melchior de. "La Débâcle." *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, CXII (1892): 443-458.
- Zola, Emile and Henri Mitterand. *La débâcle*. Collection Folio. Vol. 1586. Paris: Gallimard, 1984.
- Zola, Émile. *La Débâcle: Oxford World's Classics*. Translated by Elinor Dorday and Robert Lethbridge. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Zola, Émile. "Différences entre Balzac et moi." *Oeuvres Completes*. Vol. 5. Paris: Pleiade, 1960: 1737.
- Zola, Émile. *Le Roman Experimental*. Paris: Garnier-Flammarion, 1971.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Alphonse Daudet

- Bannour, Wanda. *Alphonse Daudet: bohème et bourgeois*. Paris: Perrin, 1990.
- Benoît-Guyod. *Alphonse Daudet: Son Temps, Son Oeuvre*. Paris: Jules Tallandier, 1947.
- Bornecque, Jacques-Henry. *Les années d'apprentissage d'Alphonse Daudet*. Paris: Nizet, 1951.
- Brivois, Jules. *Essai de bibliographie des oeuvres de M. Alphonse Daudet avec fragments inédits*. Burt Franklin Bibliography & Reference Series. Vol. 91. New York: B. Franklin, 1970; 1895.
- Dufief, Anne-Simone. *Alphonse Daudet: romancier*. Paris: Honoré Champion, 1997.
- Hare, Geoffrey. *Alphonse Daudet: A Critical Biography*. London: Grant and Cutler, 1978.
- Sachs, Murray. *The Career of Alphonse Daudet*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Sherard, Robert. *Alphonse Daudet: A Biographical and Critical Study*. London: E. Arnold, 1894.

Theodor Fontane

- Craig, Gordon. *Theodor Fontane: Literature and History in the Bismarck Reich*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Ehlich, Konrad, ed. *Fontane Und Die Fremde, Fontane Und Europa*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2002.
- Grawe, Christian and Helmuth Nürnberger, ed. *Fontane Handbuch*. Stuttgart : Kröner, 2000.
- Howe, Patricia and Helen Chambers. *Theodor Fontane and the European Context: Literature, Culture and Society in Prussia and Europe: Proceedings of the Interdisciplinary Symposium at the Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London in March 1999*. Internationale Forschungen Zur Allgemeinen Und Vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft. Vol. 53. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001.
- Jolles, Charlotte. *Fontane Und Die Politik: Ein Beitrag Zur Wesensbestimmung Theodor Fontanes*. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1983.

- Keiler, Otfried, ed. *Theodor Fontane im literarischen Leben seiner Zeit : Beiträge zur Fontane-Konferenz vom 17. bis 20. Juni 1986 in Potsdam*. Berlin: Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, 1987.
- Osborne, John, "Aus Schottland und Frankreich: Überlegungen zum Gattungscharakter von Fontanes Kriegsberichten." *Fontane Blätter* 75 (2002): 42-63.
- Osborne, John. *Meyer Or Fontane? : German Literature After the Franco- Prussian War, 1870-71*. Abhandlungen Zur Kunst-, Musik- Und Literaturwissenschaft. Vol. 341. Bonn: Bouvier, 1983.
- Osborne, John. *Theodor Fontane--Vor Den Romanen: Krieg Und Kunst*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.
- Rasch, Wolfgang. *Theodor Fontane Bibliographie: Werk und Forschung*. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- Robinson, A. R. *Theodor Fontane: An Introduction to the Man and His Work*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1976.
- Sprengel, Peter. *Von Luther Zu Bismarck: Kulturkampf Und Nationale Identität Bei Theodor Fontane, Conrad Ferdinand Meyer Und Gerhart Hauptmann*. Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 1999.
- Thuret, Marc, ed. *Theodor Fontane: Un promeneur dans le siècle*. Asnières: Institut d'Allemand d'Asnières, 1999.
- Villmar-Doebeling, Marion. *New Approaches to Theodor Fontane: Cultural Codes in Flux*. Studies in German Literature, Linguistics, and Culture. Columbia, SC.: Camden House, 2000.
- Zwiebel, William L. *Theodor Fontane*. Vol. 831. New York: Twayne, 1992.

Detlev von Liliencron

- Burns, Barbara. *The short stories of Detlev von Liliencron: passion, penury, patriotism*. Lewiston, NY: E Mellon Press, 1998.
- Dohnke, Kay, and Hermann Friedrichs. *Die drei Leben des Detlev von Liliencron: die Kellinghusener Jahre*. Vaale: O. Plotz, 1994.

- Mainholz, Mathias, ed. *Artist, Royalist, Anarchist: Das Abenteuerliche Leben des Baron Detlev Freiherr von Liliencron, 1844-1909*. Herzberg: Traugott Bautz, 1994.
- Royer, Jean. *Detlev von Liliencron: Itinéraire et évolution du poète lyrique (1844-1891)*. Berne: P. Lang, 1993.
- Royer, Jean. *Detlev von Liliencron und Theobald Nothig*. Herzberg: Verlag Traugott Bautz, 1986.
- Stolte, Heinz Hermann. *Detlev von Liliencron: Leben und Werk*. Husum: Husum-Druck- und Verlagsgesellschaft, 1980.
- Wilkening, William. "Liliencron, Bierbaum, Dehmel: A Complementary Triangle." *Studies in Modern European History and Culture*. Vol. 3 (1977): 138-149.

Émile Zola

- Brown, Frederick. *Zola: A Life*. 1st ed. New York: Farrar, Strauss, Giroux, 1995.
- Kellner, Sven. *Émile Zola et son Oeuvre*. France: Les Deux Colombes, 1994.
- Langenhagen, Marie-Aude de and Gilbert Guislain. *Zola: Bibliographie, Analyse Littéraire, Etude détaillée des principales œuvres*. Vol. 16. Levallois-Perret: Studyräma, 2005.
- Laville, Béatrice. *Champ littéraire Fin De Siecle Autour De Zola*. Modernités. Vol. 20. Pessac: Presses universitaires de Bordeaux, 2004.
- Lintz, Bernadette. "L'Empereur fardé: Napoléon III des Châtiments à La Débâcle." *Nineteenth Century French Studies* 35, no. 3 &4 (2007): 610-627.
- Mitterand, Henri. *Zola*. Paris: Fayard, 1999.
- Mitterand, Henri. *Zola, l'Histoire Et La Fiction*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1990.
- Moens, Julie. *Zola L'Imposteur: Zola et la Commune de Paris*. Bruxelles: Editions Aden, 2004.
- Rufener, Helen Beatrice La Rue. *Biography of a War Novel; Zola's La Debacle*. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946.
- Sältzer, Rolf. *Entwicklungslinien der deutschen Zola-Rezeption von den Anfängen bis zum Tode des Autors*. Berne: Peter Lange Publishing, 1989.

Nineteenth-Century France and Germany and the Franco-Prussian War

- Carr, William. *The Origins of the Wars of German Unification*. Origins of Modern Wars. London; New York: Longman, 1991.
- Gildea, Robert. *The Third Republic from 1870-1914*. Seminar Studies in History. London; New York: Longman, 1988.
- Howard, Michael Eliot. *The Franco-Prussian War; the German Invasion of France, 1870-1871*. London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1961.
- Palat, Barthelémy-Edmond. *Bibliographie générale de la guerre de 1870-1871: répertoire alphabétique et raisonné des publications de toute nature concernant la guerre franco-allemande parues en France et à l'étranger*. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1896.
- Price, Roger. *The French Second Empire: An Anatomy of Political Power*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Shafer, David A. *The Paris Commune: French Politics, Culture, and Society at the Crossroads of the Revolutionary Tradition and Revolutionary Socialism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Sowerwine, Charles. *France Since 1870*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Tombs, Robert. *France, 1814-1914*. New York: Longman, 1996.
- Tombs, Robert. *The Paris Commune, 1871*. Turning Points. London: Longman, 1999.
- Wawro, Geoffrey. *The Franco-Prussian War: The German Conquest of France in 1870-1871*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Memory and Transnational History

- Assmann, Aleida. *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlung des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. Munich: Beck, 1999.
- Confino, Alon. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *American Historical Review* no. 102 (1997): 1386-1403.
- Erl, Astrid and Ansgar Nünning. *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. Media and Cultural Memory. Vol. 8. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Erl, Astrid. *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen: Eine Einführung*. Weimar: J. B. Metzler, 2005.

- Espagne, Michel. *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands, perspectives germaniques*. Paris: 1999.
- Forrest, Alan. *The Legacy of the French Revolutionary Wars: The Nation-in-Arms in French Republican Memory*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Hewitson, Mark. *National Identity and Political Thought in Germany: Wilhelmine Depictions of the French Third Republic, 1890 -1914*. Oxford Historical Monographs. England: Clarendon Press, 2000.
- Jeismann, Michael. *Das Vaterland Der Feinde: Studien Zum Nationalen Feindbegriff Und Selbstverständnis in Deutschland Und Frankreich 1792-1918*. Sprache Und Geschichte. Vol. 19. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1992.
- Leiner, Wolfgang. *Das Deutschlandbild in der französischen Literatur*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1989.
- Mehrkens, Heidi. *Statuswechsel: Kriegserfahrung und nationale Wahrnehmung im Deutsch-Französischen Krieg 1870/71*. Essen: Klartext, 2008.
- Middel, Matthias. "Kulturtransfer und historische Komparistik. Thesen zu ihrem Verhältnis." *Comparativ* 10 (2000): 7-41.
- Mitchell, Allan. *A Stranger in Paris: Germany's Role in Republican France, 1870-1940*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2006.
- Nora, Pierre, ed. *Les Lieux de mémoire*. 7 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1984-92.
- Nünning, Ansgar and Marion Gymnich, and Roy Sommer, eds. *Literature and Memory: Theoretical Paradigms, Genres, Functions*. Tübingen: Francke, 2006.
- Paletschek, Sylvia, and Sylvia Schraut. *The Gender of Memory: Cultures of Remembrance in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-century Europe*. Frankfurt: Campus-Verlag, 2008.
- Paulmann, Johannes. "Internationaler Vergleich und interkultureller Transfer." *Historische Zeitschrift*, 267 (1998): 649-85.
- Plessen, Marie-Louise. *Marianne und Germania 1789-1889: Frankreich und Deutschland: zwei Welten--eine Revue*. Berlin: Argon, 1996.
- Schivelbusch, Wolfgang, and Jefferson S. Chase. *The Culture of Defeat: On National Trauma, Mourning, and Recovery*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2003.
- Taguieff, Pierre-Andre. *La force du prejudice: Essai sur le racisme et ses doubles*. Paris: Editions la Decouverte, 1988.
- Varley, Karine. *Under the Shadow of Defeat: The War of 1870-71 in French Memory*. New

York: Palgrave, 2008.

Werner, Michael and Bénédicte Zimmerman. "Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity." *History and Theory* 45 (February 2006): 30-50.

Werner, Michael and Bénédicte Zimmerman. *De la comparaison à l'histoire croisée*. Paris: 2004.

Werner, Michael and Bénédicte Zimmerman. "Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung. Der Ansatz der *histoire croisée* und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 29 (2002): 607-636.

Wilson, Colette E. *Paris and the Commune, 1871-78: The Politics of Forgetting*. Cultural History of Modern War. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press, 2007.

Gender, Nationalism and Nation-Building

Belgum, Kirsten. *Popularizing the Nation: Audience, Representation, and the Production of Identity in Die Gartenlaube, 1853-1900*. Modern German Culture and Literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.

Breuilly, John. *Germany's Two Unifications: Anticipations, Experiences, Responses*. New Perspectives in German Studies. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Brosman, Catharine Savage. *Visions of War in France: Fiction, Art, Ideology*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999.

Green, Abigail. *Fatherlands: State-Building and Nationhood in Nineteenth -Century Germany*. New Studies in European History. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Hagemann, Karen. "Of 'Many Valor' and 'German Honor': Nation, War, and Masculinity in the Age of the Prussian Uprising Against Napoleon." *Central European History* 30, no. 2 (1998): 187-220.

Hagemann, Karen and Catherine Hall, eds. *Gendered Nations: Nationalisms and Gender Order in the long Nineteenth Century*. Oxford, New York: Berg, 2000.

Herminghouse, Patricia and Magda Mueller, eds. *Gender and Germanness: Cultural Productions of Nation*. Oxford and New York: Berghahn Books, 1997.

Hroch, Miroslav. "From National Movement to the Fully-Formed Nation: The Nation-Building Process in Europe." *Becoming National: A Reader*. Edited by Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

- Martin, Michele. *Images at War: Illustrated Periodicals and Constructed Nations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- Peterson, Brent Orlyn. *History, Fiction, and Germany: Writing the Nineteenth-Century Nation*. Kritik. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2005.
- Sinah, Mrinalina. "Gender and Nation." *Women's History in a Global Perspective*. Edited by Bonnie G. Smith. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004: 229-274
- Vogel, Jakob. *Nationen im Gleichschritt: Der Kult der "Nation in Waffen" in Deutschland und Frankreich, 1871-1914*. Göttingen: 1997.

Reading, Writing, and Publishing in France and Germany

- Baguley, David. *Naturalist Fiction: The Entropic Vision*. Cambridge Studies in French. Cambridge England; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Berman, Russell A. "Writing for the Book Industry: The Writer under Organized Capitalism." *New German Critique*, no. 29, *The Origins of Mass Culture: The Case of Imperial Germany* (1983): 39-56.
- Byrnes, Robert F. "The French Publishing Industry and its Crisis in the 1890's." *The Journal of Modern History* 23, no. 3 (1951): 232-42
- De la Motte, Dean and Jeannene M. Przyblyski. *Making the News: Modernity & the Mass Press in Nineteenth-Century France*. Studies in Print Culture & the History of the Book. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.
- Demarco, Eileen. *Reading and riding: Hachette's railroad bookstore network in nineteenth-century France*. Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2006.
- Datta, Venita. *Birth of a National Icon: The Literary Avant-Garde and the Origins of the Intellectual in France*. Albany: SUNY, 1999.
- Durand, Michel. *Michael Georg Conrad à Paris*. Berne: Peter Lang, 2004.
- Duval, Elga Liverman. *Téodor de Wyzewa: Critic Without a Country*. Genève: E. Droz, 1961.
- Florack, Ruth. *Tiefsinnige Deutsche, frivole Franzosen: nationale Stereotype in deutscher und französischer Literatur*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2001.
- Forth, Christopher E. "Nietzsche, Decadence, and Regeneration in France, 1891-95." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 34, no. 1 (1993): 97-117.
- Jelavich, Peter. "The Censorship of Literary Naturalism, 1890-1895: Bavaria." *Central European History* 18, no. 3/4 (1985): 344-359.

- Jurt, Joseph. "The Transnational Reception of Literature: The Reception of French Naturalism in Germany." *Participations* 2, no. 1 (2005).
- Kafitz, Dieter. *Decadence in Deutschland: Studien Zu Einem Versunkenen Diskurs Der 90er Jahre Des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Heidelberg: Winter, 2004.
- Koelb, Clayton, and Eric Downing. *German Literature of the Nineteenth Century, 1832-1899*. Vol. 9. Rochester, N.Y.: Camden House, 2005.
- Langford, Rachel, ed. *Depicting desire: gender, sexuality, and the family in nineteenth century Europe: literary and artistic perspectives*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2005.
- Levesque, Paul. "Jahrhundertwende, Fin de Siècle, Wilhelminian Era: Re-examining Germany Literary Culture 1871-1918." *German Studies Review* 13, no. 1 (1990): 9-25.
- Lidtke, Vernon. "Naturalism and Socialism in Germany." *The American Historical Review* 79, no. 1 (1974): 14-37.
- Lyons, Martyn. *Reading culture and writing practices in nineteenth-century France*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Lyons, Martyn. *Readers and Society in Nineteenth-Century France: Workers, Women, Peasants*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- Martino, Alberto and Georg Jäger. *Die Deutsche Leihbibliothek :Geschichte Einer Literarischen Institution (1756-1914)*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1990.
- Marshall, Alan. *The German Naturalists and Gerhart Hauptmann: Reception and Influence*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1982.
- Maurer, Warren R. *The Naturalist Image of German Literature: A Study of the German Naturalists' Appraisal of their Literary Heritage*. München: W. Fink, 1972.
- Murray, Penelope, ed. *Genius: The History of an Idea*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Pascal, Roy. *From Naturalism to Expressionism; German Literature and Society 1880-1918*. Literature and Society. London: Wiedenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.
- Potthast, Barbara. *Die Ganzheit Der Geschichte: Historische Romane im 19. Jahrhundert*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2007.
- Prickett, David James. "The Soldier Figure in Discourses on Masculinity in Wilhelmine and Weimar Germany." *Journal of Germanic Studies* 44, no. 1 (2008): 68-86.
- Remak, Henry. "The German Reception of French Realism." *Modern Language Association* 69, no. 3 (1954): 410-431.

- Schneider, Lothar L. *Realistische Literaturpolitik Und Naturalistische Kritik : Über Die Situierung Der Literatur in Der Zweiten Hälfte Des 19. Jahrhunderts Und Die Vorgeschichte Der Moderne*. Studien Zur Deutschen Literatur. Vol. 178. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2005.
- St. John, Michael. *Romancing Decay: Ideas of Decadence in European Culture*. Brookfield, Vt: Ashgate, 1999.
- Stewart, Mary. "German Naturalism and the Novel." *The Modern Language Review* 71, no. 4 (1976): 846-856.
- Stöber, Rudolf. *Deutsche Pressegeschichte: Einführung, Systematik, Glossar*. Reihe Uni-Papers. Vol. Bd. 8. Konstanz: UVK-Medien, 2000.
- Thogmartin, Clyde. *The National Daily Press of France*. Birmingham, Ala.: Summa Publications, 1998.
- Wayne, Anthony. *Changing Cultural Tastes: Writers and the Popular in Modern Germany*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2007.
- Weedon, Chris. *Gender, Feminism, and Fiction in Germany, 1840-1914*. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.