P. Dwyer

New Avenues for Research in Napoleonic Europe

The approaching bicentennial of the founding of the Napoleonic Empire is an appropriate occasion to review the state of research and to suggest possible avenues for further study. Despite two hundred years of historiography, it is safe to say that there is virtually no part of Napoleonic Europe, or any aspect of the Napoleonic Empire, that does not cry out for further research (or at least the dissemination of foreign scholarship by means of English-language synthesis). Generally speaking, the history of the Napoleonic period lags behind that of the French Revolution, but it has also suffered from short-term, relatively narrow approaches that focus on the somewhat artificial timeframe of 1799–1815. Some of the following suggestions, therefore, point to themes that take into account much broader time periods including the late eighteenth up to the mid-nineteenth centuries. They have been provided by a number of specialists in the field, who were asked to contribute ideas based on their extensive knowledge of both the archival and secondary material. It goes without saying that the avenues for future research into Napoleonic Europe are by no means limited to what one can find here.

The wars are as good a place as any to start. Though the narrowly military aspects of the period have been thoroughly trawled over — of very uneven quality, there are countless studies of generals and battles — there are many others crying out for further research. For example, the structure and personnel of Napoleon's officer class could benefit from systematic study, in the manner of Jean-Paul Bertaud.[1] This is also the case for the various satellite armies where it would be nice to know a lot more about the

European History Quarterly Copyright © 2003 SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, Vol. 33(1), 101–124.
[0265-6914(200301)33:1;101–124;031245]

social composition of their officer corps. The wars themselves have been quite well covered although, with a few exceptions, there is no good general history that aspires to be anything other than a 'campaigns of Napoleon'.[2] One can also point to the absence of any study of the popular experience of either French occupation or the wars in general. How did the French armies behave? What was the experience of women at their hands? To what extent did the civilian population suffer the ravages of starvation and disease? How many people actually died in the wars? What is needed here is some sort of 'people's history', even if it has to be said that setting about such a work might well present insuperable difficulties. In short, interest has tended to be too narrowly focused on the armies in their role as fighting machines, a role generally viewed from above. We also need to know more about the history of the military from below — the perceptions of ordinary soldiers and of their morale during the long years of campaigning. Nor are armies merely fighting machines. Throughout this period they were used extensively for civilian policing duties, which implies a whole raft of different relationships with civilians. These could usefully be the subject of further research, both in France itself and in the annexed territories.

So, too, could the criminal activities of soldiers, another area which necessarily brought them into conflict with civilian populations. Here there is still considerable work to be done in the archives of the Justice Militaire at Vincennes. More research on military supply — with the conscription not just of men (carters, bargees and others) but also of carts and horses and even donkeys for the war effort — and the mobilization of the economies of European states for the Napoleonic campaigns is needed. Despite Napoleon's concern to project a caring image towards his men and the detailed work that has been done on one or two well-known medical figures such as Dominique Larrey, surprisingly little work has been done on military medicine as a whole. We could learn with profit more about the standard of medical care that was provided in the armies and the resources which Napoleon put into it; about the impact of military demands on civilian hospitals in France and across Europe; and about the effects of disease on both the military and the civilian populations with whom they came into contact.

Law, order and policing in Napoleonic Europe were bound up inextricably with problems of conscription, and there is no doubt

that this subject has been the one that has done more than any other to open up the domestic history of the Napoleonic period to serious study. Conscription was to dominate so much of the political agenda and arouse much opposition among ordinary people. The most profound, seminal work has been done by Anglo-Saxon scholars, most notably by Alan Forrest in his indispensable work on conscription and desertion in France, and the crucial article by Isser Woloch.[3] Forrest's work ranges over the whole Revolutionary-Napoleonic period, and is based on intensive archival work in French departments, thus — almost for the first time — giving students a study of the regime 'on the ground', and yielding valuable insights into popular resistance to the state at the local level. By contrast, Woloch's article (which was later followed by his wider book length study) views the history of conscription from the centre.[4] Whereas Forrest senses that conscription sparked fierce, deeply-rooted resistance to authority in many communities, Woloch sees it as a catalyst for change and the advance of the state into hitherto isolated, autonomous areas.

The progress of conscription, and popular reactions to it, may be well-known for France itself, but we know far less of the territories which France annexed. The production of Forrest-style studies with regard to military affairs in every part of the Empire is, in fact, badly needed. Charles Esdaile has dealt with the Spanish case, but Holland, the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, Central Europe (although we can look forward to the work by Michael Rowe, who is currently doing research on conscription in the Rhineland), southern Italy,[5] and the Illyrian Provinces are all areas that would be worth examining.[6] Was resistance in the annexed territories born of the same impulses as in metropolitan France, or did ideology play a greater part? Did anti-French feeling or proto-nationalism help to explain it? This in turn raises the important question of perceptions of the French army outside France. Did French propaganda about bringing liberty to the oppressed bear any fruit, or was their vision one of suffering, as the victims of French conquest, of soldiers bringing fire and slaughter in the tradition of any invading force in early modern Europe? Work on popular images of the army (in folklore, popular prints and caricatures) is well advanced for France itself; again, it would be interesting to see how others perceived and represented the French, and whether the image of soldiering

generally was undergoing any sort of transformation during the Napoleonic years.

The militarization of French and European society under Napoleon also spills over into social history. Some years ago, Theodore Zeldin highlighted ambition as a category of analysis for French history, and that is particularly apt in assessing society during the Napoleonic experience. We need to know a great deal more about the hold of military values and ambition on the population at large, or their indifference to all of it. There is also the abrupt *discontinuity* of ambition that had to be negotiated after 1814, when the army's size and role shrank dramatically, and when domination of the upper officer corps largely reverted to the old aristocracy.

Quite naturally, Napoleon's vast military machine and the durable interests created by it do not stop in 1815. This is reflected in Jean Vidalenc's rather old study of the demobilized officers of the ex-Napoleonic army who were involuntarily put on half-pay after the Restoration.[7] More generally there is the question of national pride after 1815, the continued love affair of some elements of the French population, despite all the carnage and disasters, with the military 'glory' of the revolutionary and Napoleonic armies. This mystique, for example, captivated Lazare Carnot, and led him to rally to Napoleon during the Hundred Days even though he generally loathed Napoleon as a tyrant.

Some areas of social history invite further research specific to the Napoleonic years, while others have trajectories reaching back into the revolutionary decade or the *ancien régime*, and going past Napoleon's abdication well into the nineteenth century. As an example of the former, the everyday life of both French and European men and women has been neglected, despite the fact that there is an abundance of archival material that could potentially help researchers to portray a more accurate picture of imperial Europe. Justice, finance and education are areas where state control most affects the lives of ordinary people and yet, despite the abundance of archival material, studies have rarely gone beyond analyses of institutions. For example, we do not really know how justice was able to contribute to the consolidation of the bourgeois order on an everyday level.

An example of research transcending the traditional timeframe of the period is Judith Miller's work on the grain trade in

Northern France.[8] She situates the serious subsistence crisis of 1812 in a much broader context, both before and after that traumatic episode. Similarly, one might study how changes in family law codified by the Civil Code affected actual practice in different regions, not only during the short period of the Empire, but during the cycle of family life that continued after 1815, as exemplified in the work by Margaret Darrow on family, class and inheritance in the south of France.[9] We still do not know, for example, how the establishment of political stability under Napoleon affected the character of urban life during and after the Empire.

We already have dependable and generally sufficient scholarship on such subjects as the local Napoleonic *notables* (though here, too, there is need for deeper treatment), the imperial nobility, governing state institutions, marshals, prefects, mayors, and certain cultural, professional and educational institutions. But there are also blank spaces or question marks. The most obvious concerns the networks of patronage and nepotism in the regime. One way to think of this is from the 'bottom up', as a question of individual family strategies and connections. Friendship and kinship alike could bring an entrée to government service.[10] At the higher reaches of the government, blatant nepotism could be found on behalf of brothers, nephews, in-laws, and sons (the Portalis family comes to mind). But how, in particular, did well-connected young men begin their ascent? The recruitment of *auditeurs* for the Council of State and the ministries was a prized entry point for advancement, and a hothouse for patronage and nepotism. This institution has been mapped by Charles Durand, but his book could be used as a starting point or as a resource for further research on particular families or patterns of influence.[11] Of course no regime before or after Napoleon lacked elements of nepotism, but by virtue of its relatively artificial nature, the Napoleonic regime seems highly prone to that influence.

For the study of local society, a remarkably rich collection of source material is available in the over fifty departmental handbooks compiled under the direction of various prefects.[12] Few of the local monographs in which the French generally excel actually deal with Napoleonic social history, as opposed to administrative and political developments.[13]

Some progress has been made in the area of cultural history, but here much more remains to be done. Annie Jourdan's examination of the construction of Napoleon's public image, and Werner Telesko's analysis of contemporary paintings, are good starting points. [14] Some recent work has also been done on Napoleonic caricature.[15] We can look forward to Pascal Dupuy's forthcoming monograph on representations of France and the French in English caricature (1750–1815).

As well as the politics of culture, the culture of politics is another area that has begun to be explored in recent times. Isser Woloch's splendid book on Napoleon and his collaborators falls into that category.[16] Malcolm Crook has begun to make some inroads into the plebiscites and elections during the Napoleonic era, not in terms of their outcomes (which were pretty predictable), but in terms of the way in which voters regarded the process and how they responded.[17] The plebiscites were an ingenious way devised by the regime of managing popular sovereignty so that the will of the people could still be invoked.

Compared to the eighteenth century and the later nineteenth century, women and gender issues have received very little attention in studies of the Napoleonic period and have only very recently begun to be explored.[18] It is common for historians to remark on the anti-feminist, if not downright misogynist character of the Napoleonic Code, but that is usually the extent of the analysis. Jennifer Heuer has looked at the ways in which the institutionalization of the Civil Code changed the application of citizenship law,[19] while Denise Davidson is currently preparing a study on women and urban life in France between 1800 and 1830. Davidson argues that women's behaviour became a yardstick for measuring the health of French society in the aftermath of the turmoil of the Revolution, and that gender norms were integrally connected to the construction of a stable social order.[20] Steven Kale has worked on women and salon culture in the aftermath of the Revolution, and has some interesting things to say about Napoleon and the revival of salon sociability.[21] Much of the existing work, however, focuses on the prescriptive such as the Civil Code and its restrictions or on medical discourse, but also on prominent figures such as Josephine and in a different context Madame de Staël. This is partly a question of sources, partly an assumption that the drama of the Revolution is played out (or at least that struggles for women's rights are temporarily

quiescent), and partly a continuation of the emphasis on great men and armies, but there is still a lot of space open for further investigations. One avenue worth exploring is gender and the Napoleonic Empire outside of France. Here we are beginning to see some interesting work appear. John Lawrence Tone has written on women and the Spanish resistance,[22] while Karen Hagemann has studied the construction of a German (and manly) identity during the Wars of Liberation.[23] In this context, much more could be done to use gender to illuminate resistance to Napoleon and Napoleon's armies, the nature and role of 'nationalism' or religion in resistance in different parts of conquered Europe, the impact of war and conscription, and the extent to which the Napoleonic Code was implemented in the Empire and what social changes that brought about.

Religious life in Napoleonic France remains appreciably underexamined by comparison with either the pre-1799 or the post-1815 eras, although it is one of the potential growth areas. As Gérard Cholvy has already noted, we have little on religious activities in the years following the Concordat.[24] To begin with, there is scope for an authoritative study of church–state relations in France building on the recent work of Michael Broers and Edouard Leduc.[25] How much did the regime's later anti-sacerdotalism diminish popular affection for the Empire within France? To what extent was there an attempt to exert centralized imperial control over other Catholic churches outside France where concordats formed an essential part of the Napoleonic settlement of religion? The Concodatory Church of 1802 (*Eglise concordataire*) represented a genuinely new creation, an attempt by the consul to end the religious rupture caused by the civil constitution of the clergy. But how did the *Eglise concordataire* actually operate? How successful was this attempted junction between refractory and constitutional clergy? We need more local studies comparable to Thierry Blot's study on the church in Bayeux to make sense of events.[26] Diocesan studies are one way into this area, and with the excellent Privat series complete, the springboard is in place. There is also the recently submitted Cambridge doctoral dissertation by D.O.A. Hawes on the Constitutional clergy and the Concordat in the diocese of Dijon, which argues that popular disaffection owed much to the marginalization of the constitutional clergy within the post-1802

united church. That church made a precarious start. Scholars found it recovered during the Restoration, but how far had that recovery gone before 1815, and in what regions? Why did the challenge from the *Petite église*, potentially so serious in 1801–2, turn out to be a damp squib. The last collective study of that Catholic remnant dates back to the 1890s. Above all, there is an acute need for a study of male religiosity in the Napoleonic period. This would better permit us to gauge and understand how much the militarization of the male population continued to act as an agency of de-Christianization, and the extent to which Catholics, Protestants and Jews were able to counteract it.

Remaining within France, not enough attention has been given to the post-1809 breach with Rome; the weight tends too much to stay with the restoration of the church in the early years. There is a wealth of archival material in the Archives nationales on the unease in many areas (usually previous centres of counter-revolution) in the last years of the empire. The *Concile Nationale* of 1810–11, and the second Concordat of Fontainebleau (1813) also need examination, in the same context. Indeed, Michael Broers's emphasis on the importance of the Concordat of Fontainebleau as a landmark in imperial–papal relations suggests that this deserves a book in itself. These aspects of the subject and period paint the late Empire in a rather more 'radical', revolutionary light than it usually receives — it was anything but crypto-monarchist!

Finally, the Concordat was a real, if short-lived, revolution outside France — the Rhineland, Italy and the Belgian departments. Few seem to have grasped the potential for opposition until recently, or the capacity of clergy and laity to ally against many of its terms (even if sometimes their objections were to different aspects of the Concordat, the Concordat came as a package deal, so it welded opposites together). The capacity for religion to act as a politicizing catalyst needs examination, at the grassroots level.

As a general rule, historians have tended to neglect the Napoleonic administration, although there have been a number of French theses and articles on the prefectural system in various parts of France.[27] In addition, a number of older studies are still of some use.[28] The French departments too remain very neg-

lected. The 1970s saw a string of local revolutionary studies appear but the Napoleonic period was simply passed over. Gavin Daly's recent study on Rouen and the Seine-Inférieure illustrates the various approaches open to scholars, which could be applied to any number of imperial departments.[29] The same argument applies with even greater force to the annexed departments within the Empire. An in-depth analysis of the type written by Clive Church could be applied with great value to subjects such as taxes, state expenditure, financial administration and public debt which, despite their central importance, have not received the appropriate attention they deserve in both Napoleonic France and throughout the Napoleonic Empire.[30] An even greater problem than the departments is neglect of the communal perspective, although John Dunne is currently trying to rectify that lacuna, at least for selected annexed departments.[31]

There is no recent synthesis of the French state's financial and fiscal institutions, which is possibly the least-researched topic in Napoleonic France and Europe. Indeed, the most comprehensive work on finances in Napoleonic France is more than seventy years old.[32] Clearly, there is need for a more updated study on that area. Alexander Grab and Donald Sutherland are good starting points.[33] Francois Crouzet deals specifically with Napoleonic finances at the end of a recent book, but his treatment is really quite slight (it ends in 1804).[34] However, it does at least establish the importance of the 'franc de germinal' of 1803 as a bimetallic standard that brought lasting monetary stability to France for over a century. Specific works on finances are also necessary for most of the satellite states which, after all, were forced to help pay for a large portion of the huge military expenditures of the French emperor. Legislative history is also an area that could do with further research. For most of the Napoleonic satellites, studies on financial policies have yet to be written.[35] There is little or nothing, for example, on the Secrétariat d'Etat.[36] There is nothing on the history of Napoleon's supply service.

There is a need for discussions of the French and European economies under Napoleon, and the implementation and impact of such policies as the emancipation and the expropriation of the church. Further studies of the Atlantic ports and the impact of the Continental Blockade in the Empire and in the lands of the 'Grand Empire' are needed.[37] François Crouzet has done this in a general sense, while Paul Butel has focused on Bordeaux, and

Gavin Daly on Rouen, but much more needs to be done on the commercial classes, and indeed the fate of maritime ancillary industries.[38]

The dearth of current research into Napoleonic agriculture is also notable. Was there stability or growth during the Napoleonic era? What were the effects of the Revolutionary land sales? Did they hold back both an agricultural and an industrial revolution in France? Did peasants acquiesce in Napoleon's regime? Was there simply a 'luck factor' of generally good harvests during the Empire? The relevant entry in Jean Tulard's *Dictionnaire Napoléon* says very little, and the further bibliographical leads that it cites are all pretty old. The challenge is finding researchers who are prepared to delve into these subjects which are not exactly scintillating.

There is a real irony in the fact that, despite the traditional labelling of the Napoleonic regime as a 'police state', and frequent references to Fouché's ubiquitous network of spies and informers, it is only comparatively recently that scholars have turned to this aspect of the Napoleonic period in earnest. Even then, a great deal of the recent research centres on non-French parts of the Empire, especially Italy, although in the context of policing there is a need for more work in English on the states of the Confederation of the Rhine.[39] There is also a definite need for scholarly biographies in English on the Ministers of General Police, Fouché and Savary. The history of the gendarmerie, on the other hand, is well served.[40]

Many of the central problems of the period associated with policing were traced best by Colin Lucas in a series of seminal articles on the Directorial period, which have done much to set the agenda for those who followed.[41] Building on this is the perceptive article by Howard Brown, which widens these issues beyond a regional perspective.[42] A clear area for further study is to follow in the footsteps of these people and to provide more detailed studies of France itself. The lack of such work is odd, given the real and easily accessible riches of the Archives nationales de Paris for the Napoleonic period.

The archival material can be used in a multiplicity of ways. Police bulletins, for example, give not only an abundance of information regarding common crimes, but also detailed information on the movement of travellers, the population of Paris

prisons, the situation of prisoners of war and deserters, the state of the roads, internal and external commerce, the price of wheat, and the *levés* of conscripts. They provide information on the state of public opinion, the maintenance of law and order, the reaction to religious policies and information on intercepted foreign correspondence.[43]

The Archives nationales also hold thousands of cartons of police records and there is also considerable material on policing to be found in France's many departmental and communal archives. It would be useful to have an institutional study of the Ministry of General Police and its dealings with local officials throughout the Empire. Police archives could be used in conjunction with France's rich judicial records (held in the departmental archives) to study various aspects of crime, criminality and criminals. An examination of municipal archives would also reveal much about policing in the Empire's towns and cities.

Much research still remains to be done on the many conspiracies against Napoleon by royalists and republicans and on the machinations of foreign (especially British) agents and spies in France.[44] The opposition to Napoleon by liberal intellectuals, returned (royalist) émigrés, priests who sided with the Pope in his quarrel with Napoleon, and the many thousands of ordinary men and women who resented high taxes and heavy conscription, offers many possibilities for fresh and exciting research. Linked in with this, of course, is the need for much more work on collaboration, especially at the lower levels.

The history of the Napoleonic Empire is mixed in terms of output. We are relatively well provided for in English works on Napoleonic Italy, thanks to the research of scholars such as Stuart Woolf, Michael Broers, John Davis, and Alexander Grab. There are also encouraging signs that Spain is beginning to attract more interest (we can look forward to Charles Esdaile's forthcoming work on the Peninsular Wars). However, if we can turn to Simon Schama for his magisterial treatment of Holland,[45] we still lack similar detailed accounts of Napoleonic Belgium, Germany and Switzerland. English writings on Poland (the Duchy of Warsaw) are even thinner on the ground, apart from the general histories, and there is nothing substantial at all on the 'Illyrian Provinces'. What we need is a series of syntheses in English of the major and prolific research published in most of

the main European languages on all those countries over the past forty years or so. Only then will we understand how the instruments of French rule (administration, justice, financial exactions, military recruitment, the Continental System) were applied in the subject and allied states of the 'Grand Empire', and with what effect. Only then, in particular, will we be able to assess the full impact of the sale of property confiscated from the church, of the *Code Napoléon*, of French 'cultural imperialism' in the more and less receptive conquered lands, and of Napoleon's 'politics of grandeur' and 'spoils system' in his larger imperial scheme. The issue at stake is much bigger than Napoleon himself. It reaches well beyond old questions, such as: was he the true heir of the French Revolution? What did he owe to his Revolutionary inheritance? Was he the last of the enlightened despots or a prophet of the modern state? Was he a radical or a conservative at heart? Was he ultimately a force for good or ill? The issue we face is nothing less than how his imperial system *actually* worked under the administrators and military commanders who were called upon to implement it, how the various subject peoples *actually* reacted to that system at the time, and what institutional legacy it *actually* left, or did not leave, in all parts of the former 'Grand Empire' after 1815.

Linked to the Empire is of course foreign policy that, along with military aspects, is another area where there is a great deal of research of uneven quality. While relations between the great powers and France have largely been examined — Paul Schroeder provides some thought-provoking alternative interpretations of relations between the major powers, and the European states system[46] — we could still benefit from more research on the middle and smaller powers such as Prussia, Spain, Sweden, Denmark and various Italian and German states. The role of the various interest groups in the formation of foreign policy in France — French (proto)-industrialists, the military, the imperial family, Napoleonic élites — has received little or no attention from scholars (assuming of course they actually had a role to play). In this vein, it would be worthwhile examining the notion of an 'ideological consensus' formed in favour of France's bid for hegemony in Europe (and indeed the world) among, not only the French élites, but also the military, businessmen and the French people. Some attention should also be given to the perceptions and prejudices of the statesmen and officials who advised

Napoleon, especially with regard to Britain. In short, a study of Napoleon's foreign/military objectives, which does not get bogged down in the operational history of individual campaigns, and which incorporates factors such as domestic pressures, finances and manpower, would be invaluable. What is needed, in fact, is a counterpart to Rory Muir's study of Britain, but which focuses on the French perspective.[47]

Indeed, there are a number of other important questions that may lead to new insights into the ways in which foreign policy was formulated and implemented in France under Napoleon. These include: the family/dynastic aspect of expansion; the charismatic nature of Napoleon's leadership; the apparent self-destructive nature of his behaviour; the continuing, almost obsessive, unresolved conflict with Britain; Napoleon's relations with Alexander I of Russia; the increasing distance that Napoleon placed between those (including the French) over whom he ruled; Napoleon's inability to cope with defeat; his inability to accept responsibility for his actions along with the tendency to blame subordinates or simply circumstances for his failures; his sensitivity to criticism; the tendency to bear grudges for long periods of time; the uncertain foundations of Napoleon's power and the belief that he was obliged to produce victories in order to maintain power; and his seemingly boundless aggression.

Popular responses to foreign policy in France, and the role of public opinion in general, is lacking. Something similar to Arlette Farge's approach to eighteenth-century public opinion could be used profitably to study both the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods.[48] This would most certainly benefit an analysis of the last years of the Empire. The apparent absence of an insistent popular clamour for peace — the lack (to use an anachronism) of any 'peace movement' in the later years of the Empire — has always been puzzling. From the government's prefectorial and police reports, we know of widespread war weariness and the fervent hope for a durable peace in the wake of French victories as late as Lützen in 1813. The desire for peace was no doubt all the greater, in light of the remarkable success of the regime in suppressing most draft evasion by 1810 through bureaucratic pressure and coercive techniques. The question is: how did this war weariness express itself? And why did it not have a greater impact until the game was over, during the final 'Battle of France'? The flow of official reports and correspondence (at various local as

well as national levels) could be combed systematically with an eye on this question.

On this point, perhaps the clergy should be reconsidered. Certainly, priests had generally become Napoleon's 'moral prefects' and part of his propaganda machine. But was any anti-war sentiment finding expression in the pulpit or elsewhere in the clergy's rounds? Mercantile communities, particularly in the hard-hit Atlantic ports, might also be revisited with this question in mind. And related to this, how did the families of the soldiers who perished in the Russian debacle, and who were mostly unaccounted for, react to the news or the lack of news about their kin?

The Empire brought with it popular resistance, another area that is crying out for research. The material is neither abundant nor particularly satisfactory, and it is only in recent years that historians have begun to examine the problem in terms other than those of narrative military history. Recent introductions all stress the importance of such issues as banditry, social unrest and resistance to enlightened reform, whether Napoleonic or absolutist.[49] Here again, Charles Esdaile is looking at Spain, but it is a shame that John Tone has not gone on to analyse some other region of the country than the quite exceptional example of Navarre.[50] As to other parts of the Empire, we really do know extraordinarily little, the one exception being the Kingdom of Italy and, to a lesser extent, Holland.[51] Milton Finley provides a basic narrative and quite a lot of suggestive detail, but we really must have some decent works on the nature of the Calabrian revolt.[52]

However scant, coverage of popular resistance in Italy is princely indeed compared to that accorded to Germany and the Tyrol. Insofar as the former is concerned, there is almost nothing in English other than an extremely suggestive chapter in Tim Blanning's study on the Rhineland.[53] It would be very helpful to know why the attempts to stir up revolt in Germany 1809 failed so conspicuously? Was the disorder described in Blanning's study replicated in such comparable districts as the Black Forest? How widespread was draft evasion? Discussion of the revolt in the Tyrol is confined to a couple of narratives, although the 1980s

saw a spate of German works.[54] It may well be that these contain fresh insights.

The growth of the state seems to dominate recent research on Napoleonic Central Europe, especially on the Confederation of the Rhine. Up until about the 1970s, research into Napoleonic Germany was geographically skewed in favour of Prussia. Since then, much work has been done on the 'Third Germany'. The Habsburg monarchy, by contrast, is neglected for this period, which falls between the two stools occupied by Joseph II and Metternich.

The rise of the bureaucratic, centralized, sovereign state in Central Europe is connected to several debates, including the nature of the transition from the enlightened absolutism/privileged estates of the eighteenth century to the constitutional liberalism of the nineteenth. To what extent did the intervening Napoleonic period (marked, perhaps, by 'bureaucratic state absolutism') represent natural progression from the one period to the other? To what extent was it a deviation or a break? Related to this, in turn, is the question of which reforms were the most progressive in the Napoleonic period: those of Prussia, which Thomas Nipperdey argues went beyond the enlightened absolutism of the eighteenth century and prefigured nineteenth-century developments; or the reforms of the south German states, which many argue were more progressive because they subordinated the nobility to the state more thoroughly than in Prussia, thereby paving the way for constitutional liberal developments later on? According to this last interpretation, the subordination of the nobility (and, indeed, other intermediate bodies such as independent cities, guilds, etc.) was a prerequisite for constitutional liberalism. This failed to occur in Prussia, hence its ultimately disastrous *Sonderweg*.

Within these wide competing interpretative frameworks, the fate of the nobility and other intermediate bodies standing between state and citizen assumes importance. While much has been written about the Prussian *Junkers*, less research has been done into the nobility in the western states. Granted, Elizabeth Fehrenbach has shown how Confederation of the Rhine nobles successfully fended off or watered down the Napoleonic Code, while Christof Dipper has done some work on the fate of the 'mediatized' nobility.[55] Yet lacunae still remain in numerous other areas, especially the relationship between the old nobility

and the new bureaucracies of the south German states (although this gap in our knowledge is closing fast with several recent publications on bureaucracy in these states).

The nobility was not the only formerly privileged estate challenged by state building in Central Europe. The formerly independent imperial cities and hometowns, with their patrician élites and fractious guilds, were another. Despite Mack Walker's seminal contribution, more research could be done on the relationship between this group and the bureaucratic states to which they found themselves subordinated in the Napoleonic period.[56] Again, this area is linked to the origins of nineteenth-century German liberalism, the focus for Lothar Gall's recently completed large-scale research project that examined seventeen German cities in this period from the perspective of the role of the urban middle class (*Bürgertum*) in the transition to nineteenth-century liberalism.[57] Further east, in Hungary, where a substantial *Bürgertum* did not exist, a similar unresolved debate centres on the connection (or lack of one) between the eighteenth-century Enlightenment that infused much of the nobility, and the nineteenth-century liberal nationalism that was also sustained by this group.

Another privileged *ancien régime* institution that has been neglected to an even greater extent is the Catholic Church in Germany. This is surprising, given that the Napoleonic era was a crucial period in its development. After all, 1803 marked the end of an institution (the *Reichskirche*) that had existed for almost a millennium. Arguably, the destruction of this institution paved the way for the resurgence of the Catholic Church in Germany on the spiritual plane in the nineteenth century. Furthermore, it is hard to envisage the emergence of another important nineteenth-century movement, political Catholicism, in a context where the Catholic Church had remained as institutionally important as before 1803. The exact nature of this transition has not been adequately explored.

The 'perspective from below' to state-formation is generally neglected. What did the interface between state and locality look like in those areas that experienced rapid state formation? Were local élites undermined, preserved or reinforced by the intrusion of the state? To what extent was progress made in transforming peasants into Bavarians, Westphalians or Badenese? This last question is potentially interesting. Central Europe's bureaucrats

were not only destroyers of existing privileges and exploiters of ordinary people. While the actual state and legal institutions that they created are relatively well known, less had been written, until recently, on their attempts to create new identities to underpin these institutions. This vein — containing material on public opinion and the formation of identity by newly-emerging states — is now being mined actively, but no doubt has much more to yield. This particular area of research is also linked to the transition from medieval/early-modern concepts of civic rights to the modern notion of state citizenship. The 'symbolization' of this transition, and efforts by the German states to forge a new state identity out of the various local allegiances and supranational (Catholic and *Reich*) identities that had existed earlier, appears to be an especially fruitful area for future research.

Perhaps the best covered of all the countries under Napoleon's rule is Spain, although here also there is much room for improvement (alas, Portugal has by contrast been absolutely ignored). However, if we know a great deal about the war in Iberia in terms of big names, big battles and high politics, we know very little about such issues as popular motivation and mobilization — the very issues, indeed, that could be said to be most important to an understanding of the conflict. With regard to Spain, in particular, this is the result of a combination of a variety of factors. Thus, until comparatively recently, in Spain academics have shunned the military aspects of the War of Independence, while the majority of foreigners who have looked at the conflict have been 'old' historians who, in addition, have lacked both the language skills and the financial resources necessary to pursue research in the Spanish archives. In recent years, however, a number of scholars have shown that researchers willing to do the demanding work of the social historian can make an enormous difference. Certainly, the issue is not want of information insofar as such issues as conscription, collaboration, irregular resistance and the emergence of new forms of political authority are concerned. Important collections of material may be found in a number of provincial archives, good examples being the Archivo General de Navarra, the Archivo Histórico Provincial de Cádiz, the Archivo del Reino de Galicia at La Coruña, the Archivo Histórico Provincial de Badajoz, and the Archivo de la Corona de Aragón in

Barcelona. Many municipal archives also contain much of interest, for example, the Archivo Municipal de Zaragoza, which houses a very large collection relating to General Palafox's administration of Aragón.

There is, however, a persistent myth that because the struggle against the French was by definition local, it can most effectively be studied at the local or municipal level. This is simply untrue. From the very beginning of the war, successive Spanish governments struggled to remain in close touch with the provinces, whether or not they were free or occupied by the enemy, while the local authorities were in their turn keen to stay in contact with the centre. As a result, the national archives are just as indispensable. Two sources of particular importance in this respect are the papers of the *Junta Central*, which are held by the Archivo Histórico Nacional, and the papers of the *cortes* of Cádiz, which are held by the Archivo de las Cortes. Nor to be scorned are collections of private papers such as those of General Francisco Copons y Navia, the latter being held by the Real Academía de Historia and the Servico Histórico Militar respectively.

An especially rich source on all matters relating to the Spanish war effort may be found in the extensive pamphlet literature of the period. Important collections here include the holdings of the Collección Documental del Fraile (Servico Histórico Militar), the Collección Gómez Imaz (Biblióteca Nacional) and the Collección Gómez Imaz (Biblióteca del Senado). For the burgeoning press, meanwhile, a good place to start is the Hemeróteca Municpal de Madrid.

Just as Anglo-Saxon historians have tended to neglect the Spanish provinces, so Spanish scholars have tended to neglect the British ones. While Britain's archives are obviously primarily used for matters relating to the operations of Wellington and Moore, this is unfortunate since they contain much useful information on the Spanish war effort. Housed at the University of Southampton, the Wellington Papers, for example, are of particular interest for the study of the Spanish army and guerrillas in the period 1812–14, while the situation in 1808 is well covered by the reports of such liaison officers as Charles William Doyle in the War Office Papers (Public Records Office). Last but not least, there are important collections of private papers at the British Library (Moore, Lord Wellesley, James Willoughby Gordon), the University of Nottingham (Bentinck), the Uni-

versity of Liverpool (Blanco White), and the University of Manchester (Clinton).

Armed with material culled from these sources, it should be possible to arrive at a much more accurate picture of Spain's resistance to Napoleon than the one offered by current orthodoxy. No more, for example, will it be possible to generalize about the people of Spain rushing to take up arms for God, king and country, or maintain that the populace fought the French while the upper classes collaborated. Through the use of such material as notarial records and parish registers — in which most provincial archives are extremely rich — it should be feasible to examine the impact of the war on Spanish society, this being another area on which much work could still be done.

The possibilities for future research that focuses either specifically on the Napoleonic era, or which transcends the traditional timeframe to incorporate the Revolution and even the Restoration, are abundant. It is evident in the last decade, since the appearance of Charles Esdaile's piece in this journal, that research has moved away from the traditional limits placed on the period by diplomatic and military histories.[58] Nevertheless, progress has been slow and much remains to be done. Indeed, in terms of scholarly research, it is safe to say that the Napoleonic era is one of the most under-exploited periods in French and European history. There is no longer any reason for it to remain the poor cousin of the French Revolution.

Notes

This article is a compilation of suggestions and comments made by Nigel Aston, Michael Broers, Malcolm Crook, Gavin Daly, Denise Davidson, John Dunne, Geoffrey Ellis, Charles Esdaile, Alan Forrest, Alexander Grab, Jennifer Heuer, Michael Rowe, Michael Sibalis, John Lawrence Tone, and Isser Woloch. I would like to thank them all for their valuable suggestions.

1. Jean-Paul Bertaud, *The Army of the French Revolution: From Citizen-Soldiers to Instrument of Power* (Princeton, NJ 1988); idem, 'Napoleon's officers', *Past & Present*, Vol. 112 (1986), 91–111.

2. Those exceptions are: David Gates, *The Napoleonic Wars, 1803–1815* (London 1997); Charles Esdaile, *The Wars of Napoleon* (London 1995), and his more recent *The French Wars, 1792–1815* (London 2001).

3. Alan Forrest, *Conscripts and Deserters: The Army and French Society During*

the Revolution and Empire (Oxford 1989); Isser Woloch, 'Napoleonic Conscription: State Power and Civil Society', *Past & Present*, Vol. 111 (1986), 101–28.

4. Isser Woloch, *The New Regime. Transformations of the French Civic Order, 1789–1820s* (New York 1994).

5. Some work has been done for Italy by Alexander Grab, 'Popular Uprisings in Napoleonic Italy', *Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, Proceedings XIX* (1990), 112–19; 'State Power, Brigandage and Rural Resistance in Napoleonic Italy', *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 25 (1995), 39–70; 'Army, State and Society: Conscription and Desertion in Napoleonic Italy, 1802–1814', *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 67, no. 1 (1995), 25–54.

6. Charles Esdaile, *The Spanish Army in the Peninsular War* (Manchester 1988).

7. Jean Vidalenc, *Les Demi-Solde: étude d'une catégorie sociale* (Paris 1955).

8. Judith A. Miller, *Mastering the Market: The State and the Grain Trade in Northern France, 1700–1860* (Cambridge 1999).

9. Margaret H. Darrow, *Revolution in the House: Family, Class, and Inheritance in Southern France, 1775–1825* (Princeton, NJ 1989).

10. Friendship ties, for example, are evoked in Pierre Marot, *Recherches sur la vie de François de Neufchâteau à propos de ses lettres à son ami Poullain-Grandprey* (Nancy 1966), and in the valuable *Mémoires de A.-C. Thibaudeau, 1799–1815* (Paris 1913).

11. Charles Durand, *Les Auditeurs au Conseil d'état de 1803 à 1814* (Aix-en-Provence 1958).

12. They have been republished and introduced by Jean-Claude Perrot under the title *Sources statistiques de l'histoire de France: les enquêtes des préfets de l'Empire*, published by the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris and on microfiche by Clearwater Publishing (New York 1975). Jean-Claude Perrot and Stuart Woolf, *State and Statistics in France, 1789–1815* (New York 1984) puts this valuable source in perspective.

13. The exceptions, to one degree or another, include Maurice Agulhon, *La vie sociale en Provence intérieure au lendemain de la Révolution* (Paris 1971); Jean-Pierre Jessenne, *Pouvoir au village et révolution: Artois, 1760–1848* (Lille 1987); Fernand L'Huillier, *Recherches sur l'Alsace napoléonienne* (Paris 1947); and Peter Jones, *Politics and Rural Society: The Southern Massif Central c. 1750–1880* (Cambridge 1985).

14. Annie Jourdan, *Napoléon. Héros, imperator, mécène* (Paris 1998); Werner Telesko, *Napoleon Bonaparte* (Vienna 1998).

15. See the works by Pascal Dupuy, 'Le 18 brumaire en Grande-Bretagne: le témoignage de la presse et des caricatures', *Annales historique de la Révolution française*, Vol. 318, no. 4 (1999), 773–87; and idem, 'La campagne d'Italie dans les gravures anglaises sous le Directoire: diffusion et interprétations (1796–1798)', in Jean-Paul Barbe and Roland Bernecker, eds, *Les intellectuels européens face à la campagne d'Italie, 1796–1798* (Munster 1999), 209–31. There is also the massive work on caricature by Hans-Peter Mathis et al., *Napoleon im Spiegel der Karikatur* (Zurich 1998).

16. Isser Woloch, *Napoleon's Collaborators: The Making of a Dictatorship* (New York 2001).

17. Malcolm Crook, 'The Uses of Democracy. Elections and Plebiscites in Napoleonic France', in Maire F. Cross and David Williams, eds, *The French*

Experience from Monarchy to Republic, 1792–1824. New Dawns in Politics, Knowledge and Culture (Basingstoke 2000), 58–71.

18. See, for example, Susan Conner, 'Up from the Footnotes: Amazons, Miscreants, Marginal and Not-So-Marginal Women in Napoleonic Social History', *Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, Proceedings* (1997), 213–20.

19. Jennifer Heuer, '"Afin d'obtenir le droit de citoyen . . . en tout ce qui peut concerner une personne de son sexe': devenir ou cesser d'être femme française à l'époque napoléonienne', *Clio: histoire, femmes et sociétés*, Vol. 12 (2000), 15–32; and with Anne Verjus, 'L'invention de la sphère domestique au sortir de la Révolution', *Annales historique de la Révolution française*, Vol. 327 (2002), 1–28; the last section deals with the Napoleonic period.

20. See also Denise Davidson, '*Bonnes Lectures*: Improving Women and Society Through Literature in Post-Revolutionary France', in M. Cross and D. Williams, eds, *The French Experience from Republic to Monarchy*; and idem, 'Women Counted Too: Napoleonic Festivals and First Empire Politics', *French History*, Vol. 16, no. 3 (2002).

21. Steven D. Kale, 'Women, Salons, and the State in the Aftermath of the French Revolution', *Journal of Women's History*, Vol. 13 (2002), 54–80.

22. John Lawrence Tone, 'Spanish Women in the Resistance to Napoleon, 1808–1814', in Victoria Lorée Enders and Pamela Beth Radcliff, eds, *Constructing Spanish Womanhood: Female Identity in Modern Spain* (Albany 1999), 259–82.

23. Karen Hagemann, *"Mannlicher Muth und Teutsche Ehre". Nation, Militär und Geschlect zur Zeit der Antinapoleonishe Kriege Preußens* (Paderborn 2002). Some of the findings have been published in English as 'A Valorous Volk Family: the Nation, the Military, and the Gender Order in Prussia in the Time of the Anti-Napoleonic Wars, 1806–15', in Ida Blom, Karen Hagemann and Catherine Hall, eds, *Gendered Nations: Nationalisms and Gender Order in the Long Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 2000), 179–206; and 'Of "Manly Valor" and "German Honor". Nation, War and Masculinity in the Age of the Prussian Uprising against Napoleon', *Central European History*, Vol. 30, no. 2 (1997), 187–220.

24. Gérard Cholvy, 'Les peuples de France entre religion et révolution (1760–1830)', in J. Martin, ed., *Religion et Révolution* (Paris 1994), 19.

25. Michael Broers, *Politics and Religion in Napoleonic Italy: The War Against God, 1801–1814* (London 2001); Edouard Leduc, *Portalis 1746–1807* (Paris 1991).

26. Thierry Blot, *Reconstruire l'Eglise après la Révolution: le diocèse de Bayeux sous l'épiscopat de Mgr Charles Brault, 1802–1823* (Paris 1997).

27. Of the recent studies focusing directly on prefectoral administration, the most comprehensive are R. Carrier's *Une isle au milieu de l'Empire'. Le département de l'Aveyron sous le Consulat et l'Empire (1800–1813) contribution à l'histoire de l'administration préfectorale* (Toulouse-I 1993), and François de Lannoy's *L'Administration préfectorale de la Manche l'Aveyron sous le Consulat et l'Empire (1800–1815)* (Paris-IV 1992). The most accessible recent French article is Catherine Lecomte, 'L'administration départementale, acteur du renouveau en Seine-et-Oise, 1800–1815', *Revue Historique*, Vol. 576 (1990), 305–32.

28. See Nathalie Petiteau, *Napoléon, de la mythologie á l'histoire* (Paris 1999), 303–10.

29. Gavin Daly, *Inside Napoleonic France: State and Society in Rouen, 1800–1815* (Burlington, VT 2001); and Jeff Horn, 'Building the New Regime: Founding

the Bonapartist State in the Department of the Aube', *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 25, no. 2 (2002), 225–63.

30. Clive H. Church, *Revolution and Red Tape: The French Ministerial Bureaucracy, 1770–1850* (Oxford 1981).

31. See, for example, John Dunne, 'Napoleon's "Mayoral Problem": Aspects of State–Community Relations in Post-Revolutionary France', *Modern & Contemporary France*, Vol. 8, no. 4 (2000), 479–91.

32. Marcel Marion, *Histoire financière de la France depuis 1715*, Tome IV 1797–1818: La fin de la Révolution, le Consulat et l'Empire, la libération du territoire (Paris 1925).

33. Alexander Grab, 'State, Society and Tax Policy in Napoleonic Europe', in Philip G. Dwyer, ed., *Napoleon and Europe* (London 2001), 169–86; Donald M.G. Sutherland, 'Taxation, Representation and Dictatorship in France, 1789–1830', in William M. Ormrod, Margaret and Richard Bonney, eds, *Crises, Revolutions and Self-Sustained Growth* (Stamford, CT 1999).

34. Francois Crouzet, *La grande inflation: la monnaie en France de Louis XVI à Napoléon* (Paris 1993).

35. The exception is Alexander Grab, 'The Politics of Finance in Napoleonic Italy (1802–1814)', *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, Vol. 3, no. 2, (1998), 127–43; and Simon Schama, 'The Exigencies of War and the Politics of Taxation in the Netherlands, 1795–1810', in J.M. Winter, ed., *War and Economic Development: Essays in Memory of David Joslin* (Cambridge 1975), 103–37.

36. Other than the book by Baron Ernouf, *Maret, duc de Bassano* (Paris 1893).

37. For further directions one should consult Geoffrey Ellis, *The Napoleonic Empire* (London 1991), ch. 6, now revised in a second edition for prospective publication in 2003, and in the relevant section headed 'The Continental Blockade' (pp. 101–12) of Ellis's *Napoleon* (London 2000). These are really only updated digests of material in Ellis's published doctoral thesis, *Napoleon's Continental Blockade: The Case of Alsace* (Oxford 1981).

38. See Gavin Daly, 'Merchants and Maritime Commerce in Napoleonic Normandy', *French History*, Vol. 15, no. 1 (2001), 26–50. Butel's publications on Bordeaux appeared in the 1970s and 1980s. Among the most important are: 'Crise et mutation de l'activité économique à Bordeaux sous le Consulat et l'Empire', *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, Vol. 17, no. 3 (1970), 540–58; 'Guerre et commerce: L'activité du port de Bordeaux sous le régime des licences, 1808–1815', *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, Vol. 19, no. 1 (1972), 128–49; and 'Succès et déclin du commerce colonial français, de la Révolution à la Restauration', *Revue Economique*, Vol. 40, no. 6 (1989), 1079–96, along with a number of other essays on various aspects of maritime trade under Napoleon.

39. For the imperial departments of Piedmont, see Michael Broers, 'Policing Piedmont: "the Well Ordered Police State" in the Age of Revolution, 1794–1821', *Criminal Justice History*, Vol. 15 (1994), and the relevant chapters of *Napoleonic Imperialism and the Savoyard Monarchy, 1773–1821. State Building in Piedmont* (Lampeter 1997). In the wider context of Napoleonic Italy as a whole, see Michael Broers, 'The Police and the *Padroni*: Italian *Notabili*, French Gendarmes and the Origins of the Centralised State in Napoleonic Italy', *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 26, no. 3 (1996), 331–53. The well-established study by John Davis, *Conflict and Control. Law and Order in Nineteenth Century Italy* (London 1988), sets the Napoleonic period in a wider chronological framework.

40. Clive Emsley, *Gendarmes and the State in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford 1999).

41. Colin Lucas, 'The First French Directory and the Rule of Law', *French Historical Studies*, Vol. 10, no. 2 (1977), 231–60 ; and 'The Problem of the Midi in the French Revolution', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Vol. 28 (1978), 1–25.

42. Howard Brown, 'From Organic Society to Security State: The War on Brigandage in France, 1797–1802', *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 69, no. 4 (1997), 661–95.

43. A good starting point, before going into the archives, is Ernest d'Hauterive, ed., *La Police secrète de premier Empire: Bulletins quotidiens adressés par Fouché à l'Empereur* (3 vols, Paris 1908–22) and Jean Grassion (2 vols, Paris 1963–4); and Nicole Gotteri, *La Police secrète du Premier Empire, bulletins quotidiens addressés par Savary à l'empereur* (4 vols, Paris 1997–2000) with more volumes to appear.

44. See Elisabeth Sparrow, 'The Swiss and Swabian Agencies, 1795–1801', *Historical Journal*, Vol. 35, no. 4 (1992), 861–84; and idem, *Secret Service: British Agents in France, 1792–1815* (Rochester, NY 1999).

45. Simon Schama, *Patriots and Liberators: Revolution in the Netherlands 1780–1813* (London 1977).

46. Paul W. Schroeder, *The Transformation of Europe, 1763–1848* (Oxford 1994).

47. Rory Muir, *Britain and the Defeat of Napoleon, 1807–1815* (New Haven, CT 1996).

48. Arlette Farge, *Subversive Words: Public Opinion in Eighteenth-Century France* (trans. Rosemary Morris, Cambridge 1994).

49. Esdaile, *The Wars of Napoleon*; Stuart Woolf, *Napoleon's Integration of Europe* (London, 1991); and Michael Broers, *Europe Under Napoleon* (London, 1996).

50. John Lawrence Tone, *The Fatal Knot: the Guerrilla War in Navarre and the Defeat of Napoleon in Spain* (Chapel Hill, NC 1994); idem, 'Napoleon's Uncongenial Sea: Guerrilla Warfare in Navarre during the Peninsular War, 1808–1814', *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 26, no. 3 (1996), 355–82.

51. Schama's *Patriots and Liberators* has quite a lot about anti-conscription riots.

52. Milton Finley, *The Most Monstrous of Wars: The Napoleonic Guerrilla War in Southern Italy, 1806–1811* (Columbia, SC 1994).

53. Timothy C.W. Blanning, *The French Revolution in Germany: Occupation and Resistance in the Rhineland, 1792–1802* (Oxford 1983).

54. F. Eyck, *Loyal Rebels: Andreas Hofer and the Tyrolean Uprising of 1809* (New York 1986); and L. Harford, 'Napoleon and the Subjugation of the Tyrol', *CREP* (Consortium on Revolutionary Europe) (1989), XIX, 704–11. The German works include W. Pfaundler and W. Kofler, *Der Tiroler Feiheitskampf unter Andreas Hofer* (Munich 1984); D. Stutzer, *Andreas Hofer und die Bayern in Tirol* (Munich 1983); and B. Wurzer, *Tiroler Freiheitskampf: Andreas Hofer und der Heldenhafte Aufstand eines Volkes 1809* (Nuremberg 1984).

55. Elizabeth Fehrenbach, *Der Kampf um die Einführung des Code Napoléon in den Rheinbundstaaten* (Wiesbaden 1973), and *Traditionale Gesellschaft und revolutionäres Recht: Die Einführung des Code Napoléon in den Rheinbundstaaten* (Göttingen 1974); Christof Dipper, 'Die Reichsritterschaft in napoleonischer

Zeit', in Eberhard Weis, ed., *Reformen im rheinbundischen Deutschland* (Munich 1984), 53–73.

56. Mack Walker, *German Home Towns: Community, State, General Estate, 1648–1871* (Ithaca, NY 1971).

57. Lothar Gall, ed., *Vom alten zum neuen Bürgertum. Die mitteleuropäische Stadt im Umbruch 1780–1820* (Munich 1997).

58. Charles Esdaile, 'The Napoleonic Period: Some Thoughts on Recent Historiography', *European History Quarterly*, Vol. 23, no. 3 (1993), 415–32.