

Chapter 5

PERSONAL PASTS AS NATIONAL HISTORY



Who hasn't experienced it: how the most indisputable facts of our time are being concealed or perverted, and with that, history faked.

—Berthold Auerbach, *Tagebuch aus Wien* (1849)¹

For decades after the liberal network's collapse, its former members tried to define for posterity the meaning of political friendship and liberals' political choices before 1867. In doing so, they refashioned their deeply personal memories into didactic national history. This chapter analyzes the published and unpublished auto/biographical writings of Gustav Freytag, Max Duncker, Charlotte Duncker, and Rudolf Haym.² Freytag and Max Duncker authored separate accounts of Karl Mathy's life after his untimely death in 1868. In the late 1880s, Charlotte Duncker and Rudolf Haym began intertwined biographies of the recently deceased Max Duncker.³ Chapter 1 drew on these texts to reconstruct the social backgrounds and interactions of network members during the *Vormärz*. This chapter is less about the subjects' historical lives than about how and why their four biographers attempted to integrate their deceased subjects into their history of German national unification. It engages “with the manner in which the imaginations and fantasies of the past stamp their imprint on what liberals can think, utter and write . . .”⁴

Although these biographers chose different forms and framing devices in their respective works, they nonetheless advanced similar claims about the past, the nature of political friendship, and the value of network activities to the nation before 1867. Their approach—what I call “affective characterization”—sought to achieve three related goals. First, the writers sought to “relive” or commune with the past by continuing political friendships with their deceased subjects. This dialogic desire, in turn, obliged them to create dynamic characters from static—dead—biographic subjects.⁵ Second, the biographers created fictional thoughts and (inter)actions for their subjects as characters that they then used to make authoritative—and revisionist—political claims about the past. Third,

the biographers incorporated a didactic goal. Each writer offered readers sympathetic portrayals of their subjects as historical figures who struggled for the nation and suffered to achieve a liberal German nation-state.⁶ Repurposing the “didactic liberalism” of the pre-unification period, the four biographers hoped that their readers would emulate the liberal ideals and bourgeois social mores of their deceased subjects in the present.⁷

The historical interaction between nation and narration has relevance for historians eager to explore how contemporaries conceived of their own place in a future political homeland—especially those who, like our subjects, wrote so much about each other.⁸ Fictional narrative forms influenced how the authors chose to tell the history of the nation and their political friends.⁹ Intellectuals’ emphasis on the clear distinction between the real and unreal, between the imagined (superstition) and the scientifically verifiable (fact), gathered much of its force in the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century, that is, during the network biographers’ period of education and early adulthood. From the Enlightenment came liberals’ demand for the clear progression of events in the form of a linear narrative. From Sentimentalism came liberals’ association of emotion with authenticity and individual subjectivity. From Romantic nationalism and the legacy of Pietism came liberals’ eagerness to integrate individual emotional experience and social progress into a single, national story.¹⁰ Most conspicuously for network members—but certainly not for them alone—national history became the main lens through which to understand and organize individual lives and their own memories into narrative forms.¹¹ An emotional narrative element was key because it allowed the four biographers first to captivate readers, prompting them secondarily to accept, reject, or ignore the authors’ claims and characterizations. Before a text asked its readers for an emotional reaction, a political judgment, or any kind of activism, it asked them to keep reading.¹²

This final chapter is divided into two parts. The first part explores the form and narrative framing of each auto/biographical work under consideration. It begins with Gustav Freytag’s biography of Karl Mathy, published in 1869, which reads like a bourgeois national epic.¹³ Freytag’s imaginative biography was followed in 1875 by Max Duncker’s more rigorous biographical essay on Mathy.¹⁴ After Max Duncker died in 1886, his life story was soon taken up by Charlotte Duncker in nearly 1,200 pages of unpublished biographical “sketches” from his life.¹⁵ Rudolf Haym relied heavily on Charlotte Duncker’s sketches to publish his own “friendly” biography of her late husband a couple of years later. In the process, Haym nearly erased Charlotte Duncker from the network’s story and their national history. The second part of this chapter addresses the content of the four texts.¹⁶ In each text, the biographers imagined foreign and domestic settings to illustrate the intermingling of politics, *Bildung*, and morality in their subjects’ formative experiences during the *Vormärz*. The biographers narrated

major events in their subjects' lives, first, in order to connect with their subjects emotionally through their character development, and second, to propagate their interpretations of network activities and political friendship before 1866. The chapter concludes by examining how the biographers depicted rifts within the network under the shadow of Bismarck.

The Forms of Network Biography

Soon after Karl Mathy's early death in 1868 from heart disease, Anna Mathy asked Gustav Freytag to write a biography of her late spouse. Freytag set to work quickly, using few written sources.¹⁷ In December 1869, he informed Heinrich von Treitschke that the book would soon appear and asked him to forgive its many failings.¹⁸ He told Treitschke not to let the final product "displease him": "It had to be written without sufficient materials, and therefore a sort of filling of the thin record was attempted with general observations about human life."¹⁹ Freytag's frequent depictions of Mathy's imagined feelings and thoughts, descriptions of geographic settings and their effect on his mood and political convictions, resulted partly from this effort to fill the empty spaces left by the alleged paucity of sources.²⁰ Freytag manipulated disparate materials to fit his own assumptions about "life in general." He wanted, then, to create a "readerly" biography for Mathy's surviving friends and unknown readers alike.²¹ The process showed how Freytag thought a human life should look in the pursuit of national ideals.

"A different and larger concern," Freytag later confided in Treitschke, "lay in the biographer's obligation regarding unanswered political questions." He added that "there was no writing the book without a few [political] indiscretions. Therefore, it was difficult to be measured."²² Freytag was alluding to the biographer's obligation to address current political issues through the past life of their subject. The book appeared in 1869, that is, two years after the Prussian government had incorporated the German states north of the Main River into the North German Confederation. Austria had been defeated, but the largely Catholic states of southern Germany remained outside the Confederation. Because national unification remained incomplete for Freytag and many other liberals, his biography of Mathy virtually demanded a didactic form.

Freytag's authorial "indiscretions" were likely his portrayal of Mathy's illegal political activities in the 1830s and 1840s. Although they fit into the narrative of righteous resistance to Metternich and his reactionary policies, particularly his suppression of oppositional associations and the press, Mathy's deeds still carried a whiff of *kleindeutsch* radicalism that was unwelcome in the political climate of 1869. After the accommodation of most moderate liberals with moderate conservatives in the 1850s and 1860s, Freytag wanted to mitigate Mathy's transgressions—not to mention his own—with sympathetic treatment of his

semi-fictional biographical character. Although he liberally mixed fact and fiction, Freytag avoided the traps of becoming an unreliable narrator or jeopardizing reception of his book as authoritative history; he simply presented his fiction as objective fact.²³

The book had an important purpose beyond recording Mathy's life, doing a favor for Anna Mathy, or providing a gift to their mutual political friends. The character of Karl Mathy that Freytag constructed was a prototype for the southern German patriot and Protestant striving for national unification under Prussian leadership. Freytag replicated this project in his popular *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit* (1859–67). Each individual who was featured in these vignettes (*Bilder*) represented an expression of a single national soul.²⁴ Indeed, Freytag told Duke Ernst II of Coburg in 1868 that it was a joy “to write [Mathy's] life” because it “is in many respects typical of the political and social development of the nation after 1830.”²⁵ The biography was more persuasive because of the author's emotional attachment to his subject, Freytag implied. He also shared this emotional aspect of the writing process with Ernst to narrow the duke's possible reactions to the book, not least because Freytag had mostly ignored Ernst's role in the former network.

Freytag explained to Duke Ernst that his biographical excursion into contemporary history aimed to show that it was not a single man, nor a particular “passage of arms,” that had created the North German Confederation: many individuals had participated in the “spiritual struggle” for the nation.²⁶ Germans needed to be reminded, Freytag believed, of the importance of the work of liberal nationalists—of his political friends—before Bismarck's wars decided the matter.²⁷ Freytag contended that the “spiritual” or cultural battle for Germany—in his mind against conservatives, Catholics, Jews, and Poles—was as glorious as Bismarck's geopolitical triumphs.²⁸ German history became, for Freytag, one long story of the political education of the (Protestant) bourgeoisie.²⁹ He wrote Mathy's biography as part of his larger project to edify young Germans with the non-martial national feats of his generation of middle-class men.³⁰ Through his *Bilder* and his Mathy biography, Freytag tried to reconcile German regional diversity into a single, bourgeois, *kleindeutsch* model.³¹

This singular definition of German-ness fed into Freytag's effort to remind liberal nationalists that the work of unification remained incomplete. The conclusion of Freytag's book was therefore a thinly veiled call for the admission of Baden into the North German Confederation. The author even implied that Bismarck, who had refused to accept the grand duchy's inclusion for fear of provoking Napoleon III and alienating the other southern German states, had pushed Mathy into an early grave.³² Mathy's life's work was left unfinished, and Freytag urged the reader to help complete it.

Treitschke was very pleased with Freytag's biography: “I would have never thought that so much could be made from such sparse material.”³³ He expressed

how “proud” and “joyful” the book made him, although he felt Freytag had treated the southern Germans too gently.³⁴ Treitschke conceded that the biographer’s “diplomatic reserve” was important, “if the book is to work and endear the image of our friend” to Germans in the south as it had to those in the north.³⁵ Treitschke recognized the propaganda value that the “image” of Mathy could have south of the Main in coaxing southerners into accepting the Confederation or joining a reconfigured Germany in the future. Treitschke admitted, however, that most readers in Baden would never forgive the “sins” of Mathy’s “character.”³⁶ Still, Freytag characterized Mathy as an exemplary patriot in almost every way: an advocate of *Kleindeutschland*, a moderate liberal, a supporter of the Zollverein, a constitutional monarchist, and someone tightly integrated into a network whose members endorsed Prussian leadership in the quest for the nation-state.³⁷ In Treitschke’s eyes, Freytag had accomplished the biographer’s task by distilling Mathy’s life into a convincing example of national, world-historical meaning. This distillation was more a conjuring act than rigorous historical biography, however, as Freytag admitted.³⁸

In 1875, Max Duncker published an essay on Karl Mathy in the *Badische Biographien*. The *Biographien* series was part of the modern project of claiming past figures for the national canon. Integrating Mathy into Baden’s history also included him into one of many regional variations on German national identity.³⁹ The *Biographien*, like other encyclopedias, might have been found in the home of any family in Baden with claims to *Bildung*. Unlike Freytag’s biography, however, which followed Mathy’s life over hundreds of pages, Duncker’s biography comprised fewer than twenty-five pages.

The essay appeared shortly after the collapse in 1873 of the financial and emotional “euphoria of the founding years” of the German Empire.⁴⁰ A severe economic depression, combined with a general sense of crisis among ruling circles, intertwined with the Prussian state’s *Kulturkampf* against the Catholic Church and fears of the growing influence of social democracy.⁴¹ Protestant and Jewish liberals tended to view the *Kulturkampf* as a war for national cultural unity against Catholic Germans, and liberals’ attitudes toward socialists represented a more intense form of their rejection of democrats and radicals after 1848.⁴² Although Duncker had served in the Prussian government under Bismarck and helped draft the constitution of the North German Confederation, he emphasized to his readers, as Freytag had in 1869, that it was not just generals and conservative state leaders who were responsible for German unification.⁴³

Max Duncker framed his essay by drawing the reader’s attention to a portrait of Mathy hanging in the halls of the Reichstag. It stood, he wrote, “between the images of Arndt and Stein, of Uhland and W[ilhelm] von Humboldt.” He continued: “out of [a] round frame a profile sets itself apart; its powerful curved forehead, its penetrating eyes and calmly closed lips express decisive will and

tenacious vigor: it is the portrait of Karl Mathy.”⁴⁴ Duncker conspicuously placed the image of Mathy in the pantheon of German intellectuals and civilian reformers. He argued that these men—Mathy included—belonged in the Reichstag because they had prepared the national project with patience, warm hearts, and cool heads.⁴⁵ Housed in a symbol of parliamentarianism, the images of these famous men helped legitimize the nation-state, newly expanded to include the southern states of Germany.

Duncker’s description also conjured up a detailed, mournful, and sympathetic image of Mathy alongside other ghosts of the German national past. Mathy now appeared less ethereal: his physical features became markers of a moral life, reflecting the fascination in the nineteenth century with physiognomy and processing emotional trauma through reimagining “the body and details of physical appearance.”⁴⁶ Duncker elucidated Mathy’s traits: a “curved” forehead (representing a large and powerful brain), prominent eyes (to perceive and investigate the world), and “calmly closed lips” (the organ of self-expression under rational control). Duncker’s emotional relationship to the portrait of his friend—likewise a phenomenon in network letter-writing—worked to enliven readers’ mental image of Mathy. Duncker seems to have found a Romantic, melancholic comfort in pondering, then repurposing, Mathy’s portrait.⁴⁷ Indeed, what Tobias Heinrich has identified as the re-enforcing interaction between biography and portraiture was demonstrated by Max Duncker in his essay.⁴⁸ Both media sought to encapsulate and preserve for posterity the objectified life of an individual. From the drawn body to the written life of a national hero, Duncker worked as a biographer to make this interplay visible and legible to readers. He also sought to teach readers how best to mourn a friend and fellow patriot.⁴⁹

Max Duncker completed his framing device by emphasizing how dearly the loss of Karl Mathy was felt in 1868—by his friends and the nation. Like Moses and the Promised Land, Duncker implied, Mathy’s “tragic fate” was that he did not live to see 1871, though he foiled French designs on Baden by helping to pave the way for the grand duchy’s entry into a unified Germany.⁵⁰ In this sense, for Duncker, the death of Karl Mathy both prepared and presaged the (re)birth of the German Empire.

The third text considered here is Charlotte Duncker’s auto/biographical sketches based on the life of her deceased husband, Max Duncker. Although Duncker had previously written brief biographical letters to Treitschke on specific themes, she wrote the majority of the sketches from the mid-1880s to help Rudolf Haym produce a published biography.⁵¹ Duncker’s initial decision to write biography in letter form reflected societal pressure on women to restrict their writing to epistolary correspondence, an appropriately feminized form of writing.⁵² She also drew on the legacy of “amateur” women historians excluded from the male-dominated realm of institutionalized historiography.⁵³ Duncker’s sketches grew longer and

more autobiographical as she attempted to burst the traditional bounds of letter-writing for women as a private, domestic experience.

Charlotte Duncker's narration generally took the form of blocks of text after formal salutations, meant to signal that her reflections would develop as an extended letter—what Haym called “*Aufzeichnungen*.”⁵⁴ Haym had asked that she proceed chronologically in this form through the “Duncker archives” so he could see a whole year before him in one “go.”⁵⁵ Ritual self-abasement about the inadequacy and partisanship of her depictions often framed Duncker's narrative and emphasized her place as a storyteller, rather than a scholarly biographer or critic. A typical example of such humility read: “Honored friend[,] I am continuing to tell you what I know [and] how experiences were for me.”⁵⁶ Duncker assured Haym that she was not analyzing her late husband's papers. Rather, she retold events as they seemed *to her*. She thereby indicated that, as a woman, she accepted that her direct experiences provided material that required the interpretation and corrections of an educated man—Haym—before they might be suitable for publication.⁵⁷

These editorial interactions between Charlotte Duncker and Rudolf Haym began in the second sketch, which covered Max Duncker's childhood home and extended family. As Duncker's sketches developed into a critical life-and-times biography of her spouse over hundreds of pages, Haym added marginalia and other markup, engaging with her writing in an increasingly serious manner. An early example of this editing centered on Duncker's summary of her husband's studies at the University of Berlin. She wrote that Max Duncker attended lectures by the French historian Jules Michelet and heard Hegel's lectures on “Philosophy and History” and the “Philosophy of Religion.”⁵⁸ Haym crossed out Charlotte Duncker's description of the Michelet lectures, writing “false” in pencil before drawing question marks after her reference to Hegel's lectures.⁵⁹ The veracity of Duncker's description cannot be determined beyond doubt, but the more important point here is Haym's interaction with her writing. Haym strained to correct her, especially concerning Max Duncker's academic history and personal interaction with Hegel, who was the patron saint of many European liberals and most scholars in the network, including Haym.⁶⁰ He sought to protect what he saw as the true story of Max Duncker's formative years—indeed, those of his entire milieu—from the misremembering of Charlotte Duncker.

Haym's marginalia and underlining continued throughout each sketch.⁶¹ At the beginning of sketch IX, covering 1849, Charlotte Duncker included a bibliography.⁶² She worked from that point on to professionalize her auto/biographical writing. She adopted the conventions of academic history, namely, practicing the organized and critical engagement with (mainly) written sources. She also began to divide her sketches into sections that separated personal life from political activity—private from public matters. Particularly in descriptions and analysis of political developments in the 1850s and 1860s, Duncker placed dates and

references to letters and other documents in the margins to support her claims.⁶³ At times, she relegated events in her husband's personal and professional life to bullet points in the sketches for the years after 1852, saving space for her own analysis of Prussian and German politics.⁶⁴

The organization of Charlotte Duncker's work seemed at first to fit the auto/biographic genre of the "relational memoir," in which life stories are mediated through subjects' interactions with friends, family, and other influential figures.⁶⁵ However, her later arrangement of political analysis and narrative tended to focus on distinct historical developments rather than interactions with specific people. Max Duncker was the titular protagonist of Charlotte Duncker's auto/biographical narrative, but in sketches from the late 1850s onward she focused on her own analysis.⁶⁶ The personal relationships between Karl Mathy or Max Duncker and their supporting characters—be they parents, grandparents, friends, or adversaries—were nodes that Charlotte Duncker used to connect individual experience to the movement of national history. Her organizational strategy ran counter to the prevailing method adopted by most of the other network biographers. They tended to position political places and events as the backdrop for their characters' (inter)actions: encounters in exile, on trains or in the street, at legislative assemblies, or at furtive meetings around Duke Ernst in Gotha. Charlotte Duncker did the reverse.

Duncker's unusual treatment of events resulted from the dictates of a public sphere that hushed women's voices. She was obliged to limit her political activity within the network in the 1850s and 1860s, so the sketches became an arena in which she did her utmost to present her ideas about a *past* in which she had participated but from whose *history* she was excluded. As Bonnie Smith has shown, "much historical writing and research was familial," with the wives and children of male historians researching and writing for each new project, turning their home into a sort of "literary workshop."⁶⁷ In the end, however, Charlotte Duncker's male political friend (Haym) marginalized her work, much as other network men had in the 1860s.

In later sketches, and especially those dealing with 1863, Charlotte Duncker included forewords and tables of contents and bound the pages of her writing to look more like a book.⁶⁸ The form and physical representation of the text shifted from a series of long letters to a manuscript—that is, from a form that expressed feeling and intermingled personal and political matters to one that separated opinion from "objective" analysis. Duncker's foray into Hegelian history for the year 1864—in her reflexive statements on her husband's integration of Hegel's philosophy into political realism—garnered an approving marginal note from Haym.⁶⁹ Her development of what Haym would recognize as professional history preempted most of his caustic comments. He ceased sidelining in red pencil and began underlining in blue pencil. This is telling because it was underlining in blue that contemporaries used to mark official reports or other serious sources.

Nevertheless, the manner in which the two discussed Charlotte Duncker's sketches centered on Duncker's place as a female writer to the detriment of her auto/biographical project. Haym adapted an epistolary stratagem of the 1850s and 1860s to signal the inferiority of Duncker's writing. In one instance, Haym sighed appreciatively to Duncker that he could imagine exactly how she wrote, describing her "lovely, diligent hand, which so carefully, faithfully [and] prudently prepares the groundwork for me . . ." and that he would like nothing better than to see her at work.⁷⁰ Network members frequently noted the association of handwriting with the physical body and the emotions that handwriting evoked. Yet, in Haym's gender hierarchy, Duncker's writing expressed her physicality, not her mind. At work, Charlotte Duncker was a compelling vision, but was her work compelling? Haym admitted to admiring the emotions and images that Duncker's sketches called forth, but his reading of her distinct authorial voice also gave rise to gender inequality. Even when he was genuinely appreciative, Haym possessed only one vocabulary to praise Duncker.

In effect, Haym wanted to claim control of the character of Max Duncker and to diminish Charlotte Duncker's wider forays into political history. Haym exploited the fact that "female relatives were the ones most familiar with the historian's work; consequently, they were natural editors of his posthumous publications and his knowledgeable biographers."⁷¹ He acknowledged the "freedom" that writing her husband's biography left both of them as writers, but such freedom was premised on the separate spheres of bourgeois gender relations that also tended to code political problems as feminine and political achievements as masculine.⁷² Rudolf Haym's writing would be published, whereas Charlotte Duncker's writing was never expected to see the light of day.⁷³ Duncker died in 1890, shortly before the publication of Haym's biography of her husband.

In the forward to his book, published in 1891, Rudolf Haym thanked Charlotte Duncker for her assistance and noted her recent passing. He acknowledged her diligent "work up" of her spouse's papers and offered the backhanded compliment that, if she had wanted to write the biography herself, she had had the materials and knowledge to do so. Duncker was, however—still according to Haym—worried about "the bias of her love": a "womanly hand" could "be neither fitting nor successful in bringing poise and character to the depictions of the political world in which her husband's history was so manifoldly entangled."⁷⁴ Haym conformed to the contemporary assumptions of (male) historians, presupposing Charlotte Duncker's innate inability to comprehend complex political issues and the abstract relationship between the individual and society.⁷⁵ As a wife, Duncker could not have been trusted to write objectively or critically of her husband. As a woman, she could not have been trusted to evaluate the past from the cool perspective of the gentleman-citizen—even in the eyes of a gentleman-friend. As was common in joint authorship between a man and a woman, Haym proceeded to write as if he were the sole author.⁷⁶

We can readily conclude that Haym did Charlotte Duncker an injustice. From her sketches, diaries, and correspondence, it is clear that Duncker possessed the intellectual training, political understanding, and social capital to participate fully in German public life and politics. But in the foreword to his book, Haym had to write Charlotte Duncker, and women in general, out of the story of German unification and the network. He excluded a great deal of Charlotte Duncker's politics, as well as her depictions of women in German society and the liberal network. Whereas Charlotte Duncker, for example, had emphasized the role of religion in the political activism of the 1830s and 1840s and highlighted the role of women in the dissenting circles of Halle in the 1840s, these aspects vanished almost entirely from Haym's work.⁷⁷

For her own critiques of Max Duncker's abilities, we have to turn to her sketches. Overall, Charlotte Duncker considered her husband too conciliatory in policy disputes.⁷⁸ He always worked for accommodation between Bismarck and his liberal and courtly enemies, which tended to satisfy no one; ultimately, this tendency cost him his place with Prussian Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm in 1866.

The political friends did not mark as questionable the potential "bias" of male biographers' emotional relationship to their subjects. If anything, they supposed that it allowed them to meld feeling and national-political didacticism in potent biographical characters, to practice affective characterization more effectively.⁷⁹ Haym wrote at the end of his foreword that, at its core, the book was a biography of a friend, by a friend.⁸⁰ His emotional relationship with Duncker was a benefit, the best lens through which the ideal type of Max Duncker as minor though admirable national hero would appear. It is hard to overlook the double standard here. Shortly after Max Duncker's death in 1886, Haym wrote a letter to Charlotte Duncker. He had read hundreds of her husband's letters in preparation for the biography and saw in them "patriotic-political tribulations, as well as his friendship, and his trust in me." He continued: "It was also a melancholic wandering through my own past; my life often seemed to me as if it lay in the shadow of his. Fellow travelers who will then be parted by great distances." These feelings, he told Charlotte Duncker, encouraged him to continue the book.⁸¹ As Sarah Horowitz has suggested, emotional attachment between male biographers and their male subjects validated the former's claims to authority because contemporaries believed that a close friend "knew the man's thoughts better than anyone else did."⁸² Charlotte Duncker's emotions, coded feminine, threatened the political and historical goals of biography. Haym's emotions, coded masculine, enhanced the quality of the biography and its political message.

Writing about his deceased political friend and mentor, Rudolf Haym seems to have experienced a moment of self-reflection similar to those Gustav Freytag and Max Duncker felt when writing about Karl Mathy. Haym assured readers from the outset that the idea for the biography was not his own but the prod-

uct of a promise to “the widow,” whose pleas he could hardly refuse.⁸³ He then claimed that he was neither a historian nor a politician, asking the reader whether he was well-placed to offer a “character sketch” and a “piece of contemporary history” in an engaging narrative.⁸⁴ Here, Haym was guilty of false modesty. He was a well-respected literary historian, philosopher, and the founder of the eminently historical *Preußische Jahrbücher*.⁸⁵ Since the 1860s, he had published works meant, according to Hans Rosenberg, to be both “national-pedagogic and aesthetically pleasing (*bildnerisch*).”⁸⁶ Not to create a critical historical depiction of Max Duncker, with all his flaws and complexity, but to create an ideal type: that was Haym’s goal with the biography. Much like the fictive Mathy of Freytag’s book, or Duncker’s essay, the image of Max Duncker in Haym’s biography was meant to set an example for a forgetful generation of young Germans.

Unlike Gustav Freytag or Max Duncker, however, whose biographies appeared when the national project lent full coherence to individual lives, Charlotte Duncker and Haym incorporated a turn-of-the-century sense for the fragile, splintered nature of human experience and its representation.⁸⁷ The two struggled, nevertheless, to understand and evaluate the individual—no matter how insignificant—through the lens of the nation, however cracked it might have become. The approach represented a smaller version of Freytag’s oversized Mathy or a flawed version of Max Duncker’s obsessive portrait of Mathy. Haym concluded his book by emphasizing that the new generation of Germans had to understand how much life had changed before and after the 1860s. In that, Max Duncker was a prime example.⁸⁸ Haym’s mixture of mourning for his subject, nostalgia, and concern for the future fueled his desire to defend and advertise network members’ political ideals and personal virtues through biographical characters.

The Content of Network Biography: Political Friends, Political Enemies

In their biographies, Gustav Freytag, Max Duncker, Charlotte Duncker, and Rudolf Haym deployed affective characterization to create settings, thoughts, and feelings for their subjects. They turned their subjects into semi-fictional biographical characters with whom the authors and their readers could engage. In the process, the four biographers also advanced their idiosyncratic assessments of political friendship and historical events. One important element of their strategy is clear: to salvage the legacy of network members’ activities between the 1830s and 1866.

The association of natural settings with the nation had been commonplace in nationalist thought since at least the era of Romanticism.⁸⁹ The four biographers described geographic settings that permitted their biographical characters

to reflect on their feelings and the political fate of the nation. In doing so, the authors conflated foreign natural landscapes with “German” emotions, social characteristics, and political loyalties. Freytag and Max Duncker adopted a sort of neo-Romanticism that crystallized as their subjects pondered the Swiss landscape, the “ambiguities of German identity,” and political culture *before* the advent of the “age of the nation-state.”⁹⁰ This section explores some of these episodes in detail because they are illustrative of how network biographers tried not only to explain the political education of their subjects but also explain away their political subversion in light of their accommodation with state power in the late 1850s and 1860s.⁹¹

In the first episode to be considered in this way, which took place in the mid-1830s, Gustav Freytag combined meditations on natural beauty, domestic *Bildung*, and Karl Mathy’s politics. Mathy’s political and professional discontent, Freytag claimed, began with the harassment of liberals and radicals during the Restoration by the government of Grand Duke Leopold of Baden. Unwarranted official harassment, Freytag wrote, had already turned Mathy into “a troublesome opponent of the government . . . [Mathy] himself had always felt that it was a misfortune: that his honorable liberalism was forced into conflict with the creative powers of the state.”⁹² This passage exemplifies how the biographer worked to assure readers that Mathy had remained loyal to the state, a stance that liberals saw as the safest means to reform. Mathy was no revolutionary, Freytag contended. Although Mathy was under investigation for his publications advocating expanded legislative and civil rights, Freytag portrayed state repression much like bad weather: it would pass with the inevitable progress of liberalism and nationalism.

Mathy weathered the political storm in Baden, Freytag continued, by retreating to the domestic sphere, where the light of *Bildung* still shone: “Thus, the winter came and went, a light in the house, and outside, a cloudy sky, [and] still the political investigations hung over [Mathy]. As the spring of 1835 neared, Mathy lost his patience.”⁹³ Karl von Rotteck had tipped him off about an imminent police search of his home. For Freytag, the climatic environment—state repression—was unable to penetrate Mathy’s house—a domestic haven of liberalism. But now the state threatened to violate the sanctity of the bourgeois domestic sphere. Mathy had endeavored to remain in his *Heimat*, but the government failed to understand that he wished to reform the post-Napoleonic monarchical state, not overthrow it. Mathy resolved to flee to Switzerland. Freytag, thus, skewed his characterization of Mathy—who had sharply criticized the Baden government in numerous publications and participated in an unnamed smuggling ring—to evoke the sympathy of law-abiding readers.

Mirroring the experiences of other liberal nationalists in Europe, exile served to clarify Mathy’s politics and his image of the nation.⁹⁴ Freytag depicted Mathy in exile as a liberal martyr who remained faithful to the German nation and the idea of constitutional monarchy, despite his persecution. In both biographies of

Mathy, but particularly in Freytag's, Mathy's experiences in Switzerland served to moderate his political views and harden his aversion to democracy. After a compelling emotional reaction to the Swiss Alps, Mathy settled down to a respectable Biedermeier lifestyle of patriotic charity and quiet study. Freytag recounted how Mathy studied Hegel to "sharpen his mind" and how he earned money translating Lucien Bonaparte's memoirs into German and writing a commentary on the work of liberal economist David Ricardo.⁹⁵ Mathy also found an emotional refuge from contemporary political troubles in an idealized medieval past.⁹⁶ Deploying seasonal imagery of light and dark again, Freytag effused: "While the countryside lay covered in snow, and the storms of spring raged outside the window, while the country's wrath against refugees remained high, there, in the refugees' home, the verses of Walther von der Vogelweide, the Nibelungen, and Gottfried von Straßburg rang softly."⁹⁷ Freytag's lyrical language, reminiscent of his plea to Duke Ernst in 1854 for asylum, suggested that nationalism and scholarship went hand in hand—even in exile.

Yet, for both Freytag and Max Duncker, education and high ideals were not enough. The domestic cultivation of *Bildung* had to be expressed in Christian charity and liberal activism in the public realm. Freytag wrote that Mathy shared the last bits of food, money, and space in his home with exiled German liberals, while Max Duncker emphasized the personal risks that Mathy took to help his fellow countrymen.⁹⁸ The natural environment of the forbidding Swiss mountains, which both shielded and threatened German refugees, contrasted with the warm hearth that Anna Mathy cultivated.⁹⁹ Here, bourgeois domesticity functioned to restore (male) political refugees. It was in exile where both Freytag and Duncker painted Mathy as industrious, charitable, and compassionate. The two biographers reminded their readers that these virtues had paved the way for Mathy to return to fight for a liberal nation-state.

These sorts of descriptions were legion in Gustav Freytag's biography. They served partly as narrative fluff, but they also provided moments for the author to defend his subject's sometimes questionable politics and expound on his devotion to the monarchical state. Both Freytag and Duncker were struggling with the fact that Mathy had fled Baden to dodge an arrest warrant—a detail that Duncker tactfully omitted. A warrant had been issued against Mathy for smuggling contraband literature into Baden from Switzerland. Mathy had participated in the bustling trade in illegal political publications between the border states of the German Confederation and Switzerland.¹⁰⁰ After the Revolutions of 1830, Confederal authorities, and Austrian and Prussian authorities, in particular, were eager to pressure individual German states into suppressing smuggling networks and tightening domestic censorship.¹⁰¹ The high point of these official efforts came in 1835, the very year Mathy fled Baden.

Freytag's and Duncker's efforts to portray Mathy as a virtuous German citizen in exile reflected a wider network insistence, starting in the mid-1850s, that their

lawbreaking during the *Vormärz* had been well-intentioned and misunderstood. Network members sought, in this version of their history, simply to bolster monarchical Germany through liberal reforms and national unification. Freytag and Duncker endorsed monarchical rule and the rule of law through their biographical characters in order to distance themselves from the democrats and socialists whom they blamed for the failure of the Revolutions of 1848/49.¹⁰² After all, Freytag, Mathy, and Duncker later accepted official positions in the same states that had once hounded them. That fact alone merited the inclusion of scenes in these biographies explaining why some members of the network had broken the law and fled abroad before returning to seek court and government appointments. It was the network's own backstory of liberal accommodation with state power in the 1850s and 1860s.

For the two Mathy biographers, in sum, their subject needed to model Protestant virtues, moderate liberalism, and national *Bildung* in exile. To highlight further Mathy's loyalty to the monarchical state, both Freytag and Duncker focused on his disdain for German democrats and socialists sharing his Swiss exile—even though Mathy exhibited no such disdain before 1847.¹⁰³ In their narratives, Mathy shunned radical circles and viewed their leaders ironically. Yet, the biographers approved of Mathy's friendships with Italian radicals such as Giuseppe Mazzini and Giovanni Ruffini.¹⁰⁴ The Italians offered Mathy the camaraderie denied him by German radicals and kept him from joining what Freytag and Duncker deemed the empty plans of exiled radicals for democratic revolution in the German Confederation.¹⁰⁵ Ultimately, the two biographers used the spotlight that they shone on liberal politics and German patriotism to relegate democrats to the shadows, or even to suggest that they did not belong on the stage at all.

Freytag and Duncker hammered home the point by discussing their subject's attitude to monarchy. In Switzerland in the 1830s, Mathy learned to appreciate the stabilizing social power of monarchy and, both biographers argued, Germans' supposedly inborn monarchism. Network biographers again portrayed monarchism as an essential component of proper German nationalism and liberalism. As Freytag claimed: "in the foreign country, [Mathy's] feelings for his homeland became more intimate and conscious; in a republic his judgement about the one-sidedness of his home state became fuller."¹⁰⁶ Freytag and Duncker emphasized that Mathy worked to support the moderate liberal effort to save the monarchical governments of Germany from their own misguided policies of repression. This insistence reflected network arguments in the 1850s and 1860s about whether German leaders needed only the counsel of more bourgeois, liberal men to achieve national unification and enact political reforms—about the feasibility of *Bildungsmonarchie*. Between 1840 and 1858, this conciliatory attitude was often opportunist—and at times openly antagonistic—toward state ministers such as Friedrich Eichhorn, Karl von Raumer, and Otto von Manteuffel. Only

by 1858 had most members of the liberal network agreed that cultivating influence over state leaders was the surest path to peaceful unification.

The main point the two biographers attempted to make was that their subject's character remained pure, even though he went into political exile. Mathy remained a blameless model for future generations of free-thinking, virtuous Germans. Network biography, in effect, absolved Karl Mathy of any wrongdoing. Remarkably, although the biographies were published during the North German Confederation and the German Empire, the texts shared the goal of excusing Mathy's crimes in the *Vormärz*—and by proxy the crimes of his political friends.

Karl Mathy's early political friendships received similar treatment from his network biographers. Gustav Freytag and Max Duncker both sought to demonstrate the importance of political friendship for individuals and the nation. Mathy's first major political friendship, his relationship with Berthold Auerbach, was forged while in exile in the late 1830s. Freytag wrote that Mathy was the one who found a publisher for the debut collection of Auerbach's popular *Black Forest Village Stories*.¹⁰⁷ The author of this "favorite book of the Germans," Freytag effused, was a true "literary talent" who rescued German drawing-rooms from French literature.¹⁰⁸ Mathy's friendship with Auerbach and subsequent support of him was a service to the nation because it checked the allegedly corrupting influence of French culture in Germany.¹⁰⁹ Much as he had done in the decades before national unification, Freytag ignored his friend Auerbach's Jewishness.

In Freytag's biography of Mathy, the two men formed a close relationship around a shared conception of the nation, the importance of political liberalism, and the need to defend German culture against France.¹¹⁰ This insistence elided Mathy's affinity for French-style liberalism, which favored centralized government and was common among southern German liberals before 1848.¹¹¹ Freytag's biography thus imputed a certain Francophobia to Mathy that was not characteristic of him, either in the *Vormärz*, or in the 1850s and 1860s. Fear and hatred of Napoleon III, and, by extension, France, was closer to Freytag's own position in the late 1860s.¹¹² Explicit efforts to portray France as the "hereditary enemy" began in earnest only after Napoleon's defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71.¹¹³

The point for Freytag remained the German-ness of Mathy and Auerbach's friendship. Auerbach felt "*heimisch*" in the Mathy home, Freytag claimed. Anna Mathy, in one of the rare instances in which she appeared by name in the biography, had created a *gemütlich* domestic atmosphere for the cultivation of important relationships between men.¹¹⁴ Such an atmosphere was considered essential for protecting and healing the "nerves" of Biedermeier Germans.¹¹⁵ The Mathys' acquaintance with Auerbach also "opened before [them] a graceful path into the magic land of poetry."¹¹⁶ This "magic land" comforted the Mathys as they

weathered exile. Switzerland thus provided the backdrop for formative moments in the biographical narratives—a place where political friendship, emotions, and *Bildung* met monarchism and liberal nationalism.

Gustav Freytag illustrated how beneficial—almost whimsical—political friendships could be for individuals, families, and the nation. The fact that Karl Mathy was Christian and Berthold Auerbach was Jewish went without saying to the antisemitic Freytag, at least for the purposes of this particular text: both were German bourgeois liberals following the “reformed” faiths in Protestantism and the Jewish Reform movement, respectively. This argument fit with Enlightenment and Romantic notions of passionate, transcendent friendship common in the network before 1866. Intense emotional relationships helped enlightened individuals cooperate—overcoming private religious identities—to increase the cultural, social, and political power of the nation.¹¹⁷ From their friendship, Auerbach gained a publisher for his nationalist literature, whereas Mathy gained a window into the world of poetry, a path to further *Bildung*, and a welcome (nationalist) comfort among hostile surroundings. Each of these results would eventually aid Mathy on his quest for the nation, which the reader already anticipated as the ultimate beneficiary of the interfaith Auerbach–Mathy friendship.

The final example is drawn from Gustav Freytag’s and Max Duncker’s biographies of Karl Mathy. Each biographer focused on one pivotal moment in Mathy’s life to rewrite history and boost their protagonist’s appeal. They did so by creating a model of patriotic resolve tested by profound personal loss. The event in question was the death of Mathy’s last surviving child, Karl Mathy Jr., in 1856. The effects of his death on the Mathys and Dunccker and on the flow of resources within the network were extensive. Freytag’s and Duncker’s later representations of the event are central to this section.

Karl Jr. had been chronically ill for years—likely with tuberculosis—and costly cures in France and Italy had failed. After attempting to attend university, Karl Jr.’s health deteriorated rapidly in the first months of 1856, as we read in Freytag’s account: “Every free moment, [Karl Mathy] sat next to the broken figure [of his son]. . . . So passed the winter. The doctor became quieter. . . . In the final nights, he watched over the bed with his wife; on the final day, he held his son in his arms to ease his death throes.”¹¹⁸ The details of Karl Jr.’s last days were sparing, even in Karl Mathy’s diaries and Anna Mathy’s correspondence with her closest friend, Charlotte Duncker. There is no surviving document to suggest that Anna Mathy had shared a similar memory with Freytag. Mathy recorded that he sat beside his son’s bed, noting Karl Jr.’s last words, but not much more.¹¹⁹ Freytag invented a compelling scene to solicit an emotional reaction from the reader for the subject of his biography and the ideas that he represented.

The deaths of Mathy’s close friends and liberal political allies, Alexander von Soiron and Friedrich Bassermann, occurred within weeks of Karl Jr.’s death.¹²⁰

Despite these losses, Freytag reported that Mathy quickly devoted himself to new works and his “faith in the great future of the Fatherland.”¹²¹ Mathy overcame his personal sorrow in order to devote himself to the nation; personal suffering and national salvation were again linked in his biography.¹²² However, according to the Dunccker—and as the surviving documents suggest—it took years for Mathy to find fresh motivation in life, let alone for the Fatherland.¹²³

Freytag added that Mathy chose to embrace German nationalism over the “money-grubbing people of the stock market,” whom Mathy reportedly found repellent.¹²⁴ Freytag attempted to characterize Karl Mathy as sharing the author’s own thinly veiled antisemitism and his rejection of commercial finance.¹²⁵ This stratagem was found elsewhere in Freytag’s oeuvre, where he tried to provide what Celia Applegate has called “cultural legitimation” for antisemitism among the Christian reading public.¹²⁶ There was no indication that Mathy shared Freytag’s antisemitism or his aversion to new financial institutions. Indeed, Mathy embraced joint-stock companies, and much of his work after Karl Jr.’s death focused on establishing credit banks in Gotha and Mannheim.¹²⁷ While mourning his friend’s passing and the loss of Mathy’s only child, Freytag worked his own prejudices into the supposedly model character of Karl Mathy.

Max Duncker’s description of the death of Karl Mathy Jr. matched Freytag’s mixture of mourning, fictionalization, and didacticism. Duncker examined Mathy’s Sisyphean efforts to cure his son by sending him to Hyères and Palermo.¹²⁸ Duncker’s commentary followed Karl Jr.’s deterioration until, “in March 1856,” Duncker wrote, “Mathy and his wife bore their last child to the grave. It was the hardest of the trials that Mathy overcame.”¹²⁹ Karl Jr.’s death haunted Mathy, Duncker wrote, especially after he amassed the wealth that could have afforded the care that Karl Jr. had required.¹³⁰ By making such narrative choices, Max Duncker, in effect, mourned Karl Jr. and his father together through a text that also invited readers to sympathize with Karl Mathy and emulate his devotion to the nation despite crushing personal loss. In this sense, liberal politics took precedence over personal grief in Duncker’s portrayal of Mathy.

After the death of Karl Jr., both biographers wrote, the Mathy family moved to Gotha at the invitation of Duke Ernst II of Coburg. The duke received Mathy convivially as a “fellow countryman,” Freytag noted.¹³¹ In 1868, when Freytag wrote this passage, Duke Ernst was angry about Freytag’s defection to the court of the Prussian crown prince. The duke therefore received sparing treatment in Freytag’s biography. Not so the town of Gotha, for it offered the Mathys long-denied “calm” and Karl Mathy much needed “rest,” despite its dense telegraph and rail connections to the rest of Germany.¹³² What Freytag called Mathy’s “calm” was really a cover for his work to establish the Privatbank zu Gotha.¹³³ This story would not have fit Freytag’s Prussophile national history, however, because Freytag personally rejected such financial institutions and the Prussian government of the 1850s was suspicious of credit banks.¹³⁴

Freytag raced into a description of the social world of the small Thuringian town and the quiet *Gemütlichkeit* of the Mathys' new circle: "In this way, Mathy and his wife lived in Gotha in friendly contact with the Becker, Braun, Schwarz, Samwer, von Holtzendorff, [and] Freytag families. In the summer [there were] social outings to the forest or a visit to Siebleben; in the winter, the theater and home concerts with their new friends."¹³⁵ The modest charm of Gotha in Freytag's description also reflected network attitudes toward smaller *Residenzstädte*. They offered safe harbor from Confederate repression, but they lacked the vivacity and access to powerful circles of larger capitals. Freytag's focus on daily life in Gotha allowed him to cover this period of Mathy's life—and his own—without stating that Gotha, much like Switzerland, was a place of exile. Mathy might have been tolerated in Berlin or Vienna, but Freytag had fled to Gotha in 1854 to escape a Prussian arrest warrant. Siebleben was his summer home. Thus, the respectable attractions of Freytag's Gotha and the quietude of its denizens obscured the fact that it hosted exiled network members as a base for organizing illegal political activities and publications.¹³⁶

Max Duncker treated Gotha similarly in his essay.¹³⁷ He wrote about how the Mathys loved Gotha's greenery after years in large industrial cities and lauded their tight-knit circle of friends. Mathy's time in Gotha became, in Duncker's text, "an idyll after years filled with struggle," though the couple failed to escape the loss of their son.¹³⁸ Duncker described the great value that Mathy placed on the Freytags' proximity and the "affectionate terms" on which their two families interacted. In a rare moment of intertextuality, Duncker even noted Freytag's description of Gotha that was just cited.¹³⁹ The four biographers, with the partial exception of Charlotte Duncker and Rudolf Haym, hardly mentioned other biographies on their subjects. This lacuna was a way for the writers to monopolize control over portrayals of their subjects' past.¹⁴⁰

The role of friendship in Mathy's emotional convalescence and the reinvigoration of his political activity were inseparable for the biographers. Although the political overtones of Duncker's description remained more muted than in Freytag's book, Duncker nonetheless illustrated the connection for his readers between political activity and the value of friendship. He revised network history by erasing from the idyll Ernst of Coburg, whom Duncker came to distrust and then despise in the 1860s.¹⁴¹ Duncker thus removed a core, princely network member from a key stage of Mathy's life, from the cultivation of political friendship, and from his national story. Like the novelist Gustav Freytag, the historian Max Duncker exploited the overlap and interaction among literature, history, and politics in his biography to present a politically affecting image of Karl Mathy.¹⁴²

Charlotte Duncker and Rudolf Haym adopted similar methods and had similar goals in their affective characterizations of Max Duncker. Using examples drawn

from his service to the Prussian state between 1859 and 1866, these two network biographers also created a purposefully revised history of the period. They sought to settle old scores with rival network members and sing Bismarck's praises as *the* German national hero.

Haym underlined in thick, red pencil one section of Charlotte Duncker's sketches: "*Am 22 [sic] Sept wurde Bismarck Ministerpräsident.*"¹⁴³ The entrance of Bismarck into Duncker's auto/biography followed her portrayal of her husband's dogged independence in the New Era government.¹⁴⁴ Max Duncker's association with the tottering Prussian cabinet under Karl Anton von Hohenzollern and Rudolf von Auerswald, Bismarck's predecessors, as well as his later embrace of Bismarck while serving as political counselor to Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm (in 1888, German Emperor Friedrich III), alienated him from network members based around Ernst of Coburg, particularly Karl Samwer.¹⁴⁵

Caught in a perilous position, Charlotte Duncker noted, her husband received a letter from a worried Karl Mathy. The letter in question has not survived. In fact, it may never have existed as its alleged arrival would have occurred during a long period of epistolary silence between the two couples.¹⁴⁶ Mathy reportedly wrote that: "I could reassure [Max Duncker], I could write to him . . . that dwelling in Egypt had accustomed him to Egyptian darkness."¹⁴⁷ Charlotte Duncker's Mathy apparently associated the Bismarck cabinet with the Egyptian captivity of the Israelites and prompted Max Duncker to make his exodus back to the ivory tower. Charlotte Duncker feared that Mathy might succeed and coax her husband back to "more secure" scholarly work. Yet, for Duncker, her spouse held a "dual purpose" as a royal advisor and a historian. In this perhaps invented correspondence with Mathy, Duncker defended her husband's calling as an academic courtier: he was obliged as an educated man to participate in government affairs and to counsel monarchs.

Discussing this trying time for her husband, Charlotte Duncker shifted her narrative to incorporate domestic and family issues, which rarely entered the other biographies. In 1862, she was expected to care for her ailing father during the week in Halle, which, she conceded, was "a difficult test for him [Max]."¹⁴⁸ Without her, Max Duncker had no one to oversee the household. Charlotte Duncker's absence also deprived her husband of an amanuensis, as well as the domestic congeniality associated with a proper bourgeois home at a time of professional turmoil.¹⁴⁹ Duncker implied that she prioritized her husband's needs over her own, even as she grew worried about her own health. She felt a "conflict of duties" as a daughter and wife, between caring for an ill father and supporting a husband in crisis.¹⁵⁰

At this point in the sketch, dealing with late 1862, Charlotte Duncker switched to the third person. She lamented that "on top of work, on top of the ever changing, gray-on-gray situation in Halle, Max suffered unending political woes."¹⁵¹ Duncker pivoted to the "great friendly service" Anna and Karl Mathy offered

“Max and Lotte” by visiting them in Halle every Sunday.¹⁵² She highlighted the restorative power of friendly gatherings and emotional support—network services—to members during difficult periods. Emotional support and political efficacy as part of the network were intertwined in Charlotte Duncker’s sketches, and women played an important role in their administration. The episode, which began with the resistance that Max Duncker faced in cooperating with Bismarck to break the gridlock between Landtag and cabinet, demonstrates how Charlotte Duncker used the letter-sketch form to shuttle between Bismarckian high politics, her spouse’s awkward professional position, and her own conflicts, while tying each back to the role of the Mathys and political friendship in general during unstable periods.

Charlotte Duncker, like the other biographers, worked to characterize her subject’s past to instrumentalize history. Her criticisms of her husband were often coupled with apologies for his work or attacks on his adversaries. Her depiction of the value of emotional support in uncertain political climates, like those of the other biographers, also served a political purpose. She drew lines, not only between those who supported or opposed Max Duncker’s social behavior and political activities, but also between those who supported Bismarck before 1866 and those who had tried to undermine him. Charlotte Duncker clearly had an axe to grind: one side of it was political, the other personal. With unmistakable and historically significant intentionality, she adapted auto/biography to preserve and present her version of the 1860s, to make *her* idea of political friendship the model for future generations, and to advance *her* narrative of German history.

In the next sketch, Charlotte Duncker lamented: “For no other year of our life does the task of reporting seem so difficult as for the year 1863.”¹⁵³ She now presented her work as political reportage beyond personal opinion. Duncker spent most of the sketch blaming Duke Ernst of Coburg, Gustav Freytag, Ernst von Stockmar, and Karl Samwer for the fallout from the Danzig Affair.¹⁵⁴ The publication of critical letters between Prussian Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm and King Wilhelm I destabilized Max Duncker’s position as political advisor to the crown prince and threatened to ignite a succession crisis if the king decided to disinherit his son.

Charlotte Duncker defended her spouse, who, in the summer of 1863, was suspected of leaking the damaging letters and had earned the king’s ire for not preventing the crown prince’s speech in Danzig.¹⁵⁵ Max Duncker, she explained, “took Bismarck’s demand for silence so strictly that even I, who after all lived through everything with him, was not in the know.”¹⁵⁶ Charlotte Duncker portrayed her husband’s faith in Bismarck as absolute loyalty to the German nation and the Prussian state. Her characterization exonerated Duncker of malfeasance in the Danzig Affair vis-à-vis the king or government. Her subject was above all loyal to Bismarck, and thereby to the nation. He was so devoted that he risked his marriage and suffered his political friends’ censure. Max Duncker became,

in Charlotte Duncker's biography, Bismarck's long-suffering and misunderstood servant: a forerunner to the moderate liberals who in 1866/67 made their peace with the "white revolutionary."¹⁵⁷ In Charlotte Duncker's history, Max Duncker was willing to sacrifice domestic harmony and old friendships for Bismarck's plans. Her spouse became an exemplar of modern patriotism and the primacy of politics.

After excusing her husband's mistakes as advisor to the crown prince, Charlotte Duncker moved to discredit his chief rival after 1862, Karl Samwer. Samwer appeared almost villainous in Duncker's sketches as she questioned his faith in the Prussian state and Bismarck's leadership, particularly during the Second Schleswig War.¹⁵⁸ According to her sketch, the coterie around Samwer not only attacked her spouse politically, but they also betrayed him personally. Because Max Duncker's efforts were pro-Bismarckian and thus true to the German nation, the machinations of his anti-Bismarckian opponents became anti-German. By focusing first on Max Duncker's loyalty to Bismarck, then on the person who punished said loyalty, Charlotte Duncker sought to fill in her history of the network while highlighting the potential dangers of political friendship.

During the rolling crises of 1863, she remembered, "friendly intercourse grew very excited" with J.G. Droysen and August von Saucken, both sympathetic to the Dunccker's pro-Bismarck stance. "In contrast," Duncker wrote, "another group of friends, among whom can be counted with special pain Freytag a[nd] and even Samwer a[nd] Stockmar Jr., had not only abandoned their once so highly and warmly held old friend, but [they] had also, through irresponsible dealings with the crown prince, undermined [Duncker's] work, ruining the results of his faithful efforts."¹⁵⁹ Saucken and the Droysens represented the positive aspects of political friendship, whereas Samwer and company represented the damage done when such bonds were broken.¹⁶⁰

In the network of the 1860s, policy differences, such as over the army bill or Schleswig-Holstein, could lead to accusations of political betrayal, personal betrayal, and betrayal of the nation—not necessarily in that order. In her sketches, Charlotte Duncker alluded to an underlying anxiety in network relationships: political friends could prove unpredictable or unreliable. Violations of social solidarity presaged violations of political commitments; personal antipathy became a national threat. Network members might refuse the emotional, political, or professional support on which counterparts had come to rely. This effort to control others and comfort oneself re-emerged in the biographies as affective characterization. Duncker placed the responsibility for imploding the network squarely at the feet of Samwer, Freytag, and Duke Ernst: all enemies of Max Duncker, Bismarck, and, therefore, Germany.

It is also important to note that when Gustav Freytag completed his biography of Karl Mathy in 1869, Bismarck's achievements in national affairs were

undeniable; but Freytag endeavored to include bourgeois figures who acted independently of Bismarck in his own narrative. In Charlotte Duncker's biography, the political friends who had had enough political acumen to back Bismarck before 1866 played second fiddle, so to speak, to the Prussian minister president. They were not necessarily key figures in their own right in the "spiritual struggle" for the nation-state, as Freytag believed. The point here is that the figure of Bismarck overshadowed the political history that Charlotte Duncker offered, whereas the Prussian leader appeared in a more shadowy role in Freytag's and Max Duncker's earlier pieces.¹⁶¹ The "Bismarck myth" had not taken hold among members of the former network when Freytag and Max Duncker wrote in the late 1860s and early 1870s.¹⁶² Charlotte Duncker—and then Rudolf Haym—participated in an early stage of the myth-making around Bismarck, long before his resignation in March 1890 and his subsequent idolization.¹⁶³

Rudolf Haym conveyed little of Charlotte Duncker's intensity when he, too, condemned former political friends in his biography of Max Duncker. He did, however, reiterate her depiction of Max Duncker's loyalty to Bismarck, coupled with fears in the 1860s that cracks in network solidarity might shatter the national project. Haym frequently referred to the power of politics in building friendships, professional achievement, and the circulation of favors. From the formation of dissenting circles in Halle in the 1840s, to Duncker's advancement in Prussian state service, to the dissemination of political information and intrigue, political views and emotional relationships reinforced each other in Haym's account.¹⁶⁴

Haym found a prime example of such reinforcement in the instability of the New Era cabinet and Max Duncker's increasing support for the Crown during the Prussian constitutional crisis. Duncker sided with King Wilhelm I and his demand that the Landtag pass a sweeping new army bill. Most network members considered the proposal illiberal and dangerous, as Haym noted: "With regret, Duncker's friends saw him entangled in the half-measures and faint-heartedness of these policies."¹⁶⁵ In Haym's narrative, Duncker was a victim of circumstance rather than a maker of circumstances themselves. Yet Max Duncker's proclivity for prevarication appeared throughout Charlotte Duncker's sketches, as well. In this way, Haym repurposed Charlotte Duncker's critique and couched it in the language of friendly concern to present Max Duncker as a positive example of "free-thinking."¹⁶⁶ Knowing that Bismarck would lead German national unification, Haym characterized Max Duncker as an open-minded patriot, who rejected the prevailing wrongheadedness of his network rivals.

In the mid-1860s, however, Karl Samwer and most of Max Duncker's other political friends had seen such "free-thinking" as "apostasy."¹⁶⁷ For them, Duncker was not too free-thinking at all; on the contrary, he was too amenable to the government's military demands and its plans to annex Schleswig-Holstein

after the Second Schleswig War (1864). In 1863, Samwer had believed Duncker's behavior threatened their political friendship, the wider network, and the nation. Writing years later, Haym therefore had to stress that Max Duncker could discern greatness in Bismarck early on. Duncker had learned from Bismarck that backing the king against the legislature and endorsing the annexation of the Elbe duchies would lead to liberal, constitutional political life in a united Germany: "this conviction made it possible for him—he, the liberal—to see Herr v. Bismarck's entrance with different eyes than those who saw in him only the reactionary and the Junker."¹⁶⁸ Haym's religious, supersessionist allusion here cannot be overlooked (nor would it have been by his contemporary readers): for Duncker was blind, but now he could see.¹⁶⁹ His network rivals, Haym implied, remained blind to the truth, plotting to foil Bismarck. They suffered a biblical punishment for their national sin. In short, there was no place left in Haym's biography, in his history of German unification, for those who had challenged Bismarck in the 1860s. In 1891, readers knew how things had turned out: the German Empire itself had vindicated Max Duncker and damned his one-time rivals. This outcome, of course, was so much the better for Haym because he had also supported Bismarck. In Haym's account, national unity and state power outpaced friendship and liberty.¹⁷⁰

Conclusion

In the years after the dissolution of the network of political friends in 1866, Gustav Freytag, Max Duncker, Charlotte Duncker, and Rudolf Haym wrote biographies of recently deceased members. Their auto/biographical texts shared overlapping goals, which they achieved through affective characterization. The four biographers created and presented their particular understandings of the past as history through their semi-fictionalized subjects. The process was imaginative and didactic, turning subjects into characters. Characters were portrayed sympathetically and emotionally as the writers engaged in affective relationships with their subjects through their phantasmic characters. The biographers hoped that their readers would perceive their fictive subjects as individual embodiments of a single, authoritative national history. Such readers would sympathize with these semi-fictional historical subjects and emulate their liberal political virtues in the present.

Although Freytag, the Dunccker, and Haym worked at different times and through different forms, they shared these goals. Freytag's biography of Karl Mathy was more bourgeois epic than critical biography. His depictions were fictionalized when needed, he admitted, because of a lack of available biographical material. Yet, the image of Mathy that he provided was cool, virtuous, and devoted to a national cause that he never saw completed. Freytag's depiction dif-

ferred little from the Mathy of Max Duncker's more professional essay. Duncker's shorter text for a Baden reference series portrayed a similar Mathy to young readers for emulation and as an admonition about the political work left undone. Both biographers offered an alternative to Bismarckian unification by presenting Mathy as a model of bourgeois, liberal-nationalist dedication.

In the 1880s, Charlotte Duncker and Rudolf Haym took the late Max Duncker as their subject. Charlotte Duncker's text began as a sort of lengthy epistle to Haym. The letters soon became professionalized auto/biographical sketches from Charlotte Duncker's life and times, told through her characterization of her husband. She worked to salvage his reputation and advanced her own judgments about politics and political friendship. But Duncker's sketches remained unpublished, and in public she played the deferential widow until her death. Nevertheless, Haym replicated—in effect, plagiarized—many of her characterizations of Max Duncker in his published biography. Haym celebrated himself through Duncker's support for Bismarck in the 1860s, depicting Duncker as a farsighted, faithful servant of the German nation and its first chancellor. In the two biographies of Max Duncker, his rivals were either misguided or malevolent: either way, they were destined to fade from Germany's national story.

Overall, these four biographers characterized their deceased friends for both personal and political purposes. They refashioned personal pasts into national history. Their auto/biographical airbrushing of the past and their insistence on the importance of their departed friends—and thereby of themselves—in the pursuit of the nation-state suggests that German liberals understood at some level their failure to steer high politics before 1866. Life-writing offered these moderate liberals and members of the former network a chance both for political rehabilitation and emotional catharsis. Indeed, they seemed ill-disposed to make a clear distinction between the private and political—as they had been in the 1850s and 1860s, too. The elite political friends moved across fluid conceptual boundaries, muddying them at will. What at first might seem like flights of fancy, emotional outbursts, or petty (inter)personal disputes could be—and often were—part and parcel of the political culture of nineteenth-century Germany.

Notes

1. Auerbach, *Tagebuch aus Wien*, iii–iv.
2. “Auto/biography” emphasizes that biographical writing incorporates, at various levels, the biographer's own life and views. For a brief review of terminology from the field of “life-writing,” see Saunders, *Self Impression*, 3–7.
3. Heinrich von Treitschke also wrote a biographical article about Max Duncker in the 1880s.

- Berthold Auerbach hoped that his correspondence with his cousin, Jakob Auerbach, would be read as a kind of autobiography. See *Briefe an seinen Freund*, ed. J. Auerbach, xiii.
4. Freeden and Fernández-Sebastián, introduction to *In Search of European Liberalisms*, 4.
 5. See Smith, *Gender of History*, 18, 20–23, 240. Considered alongside the general interest in nineteenth-century Europe in the “supernatural,” network members’ desire to interact with the dead may not seem so far-fetched. Theories and movements such as mesmerism, animal magnetism, and spiritualism tried to account for the abnormal in human experience. Ghosts and apparitions thus retained social, cultural, and political power well into the twentieth century—and not just for country folk. For example, see Blackbourn, *Marpingen*; Harris, *Lourdes*; N. Freytag, *Aberglauben im 19. Jahrhundert*; Figal, *Civilization and Monsters*.
 6. Tobias Heinrich has demonstrated how empathy was central to auto/biographical writing. See Heinrich, *Leben Lesen*, 16.
 7. The term comes from Sheehan, *German Liberalism*, 101. See also Smith, *Gender of History*, 131; Hagemann, *Revisiting Prussia’s Wars*, 278; Lees, *Revolution and Reflection*, 40–50. One possible reason for the biographers’ didactic purpose may have been the steady erosion of liberal electoral power after 1881. See Eley, “Bismarckian Germany,” 17–18.
 8. See, for example, Bhabha, ed., *Nation and Narration*; Berger et al., eds., *Narrating the Nation*; Baczko, *Les imaginaires sociaux*; Kaiser, *Social Integration and Narrative Structure*.
 9. Fulbrook and Rublack, “Social Self,” 267; Hadley, *Living Liberalism*, 33–34.
 10. See Giorgi, *Emotions, Language and Identity*, 23; Frevert, “Was haben Gefühle in der Geschichte zu suchen,” 194; Fulda, “Telling German History,” 198–99. See also White, *Metahistory*, 5, 11, 48. This national story also had eschatological subcurrents inherited from Pietism and the later *Erweckungsbewegung*. See Lehmann, “Pietism and Nationalism”; Hoover, *Gospel of Nationalism*; Kaiser, *Pietismus und Patriotismus*.
 11. Tobias Heinrich argues that the “nationalization” of individual’s lives, and their life-stories, began with Herder’s eulogies. See Heinrich, *Leben Lesen*, 44. On the competition between historical narratives and the role of “literary media of memory,” see Hagemann, *Revisiting Prussia’s Wars*, 250–51, 280. See also Freeden and Fernández-Sebastián, introduction to *In Search of European Liberalisms*, 13–14.
 12. Barthes, *S/Z*, 4.
 13. On the effect of genre on historiography, see White, *Content of the Form*. Albert Koschorke writes that “in the world of Enlightenment morality . . . every citizen is a hero.” See Koschorke, *Körperströme*, 32.
 14. Duncker, “Mathy.”
 15. Haym, *Leben Max Dunckers*. Charlotte Duncker’s sketches are held in the GStAPK, VI. HA, Nl. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Nr. 5a.
 16. Rudolf Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 1 August 1886, GStAPK, VI. HA Nl. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 93–95.
 17. Gustav Freytag to Ernst of Coburg, 16 June 1868, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Tempeltey, 231.
 18. Gustav Freytag to Heinrich von Treitschke, 14 December 1869, *Freytag und Heinrich von Treitschke*, ed. Dove, 144–45.
 19. Freytag to Treitschke, 14 December 1869, *Freytag und Heinrich von Treitschke*, ed. Dove, 145.
 20. Mathy’s papers at the Bundesarchiv Berlin and the Geheimes Staatsarchiv are rather extensive. Freytag apparently did not have—or want to find—many of his subject’s letters or any of his diaries or notebooks.
 21. My use of the term “readerly” comes from Barthes, *S/Z*, 4–5. For Barthes, a readerly text—as opposed to a “writerly” text—is one in which readers can anticipate the arc of the plot and many of the characters’ thoughts and actions because the story conforms to established narrative strategies and stereotypes. Readerly texts thus require less effort from readers, posing questions and eliciting responses that the genre of the text itself has already narrowed. A writerly

- text, in contrast, asks readers to participate in making the meaning of the text rather than simply receiving it from the author.
22. Freytag to Treitschke, 14 December 1869, in *Freytag und Heinrich von Treitschke*, ed. Dove, 145.
 23. Freytag maintained this approach in both his fiction and his nonfiction. See Fulda, "Telling German History," 200. Karen Hagemann has written that, in the context of the memorialization of the Napoleonic Wars, although memoirs and recollections in general reflect perhaps more of the present than the past, "the narrative must still reflect important pieces of this past if they are to become and remain influential." See Hagemann, *Revisiting Prussia's Wars*, 24–25, 280.
 24. Applegate, "Mediated Nation," 44; Fulda, "Telling German History," 199.
 25. Freytag to Ernst of Coburg, 16 June 1868, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Tempelpey, 231.
 26. Freytag to Ernst of Coburg, 20 December 1869, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Tempelpey, 240. Freytag used the terms "*Waffengang*" and "*Geisteskampf*."
 27. See, for example, Carr, *Wars of German Unification*.
 28. Freytag argued against what became, after the Franco-Prussian War, the glorification of the Prussian military and the embrace of military service by the German bourgeoisie. See Frevert, *Nation in Barracks*, 149, 157. On Freytag's anti-Polish, anti-Catholic, and antisemitic beliefs, see Mühlen, *Gustav Freytag*; Healy, *Jesuit Specter*, 50.
 29. Ping, "Gustav Freytag," 608.
 30. Freytag to Ernst of Coburg, 20 December 1869, *Briefwechsel*, ed. Tempelpey, 240.
 31. Applegate, "Mediated Nation," 34, 44, 46; Fulda, "Telling German History," 199–201. Freytag also maintained a studied silence on Bismarck in the *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*. See Ping, "Gustav Freytag," 609.
 32. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 416–17; Nipperdey, *Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck*, 707. See also Gall, *Liberalismus als regierende Partei*, 385–88.
 33. Treitschke to Freytag, 9 January 1870, in *Freytag und Heinrich von Treitschke*, ed. Dove, 148.
 34. Treitschke to Freytag, 9 January 1870, in *Freytag und Heinrich von Treitschke*, ed. Dove, 148. Roland Barthes expanded his notion of the readerly text to discuss "texts of pleasure." A pleasurable text "contents, fills, grants euphoria . . . comes from culture and does not break from it, is linked to a *comfortable* practice of reading." Barthes, *Pleasure of the Text*, 14. Nevertheless, Freytag's book may not have granted Treitschke euphoria. Freytag had "filled" the blank spaces in Mathy's life-story to the point where the book reproduced generic, bourgeois expectations about the development of a "normal" human life, which were ultimately derived from *Bildungsromane*. The joy that Treitschke drew from the biography was central to Freytag's project.
 35. Treitschke to Freytag, 9 January 1870, in *Freytag und Heinrich von Treitschke*, ed. Dove, 148.
 36. Treitschke to Freytag, 9 January 1870, in *Freytag und Heinrich von Treitschke*, ed. Dove, 148.
 37. Biefang, *Politisches Bürgertum*, 47.
 38. Freytag took similar novelistic license with historical texts that appeared in his *Bilder* series. See Applegate, "Mediated Nation," 48.
 39. On the construction of regional German identities and state-building, see Applegate, *Nation of Provincials*; and Green, *Fatherlands*. See also Kaschuba, "Zwischen Deutscher Nation und Provinz," 84–85; Dann, *Nation und Nationalismus*, 34.
 40. Radkau, *Zeitalter der Nervosität*, 58–59.
 41. On the *Kulturkampf* and the longer history of confessional conflict in Germany, see H. Smith, *German Nationalism and Religious Conflict*; Gross, *War Against Catholicism*; Borutta, *Antikatholizismus*. See also Eley, "Bismarckian Germany," 4, 7, 21.
 42. Gross, *War Against Catholicism*, 246; Tal, *Christians and Jews in Germany*, 102–103.

43. Nipperdey, *Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck*, 710; Craig, *Germany*, 13.
44. Duncker, "Mathy," 45.
45. Duncker, "Mathy," 45.
46. Smith, *Gender of History*, 53; Heinrich, *Leben Lesen*, 12; Koschorke, *Körperströme*, 151.
47. On Romantics' obsession with reviving lost objects as the basis of history, see Smith, *Gender of History*, 133.
48. Heinrich, *Leben Lesen*, 47. Barthes argued that literature shifted during the nineteenth century from a code based on painting to one based on theater. Max Duncker's auto/biographical writing occupied a place between the two poles. It required a real referent. But, because Duncker wanted to continue an emotional relationship with his deceased friend—through the essay and the portrait—his writing often drifted toward something akin to literary realism. See Barthes, *S/Z*, 55–56.
49. On the role of encyclopedias in shaping emotional norms, see Frevert, "Defining Emotions," 8.
50. Duncker, "Mathy," 68–69.
51. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5a [unfoliated]; Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 1 August 1886, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 93–95.
52. French, *German Women as Letter Writers*, 20, 49–50; Clarke, *Rise and Fall of the Woman of Letters*, 7. From the emergence of the modern letter, this sanction was matched by women's use of letters to record and share their experiences and expand their social worlds. See Furger, *Briefsteller*, 59–60.
53. See Smith, *Gender of History*, 6–8.
54. Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 29 December 1886, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 115; GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 1, 15. Katherine R. Goodman argues that around 1800, women in Germany began to prefer writing their autobiographies in the epistolary form of the late eighteenth century rather than accepting the new standard of auto/biographical writing in narrative—book—form. See K. Goodman, "Elisabeth to Meta," 306.
55. Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 28 October 1886, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 111–112. Collecting one's letters to form a sort of archive or "artifact" for posterity was common throughout Europe. See, for example, Schlientz, "Verdeckte Botschaften," 28.
56. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 15. Duncker might have also used humble statements as a rhetorical device to win over her correspondent.
57. As Bella Brodzki and Celeste Schenck have argued, even though women's auto/biography in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries could be "[s]hot through with qualifications—protestations as to her modesty, insistence upon her dependence on her husband . . ." it still served as a vehicle for self-inscription and subjectivity-formation. See Brodzki and Schenck, introduction to *Life-Lines*, 8.
58. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 16.
59. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 16.
60. Ansel, *Pruz, Hettner und Haym*, 100, 116; Rampton, *Liberal Ideas in Tsarist Russia*, 15–16.
61. For example, see GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 55, 121, 163–64. Members also made marginalia in letters and reports from their political friends. Haym's marginalia were perhaps, in another iteration of network epistolary tactics, an attempt to engage—and argue—with an absent Charlotte Duncker. See Jackson, *Invisible Forms*, 163–64, 168.
62. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 156.
63. For example, see GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 157–58, 325. On sectioning, see GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 227–28.
64. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 221, 227–28, 267, 370–407.
65. Saunders, *Self Impression*, 6.

66. For example, see GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5. Bl. 206, 241–242, 252, 288, 290, 292, 308, 322, 337, 354, 383.
67. Smith, *Gender of History*, 10, 83–84.
68. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 408–501.
69. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 528–29.
70. Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 30 April 1887, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 123. It was also possible that Haym was flirting with Duncker. As Sarah Horowitz has noted, men were expected to perform a certain level of emotional expression in their correspondence with women. See Horowitz, *Friendship and Politics*, 66, 85.
71. Smith, *Gender of History*, 85.
72. Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 15 September 1886, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 104–105; Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 28 October 1886, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 111–12; Haym also reminded Duncker that he had other important things to do. See Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 29 December 1886, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 115; Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 30 April 1887, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 123–24. On contemporary men's use of "strategic sexism" to blame women for political failures and to equate political problems in general with femininity, see Kreklau, "Gender Anxiety," 174.
73. Yet it seems Charlotte Duncker did expect, by the end of her project, that the sketches would be shared. See GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 681.
74. Haym, *Leben Max Duncckers*, iii–iv.
75. Smith, *Gender of History*, 3–4.
76. Smith, *Gender of History*, 85.
77. See GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 109–19. Duncker also discussed household issues and members' economic precarity caused by government harassment. See GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 239–40. The role of women in bourgeois and royal circles was likewise important. See also GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 64, 375.
78. See GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 591.
79. The coding of men's emotions, as positive in some situations and negative in others, was key to letter-writing as well. See Bauer and Hämmerle, introduction to *Liebe Schreiben*, 28; Hoffmann, "Freundschaft als Passion," 90.
80. Haym, *Leben Max Duncckers*, iv. Haym claimed that he had devoted himself to the biography because he believed he owed it to his old friend, Max Duncker. "Friendship also comes with rights," he wrote. See Rudolf Haym to Eduard Zeller, 1 June 1891, in *Ausgewählter Briefwechsel*, ed. Rosenberg, 350.
81. All quotations are from Rudolf Haym to Charlotte Duncker, 15 September 1886, GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 56, Bl. 104.
82. Horowitz, *Friendship and Politics*, 75.
83. Haym, *Leben Max Duncckers*, iii. Duncker's insistence that Haym write the published biography reflected, perhaps, a desire to preserve her reputation in a society that had long associated women writers with sexual promiscuity. See Clarke, *Rise and Fall of the Woman of Letters*, 7.
84. Haym, *Leben Max Duncckers*, iii.
85. Ansel, *Prutz, Hettner und Haym*, 250, 265–67; Rosenberg, introduction to *Ausgewählter Briefwechsel*, ed. idem, 8. Haym privately claimed that the biography contained "a bit of scholarly life, scholarly method. . ." See Haym to Zeller, 1 June 1891, in *Ausgewählter Briefwechsel*, ed. Rosenberg, 350.
86. Rosenberg, introduction to *Ausgewählter Briefwechsel*, ed. idem, 12, 14.
87. Saunders, *Self Impression*, 10–11; Radkau, *Zeitalter der Nervosität*, 23. See also Smith, *Gender of History*, 215.
88. Haym, *Leben Max Duncckers*, 470.

89. See again Applegate, *Nation of Provincials*.
90. Blackbourn and Retallack, introduction to *Localism, Landscape*, ed. idem, 4.
91. On the post-revolutionary “accommodation” between liberals and conservative leaders, see chapters 2 and 3.
92. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 66–67.
93. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 82.
94. See, for example, Isabella, *Risorgimento in Exile*.
95. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 155.
96. On the concept of “emotional refuge,” see Reddy, *Navigation of Feeling*, 129.
97. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 156. This winter scene also drew on the legacy of Pietism and its emphasis on patriotic renewal through individual redemption. The Mathys’ isolation, both psychically and politically, only served to underscore the hermetic quality of Karl Mathy’s political sojourn in Switzerland—Mathy as nationalist hermit. See Lehmann, “Pietism and Nationalism,” 42, 44.
98. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 143; Duncker, “Mathy,” 48.
99. This dual depiction of the Swiss mountains also represented the hostility of the Swiss governments toward the masses of political refugees from Germany. See Tóth, *Exiled Generation*, 1, 7–8.
100. Both smuggling and legal trade were difficult for Confederal states, such as Austria, to track in the *Vormärz*. See Mulholland, *Bourgeois Liberty and the Politics of Fear*, 50; Nipperdey, *Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck*, 300–301. See also C. Müller, *Schmuggel politischer Schriften*.
101. C. Müller, *Schmuggel politischer Schriften*, 180–81, 186–87.
102. Lees, *Revolution and Reflection*, 68.
103. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 91, 137. See Leonhard, *Liberalismus*, 449, 463–64; Mommsen, “German Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century,” 416–18.
104. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 139. Mathy was also the German translator for Mazzini’s *La Jeune Suisse*. See Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 95.
105. Duncker, “Mathy,” 49.
106. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 139, 187.
107. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 217.
108. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 217. Nancy Kaiser writes that both Auerbach’s and Freytag’s fiction worked to integrate individuals into state institutions and the bourgeoisie. The two authors conveyed “reality paradigms” in which bourgeois characters and social developments met in narratives that readers, as loci of “literary work and external reality,” then reproduced. See Kaiser, *Social Integration and Narrative Structure*, 9, 13, 24.
109. Wilhelm Gössmann and Klaus-Hinrich Roth argue that, beginning with the Romantics, German writers developed images of Germany with constant reference to France, as well as from the French perspective, on Germany. From its inception, this process created “competition” with French intellectuals. See Gössmann and Roth, introduction to *Poetisierung—Politisierung*, ed. idem, 13.
110. I follow George Mosse’s argument about the interdependence of friendship and nationhood in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The notion of friendship shifted from one that emphasized the conscious cultivation of the individual to one that focused on friendship as a brake on uncontrolled passions and a source of unity that could be used to advance the nation. See Mosse, “Friendship and Nationhood,” 355, 360. On anti-French sentiment in early German liberalism, see, for example, Gall, “Liberalismus und ‘bürgerliche Gesellschaft,’” 343.
111. Lees, *Revolution and Reflection*, 15–16.
112. Jeismann, *Vaterland der Feinde*, 266–67; Biermann, *Ideologie statt Realpolitik*, 79–80.

113. Jeismann, *Vaterland der Feinde*, 274–75. See also Nolan, *Inverted Mirror*.
114. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 217.
115. Radkau, *Zeitalter der Nervosität*, 324–25; Nipperdey, *Germany from Napoleon to Bismarck*, 104.
116. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 217.
117. Habermas, *Frauen und Männer*, 247–49; Graf, *Politisierung*, 47–48. For an examination of religious variations on the German Enlightenment, see Altgeld, *Katholizismus, Protestantismus, Judentum*.
118. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 366–67.
119. Karl Mathy, diary entry for 30/31 March 1856, BArch, N2184/75, Bl. 316–17.
120. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 368. The three actually died in the year before Karl Mathy Jr.'s death.
121. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 368.
122. On nationalist notions of the German nation as God's chosen people, see Hoover, *Gospel of Nationalism*; and Lehmann, "Pietism and Nationalism."
123. Duncker, "Mathy," 62–63; GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 248, 252.
124. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 368, 371.
125. Freytag was apparently involved in a credit bank based in Leipzig. See BArch N2184/75, Bl. 313; Freytag to Mathy, 11 November 1856, in *Nach der Revolution*, ed. Jansen, 403–404. On Freytag's representation of Jews as avaricious businesspeople, see Stoetzler and Achinger, "German Modernity, Barbarous Slavs and Profit-Seeking Jews," 748.
126. Applegate, "Mediated Nation," 49–50.
127. BArch, N2184/75, Bl. 327; BArch, N2184/76, Bl. 136, 144. For more on Mathy's semi-official banking activities in Coburg and Baden, see chapters 2 and 3.
128. Duncker, "Mathy," 62.
129. Duncker, "Mathy," 62.
130. Duncker, "Mathy," 62.
131. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 379.
132. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 379, 383.
133. BArch, N2184/75, Bl. 327.
134. Brophy, "Political Calculus of Capital," 152–53; Barclay, *Frederick William IV*, 222.
135. Freytag, *Karl Mathy*, 381–82.
136. Karl Samwer and Karl Francke found refuge in the Duchy of Coburg after participating in the Revolution of 1848/49 and the First Schleswig War. See also Biefang, *Politisches Bürgertum*, 36.
137. Duncker, "Mathy," 63.
138. Duncker, "Mathy," 63.
139. Duncker, "Mathy," 63.
140. This stratagem seems to complicate Barthes's claim that realist authors often cite other texts to support their claims of representing reality: Barthes, *S/Z*, 39.
141. See chapter 4 on the conflicts between Duke Ernst and Max Duncker in the mid-1860s.
142. Fulda, "Telling German History," 199; Ping, "Gustav Freytag," 606.
143. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 386.
144. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 633–34. This section appears to have been written later and then inserted into this section of sketches. Charlotte Duncker had apparently been asked for more information about her husband's service to the New Era government.
145. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 386.
146. Mathy noted an argument with Max Duncker in late November 1861, in which he had told Duncker that, although he loved him, he did "regret that our correspondence is dropping because we have no points of connection": BArch N2184/76, Bl. 51. Charlotte Duncker wrote that she later repaired the bonds between the two. However, Max Duncker's papers include

- no letters from January 1863 to July 1864: BArch, N2184/11. Contact was not reestablished until 1865, shortly before the Mathys cut the Dunckers off again. See Charlotte Duncker to Karl Mathy and Max Duncker to Karl Mathy, 7 January 1866, BArch N2184/12, Bl. 193–96.
147. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 391.
 148. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 393.
 149. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 393.
 150. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 393.
 151. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 397.
 152. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 398. Her phrase in German was “*großen Freundschaftsdienst*.” This scene is just one example that highlights Charlotte Duncker’s shuttling between the first and third person. Katherine R. Goodman has contended that the epistolary form of autobiography allows for multiple voices to narrate events rather than the one voice common to retrospective narration in other forms of auto/biographical writing. See K. Goodman, “Elisabeth to Meta,” 311.
 153. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 409.
 154. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 436–42.
 155. Franz von Roggenbach to Friedrich of Baden, 14 July 1863, GAK, FA Korr. 13, Bd. 30, Doc. 67.
 156. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 438.
 157. Gall, *Bismarck*; Pflanze, *Bismarck*, 1: 328–30; Blackbourn, *History of Germany*, 194–95. See also Leonhard, *Bellizismus und Nation*, 603.
 158. Charlotte Duncker accused Samwer of being unreliable, putting Augustenburg’s sovereign pretensions before national unification, and slandering Max Duncker through Augustenburg’s press office in Kiel, among other failures. See GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 492, 515–16, 548.
 159. GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 488.
 160. On the Droysens, see also GStAPK, VI. HA NI. Max Duncker, Nr. 5, Bl. 496–97.
 161. Freytag to Ernst of Coburg, 20 December 1869, in *Freytag und Herzog Ernst*, ed. Tempelvey, 240.
 162. See Gerwarth, *Bismarck Myth*, 11–12, 18.
 163. Gerwarth, *Bismarck Myth*, 12–13; Pflanze, *Bismarck*, 3: 395–98.
 164. Haym, *Leben Max Dunckers*, 171, 177, 211–12.
 165. Haym, *Leben Max Dunckers*, 231.
 166. Haym, *Leben Max Dunckers*, 232.
 167. Karl Samwer to Karl Mathy, 10 August 1863, BArch N2184/22, Bl. 45–46.
 168. Haym, *Leben Max Dunckers*, 262.
 169. Christian liberals in Europe often saw the exercise of individual rationality and enactment of liberal policies as a means to achieve closer communion with God. See Parry, *Politics of Patriotism*, 89.
 170. See Jansen, *Einheit, Macht und Freiheit*.