
MAIKE OERTEL

Temporary Canonicity and the Horizontal Perspective: Digitization and the Emergence of “Forgotten Canons”

IN THIS CONTRIBUTION, I argue that easy access to large amounts of digitized eighteenth-century materials along with the ready availability of computational processes to analyze them produces a shift in perspective toward these materials, thus presenting new opportunities for research into historical cultural contexts, such as the *Goethezeit*. Predigital research has tended to focus on historically *vertical* perspectives, both culturally (creating canons, frequently national) and socially (creating historical narratives, frequently national histories, with canonical events, figures and sources). By contrast, the study of large corpora with the help of computational methodology can establish horizontal perspectives that reassemble contemporary contexts that (may) have been obscured by the delimiting barriers of canon and nation. These new perspectives are particularly (but not exclusively) significant for research on historical cultures. They are perhaps especially significant for historical *modern* cultures, which have produced large amounts of written, published materials, through which obscured cultural aspects and constellations can be reconstructed with some degree of reliability, due to the copious material.

I will illustrate the emergence of such a horizontal context and the resulting change in perspective through the example of an author who was highly respected at the time, Ernst Brandes, and his widely read text, *Politische Betrachtungen über die französische Revolution* (Political observations on the French Revolution). Though both the author and his text have now largely been forgotten, a horizontal analysis of this writer and his “best seller” illustrates my argument for the reconstruction of “forgotten canons.” In such horizontal contexts, certain texts and authors enjoy what one might call “temporary canonicity”: popular and respected, they connected with contemporary interests or issues to such an extent that they became representative of “their time,” but failed to become “classics.” In this respect, they delineate historical change: once relevant and much read, but now consigned to the realms of mediocrity and oblivion. To a greater extent than their “classic” contemporaries, these writers and their reception provide access to contexts around 1800 that is otherwise difficult to acquire, while their dismissal at the same time illuminates the dynamics of reception histories.

Ernst Brandes (1756–1810) was a Hanoverian civil servant who published widely on social and political issues of the day. (For most of his life, Brandes held the office of *Universitätsreferent* for Göttingen University, reporting on the business of the university to the government of the Electorate of Hannover.) *Politische Betrachtungen über die französische Revolution* appeared in July 1790, and was the first of his two volumes on the French Revolution; it presents Brandes's initial assessment of the (ongoing) developments in France and seeks to explain the most significant political event of his lifetime politically, socially, and culturally. Brandes was a member of the upper echelons of the Hanoverian bourgeoisie, who were key functionaries in the Electorate's bureaucracy and highly valued by their aristocratic rulers. This upper-middle class was, however, excluded from political ministries, executive political decision-making, and political representation. In existing research, Brandes has generally been identified as a political conservative,¹ despite the fact that his entire oeuvre, before and after 1789, argues for (limited) political reform. This mismatch is largely the result of a vertical perspective, which relies on the foreshortening effects of hindsight and tends to embed the critical preoccupations of a later period in its assessments.²

Brandes represents a specific brand of liberal conservatism that is vehemently opposed to absolutism—to him, absolutism is a form of despotism. Instead, he supports a (re)institution of the preabsolutist liberties held by the traditional estates, which had previously had a role in checking the power of princely executives. Advocating a return to earlier, lost practices is a common tactic for advancing progress and reform among political reformers from Luther to Marx. As a practicing high-level administrator, Brandes had ample opportunity to observe the workings of government and its interactions with society. Thus, unsurprisingly, he wrote on politics and *Staatswissenschaft* (government and political science); but, what really interested him were the workings of society itself, as the focus of his writing on social issues makes clear: the social influence and moral failings of the upper classes, the position and role of women (about which his writing reflects typical bourgeois binarism, confining women to the home), the role of education, and the power of culture.

In the summer of 1790, this supposed political conservative was not entirely hostile to the Revolution.³ In *Politische Betrachtungen*, he lays the blame for its outbreak largely at the doorstep of a selfish, overprivileged, and power-hungry aristocracy who, in an unrestricted, absolutist monarchy, are empowered to protect their own advantages to the detriment of society as a whole.

Bey dem unerhörten Druck jeder Art, der alles was nicht Protektion von großen oder kleinen Tyrannen genoß . . . traf, bleibt es immer beynahe ungläublich, daß ein großes geistreiches Volk ohne einen allgemeinen Aufstand zu erregen, diese Greuel so lange dulden konnte.⁴

Considering the outrageous pressure that was exerted . . . on everything that did not enjoy the protection of great or small tyrants, it remains almost incredible that such a great and spirited nation [the French] has been able to tolerate these horrors for so long without a general uprising.

After a lengthy juxtaposition of the dangers of absolutism and the benefits of a constitutional polity based on the division of powers, Brandes confidently asserts that France needs significant constitutional change (21), because good—that is, constitutional—government has disappeared in France, along with regular meetings of the *Etats Generaux* (17–18). Brandes believes that this situation could have been resolved peacefully and constructively by the new Constituent Assembly (he champions Jean Joseph Mounier, the proposer of the Tennis Court Oath), but this opportunity was wasted by the imprudent intransigence of the old order (50) and the feeble indecisiveness of the new assembly, so a violent revolutionary explosion became not just inevitable, but necessary (43, 46).

According to Brandes, this explosive political rupture could have feasibly liberated France from its despotic condition, *if* the Constituent Assembly had chosen the British form of constitutional monarchy as its model (52–54). In the first months following the storming of the Bastille, this was a realistic option (as it had been before July 14), but by the early summer of 1790, this was no longer the case. Brandes located the reasons for this development in the ascendancy of the “Democrats” in the assembly, who focused on abstract metaphysical notions of equality and liberty and were strongly influenced by the American constitution, which, in his view, did not suit French conditions. This misguided focus on impracticable models was facilitated by the obliteration of any remnants of liberal French constitutionalism (46–48).

In affirming the model character of *British* constitutionalism, Brandes reiterated what had been suggested by mid-eighteenth-century French intellectuals such as Montesquieu and Voltaire. In 1790, Brandes’s views were situated in the context of German Anglophilia, which, since its emergence in the middle of the century, had become increasingly focused on constitutionally anchored political liberty.⁵ Political Anglophilia had particular resonance for the Electorate of Hanover, which had been linked to the British Crown since 1712. Brandes himself had been fascinated by Britain since boyhood and his upper-middle-class Hanoverian home had provided many opportunities to feed this Anglophilia.⁶ By 1790, Brandes was well established as an England expert, who spoke English fluently and had firsthand experience of British law, politics, and society.⁷

In *Politische Betrachtungen*, Brandes vociferously opposes despotism, openly acknowledging a debt to Montesquieu (54–55). Despotism, for Brandes, has two possible agents: an unchecked ruler or an unregulated radical democracy; he equates the latter with the mob rule. Both crush *Freiheit* (freedom/liberty), which he declares as “seine Sache” (151), i.e., what he stands for. His version of liberty looks like this: any executive must be controlled by a representative legislature, but both the executive and legislature work together in law-making. The people must be represented, but the franchise needs to be limited and property is the enfranchising factor. Political representatives need to have a stake in society (such as property) as well as the requisite education and understanding for their role. But the power of the representative body, the legislature, must also be checked by a second chamber. The most liberal aspect of Brandes’s deliberations in *Politische Betrachtungen* is his unequivocal advocacy of a free press and of public

reporting on public matters, which include the proceedings of the representative body. This publicity, according to Brandes, allows for the formation of public opinion and, in turn, produces a balancing influence on politics. Brandes constructs public opinion entirely as the opinion of an enlightened public, who, as long as this process is not subverted by demagogues, can, and should, castigate abuses and point out errors because they are capable of a combined intellectual effort of reason (75). Such nonpartisan, reasonable considerations based on varied information and aimed at the general good are also part of the process, he says, by which *he* has arrived at the conclusions of his *Betrachtungen* (151). Brandes uses the term “öffentliche Meinung” (public opinion) repeatedly throughout his text, this is one of the earliest consistent uses in German.⁸

Writing in the early summer of 1790, Brandes criticizes the emerging French constitution—he is mainly thinking of the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* at this point—for its attempt to create a completely new political system based on philosophical abstractions such as equality and an *abstract* concept of liberty. For Brandes, politics and *Staatsrecht* needed to be based on experience and pragmatics, which are specific. He was therefore opposed to positive constitutions that start with a clean slate on the sole basis of abstract universal considerations. This practical approach, which leads him to a historicist focus on constitutional traditions, is the central plank in Brandes’s “conservative” politics, which are infused with a keen interest in progressive political change. In 1789 France needed change, i.e., France needed to break the chains of despotic absolutism. Brandes holds on to the principle behind this view even after he rejects the Revolution following its radicalization: in 1808 he would condemn the missed opportunities in German lands that could have liberalized German politics and government and thus prevented the radicalization of political thought and the rise of Napoleon.⁹ Brandes favored incremental change built on existing liberal structures; in his view, France’s problem was that it lacked structures to build on: all liberal (i.e., power-sharing) traditions had been erased from political practice and memory by absolutism (51). With such priorities, for Brandes, the national assembly was clearly moving in the wrong direction when those that favored the British model, like Gérard de Lally-Tollendal and Jean Joseph Mounier, were being marginalized. But despite these inauspicious circumstances, Brandes still expected in 1790 that the new constitution would be an improvement on its predecessor (133).

From the late 1780s to his death in 1810, Brandes was an eminent and influential intellectual figure who effortlessly mediated British and French thought and was ever present in the budding German public sphere. His works were promptly reviewed in key journals such as the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, one of the most influential sources of German-language reviews of this period, and the *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek*. Similarly, the *Leipziger Literaturzeitung* and the *Schlesische Provinzialblätter* reviewed him frequently, as did the *Journal des Luxus und der Moden*, another high-profile publication with a wide reach, in which Brandes’s publisher, Johann Mauke, advertised *Politische Betrachtungen*.¹⁰ By the early 1800s, Goethe and Schiller were reading and discussing Brandes,¹¹ as were the Schlegel

brothers.¹² Johann Gottfried Fichte, who in 1793 still publicly supported the Revolution, praises Brandes's independent and impartial thinking on this topic in his very defense of the Revolution.¹³ In 1808, Johann Wilhelm von Archenholtz refers to Brandes as "der berühmte Schriftsteller" (the famous author) in his journal *Minerva*.¹⁴

The complexity of Brandes's political stance, proposed in *Politische Betrachtungen*, makes possible the praise he garners from different political quarters, such as those represented by Fichte, Archenholtz, or Goethe. This complexity, which was clearly obvious to his contemporaries, has not been adequately captured in his limited reception and this lack of differentiation represents one of those blind spots that vertical perspectives tend to create. Brandes's position, including *Politische Betrachtungen*, would, in hindsight, be labeled "conservative" and from the nineteenth century on is frequently linked to the reactionary and repressive aims of restoring pre-Revolution political conditions. Brandes clearly did not see himself as obstructing social and political progress, and his contemporaries in the 1790s tended to view him as a reforming moderate rather than a reactionary. Fichte's praise in his *Berichtigung* suggests that he considered Brandes less conservative than he did Brandes's close friend August von Rehberg. Fifteen years later, the praise from Archenholtz, himself a political liberal who practiced independent and enlightened journalism, reiterated the view of Brandes as moderate, if not liberal. Contemporaries were, on the whole, divided on where to place Brandes's liberal-conservative stance politically, something Brandes himself predicted in *Betrachtungen* (151-52). At the time, political battle lines were far from clearly drawn: even Rehberg, who shared many of Brandes's political views, was attacked as a Jacobin by ultraconservatives while, at the same time, being considered a reactionary by radical modernizers.¹⁵ Haase's suggestion that Brandes had to camouflage his progressive political ideas from more conservative Hanoverian ministers to safeguard his position also deserves further consideration in this context.¹⁶

The evaluation of Brandes's influence has been as undifferentiated as the definition of his political position. His interest in political reform from within existing institutions was shared by his friend Karl Freiherr vom Stein, who has generally been considered the architect of this approach. Stein, Brandes, and Rehberg formed a close friendship during their student days at Göttingen in the mid-1770s,¹⁷ and Haase has made a convincing case that all three friends were equal partners in an intellectual exchange that continued until Brandes's death in 1810.¹⁸ The notion of "Reform von oben" (reform from above) was instrumental in bringing about the fragile alliance between princes, moderate reformers, and political radicals, which underpinned the successful defeat of Napoleon during the German Wars of Liberation. Based on this friendship, it is likely that Brandes, who had already vigorously promoted the same approach over twenty years before the German resistance took shape, may deserve some credit for formulating these ideas. Through these intermediaries, he may indeed have influenced policy and politics far beyond Hanover.

Politische Betrachtungen was translated into French almost immediately, appearing in Paris in 1791 in two different editions, a fact that has escaped

Brandes scholars. The editions are distinguished by (slightly) different titles and different translations, *Considérations Politiques sur la Révolution de France* remains closer to the original in terms of phrasing. The most marked difference, however, is the approach to the original in *Considérations Politiques sur la Révolution Française*: here, Brandes's work is prefixed with a preface and "augmented" with notes by an anonymous editor. The stated editorial aim is to correct minor errors, but this editor also points out that this "foreigner" has not quite grasped the nature of the French Revolution, not least due to limited information. In the editor's view, "liberty" has been placed under the authority of the masses and, in the absence of government, there is a dangerous confusion of powers, crucially not just *since* the storming of the Bastille—the very convening of the general estates already contained the covert seed of anarchy. Hence, the editor feels that Brandes's moderate support of the Revolution, i.e., his argument that France needed political change and that the Revolution was largely caused by the oppressive and exploitative nature of the *ancien régime*, needs to be rebutted in this otherwise interesting work by a fair-minded author, who, on the whole, makes valid criticisms of the emerging constitution.¹⁹ For the editor, Brandes was clearly not conservative enough. To finish with a better example of preserving liberty, the editor turns to Britain and closes the preface with a reference to Edmund Burke, quoting from Burke's *Letter to a member of the National Assembly, 19 January 1791* to point out that *this* "étranger" (Burke) has understood that the seeds of subversion were already contained in the earliest developments leading to the Revolution. *Considérations Politiques sur la Révolution de France*, on the other hand, has no preface or notes and merely makes Brandes's text available in France, and in French, a language that was far more widely read than German. It is tempting to suspect that the "edited" translation appeared as a response to *Considérations Politiques sur la Révolution de France*. The two translations illustrate Brandes's international reach but also his engagement in a *transnational* debate on "liberty" in the context of political Anglophilia. His only half-favorable reception by French (?) conservatives further underlines the complexity of his conservatism.

Yet what does all of this have to do with canon and "the great unread"? My account of Brandes's contemporary eminence and complex political position, which opens a horizontal perspective on his influences, work, and impact, has been easy to assemble because of digitization. While this information has, of course, always been extant, in predigital times, locating it would have required months, if not years or a host of research assistants, and carried a higher risk of missing more than has been missed now. It would probably have been considered untenable. Most importantly, digital resources allow us, through their sheer volume, to balance national canons, narratives, and traditions with snapshots of multifaceted horizontal perspectives on what I have called "temporary canonicity," a form of canonicity that is highly reflective of the zeitgeist.

The above results also shed light on why Brandes's fame has not lasted, and why his limited reception has produced such undifferentiated conclusions. There seem to be two key reasons for his temporary canonicity: one is his close association with two historical figures who have had more lasting,

canonizing receptions, Edmund Burke and Freiherr vom Stein. Stein acquired and retained canonical status as a key mover in the German/Prussian efforts to effect “reform from above.”²⁰ Burke achieved canonical status in modern political history as a defender of what, post-1789, I would call “Old Liberty,” which was intent on preserving pre-absolutist institutions, the platform on which Brandes also campaigned. It has frequently been assumed that Brandes was influenced by Stein (rather than vice versa); similarly, he has also often been presented as spouting “Burkean” views,²¹ despite the fact that Brandes’s *Betrachtungen* appeared four months before Burke’s *Reflections*. To assume that Brandes drew on Burke is not unreasonable; it is based on the fact that they formed a loose friendship in the mid-1780s, when the 26-year-old Brandes met the 55-year-old Burke, whom he proceeded to revere.²² But within their general political agreement there were differences: as far as Old Liberty is concerned, Burke wanted to safeguard it, while Brandes wanted to revive it. This difference is most likely the key reason why, in 1790, they diverged so sharply on the French *ancien régime*. In *Politische Betrachtungen*, Brandes was highly critical of what he saw as the regime’s despotism, whereas in *Reflections*, Burke was more forgiving, because he feared that the currently limited British despotism would lose its restraints in reacting to the radicalization in France.²³ Their shared political outlook preceded the Revolution; their political alignment identifies a transnational political position that, pre-Revolution, was less determined by personal influence (Burke on Brandes) than based on shared experiences (active political practitioners) and convictions (early liberalism).²⁴ Their divergent responses to the Revolution identified above were due to the contextual differences between them, as were their contemporary receptions. Burke would never have been considered a Jacobin, as he thought that 1790s Britain needed no political change (while a decade and a half earlier, the British colonies in America had—Burke had supported the colonists’ grievances). Brandes, however, could be considered a reformer because he supported political change in a context where, as far as Brandes was concerned, Old Liberty had not been sufficiently preserved. The continued canonicity of both Burke and Stein have since overshadowed Brandes’s thought, making it appear as if he was simply an acolyte and epigone, despite Carl Haase’s best efforts.

The second reason for Brandes’s reputational descent into obscurity is, of course, his association with a broadly reactionary *social* conservatism that had become unpalatable and uninteresting during the twentieth century. And indeed, any political progressiveness Brandes may have represented came with a pronounced (but not uncommon) sexism and social elitism and a rejection of mass education and of educational philanthropism, all of which must condemn him as a bigoted reactionary in twentieth-century eyes. However, this view misses the openness and uncertainty of Brandes’s contemporary context and his position within it.

Conclusion

Digitization and computational methods can reconstruct contemporary contexts to a larger extent and with less effort than was possible before (even if

they are used in the very basic way I have done here). Any picture generated in this way will still be selective and have blind spots and gaps but will provide an adjustment to the larger blind spots created by vertical canons and national histories. In this case, recourse to digitally accessible materials has established Brandes as an eminent writer who formulated his views in the general context of transnational debates based on political Anglophilia, and arrived, when assessing the early stages of the French Revolution, at a position that advocates reform without revolution, shares aspects with early French revolutionary thought, and prepares the influential alliance that underpinned the success of the Wars of Liberation. These insights challenge established views in two respects. They not only reassert Brandes's eminence and independence, but also shed light on an allegedly "German" brand of reform conservatism which, it turns out, was, as "Old Liberty," neither isolated nor a specifically German phenomenon. Instead, it had a strong liberalist foundation in British and also French thought.

University of Nottingham

NOTES

1. Klaus Epstein, *The Genesis of German Conservatism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1966) 571; Frederic Beiser, *Enlightenment, Revolution and Romanticism. The Genesis of Modern German Political Thought* (Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1992) 302; for more references to existing research see Carl Haase, *Ernst Brandes 1758-1810*, vol. 1 (Hildesheim: August Lax Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1973) 311, 319. Haase himself reached different conclusions (310-11).
2. Carl Haase, author of the only thorough study of Brandes, put this discrepancy down to the critics' tendency to equate pragmatism with conservatism and to Brandes's care to avoid falling foul of censorship (312-13). He tentatively suggests that later twentieth-century research is, at least partially, marked by misunderstandings (311). The second volume of Haase's study was published in 1974.
3. This was pointed out by Epstein; see also Frieda Braune, *Edmund Burke in Deutschland. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historisch-politischen Denkens*. (Heidelberg: Winter, 1917); Frederick Beiser, *Enlightenment, Revolution and Romanticism*. Other than in Haase, the liberal roots of Brandes's thinking have not been acknowledged.
4. Ernst Brandes. *Politische Betrachtungen über die französische Revolution*. (Jena: Johann Michael Mauke, 1790) 18. All subsequent references are given parenthetically in the text.
5. See Jennifer Willenberg, *Distribution und Übersetzung englischen Schrifttums im Deutschland des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Saur, 2007) 19-68 for a survey, and Michael Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987) for a detailed account.
6. Haase 39, 40-41.
7. During a six-month visit to England in 1783-84 Brandes immersed himself in British culture, politics and law, and met numerous public figures, including Edmund Burke and even King George III (Haase 115-17). On his return, he published two key

essays on Britain; See Ernst Brandes, "Über die Justiz- und Gerichtsverfassung Englands," *Hannoversches Magazin* (1785): 1362-1472; Ernst Brandes, "Über den politischen Geist Englands," *Berlinische Monatsschrift* 7 (1786): 101-26, 217-41, 293-323.

8. Maike Oergel, *Zeitgeist. How Ideas Travel* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), 57-60, 64-72.

9. See Ernst Brandes, *Betrachtungen über den Zeitgeist in Deutschland in den letzten Dezennien des vorigen Jahrhunderts* (Hanover: Hahn, 1808); see also Oergel 99-105.

10. *Journal des Luxus und der Moden* 5 (1791): "Intelligenzblatt" 150. The reviews of Brandes's works became more numerous after 1800; his two books on zeitgeist and his *Betrachtungen über das weibliche Geschlecht* (Hanover: Hahn, 1802) are his most widely reviewed publications, closely followed by the earlier *Über die Weiber* (Leipzig: Weidmanns und Erben, 1787). His early "Über den politischen Geist Englands" and *Bemerkungen über das Londoner, Pariser und Wiener Theater* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1786) were reviewed, too. His two books on the French Revolution—*Politische Betrachtungen* and *Über einige bisherige Folgen der französischen Revolution in Rücksicht auf Deutschland*. (Hannover: Ritscher, 1792)—have noticeably fewer reviews. While *Politische Betrachtungen* was reviewed promptly in *Allgemeine Deutsche Bibliothek* in 1791, as was the second edition of *Einige bisherige Folgen* in 1795, the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* only published a "Sammelrezension" of both books in 1797. The databases at Bielefeld University (Zeitschriften der Aufklärung) and at the Thüringische Universitäts- and Landesbibliothek (journals@urmel) are useful resources in this respect; <https://zsl.thulb.uni-jena.de/content/below/index.xml> and http://ds.ub.uni-bielefeld.de/viewer/browse/zeitschriftenderaufklrung*/-1/SORT_TITLE/-/.

11. See the exchange of letters between Goethe and Schiller on July 5-6, 1802, letter 866, *Briefwechsel zwischen Goethe und Schiller*; <https://www.friedrich-schiller-archiv.de/briefwechsel-von-schiller-und-goethe/1802/866-an-schiller-5-juli-1802/> and <https://www.friedrich-schiller-archiv.de/briefwechsel-von-schiller-und-goethe/1802/867-an-goethe-6-juli-1802/>.

12. See Friedrich Schlegel's letters to August Wilhelm on August 26 and November 8, 1808, in *Digitale Edition der Korrespondenz August Wilhelm Schlegels*, <https://august-wilhelm-schlegel.de/briefedigital/briefid/252>, <https://august-wilhelm-schlegel.de/briefedigital/briefid/273>. The Schlegels' sister, Henriette, reported to August Wilhelm on June 14, 1792, that Brandes had published a new book on the French Revolution (*Einige bisherige Folgen*), which had garnered critical praise <https://august-wilhelm-schlegel.de/briefedigital/briefid/2106>.

13. Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, *Fichtes Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by I. H. Fichte, vol. 6. *Beitrag zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publicums über die französische Revolution*, ed. I. H. Fichte (Berlin: Veit, 1845-46) 37-288, here 54-55.

14. J. W. Archenholtz, "Betrachtungen über den Zeitgeist in Deutschland," *Minerva* 2 (1808): 188-90.

15. Epstein 560-63.

16. Haase 313.

17. Haase 32-33, 41-42.

18. Haase 41-48.

19. Brandes, "Avant-Propos," in *Révolution Française*, n. p. The two French translations were published in the same year: Ernst Brandes, *Considération Politiques sur la Révolution Française*. Par M. E. Brandes, Secrétaire intime de la Chancellerie d'Hanovre. Traduites de l'allemand par M. de . . . Revues et augmentées par de notes de M. M. Dup.

(Paris: Gattey, 1791); Ernst Brandes, *Considérations Politiques sur la Révolution de France*. Par E. Brandes, Secrétaire intime de la Chancellerie d'Hanovre (Paris: Chez les Marchands de Nouveautés, 1791).

20. Heinz Duchhardt, *Mythos Stein. Vom Nachleben, von der Stilisierung und von der Instrumentalisierung des preußischen Reformers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008).

21. Braune called him a “besonders wirksamer Verbreiter Burkscher Weltanschauung in Deutschland” (Braune 112–13); Skalweit considers him “zum Adepten Burkscher Ideen prädestiniert,” Stephan Skalweit, “Edmund Burke, Ernst Brandes und Hannover” *Niedersächsisches Jahrbuch für Landesgeschichte* 28 (1956): 15–72, here 16.

22. See Brandes’s letters to Burke, quoted in Skalweit 34–72.

23. Ironically, when Brandes quotes Burke in *Politische Betrachtungen*, he uses passages from Burke’s parliamentary speech of February 9, 1790, in which Burke (still) attacked the *ancien régime* as “tyrannical” and “despotic” (Brandes, *Politische Betrachtungen*, 67). See Edmund Burke, *Substance of the speech of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke, in thr [sic] debate on the army estimates, in the House of Commons, on Tuesday, the 9th day of February, 1790*. (London: Debrett, 1790)

24. See Braune 74–113, especially 85–113. Nevertheless, Braune still concluded that he was “a propagator of Burkean views” (see Braune, note 37).