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is his stress on the absence of any real interest in agrarian improvement until the end of the 18th century. His attitude to the regulated grain trade has changed markedly from his work in earlier essays. He now stresses its corruption and inefficiency to a much greater degree. One ends up longing for an even more sustained account of the social and economic revolution for which the Hapsburg-Lorraine rulers of Florence were responsible after 1737. From being a protected centre of commerce and manufacture Florence was demoted to a town amongst others; its inhabitants, previously guaranteed a supply of grain, were left to fend for themselves on the open market. At the same time, the old ruling elite were ejected from office and new standards of bureaucratic efficiency were imposed. It would be hard to imagine a more interesting case study in the transition from a medieval and early modern city state to a modern city — a transition accompanied by the reception and adoption of Enlightenment ideas. Tuscany was, following the advice of Beccaria, the first state to abolish the death penalty, and government fiscal policy was debated in terms drawn from physiocracy.

Professor Litchfield felt the need to tell us what happened to the patriciate during the years of Medici rule. But in the end we have neither a full social history of the patriciate nor a full-scale study of the 18th-century reforms. Here and there, too, his book (which is beautifully produced, as we have come to expect from Princeton) is clumsily written. There are other faults, but it may be churlish to complain: Litchfield takes his place beside Cochrane as one of our few and valuable authorities on post-republican Florence. He takes us from Machiavelli to Beccaria; from the guilds to free trade; from republican magistracies, through the ducal court, to the formation of a modern bureaucracy. He has chosen to concentrate on the administration of government, and in the process he has reminded us of the interest and importance of Florence in these forgotten centuries.
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This book offers a fascinating exploration of the relationship between social and intellectual history. Combining theory and practice, Kramer begins with a sophisticated discussion of the historiographic problems involved in trying to clarify this relationship and then illustrates his recommended approach with a clearly written account of how the experience of exile affected the thought of three major writers living in Paris under the “July Monarchy.”

Rejecting approaches that stress the primacy of social experience in shaping ideas or of ideas in shaping social experience, Kramer insists on the reciprocal influence between experience and texts. As he puts it, “Without ideas, experience does not make sense. . . . Without society, ideas do not make sense.” Social experience takes place within interpretive systems derived from inherited ideas or texts while all ideas and texts appear within social systems. Most people living in stable societies, of course, are scarcely conscious of the extent to which their reality is defined by their social system. But the experience of exile, Kramer contends, “provokes new forms of interpretation by defamiliarizing the familiar and familiarizing the unfamiliar.” In the case of the three highly gifted individuals examined in this study — Heinrich Heine, Karl Marx, and Adam Mickiewicz — the experience of living in exile in a challenging and stimulating new environment (Paris of the 1830s and 1840s) played an important, perhaps indispensable, role in provoking them to work out innovative interpretations of social realities. Since their new theories (of socialism and nationalism) were of fundamental importance to subsequent European history, Kramer’s exploration of their genesis provides both demonstrations of his methodology and valuable contributions to European social and intellectual history.

The book is organized in a straightforward way, with chapters on Paris, Heine, Marx, and Mickiewicz. Kramer utilizes the existing secondary material on all four topics, but primary materials have also been used extensively. The description of “the capital of Europe,” as seen and experienced by foreigners, is an impressive piece of urban history. In part because the length of their Parisian experience varied (Heine and Mickiewicz lived out their lives in Paris after their arrival in the early 1830s, whereas Marx resided there for only a little more than a year — October 1843 to February 1845), the treatment accorded each figure is somewhat different. For Heine and Mickiewicz, whose works and importance are little appreciated in the English-speaking world, Kramer provides full accounts of their lives, literary works, and influence. With Marx, given the vast literature on every aspect of his life, Kramer concentrates on a detailed examination of how his experiences in Paris affected him during this crucial period in his intellectual development, and how this evolution found expression in the texts he produced during his months in the French capital (i.e. the articles he contributed to the Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher, The Holy Family, and the long unpublished Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts), and the text in which he settled accounts with the French socialist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (The Poverty of Philosophy of 1847). Kramer argues convincingly that Marx’s experiences in Paris encouraged him “to investigate the historical inadequacies of the economists, the philosophical errors of the Hegelians, and the revolutionary mistakes of the Jacobins.”
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and were thus crucial in helping “a German philosopher become a European social
theorist.” Heine and Mickiewicz, in contrast, were cultural mediators who explained
their native countries and cultures (Germany and Poland) to the French, and France to
their countrymen. In the course of doing so, Kramer maintains, they enhanced national
consciousness in all three countries and contributed as well to the development of
nationalism as self-conscious ideology.

On the whole this book works very well, but I have two minor quibbles. Although Kramer
equates “exile” and “émigré,” he does not discuss the contrasting role of the “émigré
experience” for important conservative writers such as Chateaubriand, Louis de
Bonald, and Joseph de Maîstre. Secondly, while the work is well documented with
extensive notes and a generous bibliography, the index is less than complete, lacking
entries for some of the minor figures mentioned in the text.
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Zeynep Celik, an American-educated Turk who teaches architecture at Columbia
University, has produced the first comprehensive study of the 19th-century
transformation in the architectural form and urban fabric of Istanbul, capital of a once-
vast Oriental empire which was then struggling merely to survive in much reduced
form. Her book began as an award-winning doctoral thesis constructed from an
interesting array of source materials, especially Turkish archival documents.

Celik limits her study to the 70 years of intense growth and change between 1838
(when the Anglo-Ottoman Commercial Treaty opened the empire to foreign capital,
enterprise, and workers) and 1908 (when the Young Turk Revolution curbed the despotic
Abdulhamit II). During this period, the first half of which coincided with the Tanzimat reform
era, considerable effort was made to recast Istanbul into a European-style capital
symbolizing an empire rejuvenated by Western-inspired reforms. The treasury,
however, was too poor to allow great schemes to be realized except in a
piecemeal fashion. As a result, Celik concludes, the city lost its Turkish-Islamic
class without gaining a uniformly
Western facade.

The book is organized into seven chapters, including an epilogue in which the author
provides a dreary fin-de-siècle image of a
once-prosperous capital — run-down and
neglected in one of its two principal regions
and modern and Western-looking in the
other. Chapter One surveys the city’s
architectural form in its Christian Byzantine
and Islamic Ottoman eras. Each was
characterized by monumental edifices and
open squares harmonizing with the hilly
topography. A striking difference between
them is that under Islamic law, which favours
individual over public rights, houses and
shops encroached upon thoroughfares. The
next chapter, on population growth,
settlement patterns, and urban reform, notes
that the Tanzimat reforms shifted
responsibility for urban administration from the kadi (Islamic judge) to appointed, but
unfunded councils. In 1857 one of these,
owing to demands by the fast-growing
foreign community for municipal services,
became the privileged Sixth District
Administration which for two decades
worked autonomously at improving facilities
in Galata and Pera north of the Golden Horn.
The focus of the third chapter is the
regularization of the urban fabric, in particular
the use of the burnt-out areas for
experimenting with Western-inspired planning
principles. Thus, the Hocapasa fire of 1865
gave birth to the Commission for Road
Improvement, which over four years
achieved in some areas south of the Golden
Horn what the Sixth District Administration
did north of it by regularizing the streets and
building fabric.

The remaining chapters, each as stimulating and rich in detail as the others, examine the
city’s interconnected transportation network; some unrealized European-authored
schemes for the city’s urban redesign along
lines popular in Europe; and the architectural
pluralism evident in the many new buildings
concentrated mainly north of the Golden
Horn. The dominance within this pluralism of
an unenriched Neoclassicism accounts
largely for the sombre and colourless fabric
of present-day Galata and Pera (Beyoğlu). It seems that, whatever the subject being
discussed, Celik is forever having to contrast,
sometimes unconsciously, the mainly foreign
quarters north of the Golden Horn with the
predominantly Muslim ones south of it; and
almost always the latter suffers by the
comparison.

This highly recommended book gives
serious attention to the 19th-century
cityscape of one of the world’s most
fascinating urban conglomerates. Besides
providing a wealth of information, often
relating as much to social history as to urban
form, this volume offers a veritable mini-
archive of maps, diagrams, and black-and-
white photographs, many appearing here for
the first time and all carefully and
unambiguously arranged on the large format
pages. The publisher too merits kudos for a
product of superb technical execution at an
affordable price.
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