Geographical print culture in the German-speaking territories, c.1690—c.1815

Abstract

This paper examines the number and type of books of geography and geographical periodicals in the eighteenth-century German-speaking territories and the place and chronology of their publication with reference to recent work on geographical print culture in the Enlightenment. The paper extends recent studies on Aufklärungsgeographie (Enlightenment geography) by taking a broadly quantitative approach and in presenting, for 345 books and 109 geographical periodicals, geographies of authoring, editing and publishing in the German-speaking territories between c.1693 and c.1815. Attention is paid to differences of content, to contemporaries’ interests in geography as a form of ordered knowledge (wissenschaft) and to the purposes of their work: broadly, education, polite sociability, and the ‘completeness’ of geography as a form of Enlightenment knowledge. We show how writing and publishing geography—and Aufklärungsgeographie—was spatially distributed and how the rise in numbers and increased diversity of geographical works raised questions about authorship and credibility and the content of geography.
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This paper examines the production of geography books and periodicals in the German-speaking territories in the long eighteenth century. Attention is paid to the number, chronology, types of geographical works, to the towns and cities in which those works of geography were written and published in that period, and to the meaning and purpose of
geography expressed in these forms of print culture. Following this introduction, the paper is in several further parts. The first outlines recent work on eighteenth-century geographical print culture and provides context to our examination of German language works. In the second and third parts, we offer comments on questions of terminology and methodology since ‘Germany’ understood as a nation state did not exist in the eighteenth century and geography enjoyed different meanings in German language works. In parts four and five which address, respectively, books and periodicals, we examine evidence for the number of German language works, their type, date, and place of publication between c.1693 and c.1815. For both books and periodicals, we address questions of authorship and the content and purpose of geographical writing. Part six considers the purpose and the reception of the works in question. In part seven, the conclusion, we address the wider implications of this study.

GEOGRAPHICAL PRINT CULTURE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Geographical print culture in the eighteenth century has been the subject of considerable attention. The content and format of books of geography has been assessed, building in part upon bibliographical studies of the numbers and authorship of such works.\(^1\) The work of Robert Mayhew has been particularly influential. He has, variously: shown ‘the character’ of eighteenth-century English geography to be related to two social and intellectual traditions, a commercial and practical tradition, and a humanistic and scholarly tradition; illuminated the relationships between geography’s books and Georgian politics; and demonstrated, with reference to citationary practices and connections between spatiality and textuality in the format and content of English language geography books, how geography’s eighteenth-century print culture responded to new knowledge derived from exploration.\(^2\) In other work, Mayhew has revealed interrelationships between Enlightenment philosophy and politics,
either in individual works such as William Guthrie’s *Geographical Grammar* (1770) with its introduction into British geographical discourse of key themes from the Scottish Enlightenment, notably stadial theories of social development in the work of Adam Smith, Adam Fergusson and others, or, at greater length, he has explored the political languages of British geography after 1650. In this and other work, Mayhew has effectively countered the persistent and unwarranted historiographical ‘effacement of early modern geography’.

These insights into eighteenth-century British geographical print culture have been added to by others. Dodds’ analysis of booksellers’ records illuminates not just the geography of the book trade in Enlightenment Edinburgh but also the gendered reading of geography’s books. At a different scale, and with reference to ‘mainstream British geographical books’ published between 1760 and 1830, Stock has shown how the idea of Europe was differently constituted in terms, for example, of politics, religious difference, cultural boundaries, and the natural environment. Like Mayhew and Dodds, Stock is circumspect over questions of method and attentive to context. Most English language geography books in this period were not written by geographers, if, by that term, we mean persons either trained in the subject, employed by others to undertake work in it, including teaching, or explorer-voyagers. Most geography books were the product of hack writers and jobbing authors, few of whom ventured far from their libraries and desk. Because plagiarism was common, attribution of authorship, originality, and edition history can be difficult.

These issues apply no less to English-language books of geography in the early United States. There, geographical texts were used to instil a nascent national identity for that emergent polity, with Jedidiah Morse’s *American Geography* (1795) the first major book of geography in Enlightenment America to help shape that country’s national self-awareness. Others’ principally political works were similarly attentive to geography. Some attention has been given to such matters for France and the distinctions there between authorship by
‘géographes de cabinet’ and ‘voyageurs’.

But most work on eighteenth-century geographical print culture has focused on English language books of geography in their different formats and upon texts written, published, read, and reviewed in the English-speaking world, whether of England, Scotland, Britain as a whole, or the United States.

A notable exception to this Anglocentric emphasis is Dean Bond’s work on geography in late eighteenth-century Germany and on Anton Friedrich Büsching in particular. Earlier published research in the German context explored geographical teaching in universities, in Halle, in Göttingen and, notably, by Immanuel Kant in Königsberg. In turning to Büsching, Bond has widened the geographical range of studies of geography’s print culture, and advanced our understanding of authorship by examining the moral issues of epistemic credit and trust that underlay Büsching’s emphasis on accuracy and up-to-dateness in his geography. In his account of the Dane Carsten Niebuhr’s ill-fated Arabian Expedition and, but more so, in his own Neue Erdbeschreibung, whose first volume appeared in 1754, Büsching was at pains to establish ‘a new methodological foundation for the discipline of geography’.

This involved attention to the moral economy of geographical knowledge, namely the social and intellectual standing of Büsching’s informants, cross-checking claims made in correspondence, and upholding what historian of science Steven Shapin terms ‘epistemological decorum’, those procedures by which putative authors, unable directly to confirm all reports, assured themselves of the veracity of what was told them about places and events they had not seen by persons they did not know. For Büsching, ‘the need for a source critical approach in geography was inextricably linked to matters of morality’.

Büsching also produced a German language periodical. This hitherto little examined ‘periodical geography’ was a key feature of what Bond calls Aufklärungsgeographie (Enlightenment geography). Büsching brought his concerns over accuracy and distrust over troublesome sources to his ‘learned newspaper’, the Wöchentliche Nachrichten, which was
published weekly, in Berlin, between 1773 and 1787. Büsching was not alone in producing a geographical periodical. What is noteworthy, argues Bond, is that geography journals of this sort were ‘a uniquely German product’, with periodical-form geographical material in Britain and in France appearing in the proceedings and transactions of learned societies, not as a distinct genre in the public sphere: there was, then, ‘a distinct geography of periodical geography in the Enlightenment world’.  

This paper draws upon the literature cited and Bond’s call for greater attention to be paid to periodical geography to examine two related themes of Aufklärungsgeographie: the production of geography books, and the production of geographical periodicals, in the German-speaking territories. Bond focuses on the epistemological concerns evidenced by Büsching and is singular, almost biographical in scope, in attention to Büsching and his works. The debt we owe to Bond’s and others’ work is clear in what follows. But, in further understanding geographical print culture in the eighteenth century, it is appropriate to ask how representative Büsching’s Neue Erdbeschreibung and his Wöchentliche Nachrichten was of German geographical print culture generally—in purpose and content, in timing and, even, the location of publication? In short, Bond’s claim that ‘Aufklärungsgeographie was defined by distinct geographies, textual practices and print forms, and by a longer geographical tradition’ can be subject to empirical enquiry.

A NOTE ON TERMINOLOGY AND METHODOLOGY

Our concern with the number and type of books of geography and geographical periodicals and with the place and chronology of their publication takes a national perspective and a broadly quantitative approach. Qualification of the term ‘national’ is necessary: there was no Germany as a unified nation state in the eighteenth century. What existed was a political union of over 300 territories, including free cities; what, in its mapped expression, one
modern commentator has called ‘a patchwork rug’.\textsuperscript{16} The terms \textit{Nation, Volk, Vaterland} and even \textit{Deutschland} were in use in the period, but there was no single coherent identity or territory that could be called Germany.\textsuperscript{17} Our use of the term German-speaking territories rather than states or nation thus conforms with one definition then in use, namely the German language community, the \textit{deutsche Sprachgemeinschaft}.\textsuperscript{18} ‘The sense that the authors concerned were writing for a German language community yet at work within separate German-speaking territories, is apparent in a remark by Hamburg-based geographer Christoph Daniel Ebeling in 1773. Writing to Charles Burney in England, Ebeling was at pains to correct his correspondent’s views regarding German identity: ‘Then I believe there is a general mistake that you believe our nation is to be considered as one people. No Sir. History and Geography will acquaint You that we are composed of different clans or even little nations quite different from one another in dialects, customs, notwithstanding many of them have been altered by administration, mixture with foreigners, wars, migrations etc. but always say the Germans in genere [sic]. You should say the Bavarians, Upper Saxons, Lower Saxons etc.’\textsuperscript{19} We return below to the question of German geography books as indicative or not of a sense of ‘German-ness’.

The caution exercised over the use of Germany applies equally to contemporaries’ use of the term geography. German geographical authors commonly used \textit{Geographie} in the titles of their works, from its Greek roots meaning earth description. They also used two Germanic versions, \textit{Erdbeschreibung} and \textit{Erdkunde}. While both terms were broadly synonymous with \textit{Geographie}, there were subtle distinctions in meaning between them and a distinct chronology in the usage of these terms. The term \textit{Erdbeschreibung} was used of geography books from at least 1670.\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Erdkunde} was used widely only from the later eighteenth century. Adam Christian Gaspari used the terms interchangeably in his \textit{Vollständiges Handbuch der Erdbeschreibung} (1797), for example, yet also argued that \textit{Erdkunde} differed from
Erdbeschreibung in referring to a body of knowledge whilst Erdbeschreibung concerned the science to be studied: ‘The word Erdkunde actually expresses the individual knowledge of the earth which is gained through the study of Erdbeschreibung; it [Erdkunde] is however often also used as synonym for Erdbeschreibung’. In his _Encyclopädie der Historischen Hauptwissenschaften und deren Hülfswissenschaften_ (1808), Johann Fabri pointed to some of the variations used, including by Büsching:

[T]he term geography [Geographie] is expressed differently by individual writers.


2. Others explain geography [Geographie] as a science of the natural state of the known [parts of the] earth [Erdboden].

3. Again others: as a science of the earth [Erdboden], or

4. as a science which treats the description of the earth by addressing each part according to its natural and political state based on rational theorems and reliable information.

Contemporaries’ use of these geographical terms in relation to the term _Wissenschaft_ (any ordered system of knowledge and, thus, not simply ‘science’) was part of their concerns to position geography as a credible form of learning.

Eighteenth-century contemporaries categorised geographical print in order to organise different genres of geographical knowledge. In his _Geographie für alle Stände_ (Geography for all Estates) (1786), for example, Johann Ernst Fabri noted how ‘The many books which
ease the study of geography can be classified along the following categories: 1) Libraries and other works that offer information about geographical works. 2) Systems and textbooks which cover geography in all aspects or at least several parts of it. 3) Geographical dictionaries. 4) Essays and works on individual geographical curiosities in different parts or areas of the world. 5) Travel accounts. 6) Topographies and Chorographies which only describe individual places or regions. 7) Publications of geographical societies. 8) Miscellanies, periodicals, magazines, journals, weekly papers.\textsuperscript{23} Such systematisation was part of eighteenth-century interests in taxonomising and encyclopaedia as a form of classifying knowledge.\textsuperscript{24}

That the volume of German geographical literature was considerable is apparent from a comment by Albrecht Watermeyer in the second (1786) edition of his \textit{Statistisch-Historisch-Geographisches Handbuch}. He referred his readers to Fabri’s \textit{Geographie für alle Stände} (1786) wherein Fabri listed ‘more than one and a half thousand’ works of geographical literature.\textsuperscript{25} Gatterer’s \textit{Abrif der Geographie} (1775) lists more than 50 pages of geographical sources. Both Fabri and Gatterer included foreign language works and travel accounts, however, and second and later editions of German and other geographical texts as separate works.

Our analysis is restricted to works that were primarily intended to communicate geographical knowledge. It is based on the study of library catalogues and book sellers’ records, and for German language works only, and excludes travel accounts, later editions, and works in which geographical material was only incidental (within encyclopaedia, for example). Research into German geographical print culture in these terms resulted in the identification of 345 German books of geography and 109 periodical works between c.1690 and c.1815.\textsuperscript{26} Within these totals, the books were initially grouped in categories which were faithful to contemporaries’ ordering principles: (1) compendia, textbooks, and reading books;
(2) treatises (on the progress of geography and instructions of geography); (3) gazetteers/dictionaries (including pocket dictionaries); (4) pocket books; (5) explanations of maps (old and new), atlases; (6) Repertorium; (7) directories of earth descriptions (‘Landes- und Reisebeschreibungen’); and (8) Miscellanea (letters, verses, tables, picture-book/story books, areal measurements). Periodicals appeared under the headings of magazines, journals, Repertoria (directories), and sometimes Repositoria, and as publications of societies. The more detailed categorisations of content which follow are based upon close reading of the works in question—in short, ours is a ‘materialist hermeneutics’ aimed at elucidating the form, content and purpose of the works and, where we could, the audience.

DEFINING GEOGRAPHY IN THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY GERMAN-SPEAKING TERRITORIES

As did their English-language counterparts, German geographical authors recognised long-standing scale-based dimensions. Geography was understood to refer to the study of the earth as a whole, in contrast to cosmography which addressed the earth in relation to other celestial bodies, and chorography and topography, the study of nations, regions, or localities. In his Kleine Geographie vor die Anfänger (1755), for example, Johann Hager advised his readers ‘not to confuse geography with cosmography, chorography, topography, hydrography, and orography’. For Büsching, ‘Erdbeschreibung [Geography] is only part of Weltbeschreibung [Cosmography] with which it stands in close connection’, a point endorsed later by others such as Friedrich Frantz in his Lehrbuch der Länder- und Völkerkunde (1788) and Friedrich Canzler in his 1790 Abriss der Erdkunde.

German geographical authors differentiated geography by subject matter (Gegenstand); by time (Zeit), old, middle, or new, describing, respectively, the state of the earth and geographical knowledge in the Classical period, the Middle Ages, and the modern period.
era; and by scale or scope (Umfang) where reference was to smaller studies in geography. The most common distinction was that between mathematical, physical, and political geography. Gaspari outlined these terms in his 1797 work: ‘astronomical or mathematical [geography] which examines [the] shape, size, and movement of the earth and explains related lines and points; physical [geography] which addresses the state of the earth’s surface; and political [geography] which examines the earth as a dwelling place of rational creatures who share the earth and relate to one another in various ways’.30

The threefold differentiation in time between old, middle and new or, more properly, modern geography, was understood in several ways. Old commonly meant the Classical period in Europe. Middle referred to Europe’s Middle Ages. Use of the term new, newest or modern in the titles of works, especially in the late eighteenth century, reflected a view that the authors were aware of that period, the Enlightenment, as epoch-making, progressive, something fundamentally different from what had gone before.31 In this sense, and for some authors, Aufklärungsgeographie was a self-conscious project which stressed geography’s development over time, and the place of geography as an historical science; that is, it took seriously changes over time in the conditions of its own existence and in its content. Like their English-language counterparts, most German geographical authors were not professional geographers but, rather, historians, theologians, and philosophers who nevertheless shared a belief in progress and in the necessity for society’s improvement, ‘Fortschrittsgläube’. Even as opinions varied over the precise relationship between social, scientific, and moral improvement, there was a common understanding that ‘Fortschritt’ (progress) was required but that it was an incomplete process.32

German scholars read the historical theories of French and Scottish authors on stadial theory and conjectural history, the idea that society progressed through stages of development. In France, French political commentator and geographer Anne-Robert-Jacques
Turgot hypothesised three such stages: hunters, shepherds, and husbandmen. Scottish authors such as Adam Fergusson and Adam Smith conceptualised four stages: hunting, pastoralism, agrarianism, and commercialism. These ideas surfaced in German geography books: Sprengel in 1792 argued that ‘Barbarians and savages in their isolated . . . state do not have a concept of Erdkunde or Erdbeschreibung’; Gatterer in 1775 referred to ‘unaufgeklärte, halb- und ganzaufgeklärte [sic] Völker’ (not enlightened, half-enlightened and fully enlightened peoples).

The third criterion of classifying geographical knowledge, by scale and scope, was between universal and special geography, the former signalling to studies of the whole earth, the latter to descriptions of parts of the earth, as in English language works. Distinctions proposed in physical geography, for example between hydroistic geography (hydrology) and Aeroistik, atmospheric and meteorological geography, reflected moves to the more precise study of given natural phenomena. The term human geography was not in common use, matters of human difference or cultural practice being covered by Völkerkunde, ethnography. Statistical or commercial geography emerged as a sub-category toward the end of the century. This reflected the emergence in the German-speaking territories of the discipline of statistics, Staatswissenschaft or Staatskunde, the science of the state. The rise of Staatswissenschaft resulted in differences of view over the precise content of, and the boundaries between, statistics and geography. Modern scholars have argued that statistics primarily focused upon the state, and upon the German-speaking territories in particular, given growing recognition of the inefficiencies of territorial governance by the later 1700s. Eighteenth-century German geographical authors shared no single opinion. In his 1790 work, Canzler stressed the difference between statistics and geography, with geography the necessary ‘foundation and preparation for the science of the state’; by contrast, Gaspari in 1796 saw statistics as part of political geography. These differences also reflected...
competing views over geography as a university subject and a science with its own objectives and methods no longer auxiliary to mathematics, history, or statistics.

Even in this necessarily abbreviated summary, it is clear that geography was widely written about in the eighteenth-century German-speaking territories, that Büsching’s work sat in a longer and diverse intellectual tradition, that German geographical authors worked with particular classificatory schema for geography and that they, like their French, British, and American counterparts, were exercised by other’s conjectural and historical theories and by concerns over geography’s content and utility.

It is also clear that, in German geography as in English-language works, plagiarism was common and so defining authorship, originality and from that, the separateness of texts, is problematic. Writing geography was often an exercise in amalgamating or synthesising existing texts, a point which echoes Mayhew’s and Stock’s arguments concerning English language geography books at this time.39 For some, writing geography was a popular way of generating private income: so much so that one scholar bemoaned the careless production of poor quality geographical works as Buhldirne, ‘whorish’, with authors prostituting themselves ‘for the sake of the dear bread’.40 In 1803, Ehrmann similarly commented upon the deterioration in quality of some geographical works since, with so many to choose from by that period, less scrupulous authors could and did draw from the more assiduous. For Ehrmann, this raised exactly that issue of trust which had so concerned Büsching half a century earlier: ‘Since quick book research is easier than digging, scribblers of all kinds have made geography their line of work in order to create a job; these scribblers have described countries they have never seen and about which they have no new knowledge, because of that, a geographer has twice reason to ask himself at every step he takes in his science: whom do you trust?’41 Ehrmann considered it essential that geographical authors should write with
critical scepticism, to evaluate content, author, method and any contextual conditions determining the narrative form (such as censorship).  

These remarks are to note several things. As was the case in Britain and for most English-language geographical print culture, geographical authors in the German-speaking territories were not professional geographers but historians, theologians, or philosophers by training: several were jobbing authors. Some geographical authors may have seen themselves part of a German *Gelehrtenrepublik*—an imagined intellectual community whose aim was to counteract the fractured political, religious and scholarly landscape of the time. As we show below, however, most German geographical authors were concerned more with the status of geography as a form of knowledge, with distinctions within geography, and to establish geography’s intellectual credentials than they were in using geography to promote a sense of Germany as a single territory or, even, an imagined national space.

**GERMAN GEOGRAPHY BOOKS, c.1690-c.1815**

**The Chronology and Type of Book Publication**

Assessment of the chronology of publication of the 345 German geography books published in this period shows two phases: from c.1690 to c.1775, in which period geography books were published at a low level of annual output, and after that date, in which period, noticeably from the early 1780s, large numbers of books appeared annually, with ‘peaks’ in 1782, 1784, 1785, 1789, 1790, 1791, 1792, 1798, 1804, 1805, and 1810. The rate of publication fell after 1815 (Figure 1). Of the total overall, the great proportion (250 books) were books of general geography. Seven other genres of book publishing may be identified, in which specific geographical or regional descriptions formed the next largest category of publication (41 works) (Table 1). If we look in more detail at the types of geography books produced, works of general geography predominated (107 books), with books of
chorographic focus the next most numerous (92 works). Works focusing on the geography of a specific time period were the third largest category by number of works published (36). The great majority of books in this category addressed the geography of the Roman and ancient Greek worlds; only one, Christian Juncker’s *Anleitung zu der Geographie der mitlern [mittleren] Zeiten* (1712), focused on the geography of the middle ages. Works on the progress of geography were the fourth most common genre. While books on more
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres of Geography Books, c.1690–c.1815</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compendia/systems, textbooks, and reading books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions/dissertations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatises [on the progress of geography and instructions for geography]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazetteers/dictionaries [including pocket dictionaries]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repertorium [Directories of earth descriptions] (Landes- und Reisebeschreibungen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works geared to explanation of maps or atlases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellanea [letters, verses, tables, picture-books, areal measurements]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Genres of German geography books, c.1690–c.1815
| General Geography [description of the known earth] | 107 |
| Geographical chorographies [descriptions of continents, lands, regions, topographies] | 92 |
| Historical geography/geography by time period | 36 |
| Political geography [including descriptions of inhabitants, customs] | 9 |
| Physical geography [including geography of plants and animals] | 7 |
| Mathematical geography | 7 |
| Physical geography [with mathematical geography] | 6 |
| Geography and its relationship with other sciences | 26 |
| Treatises on the progress of geography and instructions on geography | 22 |
| Other geographical themes [military geography; the size of states and products; subterranean geography; trade, moon, nosology, biblical geography, medical geography etc.] | 22 |
| Pocket books [for geographical travels in Europe] | 4 |
| Explanations of maps and of atlases | 3 |
| *Repertorium* [directory of earth descriptions: *Landes- und Reisebeschreibungen*] | 4 |
| **Total** | **345** |

Table 2. German geography books, by principal theme, c.1690–c.1815.
specific aspects of geography were produced—on medical geography and diseases, for
example, and on military geography—they were few in number (Table 2).

Discussion in detail of the different genres, certainly of individual texts, is
problematic given the number and variety of texts and limitations of space, but several
general observations may be made. The categories used here are ones of relative emphasis
rather than discrete separation: most general geographies for example contained elements of
political and/or physical geography. Clearer distinction between types of geography was
apparent by the later eighteenth century. The majority of the more specialist books of
geography, in mathematical and in physical geography, were published after 1780: the
exceptions being a textbook on mathematical and physical geography in 1758, and an
introduction to mathematical geography in 1771. The publication of works of physical and
mathematical geography by the later 1700s reflected the greater attention given to
geographical teaching in German universities, a developing interest within the German-
speaking public sphere, and a relative decline in the number of political geography books
given the rapidity with which the European political landscape was then changing. The
participation of Germans and German-speakers in international exploration—Carsten
Niebuhr in Arabia, Johann Reinhold Forster on James Cook’s second voyage between 1772
and 1775—was reflected in several general geography books after c.1782 (and in their later
editions) and in works of chorographical focus. Overall, between 1782 and 1810—the ‘high
point’ of German geographical book publishing—no single theme dominated. Works of
chorography were more prevalent than earlier in the century, demonstrating an interest in the
German states and in overseas geography and exploration—particularly North America and
Oceania. Attention to America and France mirrored (and perhaps stimulated) public interest in revolutions and wars there. Interest in the progress of geography is evident in treatises on the state of geography and its relation to other sciences, with books to this purpose more common after the 1780s. The great proportion of general geography books were concerned with geographical learning, with geography in school and university education and a means to social progress: 239 books made reference to education or instructional learning in private homes, schools, colleges, and universities. If the twelve treatises on the role of, and improvement in, geographical learning are added to this group, then 251 books were primarily concerned with education and learning. For the reasons noted, however, we must be cautious about ascribing books to a single category or in attributing to authors either a single end in view or a clearly-defined audience: many had mixed audiences in mind—the interested public, more specialist readers as well as school and university students.

Geographies of Book Authorship and Production

Questions of authorship are problematic not just because of the nature of eighteenth-century geographical writing but because, for a handful of books, authorship was anonymous. While writing a book perhaps required some travel, most authorship commonly involved sedentary compilation. It is reasonable to suppose, then, that authorship and editorship commonly took place in the individual’s usual place of residence. From close reading of books’ prefatory material, library catalogues and evidence in obituaries, it is possible to identify where authorship and editorship took place.

Geography book authorship and editorship in the eighteenth-century German territories was a predominantly urban phenomenon, mainly of the principally Protestant north. Geography’s authors and editors were found almost everywhere—one or two publications were undertaken in each of eighty-eight different places—but they were mainly
located in the larger urban centres. For books, this was in Berlin (22 people), Göttingen (13), Nuremberg and Halle (9 each), Leipzig and Jena (8 each). A total of seventeen books were undertaken outside the German-speaking territories, and a handful in then German towns, most in Prussia, later ceded to other nations (Table 3).

Writing and editing geography books predominantly took place in towns and cities with academic institutions and a larger resident population. Berlin, the capital of Prussia, did not have a university until 1810, but its academy of science, the Berliner Societät der Wissenschaften, was founded in 1700. The comparatively greater number of books written there may be explained by the Prussian emphasis on improved schooling and education following the introduction in 1763 of compulsory schooling. Göttingen, Halle, and Jena were leading universities and centres for Enlightenment debate, as was Leipzig. Amongst leading geographical authors, Anton Friedrich Büssing, Johann Christian Gatterer, August Ludwig von Schlözer, and Friedrich Gottlieb Canzler all worked in Göttingen. Nuremberg, home to the Cosmographical Society, was a centre for works of historical geography (books, that is, whose principal focus was on the geography of a particular time period), early in the century by Johann David Köhler in 1724, 1728 and 1730, and, later in the century, in books by Conrad Mannert in 1788 and 1798. Königsberg was the workplace of Immanuel Kant, whose physical geography was based on his lectures. Gotthilf Christian Reccard and Johann Heinrich Jacobi also in Königsberg wrote geographical textbooks. Stuttgart was home to the Hohe Karlsschule, a military academy where geographical authors Friedrich Ferdinand Drück and Friedrich Christian Franz worked as history and language teachers. Franz wrote a textbook on general and regional geography; Drück one on Asia. Johann Christian Volz also worked in Stuttgart and wrote a textbook for the local grammar school. Hamburg, where five books of geography were authored, was a Bürgerrepublik, a city republic, and important in international trade. It is noteworthy that the geography books written and edited in Hamburg
concerned general geography, trade geography, and the Americas, the authors on the latter
two topics being Christoph Daniel Ebeling, who corresponded with Jedidiah Morse over
America’s geography, and Johann Georg Büsch.\(^{45}\)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of author unknown</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author/editor anonymous</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göttingen</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg [including Altdorf, Ensdorf, and Creglingen]; Halle</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig; Jena</td>
<td>8 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Königsberg [then in Prussia, today in Russia]; Magdeburg</td>
<td>6 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside the German territories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna – 5; Copenhagen – 2; Greifswald [in Sweden until 1815] – 2; Salzburg – 2; Yverdon-les-Bains, Switzerland – 1; Barby [USA] – 1; Paris – 1; Riga [Lithuania] – 1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The principal place of authorship and editorship of German geography books,
c.1690–c.1815

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leipzig</th>
<th>79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt am Main</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg [including Altona]</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other principal locations:</strong> Erfurt – 11 works; Göttingen – 10; Stuttgart – 9; Königsberg and Augsburg – 7 each; Breslau [then in Prussia], Tübingen, and Dresden – 6 each</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outside the German territories</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. The principal place of publication of German geography books, c.1690–c.1815

Consideration of the place of book publication shows a similar concentration in the larger urban centres, with Leipzig—the leading German book city in the eighteenth century—the chief centre of publication but not of authorship, a position held by Berlin (see Table 3). A handful of German geographies were published beyond the German territories (Table 4).

As for authorship, book publication centred upon Protestant towns and cities, with the exception of Erfurt, Munich and, further afield, Vienna. Of the ninety-nine different places of book writing, only sixteen were in the Catholic south. Of the eighty-eight places of book publishing, only fourteen were in the Catholic south.

GERMAN GEOGRAPHICAL PERIODICALS, c.1690—c.1815

The Chronology and Type of Periodical Publication

The chronology of publication of German geographical periodicals divides broadly into three phases (Figure 2). Between 1699 and the appearance of Peter Lehmann’s Historische Remarques ... aus der Geographie and a further, anonymous, and short lived (1699–1703) Singularia Historio-Geographica published in Leipzig, and 1779, only a handful of geographical periodicals appeared. Those in the 1760s included Hager’s Geographischer Büchersaal (1766–1778) and Büsching’s Magazin für die neue Historie und Geographie (1767–1793). In and from 1780, numbers increased sharply, with prominent periodical peaks in 1782, 1790 and 1791, before a decline after 1801. The periodicals appearing from 1780 reflected interests in state-related issues, historical, geographical and statistical information,
developments in geography, and *Erd- und Völkerkunde*—general geographical accounts written to expand on descriptions in textbooks. These often drew upon others’ travel accounts and exploration narratives of North America, Oceania, or Asia. The general intent was to inform the public and scholars alike about new geographical findings, and to comment upon trade and regional and world politics. Several later eighteenth-century periodicals were concerned, more evidently than their earlier counterparts, with reviewing geographical publications and monitoring the progress of geography, or a particular sub-theme of it, as a science (*Wissenschaft*) in its own right. The periodicals published in the final decade of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century were almost all intended for more specialist and geographically interested audiences.

For contemporaries, the increase in geographical periodicals from the late eighteenth century was evidence of developments within geography, however understood, and of demand from the German public for new geographical and state-based information. Friedrich Canzler noted thus in the first issue of his *Allgemeines Archiv* in 1787, ‘The gigantic progress which the Länder- Völker- and Staatenkunde experienced during the second half of the current century, and which seems to continue, is certainly a distinctive attribute of our times. Everyone strives to acquire and supply news for the purpose of these sciences’. Modern scholars have shown that periodicals of all sorts increased throughout the German-speaking territories, markedly from the 1770s, and that they did so chiefly in Leipzig, Berlin, Hamburg, and Frankfurt am Main. Geographical periodicals were part, then, of a burgeoning interest in current and world affairs and in literary information as a form of polite entertainment. Our research makes the geographies of this public interest in geography more precise in terms of the authorship for, and the editing of, periodicals (Table 5) and the urban centres of periodical production (Table 6).
Periodical writing and editing centred upon Göttingen given the presence in the university (Georgia Augusta, founded in 1735) of several leading geographers, and in Halle and Berlin for the same reason. These cities benefitted in their scholarly foundations from the political and financial patronage of their respective territorial rulers—an essential feature in the promotion of Enlightenment knowledge. In periodical authorship, the general pattern was of a single author or editor in individual towns or cities, with only three persons outside the German-speaking territories—in St Petersburg and in Riga (Table 5). In terms of periodical publication, Leipzig and Berlin predominated as they did for geography books (cf. Tables 4 and 6). Many smaller urban centres—28 in total—published only a single periodical in this period. St Petersburg, with four, Riga and Copenhagen with one each, were the locations for German periodical geography beyond the German-speaking territories (Table 6).

The majority of these geographical periodicals—60 of the 109 identified—addressed geography as a whole (general geography), with the others focusing on one or more particular topic, geography’s relationship with cognate subjects, or discussing themes for which geographical insight was considered necessary for public life—international trade, European politics, boundary changes. Thirteen periodicals were essentially chorographical, centring their concerns upon Westphalia, Prussia, Franconia, Saxony, and Bavaria, respectively, a fact which speaks against the notion of geographical periodicals as a whole helping constitute a sense of a greater German-ness. The commonly stated intent of editors and authors that their periodical should speak to enthusiasts or lovers of geography was designed to appeal to readers with more specialist interests, and to the lay public alike. Nearly all periodicals sought to promote an understanding of geography as the science of earth description, to document advances in parts of geography and in the geography of the world as revealed
through travel and exploration, and, broadly, to educate an interested public through geography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anonymous</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Göttingen</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin; Hamburg [including Altona]</td>
<td>4 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden; Marburg; Jena; Kiel; Brunswick; Chemnitz</td>
<td>2 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassel; Frankfurt am Oder; Munich; Stuttgart; Mainz; Gotha; Weimar; Schnepfental; Bielefeld; Buchholz in Minden; Dortmund; Cannstadt; Leipzig; Coburg; Schwabach</td>
<td>1 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the German territories</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna – 2; Strasbourg; Riga – 1 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. The place of authorship and editorship of German geographical periodicals, c.1690–c.1815

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leipzig</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halle; Göttingen; Weimar</td>
<td>7 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessau</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotha; Tübingen</td>
<td>3 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the German territories</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna – 9; St Petersburg – 4; Copenhagen, and Riga – 1 each</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yet, assessment of periodicals’ content does reveal differences over time. Those few published before the 1760s were general in purpose, more informative for lay audiences who read in order to be informed about their world. From the 1760s—Johan Hager’s short-lived *Geographischer Büchersaal* (1764–1778) was the first in this respect—more periodicals aimed at readers with greater familiarity with specialist themes in geography or an interest in the progress of the subject, and those who were either teaching it or being taught. The periodicals produced later in the eighteenth century and in the early nineteenth century were almost all intended for geographically aware audiences. Even allowing for these differences, it is inappropriate to think, as we might in modern context, of more publicly-oriented outlets and specialist journals.\(^49\) Many editors and authors kept their content broad in order to maintain interest and maximise sales: of his *Geographische Ephemeriden* (1798–1799), for example, Franz Xaver von Zach stated that it would include essays by numerous European correspondents and ‘geographical ‘observations’, ‘experiences’, ‘discoveries’, ‘inventions’, ‘critical reviews and news of recent scientific publications’, ‘critical news of new maps, plans, astronomical and mathematical tools’, ‘biographical news and portraits of men who have contributed substantially to these subjects [geography and astronomy]’, as well as ‘news from travelers’.\(^50\)

One advantage of publishing in periodical form was flexibility in terms of format and frequency and, potentially, lower costs than book publication. Despite increased interest in geography in the public sphere, some journals failed, forced to close either for economic reasons, for want of up-to-date and accurate information or, as some noted, because the market was so well-provided for that it was hard to maintain distinctiveness and ensure quality. Theophil Ehrmann’s *Magazin der Erd- und Völkerkunde* lasted only one issue in
1782. Johann Fabri’s *Magazin fur die Geographie, Staatenkunde und Geschichte* folded after less than a year in 1797. The fact that it was Fabri’s eighth such periodical, his first being in 1782, hints at complex personal stories of writing, editing, and publishing across different towns and cities behind those geographies enumerated above.⁵¹

THE PURPOSE AND RECEPTION OF GERMAN GEOGRAPHICAL PRINT CULTURE, c.1690–c.1815

Geographical authors and publishers in the German-speaking territories, and those few at work elsewhere, had two related aims: the education and social and moral improvement of German-speaking peoples—enlightenment through geography—and the development and improvement of geography—the completeness of geography—as a form of world knowledge, an independent and distinctive Wissenschaft.

The Benefits of Geographical Learning

Whether in treatises as a whole, in prefaces to longer works, or in articles in periodicals, the benefits of geography as a form of polite public knowledge were repeatedly stressed. Three related benefits were noted, emphasis upon each varying according to individual authors. First, geographical knowledge was regarded as beneficial to living as a good human being. Geography was commonly considered useful and necessary in supporting one’s every-day activities, and in facilitating the study of other subjects: both issues were emphasised in books designed for formal education in geography. Second, some authors considered geography a support to the Christian faith. Third, the study of geography generated polite social behaviour and patriotic sentiments.

Normann’s emphasis on geography’s utility in his 1785 *Geographische und Historisches Handbuch* is illustrative of claims to the fundamental character and purpose of geographical knowledge: ‘The utility of geography is extremely general. To know one’s dwelling place is the first and worthiest matter of human curiosity. Geography is necessary
for all estates, for all relations and occupations; it is necessary and useful for every age and
every kind of knowledge’.
Westenrieder considered geographical awareness ‘the life duty of a citizen’. Büsching began his *Neue Erdbeschreibung* with a section entitled ‘Of the utility of geography’, arguing how ‘Geography is a science not only useful for all but indispensably necessary to some persons’, and identifying the sovereign, the statesman, the theologian, the natural philosopher, the merchant, and the traveller as persons who would benefit most from geographical knowledge.

Büsching saw geography’s greatest purpose as the demonstration of the existence and greatness of God, arguing that ‘a good earth description should be an important explanation of the doctrine of the divine providence’ and how ‘the knowledge of God, the creator and preserver of all things, is eminently promoted by this science’. For Büsching, geographical knowledge and research was an exercise in the affirmation of faith, belief in a beneficent God, and a means of cognitive development, what he called gnosis, a belief inherited in Halle from his teacher, Pietist theologian August Hermann Francke. These views on Pietism, geographical knowledge and the affirmation of Judeo-Christian faith were practised by several Protestant pastors who gave geographical instruction and undertook geographical research, such as Eberhard David Hauber, Johann Reinhold Forster, and Johann Gottfried Herder. The attention to divine revelation through geographical knowledge was perhaps more acute in Büsching than in some other German geographical authors who mentioned the Abrahamic God in their prefaces without always stressing the connection between geography and faith, but it helps explain the predominantly Protestant geographies of authorship and publication. Catholicism stressed adherence to Church doctrine rather more than worldly learning, a fact evident even in those few geography books produced there after the abolition of the Jesuit order in 1773 (some of which were in Latin and in French rather than in
German): there is more to know concerning the relationship between Jesuit theology and geographical education, in the German-speaking territories and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{56}

Geographical learning was, thirdly, considered necessary for the improvement of social and patriotic behaviour. Being able to read and to understand current affairs was an indication of one’s personal enlightenment and a desire to better one’s self. Engagement with geographical literature enabled one to take part in polite social conversations in private and in public. New information about the world drove what one modern scholar has referred to as a ‘travelogue mania’ in the German states after c. 1750.\textsuperscript{57} Among contemporaries, Gaspari recognised the public’s interest in travel literature and the significance of geographical knowledge: ‘these travelogues are now the reading matter and the topic of discourse of all civilised estates. One cannot read them just with reason, nor talk about them without being exposed and ridiculed, if one does not bring a certain level of geographical knowledge to the book and the conversation. . . . It is disgraceful to be illiterate in geography in such an era’.\textsuperscript{58}

If geography was thus a basis to sociability—a key Enlightenment concept—it was also understood as useful in promoting patriotism in the sense of being familiar with, and taking pride in, the geography of one’s homeland. This was taken to be several things: \textit{Vaterland}, the Holy Roman Empire, one’s territory or even immediate local circle (\textit{Kreis}). For Norrmann in 1795, geographical knowledge helped ‘Germans of all estates to acquire a correct and precise knowledge of their homeland, to acquaint them with the merits of their homeland and to thereby inspire a reasonable national pride and patriotism’.\textsuperscript{59} Patriotism could then relate to different spatial scales—one’s immediate locale, territory or the Holy Roman Empire—a fact which reflected the fragmentation of the eighteenth-century German territories with regard to their political structures, national customs, and religion. For Christian Ebeling as we have seen, there was no such thing as a single Germany. Other authors did ask their readers to ‘render services to their fatherland and [to] describe it in
detail’ hoping, in part, to contribute to the development of a trans-German print culture and language group.\textsuperscript{60} The effectiveness of doing so, however, depended less upon the presumption \textit{a priori} that there should be a single Germany and more upon how the text in question was written and structured and how it was to be used since many German geographical books started with other states and nations: as Johann Schatzen asked in 1776, ‘With what excuse is a German expected to learn geography by first passing through mostly all other realms in Europe before giving him [sic] the opportunity to get to know Germany, his fatherland, in more detail?’\textsuperscript{61} There are parallels here with late eighteenth-century American geography and the work of Jedidiah Morse and others. In his \textit{American Geography}, Morse re-cast the textual order of English language geography books for use in America, putting America first. He also measured states against the epitome of Connecticut (his own state) and so judged their readiness to join with others to form a United States as a nascent national entity. In the eighteenth-century German-speaking territories, using geography to promote notions of the fatherland depended in part upon what was meant by that term, since it could mean either the territory alone or something greater, in part upon different authors’ intentions, and upon how particular books were used in geographical curricula.\textsuperscript{62}

\textbf{The Idea of a ‘Complete’ Geography}

Many of those later eighteenth-century texts which aimed at more scholarly audiences sought a completeness to their work. That is, it was, or should be, the purpose of geographical texts to produce a complete description of the earth, one that was up-to-date, accurate, and which demonstrated the systematisation of all forms of geographical enquiry, by theme, time period, and across the three main geographical topics (mathematical, physical, and political geography). The wish for such a complete geography was expressed in numerous ways.
Theophil Ehrmann (1783) bemoaned the lack of a geographical whole in his *Magazin der Erd- und Völkerkunde*: ‘We have systems of geography, publications in Länderkunde—publications by the greatest contemporary geographers. We have a rich abundance of compendia, special geographies, travel accounts, and similar works, all in uncountable numbers. And yet, there has been no collector who has combined all these parts to one whole, which could be the foundation for a complete system’. The idea of completeness was further specified by Johann Georg Müller in an essay in 1789 calling for an approach to an ideal earth description. Müller’s desire for a critical earth description would require, he argued, the ‘compilation, comparison, and examination of the uncountable geographies, topographies and travel accounts we already have’.  

This intended completeness necessitated certain authorial and publication strategies. One approach was to distinguish between scientific geographical authorship and popular writing—the approach adopted by Büsching in mid-century. Prefaces in journals and books were used to comment on others’ publications. In his 1787 work, Canzler asked ‘German authors of travel writings and translators of foreign travel accounts’ to take note of already existing travel accounts so that multiple descriptions and ‘completely unimportant news’ could be avoided. The production of what was, in effect, meta-data was of little value unless it was accurate. So he also turned his attention to citation practices and included a section entitled ‘Wishes, suggestions, and improvements for the Länder- Völker- und Staatenkunde’ in which he asked ‘Germany’s journalists’ to improve their referencing and citational practices. The indication of sources—the traceability (*Nachvollziehbarkeit*) of geographical information—was a way to indicate the author’s credibility.

This evidence confirms Bond’s remarks on the importance Büsching attached to the moral basis of authorial credibility, to the culture of mistrust in one’s sources. Yet the fact that many authors were addressing the self-same issue in the late eighteenth century and in
the early nineteenth suggests that Büsching’s mid-century methodological caution was not widely adopted by his later counterparts, overcome as they were by the wealth of new information and the demands of a literate public. Writing to an American friend in 1809, Ebeling went even further, proposing a ‘new manner of writing geography critically’, in which drafts of works should be reviewed by local experts (scholars living in the area described) before publication.66

Other authorial strategies were used. One was collaboration, either in the production of the journal, or in working together to elicit the required information. There is evidence by the later eighteenth century of groups of scholars working to produce periodical form publication and, in book form, the reportorial, to this common end. Examples include the Mitglieder der Kosmographischen Gesellschaft (members of the Cosmographical Society) who published Cosmographical News and Collections for the Year 1748, and a journal in the mid-1780s. Of the 109 periodicals identified, twenty-two were edited by two or more scholars, most of them in the last decades of the eighteenth century and in the early nineteenth. Forster and Sprengel’s Beiträge zur Völker- und Länderkunde (1781–1790), Bruns and Zimmermann’s Repositorium für die neueste Geographie, Statistik und Geschichte (1792–93), and Fabri, Johann Ernst and Hammerdörfer’s Historische und geographische Monatsschrift (1788) are examples. The Allgemeine Geographische Ephemeriden edited by Franz Xaver von Zach was ‘composed by a society of scholars’ scattered across the German-speaking states. For a few, periodicals were a means of archiving geographical material. Bruns and Zimmermann (1792) described the aim of their Repositorium as to ‘store some of the newest and most remarkable enrichments in geography made by foreigners. For future geographers, it would be very useful if all these materials could be combined in one collection’.67 Repertoria were books or directories that offered summaries of other publications’ content and commented on their utility, method, and quality. Johann Samuel
Ersch’s *Repertorium über die allgemeinern deutschen Journale und andere periodische Sammlungen für Erdbeschreibung, Geschichte und die damit verwandten Wissenschaften* (1790–1792) intended to provide an overview of all general German language journals and other periodical collections for the description of the earth, history, and the related sciences. But this was compromised by the volume of material with the result that it was out of date upon publication.

Attempts at completeness were hampered by changes in Europe’s geography as well as from the volume of new material. This is particularly apparent in works published in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. As Gaspari (1797) explained, ‘This [the world’s political geography] sees daily changes and so [does] also every geographical compendium. We further do not yet know the earth completely; our Erdkunde is considerably widened and corrected from time to time’.68 Another author argued that political geography in particular experienced changes in its content and ‘truth’ and bemoaned, ‘What is strictly true today, is no longer true tomorrow.’69

A further strategy to deal with the wealth of new information was publication of revised editions and supplements. Fabri’s *Handbuch der neuesten Geographie für Akademien und Gymnasien* (first published in 1784–1785) went through nine further editions between 1787 and 1819, his *Kurzer Abriß der Geographie* over fifteen editions between 1786 and 1817. If this points to the importance of edition history in geographical print culture, there is also evidence that attempts at completeness were not accompanied by full citation of the relevant sources. Several authors referred only to their main sources (*Hauptquellen*) and pointed to limitations of space and lack of audience interest in justification of their decision. This is true of Norrmann’s (1785) *Geographisches und Historisches Handbuch der Länder-Völker-und Staatenkunde*, Jacobi’s (1791) *Allgemeine Uebersicht der Geographie, Statistik und Geschichte sämtlicher Europäischen Staaten*, and Gaspari’s (1797) *Vollständiges*
Handbuch der Erdbeschreibung. But it was not true of all. After 1754, many authors concerned with geography’s epistemic credentials as a science highlighted Büsching as a key reference in their preface or in footnotes: Drück (1784) declared, for example, that ‘The sources which the author has drawn from are only mentioned if they are not Büsching’s’. Moritz Erdmann Engel (1791) based his Neues Handbuch der Geographie on works by Büsching and others: ‘That I have used the excellent publications of Büsching, Gatterer, Fabri, Norrmann, and Watermeyer and other men who have rendered services to this science, this, I think is more a way of grateful recognition than an excuse’.

Although it is here summarily noted of numerous texts rather than disclosed from close examination of a few as Bond does of Büsching, there is clear evidence of the broadly dual purpose of German geographical print culture, and, toward the end of the eighteenth century, of different authorial and publication strategies designed to cope with new information, geographical competitors, and public demand, and changes in political and territorial boundaries, especially in Europe itself. By 1815, German language attempts to produce a complete geography, itself an expression of Enlightenment encyclopaedism, were beginning to fail under the weight of new evidence and their own expectations: in that, they were not alone.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Recognising the caveats that necessarily attach to what is a national study of large numbers of books and periodicals in a subject then without clear boundaries, this account of German geographical print culture nevertheless extends understanding of the geographical dimensions of Aufklärungsgeographie. It does so by giving greater precision to the authorship, editing, and publication of geography books and periodicals in, and beyond, the German-speaking
territories. Rather than reiterate the principal findings, we close by considering some wider implications: they, like our findings, are suggestive rather than definitive.

Ours is very largely a production-based descriptive analysis, taking production to mean writing and compiling—authorship and editorship—and producing and printing—the publication of books and periodicals of geography. German language geographical print culture was a largely urban and Protestant phenomenon. This being so, there are opportunities to examine the relationships—authorial, financial, even denominational—between authors and editors (when not the same person) in and between given towns and cities, and, of a few persons, to scrutinise through their correspondence the networks of the geographically-minded in and beyond the German-speaking territories. Studies of eighteenth-century map making have similarly highlighted sectoral and status-based differences in map production, in Paris and in London—between colourists, engravers, atlas and book binders and so on—and identified trans-national networks of informational exchange.\(^73\) Production-based analysis might further address the idea of citationary geographies—how and when new evidence was cited in justification of an author’s arguments, as Mayhew has shown of John Pinkerton’s 1802 *Modern Geography*.\(^74\)

Equally, work might be done on the edition history of German geography books to trace more exactly how, when, and why authors changed the content of their works, and, to extend Bond’s arguments on Büsching, to know how many later authors adopted his culture of mistrust over others’ evidence. Such issues of trust, testimony, and truth extend also to the translation of geographical works, the translation into German of geographical information in other languages, and, less common, the translation into English of German language works. The translation into German of works of moral philosophy and political economy in the Enlightenment has been studied: geographical print culture lends itself to comparable assessment.\(^75\) As others have shown of the translation into English of Humboldt’s scientific
works in the nineteenth century, translation could involve considerable redaction, even outright alteration, of the author’s original intentions in order to suit different audiences and perceived needs. In short, and terms of production, what did Aufklärungsgeographie look like in different places, in different editions, in translation, as it moved over time and across state and national borders?

Similar questions concerning the reception of German geographical print culture are easier to pose than answer. The study of how books have been read, in different places and by different audiences with different interests in mind, is an established theme of nineteenth-century science. That it is less common of Enlightenment geography books and periodicals may reflect the vagaries of extant sources, but the presence of large numbers of German periodicals, especially after c.1780, offers possibilities in this respect, since many contained reviews of and commentaries upon others’ geographical works. This is a matter of scale, method, and audience: whether one looks at an individual’s work, a particular text, or at geography books in the home, or in school, or across different territories, even the nation. In production certainly and most likely in its reception, Aufklärungsgeographie had multiple geographical dimensions.
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Figure 1. Publication rates, by year, of the 345 German language geography books published in the German-speaking territories, by year of first edition or year of first identified version, c.1690–c.1815.

Figure 2. Publication rates, by year, of the 109 German geographical periodicals published in the German-speaking territories, by year of first edition or year of first identified version, c.1690–c.1815.
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