

Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte

Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris

(Institut historique allemand)

Band 33/2 (2006)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2006.2.75522

Rechtshinweis

Bitte beachten Sie, dass das Digitalisat urheberrechtlich geschützt ist. Erlaubt ist aber das Lesen, das Ausdrucken des Textes, das Herunterladen, das Speichern der Daten auf einem eigenen Datenträger soweit die vorgenannten Handlungen ausschließlich zu privaten und nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken erfolgen. Eine darüber hinausgehende unerlaubte Verwendung, Reproduktion oder Weitergabe einzelner Inhalte oder Bilder können sowohl zivil- als auch strafrechtlich verfolgt werden.

dem Regierungsantritt König Ernst Augusts, der das Ende der Personalunion mit England bedeutete, zieht.

Schließlich werden »Arbeit und Alltag am königlichen Hof in Hannover im 19. Jahrhundert« in Form einer Darstellung der Organisation des Hofes und seiner vier Hofstäbe, insbesondere des Oberhofmarschallamtes, angegangen. Die Mechanismen und die Wandlungen der Struktur des Hofes in Hannover bis zur Annexion des Territoriums durch Preußen 1866 werden dabei übersichtlich und anschaulich deutlich gemacht.

Da den einzelnen Beiträgen jeweils eigene Quellen- und Literaturverzeichnisse beigegeben sind, schließt das Werk mit einem Abbildungsverzeichnis und einem getrennten Orts- und Personenregister im Anhang.

Die inhaltlich und qualitativ sehr heterogenen Beiträge des vorliegenden Bandes beleuchten schlaglichtartig einige Bereiche der Lebenswelt des Adels in Kurhannover und der Region. Vollständigkeit und Ausgewogenheit wurde weder erstrebt noch erreicht. So kann der Band willkommener Anlaß einer weiteren Beschäftigung mit dem sicherlich interessanten Phänomen adeligen Lebens und adeliger Lebensumstände nicht nur im Nordwesten des Heiligen Römischen Reiches Deutscher Nation sein.

Bernhard MUNDT, Ludwigshafen/Rh., Mundenheim

Jürgen LUH, *Kriegskunst in Europa 1650–1800*, Cologne, Weimar, Vienna (Böhlau) 2004, 298 p., 36 ill., ISBN 3-412-13703-0, EUR 44,00.

The »Art of War« in early modern Europe has not been neglected by historians, and there is good reason to ask what a new, concise account of the practicalities of waging war between 1650 and 1800 can offer over and above the mass of existing publications on the subject. Jürgen Luh appears to have asked himself this question, and his new volume contributes innovatively to the literature on *Ancien Régime* warfare. In the first place he assimilates, synthesizes and, where appropriate, criticizes recent scholarship on early modern warfare, much of it reactions and responses to the »military revolution« thesis of Michael Roberts, first launched in the 1950's and still serving as a catalyst of fruitful debate. In the second, he organizes the material of his book to emphasize the working assumptions of »new« military history, which has sought to place warfare within a wider political, social, economic and cultural context. Both the awareness of new writing on *Ancien Régime* warfare, and the commitment to placing war in a wider historical context are evident from the outset in the present volume. Unusually, the opening chapter considers logistics, supply systems and medical care rather than weaponry, tactics and troop formations. The implication is plain, and draws on the comment of Imperial Field Marshal Montecuccoli that the »well-being of the army is the highest priority«. Montecuccoli's remark is paradoxical: supply of food and munitions to most armies encountered organizational, financial and transportation problems which remained formidable during the eighteenth century, and ensured that most troops were badly fed and ill-protected from the elements; despite more sophisticated medical theory, the actual state of medical support in the armies remained lamentable, and deaths through epidemic disease, poor diet and inadequate care for those who fell sick still outweighed by a vast proportion those suffered through direct enemy action. Yet for all these obvious inadequacies, the quotation acknowledges the basic priorities of warfare. Fighting battles or waging sieges were subordinated to the mundane but vital concerns of maintaining supplies, moving armies, their artillery and support facilities without suffering organizational breakdown, and keeping enough men fit and effective to be able to sustain military operations through a campaign. Practicalities interest Luh, and he devotes considerable space to the employment of portable flour mills and the capacity of bread-baking ovens with the armies, drawing, as elsewhere in his book on a rich range of archival and

contemporary printed accounts to supplement and illustrate existing scholarship. His dense section on medical care, hygiene and welfare for invalid soldiers discusses levels of sickness and mortality in armies on campaign, the developments in treatment and approach to the troops' health and how far they could be introduced in practice, the dismal provisioning of military hospitals and the untrustworthiness of the staff, all of it well-illustrated by contemporary account and particular anecdote.

The second section is concerned with fortification and siege warfare, accepting the assumptions of almost all contemporaries that sieges were the determining factor in warfare, more frequent than battles and more capable of achieving lasting military/political gains. Though Maurice de Saxe and Frederick the Great provided dissenting voices, Luh notes that Frederick rapidly altered his views after the stubborn resistance of the ill-maintained Austrian fortifications in Silesia. The theoretical debates about fortification are here juxtaposed with a detailed account of the »second stage« of artillery-fortification practice, the increasing elaboration of outworks identified with Vauban and Coehoorn and their eighteenth-century successors. Luh is sympathetic to the arguments of Jeremy Black and others, that the original »military revolution« thesis misrepresents the dynamic of military change by concentrating upon the period 1560–1660. He would agree with Black that the changes in the scale of armies, their organization and weaponry in the century *following* 1660 have more claim to be regarded as »revolutionary« than those associated with the military world of Maurice of Nassau and Gustavus Adolphus. In discussing fortification and siege warfare, Luh moves this argument on to offer some ideas about the dynamic of change *within* the period 1660–1780. Fortifications developed in complexity, sophistication and expense in the second half of the seventeenth century, and the length of sieges reflected the formidable power of the defensive over even the largest besieging forces of the period of the War of the Spanish Succession. Yet by the mid-eighteenth century the average duration of sieges had dramatically shortened; developments in the effectiveness and quantity of siege artillery had made prolonged resistance less tenable, and states lacked the financial resources for yet another, even more elaborate and extensive reconstruction of their principal fortifications. As counterpoint to this account of the rise and fall of the defensive, Luh provides a detailed challenge to the view, widely held since Vauban, that the »war of sieges« was a phenomenon restricted largely to Western Europe. Detailed evidence underlines the extent to which fortification was a determining factor in warfare across Eastern Europe and down into the zones of conflict between Habsburgs, Russians and Ottomans.

Similar »military revolution« arguments about shifts in the nature of warfare inform the third major section, where the issues of weaponry and tactics are given their place. Strikingly, and against the recent orthodoxy, Luh is not convinced by the arguments for the key tactical significance of the flintlock musket and the ring-bayonet. Setting aside a battle such as Malplaquet (1709), with its huge losses incurred through musket shot (and admittedly this is a big exception), he draws on contemporary comment to argue that the flintlock continued to be inaccurate, and with a bayonet fixed to the muzzle even slower to load than its predecessor, and that the impact of closer-packed, flintlock volleys against advancing troops was, in many circumstances, still negligible. In this context of firearms that had not exponentially increased their killing-power, and a defensive weapon, the bayonet, which offered much less psychological reassurance than the traditional pike, Luh makes the case for the continuing predominance of the cavalry on the battlefield. Far from being easy victims of volleys from well-drilled infantry battalions, the capacity of cavalry to break infantry units, causing panic and heavy loss, was a major factor in the battlefield victories of the early eighteenth century. The single, great transformation of warfare, Luh argues, occurred in the middle of the eighteenth century, and was a direct consequence of the improved quality, organization and effectiveness of artillery. A huge increase in the quantity of field artillery mustered on the battlefield from the 1740's onwards, as with the quantities of siege guns

now deployed by besieging armies, transformed the character and the hazards of war. Continuous use of massed artillery throughout battles hugely increased the casualties amongst both infantry and cavalry, and heightened the proportion of those killed or permanently disabled. More than anything else this raised the stakes in fighting battles, and made the human cost of large-scale combat, especially in terms of veteran and highly-drilled professional troops, unsustainable over lengthy wars.

A final section of the book acknowledges that most recent growth-area in military studies, the cultural context of combat. Here, Luh turns his attention to the development and elaboration of uniforms, making the point that their very lack of functionality, criticized by some contemporaries, bears witness to the extent to which the armies were a manifestation of princely sovereignty and self-assertion rather than instruments for the rational pursuit of military advantage. As the control of the sovereign increased over the entire army and not simply a prestigious ›household‹ of princely units, so more elaborate and colourful uniforms became the norm, much more than had been the case when the majority of units were the property of their grandee commanders. At the same time, this apparent tightening of royal control over the army was accompanied by a high degree of deference to social status and the hierarchy of court and lineage; the »etiquette« of campaigning left a great deal of scope for the eighteenth-century noble to engage in peer-rivalry and conspicuous consumption.

A misleading propensity of many such general studies which open in the mid-seventeenth century is to take most of the examples and indeed the basic role-model from France and the French army of Louis XIV and XV. This is not the case with the present volume, and Luh draws a broad brush across west-central Europe, though with more consistent attention to the states of the Empire and to the Habsburgs than to Scandinavia and the Mediterranean territories. But the range of examples, many drawn from original archival material, is impressive and builds confidence in the judgements of the author. A series of annexes reproduce archival documents that have been central to some of the debates of the main chapters. If there is any obvious omission in a work whose concise form must have obliged the author to make numerous hard decisions about his material, it is perhaps in a more direct engagement with the life of the ordinary soldier. Not strictly related to the »Art of War«, nonetheless the structures of recruitment, the attempt to drill and retain troops, the development of barracks, problems of *nostalgie* and desertion, are as central to understanding the operational effectiveness of *Ancien Régime* armies as uniforms, hospitals and supply wagons. This is however a book which, both in its text and well-chosen and untypical illustrations, has much to offer as both an introduction to warfare in this period, and for those who have already read widely in the subject.

David PARROTT, Oxford

Thomas HÖPEL (dir.), Deutschlandbilder – Frankreichbilder 1700–1850. Rezeption und Abgrenzung zweier Kulturen, Leipzig (Leipziger Universitätsverlag) 2001, 315 p. (Veröffentlichungen des Frankreich-Zentrums, 6), ISBN 3-934565-97-2, EUR 44,00.

Le présent ouvrage, publié dans une collection dédiée aux recherches sur la France, s'inspire des travaux menés en Allemagne et en France sur les transferts culturels. La perspective générale des 16 contributions proposées reflète la multiplicité des facteurs qui ont engendré non pas *une*, mais *des* images de la France et de l'Allemagne depuis le XVIII^e siècle. L'introduction de T. HÖPEL justifie le cadre chronologique choisi par l'intensité exceptionnelle des relations culturelles entre la France et l'Allemagne entre 1700 et 1850, qui s'inscrivent dans la succession de phénomènes eux-mêmes exceptionnels: les Lumières, la Révolution française et la période napoléonienne. Les contributions partent de trois questions: quels stéréotypes sont développés, par qui et pourquoi? Quels sont les »slogans« (*Parolen*) de leur